

months of the last six Presidential terms. It doesn't say whose line it is, but if you guessed the Biden administration is the red one at the top with nearly six times the number of illegal border crossings, then you would be correct, Mr. Speaker.

The seeds of this crisis were planted on day one when 64 executive orders were signed by President Biden that undermined border security and encouraged illegal immigration. What followed has been an unprecedented surge of illegal immigration.

Instead of acknowledging this failure, we get denial. Biden administration officials wrote off the crisis as "cyclical" and "seasonal" right about here, 11 months into his term.

Biden administration officials continued to insist that the border crisis was just part of the normal "ebbs and flows" at 35 months into his Presidency.

President Biden only finally admitted that the border is "not secure" all the way up there at the top, right at the 36-month mark.

What changed, Mr. Speaker, from "ebbs and flows" to just 2 weeks later that the border is "not secure"?

Mr. Speaker, there were no laws that changed during that time, just the will to enforce them.

The Biden administration created this crisis at the border with the stroke of a pen and these 64 executive orders, and, Mr. Speaker, he can end it with the stroke of a pen.

Be that as it may, there is no leadership. Instead, Biden administration officials treat border policy like a hot potato because it is politically thankless, and it shows.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. GONZALES, for introducing this resolution that methodically and thoroughly documents the Biden administration's border failures, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Speaker, whatever complaints House Republicans may have with the Biden administration's immigration policies, this resolution will do absolutely nothing to address them.

They have had plenty of opportunities to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to reform our broken immigration system, and they have walked away time and again. Most recently, they rejected a bipartisan border deal negotiated by one of the most conservative Republicans in the Senate because Donald Trump told them to. He and they would rather preserve the issue for the upcoming election than actually work to solve problems.

So, here we are again, for the third time already this year, with a meaningless, nonbinding resolution that talks tough and accomplishes nothing. What better way to sum up this Republican Congress?

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this meaningless resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to understand that this policy is deliberate. If you voted for this administration, then this is exactly what you voted for. If you are surprised by that, then you weren't paying any attention because this is exactly what the Democrats promised to do. This is exactly what they have done, and this is exactly what they have defended for the last 3 years in this House.

The laws didn't change 3 years ago; the Presidency changed. An administration that enforced the most secure borders in our lifetimes was replaced by one that deliberately opened them to the world.

Last year, House Republicans passed legislation that will make it easier for future Presidents like Donald Trump to enforce our immigration laws and harder for Presidents like Joe Biden to undermine those laws, but that will require a new Senate and a new President.

The cold, hard truth is that this growing crisis cannot be fixed by bills that Senate Democrats won't pass and that Biden won't sign or enforce if they are signed.

This crisis can be fixed only by replacing this entire administration and their enablers and abettors in Congress with those who are devoted to securing our borders, restoring our sovereignty, defending our people, and enforcing the rule of law. That can only be done by the American people at the ballot box.

Until then, at every opportunity, we will decry and condemn these policies that are bringing such suffering and such harm upon our great Nation. Let us pray there is still time.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1137, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. 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.

□ 1315

ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2023

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal anti-discrimination laws concerning edu-

cation programs or activities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6090

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance;

(2) while such title does not cover discrimination based solely on religion, individuals who face discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics do not lose protection under such title for also being members of a group that share a common religion;

(3) discrimination against Jews may give rise to a violation of such title when the discrimination is based on race, color, or national origin, which can include discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics;

(4) it is the policy of the United States to enforce such title against prohibited forms of discrimination rooted in antisemitism as vigorously as against all other forms of discrimination prohibited by such title; and

(5) as noted in the U.S. National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism issued by the White House on May 25, 2023, it is critical to—

(A) increase awareness and understanding of antisemitism, including its threat to America;

(B) improve safety and security for Jewish communities;

(C) reverse the normalization of antisemitism and counter antisemitic discrimination; and

(D) expand communication and collaboration between communities.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Antisemitism is on the rise in the United States and is impacting Jewish students in K-12 schools, colleges, and universities.

(2) The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (referred to in this Act as the "IHRA") Working Definition of Antisemitism is a vital tool which helps individuals understand and identify the various manifestations of antisemitism.

(3) On December 11, 2019, Executive Order 13899 extended protections against discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to individuals subjected to antisemitism on college and university campuses and tasked Federal agencies to consider the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when enforcing title VI of such Act.

(4) Since 2018, the Department of Education has used the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when investigating violations of that title VI.

(5) The use of alternative definitions of antisemitism impairs enforcement efforts by adding multiple standards and may fail to identify many of the modern manifestations of antisemitism.

(6) The White House released the first-ever United States National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism on May 25, 2023, making clear

that the fight against this hate is a national, bipartisan priority that must be successfully conducted through a whole-of-government-and-society approach.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the term “definition of antisemitism”—

(1) means the definition of antisemitism adopted on May 26, 2016, by the IHRA, of which the United States is a member, which definition has been adopted by the Department of State; and

(2) includes the “[c]ontemporary examples of antisemitism” identified in the IHRA definition.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

In reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) on the basis of race, color, or national origin, based on an individual’s actual or perceived shared Jewish ancestry or Jewish ethnic characteristics, the Department of Education shall take into consideration the definition of antisemitism as part of the Department’s assessment of whether the practice was motivated by antisemitic intent.

