

and Bedford Counties in Harrisburg, where he was committed to addressing the issues that matter most to our communities.

During his time both as a member of Pennsylvania's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Affairs and the Committee on Children and Youth, Representative Jerry Stern poured himself into his work each and every day.

By building coalitions and passing legislation that supported our farmers and by advocating for children in the foster care system and working to ensure that they received the support and the care that they needed, Representative Jerry Stern showed his commitment to the people of central Pennsylvania.

Today, please join me in remembering the life of Representative Jerry Stern and offering condolences to his wife, Susan, and to his entire family.

CELEBRATING KEVRE HENDRICKS

(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 acknowledge and celebrate Kevre Hendricks, a master musician, dedicated educator, Virgin Islands National Guardsman, and this year's honoree for the Crucian Christmas Festival Village in my home, St. Croix.

Mr. Hendricks is a passionate advocate for music and the arts in our community and tremendously committed to the work of supporting young people interested in music. He not only teaches music but also teaches creativity, discipline, and dedication to craft.

He is a teacher, a band director for St. Croix Educational Complex High School, and the musical director of a local band that has won the Crucian Christmas Festival Road March numerous times.

Congratulations to Cousin Kevre on this well-deserved recognition. We all look forward to this year's Village experience and Maestro's Musical Haven.

Festival on St. Croix is the warmest celebration of all, with sweet music, food, and fellowship.

RECOGNIZING MORGAN COUNTY SHERIFF ROBERT MARKLEY

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

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the retirement of Morgan County Sheriff Robert Markley.

From the beginning of his career as a beat cop patrolling the streets to keep our community safe to serving as Morgan County's law enforcement officer, Sheriff Markley has dedicated his life to protecting the innocent, delivering swift justice to criminals, and keeping all of us safe.

He has been a pillar in the community, a mentor to everyone in local law enforcement, and the leader Morgan County needed.

I thank him for his dedication and leadership over these last two decades. He truly will be missed. I hope he will continue to advise and guide the next generation of local law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, I thank him for everything he has done.

RECOGNIZING TWO ILLINOIS STATE CHAMPION FOOTBALL TEAMS

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

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize two State champion football teams in my district, the East St. Louis Flyers and the Belleville Althoff Crusaders.

Under Coach Darren Sunkett's leadership, the Flyers went 13-1 this season, winning their 11th State championship on November 28 with a 48-28 victory over Geneva.

I also congratulate the Crusaders football team for winning the 2024 1A Illinois State championship and running back Dierre Hill, Jr., on being named the 2024 Illinois Gatorade Player of the Year. What an incredible accomplishment.

I know that each and every player, coach, and staffer put in hours of practice and preparation to help the Flyers and the Crusaders achieve their goals on and off the field this season.

Your dedication to the game of football and our local community is an inspiration.

□ 0915

HONORING STAYING HOME CORPORATION

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

Mr. ALFORD. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor our December Small Business of the Month, Staying Home Corporation.

This fantastic business in Harrisonville, Missouri, offers a wide range of products that allow folks in the Midwest to live more comfortably in their own homes.

Owners, Mike and Natalie Vogt, share their story about how they came to own Staying Home. Their hope is to provide jobs to those in need, donate to causes that the Lord directs, and create a company that continues those goals.

Not only are Staying Home Corporation's products beautifully designed, but they are also brilliantly functional, reliable, and affordable.

From elevators to stair lifts, ramps, and storm shelters, this business elevates home life and safety with their

durable products. Each product is beautifully crafted and expertly engineered in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Staying Home Corporation, our December Small Business of the Month.

HONORING STEPHENS COUNTY SHERIFF RANDY SHIRLEY ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor the remarkable career and legacy of my dear friend, Stephens County Sheriff Randy Shirley, who is retiring after serving as sheriff for 16 years.

Randy, who has been in law enforcement for five decades, has always given his unwavering dedication to the safety and well-being of the folks in north Georgia, leaving an indelible mark on our community.

