

I implore Speaker JOHNSON to save the Affordable Connectivity Program. Let's bring it to the floor for a vote for an extension. We can get this done.

□ 1015

SANTA FE SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, Saturday marked the 6-year anniversary of the shooting at Santa Fe High School where 10 innocent lives were lost at the hands of evil. We will never forget that tragic day that forever changed Santa Fe, Texas.

As a community, we have witnessed the resilience of Santa Fe. The community's strength, their courage, and unity have been inspiring. We honor the victims by remembering their lives each and every day.

Thank you for the bravery of the first responders and everyday heroes who showed remarkable courage on that day and in the days that followed.

Madam Speaker, 6 years have passed, and not a day goes by that I don't think about each life that was taken on May 10, 2018. That day will be ingrained in my memory and our community until the end of time.

Let us continue to work together to ensure that such a tragedy never happens again.

TAX WAIVER

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

Mr. DELUZIO. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the large majority of us came together to pass the Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act.

The bill includes a provision to exempt from Federal taxes payments for residents like my constituents who were impacted by the East Palestine train derailment and who received payments from Norfolk Southern Railroad.

This is something I have been pushing for along with many others.

The East Palestine derailment was a disaster for a lot of families in Beaver County, which is just over the State line from our neighbors in Ohio.

It is ridiculous to me that folks who were hurt by this toxic train derailment in their backyard or their farm have to pay taxes on Norfolk Southern's payments to them.

Let's remember: It was the railroad's negligence and incompetence that caused this whole mess in the first place.

I was glad on Tuesday night that we passed a bill to help folks who were hurt.

If the Senate follows suit, as they should, these payments will be exempted from Federal taxes, as they should be.

Let's keep going to hold big railroads accountable and make freight rails safer. Madam Speaker, we can do that by passing my bill, the Railway Safety Act.

CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

Our AANHPI community is a diverse diaspora, but too often we are lumped together as one monolithic, model minority group, often forced to choose identity between Asian, Pacific Islander, or for me at the very worst, other.

We are so much more than "other." We are the fastest growing population in the country. We are made up of 70 ethnic groups. We speak over 100 different languages and dialects. We are the descendants of people, cultures, and traditions that are centuries older than this country we now call home, and we deserve to be seen, to be heard, to be recognized for who we are, where we come from, and what we stand for.

We are so much more than "other." During this month and every month, I challenge my colleagues to join us in uplifting the achievements, the voices, and the struggles facing our AANHPI community and commit to working toward a future where we are all truly seen, engaged, and represented.

LIFT THE HOLD

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues, Congresswoman SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Senator TIM KAINE, and many other Members of both Chambers who are urging House Foreign Affairs Committee Chair MICHAEL McCAUL and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Ranking Member JAMES RISCH to lift the hold on the State Department's request for \$94 million for the multinational security support mission in Haiti.

Congressional Republicans' refusal to support this mission is a serious obstacle to restoring peace, security, and democratic governance in Haiti. As Kenyan President William Ruto visits Washington this week, it is crucial that we find a path forward on these funds. Establishing the MSS is vital to advancing U.S. national security interests, demonstrating American leadership in the Caribbean, and providing a lifeline to the Haitian people.

We must act decisively and together. Haiti has a fighting chance to mitigate

the chaos plunging and plaguing its communities if we support the MSS mission now.

INTENT TO DESIGNATE KENYA AS A MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-144)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2321k), I am providing notice of my intent to designate Kenya as a Major Non-NATO Ally.

I am making this designation in recognition of Kenya's many years of contributions to the United States Africa Command area of responsibility and globally and in recognition of our own national interest in deepening bilateral defense and security cooperation with the Government of Kenya. Kenya is one of the United States Government's top counterterrorism and security partners in sub-Saharan Africa, and the designation will demonstrate that the United States sees African contributions to global peace and security as equivalent to those of our Major Non-NATO Allies in other regions. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2024.

PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1243, I call up the bill (H.R. 192) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 1243, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 192

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITING VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.

An individual who is not a citizen of the United States may not vote in an election for public office in the District of Columbia or in any ballot initiative or referendum in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.

The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-242) is repealed, and

any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

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

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 192, an act to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital.

In reporting out H.R. 192, the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability holds that Congress must act to exert its constitutional responsibility to oversee the District of Columbia and make certain necessary amendments to the District's law.

Since the voters entrusted Republicans with control of the House in the 118th Congress, the Oversight Committee has conducted long overdue oversight of our Nation's Capital City, including holding hearings on the District of Columbia.

Specifically, to the topic we are discussing today, the Oversight Committee held a joint hearing with the Committee on House Administration on election integrity in the District.

At that hearing, the committees examined the District government's Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, which allowed noncitizen residents to vote in D.C. local elections.

This act includes illegal immigrants and even foreign diplomats, whose interests may be opposed to the interests of Americans. This radical change to our election laws upset lawmakers on both sides of the aisle, Madam Speaker.

D.C. Mayor Bowser withheld her signature on the Act, something she had done only a handful of times in her tenure.