SEC. 6. OTHER RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) GENERAL RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to expand the authority of the Secretary of Education;

(2) to alter the standards pursuant to which the Department of Education makes a determination that harassing conduct amounts to actionable discrimination; or

(3) to diminish or infringe upon the rights protected under any other provision of law that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6090.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6090 is designed to combat the deeply disturbing trend of anti-Semitic harassment in schools, colleges, and universities across the country. We are seeing it unfold right now on our television screens.

Anti-Semitic harassment on these university campuses is, unfortunately, not a completely new phenomenon. As early as 2005, the U.S. Commission on

Civil Rights warned that campus anti-Semitism had become a serious problem.

In 2013, a Pew Research Center survey of Jewish Americans found that experience with anti-Semitism was more prevalent among young adults in higher education.

In 2014, a Brandeis Center-Trinity College study found that anti-Semitism was particularly pervasive on college campuses, with 54 percent of Jewish students on 55 campuses having reported that they experienced or witnessed anti-Semitism during the 2013–2014 academic year.

In 2021, the Louis Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law conducted a survey of Jewish fraternity and sorority students, finding that most have felt unsafe at some point while on campus and in virtual campus settings. These fears are justified. The catalog of anti-Semitic harassment in America’s top institutions of higher learning is there for everybody to see. Those incidents have increased sharply following the October 7, 2023, terrorist attacks in Israel perpetrated by Hamas and its allied groups.

In late October 2023, at Cooper Union in New York, visibly Jewish students were forced to shelter inside a library as pro-Palestinian protesters tried to gain entry, banging on doors and windows, with the purpose of terrifying them.

On October 26, 2023, anti-Israel protesters assaulted multiple Jewish students at Tulane University in New Orleans.

On November 3, 2023, a Harvard law student and other anti-Israel protesters physically and verbally attacked a first-year Israeli student at the Harvard Business School while he pleaded with them to stop.

From October 7 until mid-January of 2024, the Department of Education has launched 51 investigations into complaints alleging discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry in K–12 schools and colleges and universities.

From January 16, 2024, until today, the Department has launched over 45 investigations into schools and colleges. These investigations overwhelmingly concern anti-Semitic conduct in these schools.

In fact, on April 23, 2024, the Education Department launched an investigation into Columbia University, and we all know what is happening there right now. Hundreds of anti-Israel protesters have occupied Columbia University’s west lawn and erected dozens of tents, disrupting campus life and creating a hostile environment for Columbia’s Jewish students. Hundreds of pro-Hamas students were arrested for trespassing after repeated warnings to vacate the area, only to be released and returned to Columbia.

A rabbi at Columbia’s Orthodox Union Jewish Learning Initiative has advised Jewish students to leave campus because the university has shown that it cannot keep them safe.

Columbia revoked the campus access of a Jewish professor who has been critical of school administrators because the university said it couldn’t ensure his safety.

Speaker JOHNSON, Chairwoman FOXX, and Republican members of the New York delegation went to Columbia University last week and, while addressing the campus, were greeted by anti-Israel chants of: “From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free.”

What that calls for actually is the eradication of the Jewish people. We all know that expression is abhorrent in our society and, yet, it is going on, it seems now, hourly on our college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The surge in the ancient bigotry of anti-Semitism over the years, especially since October 7, must not continue. It is long past time that Congress act to protect Jewish Americans from the scourge of anti-Semitism on campuses around our country.

The Antisemitism Awareness Act expresses the sense of Congress that discrimination against Jews may violate title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 when it is based on race, color, or national origin, which can include discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics.

The bill requires the Department of Education to take into account the 2016 International Holocaust Remembrance Act’s definition of anti-Semitism as part of its assessment of whether anti-Semitic discrimination has occurred. The IHRA definition provides a consistent framework for the Department of Education schools, colleges, and universities to apply to police anti-Semitic discrimination and harassment.

The IHRA’s definition is widely accepted and a vital tool for identifying and addressing discriminatory conduct that is motivated by anti-Semitism. It has been adopted by at least 31 States. This bill is exactly the type of legislation needed to protect Jewish Americans from harassment and attacks for simply being who they are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I devoted much of my life to combating anti-Semitism, and I am as attuned as anyone to threats and bigotry aimed at Jewish people. I will take lectures from no one about the need for vigorous efforts to fight anti-Semitism on campus or anywhere else.

I am also a deeply committed Zionist who firmly believes in Israel’s right to exist as a homeland for the Jewish people. However, as someone who is also a longtime champion of protecting freedom of speech, I must oppose this misguided bill.

While there is much in the bill I agree with, its core provision would put a thumb on the scale in favor of

one particular definition of anti-Semitism to the exclusion of all others, to be used when the Department of Education assesses claims of anti-Semitism on campus.

This definition adopted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, or IHRA, includes “contemporary examples of anti-Semitism.” The problem is that these examples may include protected speech in some contexts, particularly with respect to criticism of the State of Israel.

To be clear, I vehemently disagree with the sentiments toward Israel expressed in those examples, and too often criticism of Israel does, in fact, take the form of virulent anti-Semitism.