For 16 years, Sheriff Randy Shirley has led the Stephens County Sheriff's Office with integrity, vision, and a servant's heart. His achievements are many, but what stands out the most is his tireless devotion to our community.

From fighting crime and keeping drugs off our streets to enhancing transparency and mentoring the next generation of law enforcement, his actions have always reflected his deep love for the people he has served.

Madam Speaker, I thank Sheriff Shirley for putting his life on the line to protect ours. After December 31, while his boots may no longer be on the ground under that badge, his legacy will continue to inspire us all.

I wish my friend fair winds and following seas.

JUDICIAL UNDERSTAFFING DELAYS GETTING EMERGENCIES SOLVED ACT OF 2024

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1612, I call up the bill (S. 4199) to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KIM of California) pursuant to House Resolution 1612, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4199

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 "Judicial Understaffing Delays Getting Emergencies Solved Act of 2024" or the "JUDGES Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Article III of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to

establish judgeships in the district courts of the United States.

(2) Congress has not created a new district court judgeship since 2003 and has not enacted comprehensive judgeship legislation since 1990.

(3) This represents the longest period of time since district courts of the United States were established in 1789 that Congress has not authorized any new permanent district court judgeships.

(4) By the end of fiscal year 2022, filings in the district courts of the United States had increased by 30 percent since the last comprehensive judgeship legislation.

(5) As of March 31, 2023, there were 686,797 pending cases in the district courts of the United States, with an average of 491 weighted case filings per judgeship over a 12-month period.

(6) To deal with increased filings in the district courts of the United States, the Judicial Conference of the United States requested the creation of 66 new district court judgeships in its 2023 report.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIPS.—

(1) 2025.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Iowa;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of New York;

(x) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; and

(xi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: California (Northern: 15, Eastern: 7, Central: 28, Southern: 13);

(ii) by striking the item relating to Delaware and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Delaware: 5;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Florida (Northern: 4, Middle: 16, Southern: 17);

(iv) by striking the items relating to Indiana and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Indiana (Northern: 5, Southern: 6);

(v) by striking the items relating to Iowa and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Iowa (Northern: 3, Southern: 3);

(vi) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: New Jersey: 18;

(vii) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: New York (Northern: 5, Southern: 29, Eastern: 15, Western: 4); and

(viii) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Texas (Northern: 12, Southern: 20, Eastern: 8, Western: 13);

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2025.

(2) 2027.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona;

(ii) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of Idaho;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Texas; and

(x) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to Arizona and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Arizona: 13;

(ii) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: California (Northern: 16, Eastern: 8, Central: 30, Southern: 13);

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Florida (Northern: 4, Middle: 17, Southern: 18);

(iv) by striking the items relating to Georgia and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Georgia (Northern: 12, Middle: 4, Southern: 3);

(v) by striking the item relating to Idaho and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Idaho: 3; and

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Texas (Northern: 13, Southern: 21, Eastern: 8, Western: 13);

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2027.

(3) 2029.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the district of Nebraska;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of New York;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas; and

(x) 1 additional district judge for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (2) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: California (Northern: 17, Eastern: 9, Central: 31, Southern: 13);

(ii) by striking the item relating to Colorado and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Colorado: 8;

(iii) by striking the item relating to Delaware and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Delaware: 6;

(iv) by striking the item relating to Nebraska and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Row: Nebraska: 4;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: New York (Northern: 5, Southern: 29, Eastern: 16, Western: 4); and

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

Table with 2 columns: State/District, Count. Rows: Texas (Northern: 13, Southern: 22, Eastern: 9, Western: 14);

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2029.

(4) 2031.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 1 additional district judge for the district of Arizona;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the central district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the western district of New York; and

(x) 2 additional district judges for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (3) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to Arizona and inserting the following:

“Arizona 14”;

(ii) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern 18
Eastern 10
Central 32
Southern 14”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern 4
Middle 18
Southern 19”;

(iv) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

“New Jersey 19”;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern 5
Southern 29
Eastern 16
Western 5”;

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern 13
Southern 22
Eastern 9
Western 16”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2031.