On February 9, 2023, 260 Members of this House voted to overturn the D.C. act through a resolution of disapproval.

In that vote, 42 House Democrats voted to block the D.C. law.

However, the bipartisan resolution of disapproval was not considered in the

Democratic-controlled Senate, so D.C.'s noncitizen voting law went into effect. This, in my opinion, and the opinion of many Americans across the country, is unacceptable.

The primary factor that differentiates American citizens from noncitizens is the right to vote.

D.C. residents should be confident that their local government vote is not being diluted by noncitizen residents or illegal immigrants casting votes.

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital, and the rules of the U.S. House charge the Committee on Oversight and Accountability with a duty to oversee the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative PFLUGER's commonsense bill to ensure that only United States citizens have the right to vote in local D.C. elections and to support the repeal of D.C.'s radical law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today to oppose H.R. 192, yet another attack on home rule in the District of Columbia. I wish we were here today talking about climate change, which is a dagger at the throat of humanity.

We have seen record drought in the Midwest, record forest fires in the West, record flooding in the East, hurricanes of record velocity in the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana's beloved Gulf Coast. There were mosquitoes in the north pole last summer. The sea levels are rising everywhere.

However, we are not here to talk about that emergency.

I do have a book for my friend, Mr. HIGGINS, called "Bayou Farewell" written by one of my constituents about what has been taking place on the Louisiana coast that I am going to offer to him today.

We are not talking about climate change, and we are not talking about gun violence, despite the fact that America now has rates of gun violence and gun-related mortality 20 times higher than the nations of the European Union. Gun violence is now the leading cause of death among children and young people under 18 in America. It is out of control.

However, we are not talking about that.

We are exercising our constitutional authority, as my distinguished colleague from Louisiana says, to oversee the District of Columbia. Here today what has caught our eye is that they have legislation which passed and has become law in the District of Columbia which allows permanent residents and other noncitizens to register to vote.

As a result, they have nearly a half million registered voters in the District of Columbia. Madam Speaker, 512 of them are noncitizens. A little bit more than one-tenth of 1 percent of registered voters are noncitizens.

Their primary election in 2024 has already begun. The D.C. voters received their ballots or began receiving ballots in the mail on April 29, and the District has already begun accepting ballots.

The D.C. Council had transmitted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 to Congress for the required review period on January 10, 2023.

The House passed a disapproval resolution, as my friend mentioned, on February 9, 2023. The Senate did not pass the disapproval resolution.

The act became law in March of 2023.

What we are talking about now is passing legislation to overturn a practice that is literally taking place as we speak within the District of Columbia.

Now the critical point everybody needs to understand is that the District of Columbia has no voting representation in the House of Representatives, nor does the District of Columbia have any voting representation in the United States Senate. Their legislation doesn't apply even to their non-voting delegate in the House, nor does it apply, of course, to Presidential elections.

What we are talking about is should these 500 or so people in the District of Columbia be allowed to vote for advisory neighborhood commission, school board, and members of the D.C. Council and mayoral elections.

□ 1030

The practice of noncitizen voting, my friend may be interested to learn, is one that actually was adopted in the vast majority of American States at different points in American history, including, I checked, in Louisiana, where it existed for around a decade.

It started, as far as I could tell, with this basic premise, that when the country began, there was a race qualification, a gender qualification, and property, wealth, and religion qualifications in different places, but the basic logic of it was that if you are a White male property owner, it doesn't make any difference what your citizenship status is. That lasted really up until the Civil War.

The practice of alien suffrage at the local level was one that became hotly contested before the Civil War. The Southern States opposed it because they said that the immigrants who were coming in who were being given the right to vote were antislavery, abolitionists. The Northern States, specifically the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln, defended the practice of noncitizen voting. This was a major bone of contention geographically, sectionally, in the country with legislation like the Kansas-Nebraska Act and other statehood admission struggles.

When the South seceded from the Union and wrote their own constitution, the very first article of the Confederate Constitution banned the practice, which we are discussing in a very modified form today. They banned anybody from voting in the Confederacy

who was not a citizen of the Confederacy. When the Union won the war, and secession was put down, alien suffrage spread across the country.

Again, the Republican Party championed it, and they championed it in the form of something called declarant alien suffrage, which is, for people who were permanent residents of the country who were on the pathway to citizenship, they were given the right to vote, especially in a lot of the Western States, as those States tried to attract population westward.

The practice appears to have been diminished and eliminated in a lot of places around the turn of 20th century and before World War I. It survives today in the form that the District of Columbia has fastened onto it for local voting on the theory that you want people at the local level to be involved in their kids' schools and you want people to be engaged in local government.

We ban noncitizen voting at the Federal level, which means we also ban it at the State level because they are linked constitutionally in Article I. So, what we are talking about is noncitizen voting chosen by a local government at the local level simply for municipal elections.

The basic logic of it there, as I understand it from just trying to read up on what the people in D.C. did, was that they saw that while noncitizens from Canada or Mexico, for example, shouldn't be able to vote in national elections because the interests of the United States and Canada and Mexico may diverge, at the local level, everybody presumably has the same basic interests in efficient garbage collection, excellent public schools, and so on.