Many Jewish students no longer feel safe on campus, and some colleges have not done nearly enough to protect them. However, while this definition and its examples may have useful applications in certain contexts, by effectively codifying them into title VI, this bill threatens to chill constitutionally protected speech. Speech that is critical of Israel alone does not constitute unlawful discrimination. By encompassing purely political speech about Israel into title VI’s ambit, the bill sweeps too broadly.

As the ACLU notes, if this legislation were to become law, colleges and universities that want to avoid title VI investigations or the potential loss of Federal funding could end up suppressing protected speech that is criticizing Israel or supporting Palestinians.

Moreover, it could result in students and faculty self-censoring their political speech. Even the IHRA definition’s lead author, Kenneth Stern, opposes codifying the definition that he wrote, the IHRA definition, for this reason.

Vigorous enforcement of the Federal civil rights law does not depend on defining terms like “anti-Semitism” or “racism.” In fact, codifying one definition of anti-Semitism to the exclusion of all other possible definitions could actually undermine Federal civil rights law because anti-Semitism, like other forms of bigotry, evolves over time, and future conduct that comes to be widely understood as anti-Semitic may no longer meet the statutory definition.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the context in which this legislation is being rushed to the floor in a cynical attempt to exploit, for political gain, the deep divisions currently on display at college campuses across the country.

Much of this activity, whether you agree with the sentiments expressed at these protests or not, constitutes legally protected speech and expression. Some participants, shamefully, have exhibited anti-Semitic conduct, and the Department of Education will rightfully investigate them, consulting the IHRA definition and other relevant definitions in the process. They do not need this legislation to help them with their inquiries.

Some students have even crossed the line into vandalism, destruction of private property, and willful disruption of campus life. They too will face legal consequences, and nothing in this bill will affect that. There is no excuse for bigotry, threats, or violence directed at anyone, anywhere, and it is imperative that we confront the scourge of anti-Semitism. Congress can help, but this legislation is not the answer.

Instead of engaging in political theatrics that do not do anything concrete to stop anti-Semitism on campus, we need to put our money where our mouth is. Last year, the Biden administration outlined a comprehensive national strategy to counter anti-Semitism, the cornerstone of which was increasing enforcement actions by the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education.

President Biden’s budget called for a 27 percent increase in funding for that office. If my Republican colleagues are serious about fighting anti-Semitism, they would have fully funded that request. Instead, they bragged about proposing to slash funding by 25 percent, funding to enforce the laws against anti-Semitism on campus. They bragged about proposing to slash funding by 25 percent and ultimately insisted that funding be kept flat despite the marked increase in anti-Semitism complaints. If my Republican colleagues are serious about anti-Semitism, we would be considering legislation to codify the national strategy today instead of fiddling with definitions.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about anti-Semitism, they would have spoken up after neo-Nazis in Charlottesville chanted: “Jews will not replace us.”

If my Republican colleagues were serious about anti-Semitism, they would have spoken up when President Trump declared that there were “very fine people on both sides” of that rally.

Additionally, just last week, former President Trump downplayed what happened in Charlottesville, calling it a “peanut” compared to recent campus protests of the Israel-Gaza war, and we heard crickets from the Republicans.

We hear nothing from our Republican colleagues when some conservatives repeated anti-Semitic tropes about George Soros or others.

I say to my Republican friends: For too long, your selective silence on these matters has been deafening. If you mean what you say here today and if you believe that the threats and vitriol that Jewish students face on college campuses is unjust and that combatting anti-Semitism is more than a convenient talking point in your politically motivated crusade against institutions of higher education, then I beseech you: Please move beyond pointless gestures and posturing and actually help us protect Jewish students. Fully fund the administration’s efforts to counter anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination. Our Nation’s students deserve no less.

By contrast, this legislation threatens freedom of speech, one of our most cherished values, while doing nothing to combat anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge Members to oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the gentleman turn on his television and watch what is going on right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER), the author of this bill.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I respond to my colleague from New York and his misguided remarks.

In 2018, the gentleman was a cosponsor of the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, which adopted the very definition that he just objected to. As a cosponsor of H.R. 5924, the definition that would be adopted is: “Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

He was a cosponsor of that bill.

H.R. 6090, which I introduced, which has 59 cosponsors, adopts the IHRA working definition and its contemporary examples. The definition is: “Anti-Semitism is a certain perception of Jews which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of anti-Semitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.”

It is the same definition, and, yet, now, somehow he is opposed to it.

Fundamentally, some of my colleagues on the left are allowing electoral politics to get in the way of doing what is right.

□ 1330

The gentleman from New York is a graduate of Columbia University, and yet couldn’t muster the courage to take the subway north to stop by and call out the anti-Semitism that is running rampant at Columbia University. It is exactly why this bill is necessary today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, and I thank my colleague, Congressman JOSH GOTTHEIMER from New Jersey, for his courage in leading on this issue.

In every generation, the Jewish people have been scapegoated, harassed, evicted from their homeland, and murdered. Many of us remember the Holocaust as the most recent large-scale instance of this, but it was hardly the first in the Jewish people’s long history of persecution.

Prior to October 7, it may have seemed like we were making progress

in fighting anti-Semitism, especially in the United States. A prime example: Jewish students weren't afraid to attend classes on their college campuses.