(5) 2033.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of New York;

(viii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Texas; and

(ix) 1 additional district judge for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (4) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern 19
Eastern 10
Central 34
Southern 14”;

(ii) by striking the item relating to Colorado and inserting the following:

“Colorado 9”;

(iii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern 5

Middle 19
Southern 19”;

(iv) by striking the items relating to Georgia and inserting the following:

“Georgia:
Northern 13
Middle 4
Southern 3”;

(v) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern 5
Southern 30
Eastern 16
Western 5”;

(vi) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern 13
Southern 23
Eastern 9
Western 17”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2033.

(6) 2035.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(i) 2 additional district judges for the central district of California;

(ii) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of California;

(iii) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California;

(iv) 1 additional district judge for the middle district of Florida;

(v) 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida;

(vi) 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey;

(vii) 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of New York;

(viii) 2 additional district judges for the western district of Texas.

(B) TABLES.—The table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by paragraph (5) of this subsection, is amended—

(i) by striking the items relating to California and inserting the following:

“California:
Northern 20
Eastern 10
Central 36
Southern 15”;

(ii) by striking the items relating to Florida and inserting the following:

“Florida:
Northern 5
Middle 20
Southern 20”;

(iii) by striking the item relating to New Jersey and inserting the following:

“New Jersey 20”;

(iv) by striking the items relating to New York and inserting the following:

“New York:
Northern 5
Southern 30
Eastern 17
Western 5”;

(v) by striking the items relating to Texas and inserting the following:

“Texas:
Northern 13
Southern 23
Eastern 9
Western 19”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall take effect on January 21, 2035.

(b) TEMPORARY JUDGESHIIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—

(A) 2 additional district judges for the eastern district of Oklahoma; and

(B) 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Oklahoma.

(2) VACANCIES NOT FILLED.—The first vacancy in the office of district judge in each of the offices of district judge authorized by this subsection, occurring 5 years or more after the confirmation date of the judge named to fill the temporary district judgeship created in the applicable district by this subsection, shall not be filled.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on January 21, 2025.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section—

(A) for each of fiscal years 2025 and 2026, \$12,965,330;

(B) for each of fiscal years 2027 and 2028, \$23,152,375;

(C) for each of fiscal years 2029 and 2030, \$32,413,325;

(D) for each of fiscal years 2031 and 2032, \$42,600,370;

(E) for each of fiscal years 2033 and 2034, \$51,861,320; and

(F) for fiscal year 2035 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$61,122,270.

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For each fiscal year described in paragraph (1), the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year shall be increased by the percentage by which—

(A) the Consumer Price Index for the previous fiscal year, exceeds

(B) the Consumer Price Index for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year described in subparagraph (A).

(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “Consumer Price Index” means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items, United States city average), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

SEC. 4. ORGANIZATION OF UTAH DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 125(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “and St. George” and inserting “St. George, Moab, and Monticello”.

SEC. 5. ORGANIZATION OF TEXAS DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 124(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (3), by inserting “and College Station” before the period at the end.

SEC. 6. ORGANIZATION OF CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COURTS.

Section 84(d) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and El Centro” after “at San Diego”.

SEC. 7. GAO REPORTS.

(a) JUDICIAL CASELOADS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and make publicly available reports—

(1) evaluating—

(A) the accuracy and objectiveness of case-related workload measures and methodologies used by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for district courts of the United States and courts of appeals of the United States;

(B) the impact of non-case-related activities of judges of the district courts of the United States and courts of appeals of the United States on judicial caseloads; and

(C) the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies of the Administrative Office of the

United States Courts regarding senior judges; and

(2) providing any recommendations of the Comptroller General with respect to the matters described in paragraph (1).

(b) DETENTION SPACE.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on an assessment of—

(1) a determination of the needs of Federal agencies for detention space;

(2) efforts by Federal agencies to acquire detention space; and

(3) any challenges in determining and acquiring detention space.