That is why they have done it. It affects a relative handful of people. I am not quite certain why we would be engaging in legislative action to overturn it, except for the purposes of sending some kind of message about it.

The gentleman also mentioned diplomatic personnel and undocumented people. As for the diplomatic personnel, a foreign passport may not be used to register to vote in the District of Columbia. The person has to have a residential address in the District of Columbia, and it cannot be an embassy or another diplomatic site because you can't register at your place of work. I don't know whether the gentleman has actually any evidence of this happening. I think, if there were, that would be something we would be interested in.

The same thing with undocumented people. It would, of course, be crazy for an undocumented person to attach their name to a public and transparent document like a voter registration document. I don't know if they have any evidence that this has happened, but we were not able to find any evidence that there were any undocumented people doing so.

In other words, the District's use of this practice for local elections and

local government functions appears to be in accord with the way it has always been used, which is for permanent residents who are part of the community who are on the pathway to citizenship.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, my friend and colleague has mentioned in his opening statement that 500 noncitizens are registered to vote in D.C. My colleague is clever to point this out, but I am quite sure he is also aware that it has been estimated that 50,000 noncitizens are eligible to vote. As the election cycles move forward, they will no doubt consider registering and casting their vote should we not turn this law.

My colleague also mentioned the topic of representation in our Nation's Capital. As a constitutional scholar and professor, he is well aware that our Founders envisioned our Nation's Capital would necessarily develop a robust citizenry and that those residents would enjoy unique access to the Republic's elected and appointed highest officials, equaling a form of representation that no other citizenry in any other city of sovereign States would enjoy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the author of this bill that we are considering today.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 192, which would prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

I think there has been a lot of talk about our Founding Fathers. I point out that I think one of the things that they envisioned was a healthy, functioning Republic with accountability, with D.C. at the epicenter, and D.C. not being a State but a District because they knew that that would change the dynamics of this place.

I, like many others, think that this Federal District is very special, and it is worth having the accountability, and that accountability is here in the United States Congress. It is Congress through the Constitution that our Founders entrusted the care of D.C., specifically "exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District.

Washington, D.C., is going through a tough time. It has not been going well in the last couple of years. In fact, let me just point out that, in 2023, this was the deadliest year on record in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, 274 people were killed. Violent crime spiked by nearly 40 percent. There were proceedings that even the Mayor opposed that had to do with violent crime, carjackings, lowering the penalties and thresholds, and making it a little bit easier. It was a strategy of appeasement that even the Mayor opposed.

In this Congress, last year, we acted and did something. What we did was said no, Washington, D.C., is not going

to lower those penalties for things like carjackings.

It was said that we would never get that through the Senate. Guess what? The Senate passed it, and President Biden signed it into law because he said it was ridiculous to reduce accountability measures in the District of Columbia.

So, here we are. In this case, the D.C. City Council has made a very shortsighted decision that I fear could be a harbinger around the country. That decision, I believe, lessens and cheapens citizenship. We see that in other areas, but the D.C. City Council has moved to allow noncitizens, including illegal aliens and foreign agents, to vote in local D.C. elections.

In fact, not only are they allowed to vote, but they are being encouraged. You can look at this flyer right here. This was just sent out by Washington, D.C., to encourage people to vote.

Yes, there may be 500 who are registered—this is a year old—but there are 50,000, according to Washington, D.C., statistics, who are eligible. They are encouraging people to vote for Mayor, for attorney general, for members of the board of education, and more.

Some may argue that, yes, these are just local elections. They are democratic elections that regularly determine taxation, the criminal code that I just referenced, and the election of the very city councilmembers who decide ordinances like who gets to vote, not to mention that many of these are decided by close margins.

I find it inconceivable that the city council and now other city councils around the United States would intentionally dilute the voting power of their constituents for noncitizens who otherwise might not meet the requirements, might not pay taxes, might not be members of the community who want the same things as those who are citizens. Therefore, I believe it is cheapening and lessening citizenship.

As the Capital of our democracy, Washington, D.C., ought to be leading the way, setting the example, not incentivizing the exact practices that our adversaries would relish. Take a look at what happened in San Francisco, where they just swore in somebody who is not a citizen to be an election administrator. The election administrator will administrate elections in that part of California, not just for local and municipal elections but all the elections.

Let's look beyond the Democrats' call for this bill to be deemed discriminatory or false claims about its intended purpose. I am asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look ahead and put citizenship back in its rightful place as the gold standard. Free and fair elections are a prerequisite for a healthy republic. I believe that is what our Founders intended. Noncitizen voting, whether it is one vote or a million votes, dilutes the voting power of the citizen.

Madam Speaker, I believe Congress must act clearly and decisively to bar noncitizens from voting in any election, including Washington, D.C., and I urge my colleagues to support my resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, just a couple of quick points about the distinguished gentleman's remarks.

First after all, what we are talking about is making a Federal decision or a congressional decision for a locality.