And yet today, we hear calls for *intifada* ring out on school grounds. We see Jewish students being physically prevented from going to class, rioters chanting "death to Israel" and "death to America," and so much more.

In the U.S., Jews account for only 2.4 percent of the population, and globally they make up 0.2 percent of the world's population. The Jewish people need our support now. They need action now. They need to know they have a place in our country now.

They cannot fight anti-Semitism alone, and they shouldn't have to either.

The Antisemitism Awareness Act requires the Department of Education to use the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism and its contemporary examples when enforcing title VI violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Codifying a single definition of anti-Semitism will help the Department of Education and school administrators, who have been feckless, clearly identify instances of anti-Semitism and protect the safety of all students, including Jewish students.

Now, some opponents may try to make the argument that this imposes restrictions on our constitutional right to free speech. It is not true.

First of all, a constitutional protection is in the bill. It clearly states: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Additionally, speech is already protected under the Civil Rights Act, but when the speech turns into harassment or other prohibited action and the action is motivated by anti-Semitism, that is when it becomes illegal conduct.

Right now, without a clear definition of anti-Semitism, the Department of Education and college administrators are having trouble discerning whether conduct is anti-Semitic or not, whether the activity we are seeing crosses the line to anti-Semitic harassment.

Other opponents to the bill say they would rather see a different bill tackling this.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. That is no reason, and no "political cover" to vote against another helpful measure.

I ask my colleagues who would prefer other solutions to consider the good it will do for the Jewish students and, yes, keep pushing for more change in the future. We need to hold these institutions accountable.

My bill has bipartisan support: 59 cosponsors, dozens of Jewish advocacy groups, including the ADL, the AJC,

and Agudath Israel. It is absurd to oppose this on the grounds that it somehow limits free speech.

Calling for death to Jews is not protected speech. It is anti-Semitic, and the fact that we have some of the highest-ranking Jewish officials in America refusing to defend the Jewish community because of politics is a disgrace, it is shameful, and it is pathetic.

Anyone who votes against this bill because they would rather put political expediency and electoral politics ahead of anything else has no business being a Member of Congress.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, never again is now, and we must act. That is our responsibility.

I would remind everyone, when you cosponsor a bill that accomplishes the same thing, nothing has changed, and yet now we need to backtrack all because of politics.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's remarks are slanderous.

First of all, the bill that I cosponsored 2 years ago was a different bill. It did not exclude—let me read from this bill: "The use of alternative definitions of anti-Semitism impairs enforcement efforts by adding multiple standards and may fail to identify many of the modern manifestations of anti-Semitism."

That is nonsense, and it was not in the bill that was, I think, about 7 or 8 years ago. The two bills are different.

Second, I oppose this bill because it infringes on freedom of speech, and there are Jewish groups, such as Reconstructionist Judaism, J Street and T'ruah that oppose this bill for the same reason, and they are not anti-Semitic. There are Jewish groups that support the bill. There are Jewish groups that oppose the bill.

I have been a supporter of Israel and of Zionism, and an opponent of anti-Semitism all my life. I have been active in Zionist organizations ever since I was in high school, and to say that anyone who votes against this bill is supporting anti-Semitism is a disgrace.

There are differences of opinion that occur on this floor from time to time, honest differences. Someone who opposes this bill may think that it infringes on freedom of speech. Someone who opposes this bill may note that the author of the IHRA definition that this would enshrine in law said don't codify it. The author, Kenneth Stern, said this is a good working definition that may indicate anti-Semitism. So are the other two, but it should not be codified into law because that could make, depending on the circumstances, free speech illegal. The author of the IHRA definition said that.

There may be legitimate differences of opinion between those who support

this bill and those who oppose this bill, but to say that anyone who opposes this bill supports anti-Semitism is a disgraceful slander.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

We all know that since Hamas' brutal and barbaric attack on Israel on October 7, 2023, we have seen an absolute explosion of anti-Semitic attacks and violence now, especially on our college and university campuses.

There is no doubt that the free exchange of ideas is a crucial pillar of our freedom, but there is also no doubt that the conversations must be grounded in truth and respect for one another.

Leadership at institutions of higher learning across our Nation have allowed these anti-Israel protests and anti-Semitic protests to descend into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, they have failed to support Jewish students. Such hatred has no place in our society.

Mr. Speaker, by clearly defining anti-Semitism, the Antisemitism Awareness Act will help the Department of Education better enforce Federal anti-discrimination laws.

This bill will, for the first time, codify protection for Jewish students who are and have been subject to anti-Semitic harassment, intimidation, and violence. It is imperative that all students feel safe on their campuses.

As such, I urge this body to pass this critical legislation and do what university leaders will not do and that is condemn these acts of hatred and support Jewish students across the country.

I am proud to join my colleague, Mr. LAWLER, in supporting this legislation, and I look forward to voting for it today.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, to ensure that we are standing up to the Jew hatred that is spreading like wildfire on campuses across our country. I am proud to lead this legislation with my friend and fellow Problem Solvers Caucus member, Congressman MIKE LAWLER from New York.