The gentleman's native Texas had noncitizen voting from 1869 to 1921. For a half-century, Texas had it. That policy is one that was completely up to them. It was never overruled by the Federal Government.

The gentleman says that foreign agents could vote under this legislation. Of course, foreign agents can vote all across the country today. People who register under the Foreign Agent Registration Act or fail to register under FARA and are convicted for that still have the right to vote. I believe Michael Flynn is still voting despite the fact that he failed to register under FARA. Paul Manafort is still voting. Other people who have been foreign agents don't automatically lose their right to vote because of that.

In the District of Columbia, if somebody wants to register from a foreign country, they effectively have to renounce their right to vote in a foreign country because the District of Columbia says you can't be voting in another country.

Incidentally, that is not the rule all over the world. Under the Maastricht Treaty, Americans who are living in European countries and are effectively domiciled there, which is defined as having physical residence plus the indefinite intention to remain, are given the right to vote in European localities—again, in just European local elections, not in EU elections or national elections. If you are an American living in Barcelona or Spain indefinitely, you get to vote in local elections there. They have adopted basically the same logic that the people in D.C. adopted, which is that they want people who are living there indefinitely to be engaged in local government.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1045

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I strongly oppose this undemocratic, paternalistic bill.

This Congress, Republicans have introduced 22 bills to overturn the District of Columbia's election laws, yet Republicans have refused to make the one and only change to D.C. election laws that D.C. residents have requested, which is to be given voting representation in the House and Senate.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the D.C. Council Chairman Phil Mendelson and D.C. At-

torney General Brian Schwalb opposing H.R. 192.

MAY 22, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write today as two of the District's top elected local officials to express our opposition to H.R. 192, which will overturn the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (Act). At its core, H.R. 192 is undemocratic. The District of Columbia should be allowed to govern itself without interference from Congress. District residents pay more federal taxes per capita than any state, serve in the military, and contribute to the national welfare just the same as people everywhere else. Yet, over the past two years, our residents have repeatedly suffered the indignity of having politicians elected elsewhere—politicians who aren't accountable to District residents attempt to usurp the authority of our elected officials.

Reasonable people can disagree about the merits of the Act. But the District's democratically elected Council voted on it and approved it. Regardless of our own views on the Act, we stand united in our belief that Washingtonians should enjoy the same right to self-determination and self-governance as people in every other state. That includes the right to determine who should participate in purely local—not federal—elections. H.R. 192 would deny District residents this fundamental right.

H.R. 192 is ill-conceived for another reason: if passed, it could sow chaos and confusion in the District's elections this year. In fact, early and mail-in voting is already underway for the District's primary election.

Congress already attempted to overturn the Act, introducing no fewer than four resolutions to repudiate the will of District voters. Each time, the resolutions have failed. We urge Congress to once again rebuff this undemocratic attack on District residents, affirm our right to self-governance, and reject H.R. 192.

Sincerely,

BRIAN L. SCHWALB,
Attorney General for
the District of Columbia.

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman, Council of
the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, before I discuss the substance of H.R. 192, I will discuss democracy and the lack of it in D.C. The nearly 700,000 District residents have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has the ultimate say, even on local D.C. matters.

My Republican colleagues are correct that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, but the majority is wrong that Congress has a constitutional duty to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice.

In Federalist No. 43, James Madison said of the residents of the future D.C.: "As a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them. . . ."

The Supreme Court held in 1953 that: ". . . there is no constitutional barrier

to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power."

D.C.'s local legislature, the Council, has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them out of office. That is called democracy.

Congress has 535 Members. The Members are elected by residents of their States. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote on local D.C. matters, they cannot vote them out of office. That is the antithesis of democracy.

The merits of H.R. 192 should be irrelevant since there is never justification for Congress legislating on local D.C. matters. However, I will discuss H.R. 192.

D.C.'s Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, allows D.C. residents who are noncitizens to vote only in local D.C. elections.

D.C.'s law is not unique. More than a dozen cities today allow noncitizens to vote in local elections. While the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act applies only to local D.C. elections, there is a long history in the United States, including before its founding, of allowing noncitizens to vote in State, local, territorial, and Federal elections. At various points, 40 States have allowed noncitizens to vote, including Texas, the home of the sponsor of H.R. 192.

Congress only first prohibited noncitizens from voting in Federal elections in 1996. The House passed the disapproval resolution on the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act in February 2023. The Senate did not vote on the disapproval resolution, and the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act became law in March 2023.

Voting, including by noncitizens, started earlier this month in D.C. primary elections. Why did Republicans wait to bring H.R. 192 to the floor until voting had already started? The majority did so to disrupt the elections.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, and they pay full Federal taxes while being denied voting representation in Congress. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 20 States.

If House Republicans cared about elections or D.C. residents, Republicans would bring to the floor the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. The act would give D.C. residents voting representation in Congress and full local self-government. Congress has the constitutional

authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. It simply lacks the will. D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are worthy and capable of self-government.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote “no” on H.R. 192.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I have not heard my Democratic colleagues address the fact that even one noncitizen’s vote will, in fact, dilute the votes of American citizens.