As we are voting today in real time, our country's universities are experiencing a tidal wave of anti-Semitism. Protesters have targeted Jewish students, haranguing them with awful Jew-hating insults and cheering on Hamas, a barbaric, foreign terrorist organization that murdered Americans on October 7 and still hold five living Americans hostage, including my constituent, Edan Alexander. I met with hostage families just this morning.

I saw these protests up close, like many Americans did, at Columbia earlier this month. I have heard the sickening Jew-hating, anti-Semitic comments comparing Zionists to Nazis, promising a redux of October 7 a thousand times over, and calling for “resistance by any means necessary” and intifada revolution. Intifada is used to call for a violent uprising against Israel and Jewish people.

These protests embolden Hamas, America’s enemy and Iranian-backed terrorist. In fact, they have put out a statement lauding professors as the leaders of the future. That is what our enemies said about the pro-Hamas protesters at these universities.

Let me clear up any confusion since I am a huge champion myself of free speech. This bill protects the First Amendment. It allows criticism of Israel. I ensured that. It was critical to me. It doesn’t allow calls for the destruction or elimination of the Jewish state, but it certainly allows criticism of Israel.

Even more, it reminds us that our universities have a title VI obligation to stamp out harassment on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand idly by as protesters call for the death of Jews on college campuses and across the country. This bill will require the Department of Education to use the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance or IHRA definition of anti-Semitism when carrying out title VI investigations.

IHRA’s anti-Semitism definition is the most widely recognized in the world. It is used by 36 countries. It condemns traditional hatred and the ugly, modern anti-Semitism that we are seeing on college campuses.

There shouldn’t be anything controversial about this bill. As was mentioned when it was first introduced in 2018, 50 Democrats and Republicans co-sponsored this legislation, including Members who are still in this body.

Right now, the Department of Education has 137 active title VI investigations, some of which have been open for years.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, the bill will give investigators a clear framework to evaluate anti-Semitism and finally hold harassers accountable.

Don’t just take my word for it. Thirty of our Nation’s leading Jewish groups back this bill. Under the last three administrations, the State Department has used the IHRA definition to monitor anti-Semitism worldwide. This bill takes a commonsense step to formalize the IHRA definition for our education systems. Again, three administrations accepted this definition of anti-Semitism.

When I was at Columbia University last week, I told the administrators

that we need deeds, not words to protect Jewish students.

Mr. Speaker, I am making the same ask of my colleagues. This bill is a critical step we can take to stand against hate. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in supporting this legislation and stand strong against anti-Semitism with no excuses, no claims of commas that they don’t like. Standing strong today against hate and anti-Semitism is what our country should stand for.

□ 1345

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I would never question those who oppose this legislation’s beliefs, their ideology, their religious faith. I do, however, question the motive.

We are in a moment of choosing, and there are not two legitimate sides to this issue. The erection of encampments on college campuses isn’t an expression of speech, it is a direct threat to Jewish students on college campuses.

Those who spew hate and ignorance and anti-Semitism in multiple horrid forms aren’t simply expressing a constitutional right; it is an infringement on the rights of Jewish students. Those who conduct themselves in this way are wrong.

They harass Jewish students who are innocently attempting simply to study. I know it and I have seen it firsthand, as I have visited students at Cornell and Binghamton in upstate New York. These students who think that they are simply extending their freedom of speech aren’t understanding the hate, ignorance, and violence that is emboldened by it. They are wrong to feel entitled that they can simply occupy buildings and public spaces and damage public property. They are wrong.

Congress should not only establish a firm commitment to the basic definition of anti-Semitism, but it ought to speak with clarity that this is wrong. Perhaps if we had said that decades ago, we wouldn’t see the escalation that we are seeing today.

Perhaps if college presidents simply accepted responsibility for the safety and security of their Jewish students, we wouldn’t see the violence we have today, we wouldn’t need law enforcement on college campuses to protect students. My God, we don’t and should never need that kind of enforcement to protect the rights of innocent students: not in tents, not occupying buildings, not threatening hate, violence, or ignorance. We shouldn’t need that kind of enforcement to ensure Jewish students can simply be Jewish students.

For that reason, I not only support the bill, I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Speak with clarity.

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

Mr. Speaker, every bit of conduct that Mr. MOLINARO described is loath-

some, as he says, but that does not mean that we ought to pass a bill that threatens freedom of speech.

This bill will do nothing to help stamp out anti-Semitism on campuses or anywhere else, but it will threaten free speech for the reasons I stated before.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman, and I also found the remarks that were directed at you to be reprehensible. I know you and I know your commitment to fair play and the First Amendment.

However, I have questions about this bill, and that is why I am here to listen to the debate. I don’t know if Mr. LAWLER wishes to respond, but there is another bill, Representative MANNING and Representative SMITH’s bill. It is bipartisan. It has, I think, 15 Members of each party on it. I have been trying to get on it, but they are doing this crazy balancing act that eliminates certain people.

I yield to Mr. LAWLER to ask if he would support H.R. 7921 and work with Mr. SMITH to get that brought to the floor.

Mr. LAWLER. Sure. I think any legislation that we can bring forward to combat anti-Semitism is critical, and I think Ms. MANNING and Mr. SMITH have done a great job working to bring a piece of legislation forward. I have introduced a number. This is but one of them.