The gentlewoman mentioned Republicans’ efforts to disrupt D.C. elections. Quite to the contrary, Madam Speaker. We seek to restore the integrity of D.C. elections. We stood in support of an American’s right to have their vote fully counted, including, most certainly, in our Nation’s Capital. When there are 50,000 potential noncitizen voters in the Nation’s Capital poised to cast a vote, that is the disruption of the D.C. voting process for the American citizens of D.C., whom we do indeed care for, love, and hope to represent.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) to speak on this bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, in America, the citizens are the sovereign, and we govern through the votes we cast. Allowing foreign nationals to cancel out the votes of American citizens makes a mockery of our democracy, and it robs Americans of our sovereign right to direct our own government and decide our own destiny.

The fact that Democrats enacted such a law into the Capital City of our Nation and in other jurisdictions across the country and defend it today on this floor speaks volumes of how far that party has drifted to the left and what a grave threat their policies now pose to the most fundamental institutions and rights that we cherish as Americans. Only the American people can change that, and only if the sanctity of our elections can be protected.

One more point: Washington, D.C., is unlike any other town or community in our Nation. Washington, D.C., belongs to the American people, who retain through their Constitution the exclusive right to govern it through their elected Representatives. This outrageous law is the strongest argument yet for Congress to take back America’s Capital City for America and to take back America from the radical left.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I quote Justice Scalia on what the very distinguished gentleman from California just described as a radical practice: In general, noncitizen voting “has been open, widespread, and unchallenged since the early days of the Republic.”

What my Republican colleagues would like to portray as some kind of outlandish practice is one that has been used at various points in our history by a majority of the States, certainly at the local level. It was the Republican Party, again, I reemphasize,

which was the great champion of non-citizen voting and stood up for it against the States that ended up seceding from the Union in the Civil War.

We were debating the very point that the gentleman fastened upon when we talked about the Census. The Supreme Court has been emphatic repeatedly that the Census counts everyone in America, citizens and noncitizens alike.

Now, we know Republicans don’t like that. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been trying to get around it in a dozen different ways, but the Supreme Court has been perfectly clear that everyone is counted in the Census, even if they don’t have the right to vote and even if they are not a citizen.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I couldn’t agree more with the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 192. This is another condescending Republican attempt to do three really specific things: Meddle in local D.C. elections; disfranchise Black and Brown voters who are fully capable of governing themselves, by the way; and eroding the trust of Americans in our Federal elections.

In the 118th Congress alone, Republicans have introduced 17 bills to overturn D.C.’s election laws, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to do the one thing that the residents of D.C. have asked for, and that is equal representation through statehood.

In the Republican tradition of undermining elections, the majority is pushing this bill while the primary elections in D.C. are underway.

Let’s be clear: It is all intentional to stoke fear among voters and raise false alarms around the integrity of D.C.’s voting process. H.R. 192 is another sorry Republican effort to continue to carry on this baseless MAGA narrative about noncitizens affecting the outcomes of Federal elections.

Let’s put this into context. A 2016 study of our Federal elections found only 0.001 percent of votes cast were cases of suspected, not proven, noncitizen voting. Even the former President’s appointed commission to investigate his claims of voter fraud by noncitizens was disbanded without identifying one single case.

In the meantime, a third of working-age Americans are living through crushing medical debt, families are spending up to 75 percent of their income on rent and utilities, and scientists agree that the climate crisis may cost 14.5 million deaths by 2050. Yet, here we are again.

Madam Speaker, we need to stop entertaining legislation based on Republican lies. There are real problems that need to be addressed and comprehensive solutions.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 17½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Maryland has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my colleague.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, in what other country than Joe Biden’s America can illegal immigrants waltz over an unsecure border?

In what other country can an illegal immigrant get immediate housing, free food, legal counseling, and free educational subsidies?

In what other country can illegal immigrants get free flights and bus rides and transportation to the city or the town of their choosing?

There is none that I know of. There is none that most Americans would know of. No country in the world would be stupid enough to allow so many unknown people, with unknown desires, with unknown intentions, to cross their border.

Why is our country the only one dumb enough to offer incentive after incentive to the millions of illegal immigrants pouring over our border every single year? To truly understand what is happening here, we have to see the big picture, and then we will realize the border policy that we have now isn’t about bad policy or dumb policy. In fact, the policy is working exactly as the orchestrators want it to work.

The left knows they can flood this country with millions of people. If the left can promise those millions of people that the Democrats are the party that will feed them, will house them, will transport them, will educate them for free on the American taxpayer’s back and that Republicans will take that away, then the Democrats can use the millions of illegal immigrants as political pawns to increase their power.

It is shameless. It is wrong. It is un-American. For years, conservatives have warned about this. We have warned about the left attempting to allow illegals to vote in elections, but it was made fun of. It was a joke. It would never happen. It was labeled, in fact, as a conspiracy theory. Yet, here we are. Here we are today. D.C., our Nation’s own Capital, allowing illegal immigrants to vote in its local elections.