I think the objective is to clearly define anti-Semitism and force accountability on these administrators and make sure the Department of Education has the teeth to enforce the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his support for that, I think it is very important. I think it is a more inclusive bill, a broader bill. It takes in not just the problems at the universities but also takes on problems in the communities at large.

There has been anti-Semitism for over 2,000 years. The Jews have a homeland. Before they had a homeland, they didn’t have that sense of security anywhere where they were. It has been threatened so many times and so many places over the years, and it should not be taken from them.

I was concerned, and Mr. NADLER made the point, that in 2017 in Charlottesville there were national socialist movements, Vanguard America groups, traditional workers parties, Klan members, all kind of rightwing anti-Semitic crowds, racist skinheads that were in Charlottesville. They marched around saying: “Jews will not replace us.”

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. President Trump said there are good people on both sides.

Well, there are good people on both sides in Columbia, but there were not good people on both sides in Charlottesville.

That anti-Semitism needs to be addressed and has not been addressed by my friends on the other side, although Mr. SMITH has addressed it and there are others, so I don't want to paint a broad brush. There have been so many instances in history that have come not from these Palestinian supporters, but from skinheads, Neo-Nazis, and Klansmen, and that needs to be addressed. I think Mr. SMITH's and Ms. MANNING's bill addresses it. I hope that comes to the floor and we do a comprehensive attack on anti-Semitism.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I first thank Mr. LAWLER for his very, very passionate and articulate defense of our Jewish brethren. It was very, very moving, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago, my first human rights trip as a Congressman was to the Soviet Union to defend Jews against pernicious anti-Semitism. I never thought, however, that the anti-Semitic hate that I saw in Moscow and Leningrad could ever happen here, but it has. It is happening, and it is escalating.

The bigotry, intolerance, prejudice, and unbridled hatred for Jews and the Nation of Israel exploding on American college campuses today is absolutely disgraceful. It is morally impermissible and illegal that Jewish students are the targets of anti-Semitic hate and violence.

In both word and deed, Hamas is a terrorist organization that commits mass murder of Jews and seeks the evisceration of Israel. Don't believe it? Remember the horrific violence of October 7 and the ongoing ordeal of the hostages, or just read the Hamas Charter of 1988, the blueprint for genocide against Jews, a modern-day Nazi-like final solution.

As co-chair of the House Bipartisan Task Force for Combating Anti-Semitism, I thank my good friends and colleagues, MIKE LAWLER and JOSH GOTTHEIMER, for authoring the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act.

This important legislation will codify the IHRA working definition of anti-Semitism into title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the landmark anti-discrimination law. Schools that receive Federal funds must comply with title VI, and this bill will clarify that the Hamas hatred infecting our campuses must be dealt with as anti-Semitic discrimination that violates civil rights.

Special thanks, Mr. Speaker, to the police, who at great risk to their own personal safety are trying to mitigate the threats to Jewish students.

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

Again, anti-Semitism is a terrible thing. Hamas is a genocidal organiza-

tion which wants to kill all Jews, not just the State of Israel. There is no question about that. There is no question we have to fight anti-Semitism. There is no question the Manning bill is a good step in that direction. There is no question we ought to give the Office for Civil Rights the 25 percent increase the President has requested to enforce title VI on college campuses where there has been no question there has been vile anti-Semitism.

That, however, does not mean we should pass this bill. This bill enshrines the IHRA definition, and I would remind you that the IHRA definition's chief author, Kenneth Stern said: Don't codify it in law because if codified into law, it would be destructive of free speech. The author of the IHRA definition said that.

The bill also specifically excludes the Jerusalem and Nexus definitions. There is no good reason for that. All three definitions give examples of things that may be seen as anti-Semitism, that may indicate anti-Semitism. None of them should be codified into law, as this bill would do for one of them.

I don't know why one and not the other two, but this bill would enshrine one of them into law against the will of its own author, who said this is my best definition, but don't enshrine it into law, or, rather, don't codify it into law because if it is made law, it could infringe free expression, and that is why not only the ACLU, but J Street, T'ruah, the Reconstructionist Jewish Movement, and a dozen other Jewish groups oppose this law, not because they support anti-Semitism—they obviously don't—but because they both oppose anti-Semitism and support freedom of speech, and those of us who oppose anti-Semitism and support freedom of speech ought to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee of the House.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, America's colleges and universities are experiencing an explosion in anti-Semitism, including explicit support for terrorism. That these taxpayer-funded institutions have become forums for promoting terrorism is unacceptable.

Campus life has become a daily trial of intimidation and harassment for America's Jewish students. Two months ago, nine brave Jewish students described for the Education Committee how their schools have become hostile environments that include death threats and physical attacks.

At numerous schools, unlawful encampments now disrupt learning and endanger students. At Columbia, a campus rabbi warned Jewish students to leave campus. A Jewish Yale student was stabbed in the eye. The Anti-Semitism Awareness Act would provide a needed tool to help better determine anti-Semitic intent, which in turn would help ensure the safety of Jewish students.

I commend Representative LAWLER for this bipartisan, bicameral bill, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Calls for the destruction of Israel, our dearest and closest ally, are wrong. Attacks on Jewish students on college campuses are wrong, as well. I thank Representative LAWLER and Representative GOTTHEIMER for this fine piece of legislation, and I thank the chairman of the Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The only way you stop this is to take action, and the Judiciary Committee started that yesterday. We sent a letter both to Secretary Blinken and Secretary Mayorkas asking three simple questions: Are the students, are the people engaged in this activity, this wrong activity, this radical activity on campuses against Jewish students, are they here on a visa? If they are, is the State Department taking actions to revoke that visa? If the State Department is taking those actions, is the Department of Homeland Security looking to remove these individuals?

Pretty basic questions, pretty important questions I think the Congress has the right to know about and the American people have a right to know about if we are ever going to stop the egregious activity going on. In order to stop it, you have to take action.

We are a legislative body. We have a piece of legislation that begins that process. Let's pass this legislation, and then let's do the oversight to get the answers to those questions so the bad guys doing this stuff on college campuses can't do it on a visa.

Remember, at Columbia, 55 percent of the student body is here on a visa.

Maybe the American people have a right to know the answers to those three questions. We posed them yesterday to Secretary Mayorkas and Secretary Blinken. Let's hope we get an answer soon. Let's hope the Biden administration steps up and starts taking action to stop what is going on.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

The pro-Hamas protests we are seeing now play out on TV that are taking place on college campuses are living proof of what happens when we tolerate hate and ignorance.

I recently spoke with the aunt of a 4-year-old girl who saw her parents and siblings murdered on October 7 by Hamas, and she was held hostage for 51 days, a 4-year-old held hostage after

seeing her parents killed in front of her.

That is the behavior that anti-Semitic college students are tolerating? It is disgusting, and it is criminal. They are learning it from those at the very top. We had a hearing not too long ago where college presidents refused to state that calling for the genocide of Jews was against their code of conduct.

Jewish students should feel safe on campus and deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. All students do. The Department of Education needs to use every tool at its disposal to provide Jewish students with a safe environment to learn.

Our laws should clearly reflect that discrimination includes the indisputable anti-Semitic rhetoric calling for violence against Jews. There are far too many inexcusable examples from this year alone, and this must stop. It cannot go on.

□ 1400

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the events unfolding at our country's colleges and universities are devastating. For years, we have taught Americans and committed ourselves to "never again." Yet, we are watching the rot of anti-Semitism stain our American colleges and universities. We must reject the spoil of anti-Semitism and adopt a clear definition of what anti-Semitism is to better position college administrators and officials to respond to the terror these so-called protesters are bringing to Jewish students.

Many of these are not pro-Palestinian protests. They are ill-informed mobs who believe that Hamas, a terrorist organization, is somehow good for the people of Gaza. That couldn't be further from the truth. Hamas continues to use innocent lives as human shields and intentionally positions civilians in the middle of combat zones while using their tunnels to protect their own military leaders and fighters.

Is this what our Nation's students want to support?

To my colleagues across the aisle who have chosen to praise these anti-Semitism protests, is that what you stand for?

School administrators cannot straddle both sides of the fence here. We would not tolerate this sort of behavior toward any other group of students, and we must not start when the target is again on America's Jewish students.

All students deserve a safe learning environment, and by adopting this definition of anti-Semitism, our college campuses are more empowered to uphold and protect safe environments for Jewish students.

Congress must be clear. America stands with Israel, and we stand with Jewish students across every college campus in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand with Jewish students and vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support meaningful action to combat anti-Semitism. Unfortunately, that is not the legislation before us. We risk threatening freedom of speech while providing no new tools that the Department of Education does not already have to investigate claims of anti-Semitism.

The White House has developed a strong blueprint for countering anti-Semitism, and there is already legislation to implement these policies. We should be working together to pass that legislation and to provide our civil rights enforcement agencies with the resources they need to address anti-Semitism wherever it occurs.

This legislation is a distraction from the important work ahead of us to protect our students and all those who face discrimination. Not only is it a distraction, but it also threatens freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, you cannot fight anti-Semitism if you cannot define it. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance offers us a clear and widely accepted definition rooted in the tragedy of the ages. After that horrific crime against humanity, the civilized nations of the world took a sacred oath: Never again.

To support that oath, these united nations restored the Jewish state to its historic homelands. That state is now under attack at home and abroad, and with this act, America stands with our Jewish brethren at home and abroad.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 6090—Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2023.

In light of recent events across the globe and here in the United States, where anti-Semitic attacks and hate crimes have risen, this bipartisan bill is an attempt to codify the definition of "antisemitism"

Specifically, this bill would require the Department of Education to take the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism into account when determining if an action or practice that violates Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was motivated by antisemitic intent.

The IHRA defines antisemitism as the following:

"Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

In its list of examples of anti-Semitic conduct, the IHRA includes "[d]enying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor," and "[d]rawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis."

While there is both support and opposition for this bill it is important to highlight the issues and concerns.

Namely, there is a concern that this bill will undermine free speech by codifying a singular definition of antisemitism.

Notably, however, the bill language provides a provision to explicitly protect against infringement of the First Amendment.

Additionally, while the Department of Education already utilizes this definition of "antisemitism" in its enforcement of Title VI civil rights claims, there is a concern that forcing the Department of Education to "consider" a particular definition of antisemitism does nothing to protect houses of worship, check antisemitic threats, or otherwise keep students safe on campus.