□ 1100

Yesterday’s conspiracy, yesterday’s conspiracy is today’s reality.

I strongly support H.R. 192 to prohibit noncitizens from voting in elections here in D.C. This is a dangerous and bad precedent and an un-American attempt at gaining power, and it needs to be stopped here and it needs to be stopped now. We have to stand up.

If we allow illegal immigrants to vote in elections now, Madam Speaker,

how long is it going to be before we are back on this floor attempting to stop a State from allowing illegal immigrants to vote in our Federal elections? American elections should be voted on by American citizens.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, H.R. 192, quite simply, prohibits noncitizens from voting in D.C. local elections and repeals the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act. This is common sense.

Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee our Nation's Capital and H.R. 192 represents the exact role Congress should take in regard to the matters of the District's governance.

Under the United States Constitution, Congress is granted exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever regarding our Nation's Capital. We recognize, as my colleagues have stated, the jurisdictional authority within the municipality and the local elected officials of our Nation's Capital, but when those local elected officials take actions which are injurious to the operations of our Nation's Capital, then we have constitutional authority and, indeed, duty to respond. Hence, why in February of last year, 260 Members of this House voted to overturn the D.C. act in question as being repealed through this bill and in that vote, 42 House Democrats did, indeed, vote to overturn that D.C. law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from New Jersey has left the Chamber because I could reassure and console him very quickly. It is against the law for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. That is embodied in Federal statute, and it is a crime for someone to attempt to do that. That is not what is on the table here today.

What is on the table is whether a locality, in this case, the District of Columbia, should be permitted to allow noncitizens to participate in local elections for things like school board and city council and advisory neighborhood commissions.

The gentleman from New Jersey should be apprised at some point that the great State of New Jersey allowed noncitizen voting between 1776 when the country began and 1820. For a half century, it was allowed in his State and obviously did not lead to the downfall of the Republic.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Oversight Committee for yielding. I also thank my colleague, the Representative from Washington, D.C., who tragically and outrageously does not have full voting rights here in this Chamber, but whose arguments and points are very well received.

Madam Speaker, I am rising in stark opposition to H.R. 192, another unbelievable attempt by my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle to legislate specifically on the District of Columbia. We are individual Representatives duly elected by our constituents to legislate for this country and our constituents have representation, and yet the District of Columbia, who we are obsessively seeing our colleagues try and legislate on, does not have representation.

Why not look at the host of issues this country is facing? We only have so much time in this body. We are almost to the halfway point left of this term. We could be working on paid leave, decreasing maternal mortality, fully funding special education, the climate crisis, a national gun violence epidemic, women's rights, real voting rights for this country.

Give me a break. This is how we are choosing to use our time, a fifth effort to legislate specifically to the Nation's Capital, the only capital of a country that does not have full voting rights in a Federal Chamber?

This is outrageous, and it is anti-democratic. Frankly, what this also is, as we have seen this playbook before and the ranking member knows this, this is another attempt to fearmonger around national elections that are coming, that supposedly those who are voting shouldn't. We need more people to be voting.

Madam Speaker, I fiercely oppose this legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her trenchant remarks. She makes an excellent point. Washington, D.C., is the only National Capital on the planet Earth disenfranchised in its own legislature, which is the vulnerability that is being exploited today by our colleagues.

Can you imagine if they told the people of Paris that they could not be represented in L'Assemblée nationale simply because they breathed the same air as representatives coming from other parts of France? You would have another French Revolution on your hands.

I will thank the people of Washington that Ms. NORTON represents, who have a valid bona fide political grievance and yet did not come down here and beat the daylights out of our police officers, wounding and brutalizing and hospitalizing nearly 150 of them.

They have gone about it the right way. They have petitioned for statehood, and they are trying to defend their rights to govern themselves.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, my distinguished colleague has mentioned that it is already against the law for an illegal to cast a vote.

We understand this, but surely the gentleman knows that corruption is

borne in the heart of man, not the mechanisms of man.

We have a duty and a responsibility as Members of this Congress to oversee the actions of the Nation's Capital City and it is our duty to mitigate against the violation of law.

We recognize that it is against the law for an illegal to cast a vote in a Federal election. We know this, but we also know that burglary is against the law, yet we have fences and gates and doors and locks. We mitigate against the actions of man, though, we know that some of those actions may be, indeed, against the law.

The existence of the statute itself does not overcome the corruption born in the heart of man. We have an obligation as a body to exercise our constitutional jurisdictional authority in the one municipality in the entire country that falls under that constitutional jurisdictional authority; that is, our Nation's Capital as the city whose laws we address today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I will clearly communicate to the folks at home what it is that we are doing here. What we are doing is, we are talking about passing a law that prohibits citizens of foreign countries from voting in elections in D.C.

It prohibits people that are here illegally from voting in elections. It prohibits spies from China from voting in elections. It prohibits people who are here from Russia that have wishes of ill will on the United States from voting in the elections in D.C.

Now, I have heard my friends on the other side say that this would disenfranchise voters in Washington.