Rather, improving civil rights enforcement should be the real key to fighting antisemitism.

In May 2023, the Biden Administration created a "U.S. National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism," a cornerstone of which is increasing enforcement actions by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR).

Since the October 7 attacks on Israel, OCR has seen a dramatic rise in discrimination claims.

President Biden's budget called for a 27 percent increase in funding to OCR, but funding remained level for FY 2024.

Last year, House Republicans pushed to cut funds for federal civil rights enforcement on college campuses by 25 percent.

Ultimately, however, House Republicans refused to increase OCR's funding.

Instead, they have fought adequately funding OCR to meet the surge in anti-Semitism complaints because, in the political hierarchy governing their culture war priorities, undermining LGBTQ civil rights is more important than protecting Jewish students from discrimination.

I think we can all agree that the recent rise in antisemitism in the U.S. is a real problem, yet sadly House Republicans mostly ignored it.

Thus, it is important to highlight that any support for this bill should also include corresponding support for the agency tasked with investigating claims of harassment and hate.

Supporting such a measure while stripping away the tools to effectively carry out its duties is short-sided.

In particularly, as we celebrate Jewish American Heritage Month this May, I must reiterate my condemnation to the rise of antisemitism—and call on my fellow elected officials,

faith leaders, and civil society leaders to continue to condemn and combat antisemitism, and to identify and educate others on the contributions of the Jewish American community.

And so, as we celebrate the Jewish American community's contributions this month, we too must honor their resilience in the face of a long and painful history of persecution.

Indeed, as stated by President Biden in his Proclamation on Jewish American Heritage Month, 2024—we must all “remember that the power lies within each of us to rise together against hate, to see each other as fellow human beings, and to ensure that the Jewish community is afforded the safety, security, and dignity they deserve as they continue to shine their light in America and around the world.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my intended vote on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

This bill would require the Department of Education to utilize the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism when interpreting whether an action or practice violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

To be clear: I condemn antisemitism in all its forms and stand with the Jewish community as they mourn the losses sustained in the October 7 terrorist attack by Hamas and the subsequent increase in antisemitic incidents in the U.S. and around the world.

But requiring the Department of Education to use the IHRA definition would stifle free speech and curtail legitimate criticisms of the Israeli government's actions.

I concur with J Street, which noted: “On its own, the IHRA Working Definition, coupled with its contemporary examples, is broad and can label legitimate political speech and critique of Israel as inherently antisemitic. We are concerned that this concerted campaign to require the use of the IHRA definition and its examples by law and regulation creates significant opportunities for abuse and politicization, including by future MAGA-aligned administrations.”

This bill violates First Amendment rights to share and debate ideas and express peaceful dissent. It is too broad and could lead to colleges and universities banning student groups that aim to provide safe refuge, community, and space to discuss issues that are important to them based on the opinion or statement of one student.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, while I was unable to attend today's vote series, had I been able to attend, I would have proudly voted yes on H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, which I am a cosponsor of. This legislation is an important step to protecting the American Jewish community, particularly in light of the alarming rise in antisemitic incidents across the country. The State Department has used the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) Definition since 2010, while the Department of Education has considered the IHRA definition of antisemitism since 2019 when reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This legislation would make the IHRA definition the official policy of federal agencies, and I urge Congress to swiftly pass it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6090 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1042. An act to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2116. An act to require the Secretary of Commerce to produce a report that provides recommendations to improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of Department of Commerce programs related to supply chain resilience and manufacturing and industrial innovation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, and in consultation with the Chairs of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, announces the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission:

The Honorable Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2023 and expiring December 31, 2025.

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2925

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

“(1) CLAIMANT RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF OPERATIONS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘operations’ means—

“(i) with respect to a locatable mineral, any activity or work carried out in connection with—

“(I) prospecting;

“(II) exploration;

“(III) discovery and assessment;

“(IV) development;

“(V) extraction; or

“(VI) processing;

“(ii) the reclamation of an area disturbed by an activity described in clause (i); and

“(iii) any activity reasonably incident to an activity described in clause (i) or (ii), regardless of whether that incidental activity is carried out on a mining claim, including the construction and maintenance of any road, transmission line, pipeline, or any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for a support facility.

“(B) RIGHTS TO USE, OCCUPATION, AND OPERATIONS.—A claimant shall have the right to use and occupy to conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

“(i) the claimant makes a timely payment of—

“(I) the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

“(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver of the claim maintenance fee under subsection (d)—

“(I) the claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claimant complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

“(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy any requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for the payment of fair market value to the United States for the use of public land and resources pursuant to the general mining laws.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) diminishes any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant;

“(B) creates or increases any right (including a right of exploration, entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant on lands that are not open to location under the general mining laws;

“(C) modifies any provision of law or any prior administrative action withdrawing lands from location or entry;

“(D) limits the right of the Federal Government to regulate mining and mining-related activities (including requiring claim validity examinations to establish the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit) in areas withdrawn from mining (including under—

“(i) the general mining laws;

“(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

“(iii) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

“(iv) sections 100731 through 100737 of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Mining in the Parks Act’);

“(v) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

“(vi) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’); or

“(E) restores any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy, or right to conduct operations) of a claimant that existed prior to the date that the lands were closed to or withdrawn