Let's think through that for just a minute. If you are allowing people that are not citizens of Washington, that are not citizens of the United States to vote here, you are diluting the vote of the people that are citizens of this city. You are diluting it. Which policy disenfranchises? It is absurd to hear people make these allegations.

Now, let's talk about some of the people that largely agree with what we are saying. The mayor didn't sign this. Even the Mayor of Washington, D.C., didn't sign this because she knows that this is outrageous. The Washington Post, that I wouldn't argue is a bastion of conservative thought, even said that "voting is a foundational right of citizenship."

Madam Speaker, I have heard my friends on the other side argue or allege that we are meddling. We are meddling.

Madam Speaker, there is this pesky little document that we take an oath to called the Constitution and, of course, I say that in jest. In the Constitution, it says: Congress is granted exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over Washington. We are doing exactly what we took an oath to do.

Let's summarize. If you want Chinese spies, if you want people who are here

illegally that also can vote in their actual home country, then you would vote “no.” You would say no, we want the status quo. We want spies to vote. We want Russian Embassy employees to vote. We want people who are here illegally to vote. That is fine. You vote “no.” However, if you think that D.C. residents, that their vote should actually count for local elections, then you vote “yes.”

Now, my friends are going to say: What about voting in Federal elections? I am sorry for anybody who moved here and found out by surprise that that is not how it works because this was established originally as a Federal District distinguishing it from the States.

I am sorry if folks just woke up and realized that, or maybe after they bought their house.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, it is unbelievable that we are even here having to debate this, once again, about whether it is appropriate for people who are citizens of foreign countries, people who are here illegally, people who can vote for Vladimir Putin would also get to vote for the Mayor of D.C.

It is unbelievable that people in this body who represent hundreds of thousands of citizens of this country believe that that is the appropriate path.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member RASKIN for the time.

Madam Speaker, this is an incredible debate we have here. Of course, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 192. It is interesting that the majority keeps talking about fair elections, ensuring that elections are done the right way, when 147 of them wouldn't even vote to certify the last Presidential election that we had here in this country. A majority of the Republican Party won't even admit or certify the last election on who actually won the last Presidential election, yet you want to talk about an attack on local neighborhood councils here in Washington, D.C., and local elections.

It is hypocrisy what we are seeing here today in this debate.

This is nothing more than the majority's attempt to attack D.C. over and over again. They want to talk about Chinese spies voting in elections. The only Chinese spies that are here in D.C. are the ones being invited by the majority to come testify at our Oversight Committee hearing to actually attack the current President of the United States. This is a ridiculous debate we are having here by the majority.

Now it sounds also that the majority is obsessed, as they always are, with

the local laws of D.C., and as I said before, if they are so interested in local government, they should resign from Congress and run for the local city council or mayor.

It is a great job. I was mayor of my community. I was on the local city council. That is what they seem to be most interested in doing.

Instead of wasting our time here, we should be focused on the real issues that Americans are facing. That is why today I will make a motion to recommit this bill back to committee and instead call up H.R. 16, the American Dream and Promise Act.

Dreamers have come to our country as children. They know no other country or have no other allegiance than to the United States, and we all know that this is true.

□ 1115

The American Dream and Promise Act is a landmark, bipartisan piece of legislation that would give these children and young adults a pathway to lawful, permanent residency. This is actually a transformational law that could impact our country. It would change the lives of nearly 2.3 million people in all 50 States.

Madam Speaker, I thank the countless Members who have worked to pass the Dream Act, including this year's sponsor, Congresswoman SYLVIA GARCIA, and advocates and community members.

Dreamers are our friends, family members, classmates, and coworkers. They are estimated to contribute about \$45 billion a year to the American economy and \$13 billion in taxes every single year. The data is clear: Dreamers, like all immigrants, make our country stronger.

I offer this amendment today to get this back on track and get this legislation through. Let's let the Dream Act come to the floor today and vote to protect these 2.3 million people.

For me, this is personal. As an immigrant myself, and as someone who has lived with immigrants, I know how important the Dream Act is to our country and to so many.

Instead of wasting our time on this bill, we should be focused on actually helping people in this country who are making our country better every single day. Today, Republicans and Democrats once again have the chance to work across the aisle to protect millions of people who have put down roots and invested in our country and our economy. It is the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, today, I hope my col-

leagues will join me in voting for this motion.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the author of the bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank all those who have risen in support of this. Let's just think about it in simple terms.

If we go back to our constituents and tell them that Washington, D.C., is allowing noncitizens to vote in local elections, they can't believe it. It has been said by several colleagues on the other side of the aisle that multiple States allowed noncitizens to vote. In the case of Texas, that was literally over 100 years ago, and we figured out it was not a good idea.

It is absolutely ridiculous that this is even a thought. I said it a little bit ago, but Washington, D.C., is not exactly having an easy time with accountability. When you look at the crime rates, violent crime is spiking by 40 percent, and 2023 was the deadliest year on record here, with 274 people killed. Look at what Congress had to do, what President Biden signed into law, to maintain the penalties on violent offenders, specifically in carjackings, because the city council in Washington, D.C., decided to lessen those penalties. This Congress voted on that last year, and the President signed it into law. That is the kind of accountability that Americans are wanting. They want that accountability.

To think that Americans are in favor of having noncitizens vote in Washington, D.C., is ludicrous. That is why this legislation is so important. Washington, D.C., should be the standard. It should be the standard. It is a unique case. It is a unique case in our country because it is not a State.

Congress has jurisdiction constitutionally authorized to us, and we are acting because the city council overstepped. They have done something that even the Mayor is not in favor of.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation to put citizenship on the pedestal that it deserves and to stop lessening and cheapening citizenship in this country. I urge support of H.R. 192.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana for a very substantive and dignified debate on this subject, which I know attracts strong views across the aisle.

I want to restate some essential points for people to keep in mind. One is that what we are talking about is local elections in the District of Columbia, so the question is who will get to vote for the school board members and the councilmembers and who will

get to vote for the neighborhood advisory commissioners. That is an institution that I think is unique to the District of Columbia, where neighborhoods have elected representatives who get to weigh in on things like the times that bars close, restaurant licenses, and stuff like that. That is really what we are talking about here.

The people in D.C. have only one non-voting Delegate for the District of Columbia, no voting representation here, no voting representation in the Senate, so the noncitizens, the 500 or so who are registered today, can't even vote for ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. It goes to the question of local elections.

I am certain that most Members of Congress and most Americans certainly didn't expect that the House of Representatives would be spending so much time debating this relatively minute matter and, I daresay, trivial matter in the context of all the national emergencies and crises we are facing today, but it does seem to be part of an election year assault on the District of Columbia.

It is a lot easier to kick D.C. around a little bit than to solve the gun crisis, which has gotten to the point where gun violence is now the leading cause of death in America for young people under the age of 18. It is a lot easier to kick D.C. around a little bit than to confront the climate crisis, which is bearing down on all of us across the country.

The gentleman has made one very powerful point, which is, constitutionally, we have the authority to do this because the people in D.C. are still under the authority of Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. That is why they want out. They want us to use our power over the District in all cases whatsoever to modify the boundaries of the District of Columbia and to yield the residential areas to the creation of a new State.

The power of Congress to do that was established in 1846 when Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax County were retroceded to Virginia. We have the power to redraw it. We can redraw it, and D.C. would actually be larger populationwise than two other States in the Union.

They want to exist on a plane of political equality. They want to be able to have the right to go through the same political experience the gentleman talked about in Texas. At one point, they wanted to grant noncitizens the right to vote in local elections. At another point, they didn't. That is all they are asking for, the right to make their own decisions for themselves.

I daresay, no matter how benevolently motivated the gentleman from Louisiana is, or I am as a Representative from Maryland, no one is more interested in the welfare of the people in the District of Columbia than the people who actually live there.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I express my sincere gratitude to my friend and colleague, Representative RASKIN, for conducting this debate in a vigorous yet respectful manner. I am certain that he will agree that this is the manner in which our Founders envisioned we may debate.

The subject of congressional interaction, exercising constitutional authority within the parameters of our Nation's Capital municipality, is a legitimate discussion. It is part of our Nation's narrative and broad debate, and this is the body, Madam Speaker, wherein such debate should take place. I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle may engage in this as we move forward in the spirit with which we have discussed and debated today.

Madam Speaker, D.C.'s noncitizen voting law does, indeed, disenfranchise American citizens. It is a dangerous policy that undermines the ability of the citizens of D.C. to have a free and fair election. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to prohibit those who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this necessary bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1243, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Robert Garcia of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 192 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

The material previously referred to by Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California is as follows:

Mr. Robert Garcia of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 192 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "American Dream and Promise Act of 2023".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—DREAM ACT OF 2023

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Permanent resident status on a conditional basis for certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

Sec. 103. Terms of permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

Sec. 104. Removal of conditional basis of permanent resident status.

Sec. 105. Restoration of State option to determine residency for purposes of higher education benefits.

TITLE II—AMERICAN PROMISE ACT OF 2023

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Adjustment of status for certain nationals of certain countries designated for temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure.

Sec. 203. Clarification.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Definitions.

Sec. 302. Submission of biometric and biographic data; background checks.

Sec. 303. Limitation on removal; application and fee exemption; and other conditions on eligible individuals.

Sec. 304. Determination of continuous presence and residence.

Sec. 305. Exemption from numerical limitations.

Sec. 306. Availability of administrative and judicial review.

Sec. 307. Documentation requirements.

Sec. 308. Rulemaking.

Sec. 309. Confidentiality of information.

Sec. 310. Grant program to assist eligible applicants.

Sec. 311. Provisions affecting eligibility for adjustment of status.

Sec. 312. Supplementary surcharge for appointed counsel.

Sec. 313. Annual report on provisional denial authority.

(For full text, please see H.R. 16.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Madam 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.

CBDC ANTI-SURVEILLANCE STATE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. 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 the bill, H.R. 5403.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SELF). Pursuant to House Resolution 1243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5403.