SEC. 8. PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY OF THE ARTICLE III JUDGESHIP RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States, shall make publicly available on their website, free of charge, the biennial report entitled “Article III Judgeship Recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States”.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a) should be released not less frequently than biennially and contain the summaries and all related appendixes supporting the judgeship recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, including—

(1) the process used by the Judicial Conference in developing the recommendations;

(2) any caseload and methodology changes;

(3) judgeship surveys with recommendations; and

(4) specific information about each court for which the Judicial Conference recommends additional judgeships.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives copies of the report described in subsection (a).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 4199.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I will be brief in opening. This is, in fact, a highly bipartisan, bicameral bill that is, by God, overdue. Not since the nineties have we done a full authorization to deal with the expansion of our country and of the adjudication of Federal laws.

The fact is this passed the Senate overwhelmingly. It had essentially no

real adversaries. It costs just 5 percent of the discretionary bill, and it saves countless billions of dollars.

The reality is this bill would have passed by unanimous consent had we brought it sooner.

I apologize to everyone here for the hour we are taking about something that we should have done before the elections and done it quickly. Nevertheless, we are where we are. We are faced with a choice today.

Do we add to the judgeships for the first time in 20 years and for nearly 40 since it was done by an ordinary legislation rather than appropriations, or do we, again, add to the backlog that is costing American businesses countless billions of dollars in excess time and fees and uncertainty as to the outcome?

Do we continue to have criminals allowed to plead out because there isn't court time and U.S. Attorneys are faced with the decision of what to do with somebody when, in fact, there just isn't enough time to get them through?

There are over three-quarters of a million cases in backlog and only about 600 judges to do it. This bill, over a 12-year period, will phase in additional judges. I would have liked them sooner, and my colleagues on the other side would have liked them sooner. This was a compromise. The compromise was painful but necessary and bipartisan, and that was that no one President and no one Senate would determine who these judges were, keeping the politics out of it. It would only be pettiness today if we were to not do this because of who got to be first.

This is no different from a coin flip at the start of a football game. Yes, the winner gets to receive or kick as they choose, but afterwards it will go back and forth for a very long time.

This is a very long time, and we should be with long thinkers on the most permanent body in government.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because of a broken promise.

Last year, I proudly joined my colleagues, Courts Subcommittee Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member JOHNSON, in introducing the JUDGES Act. For decades, Congress has been at an impasse on the question of how to create new judgeships while not knowingly giving new appointees to the other party. This bipartisan, bicameral bill would have broken that logjam by having both sides agree to take a chance on their own party winning the White House.

Under this legislation, we all promised to give the next three, unknown, Presidents a certain number of judgeships. Because no one can tell the future, we were all at an equal disadvantage.

Nevertheless, for this deal to work, the bill had to be passed before election day. On November 6, we would all know

who the next President would be, and the deal would be broken.

The Senate did its part and passed the bill over the summer, but the House Republican leadership was unwilling to take a chance on their own candidate, and they refused to bring the bill to the floor before the election. Thus, the agreement central to the JUDGES Act, that the opportunity to appoint new judges is given to an unknown future President, is now broken. However, that is not stopping our Republican colleagues from taking advantage of all of the Senators and House Members who took a chance on bipartisanship.

Unfortunately, we are back where we have always been every time a bill to create new judgeships comes before Congress, with one party seeking a tactical advantage over the other.

Since we know that Donald Trump sees the Federal courts as nothing more than an extension of his political operation, and during his first term he stacked them with dangerously unqualified and ideological appointees, giving him more power to appoint additional judges would be irresponsible.

Under the allocation set forth in the JUDGES Act, he would get 25 judgeship nominations on top of the 100-plus spots on the judicial bench expected to open up over the next 4 years. Donald Trump has made clear that he intends to expand the powers of the Presidency, and giving him 25 new judges to appoint gives him one more tool at his disposal to do just that.

Many of the people elevated by Donald Trump to the Federal bench were not just conservative-leaning judges. They have proven to be ultraconservative ideologues who have perverted the law to benefit Donald Trump and conservative causes.

They have also repeatedly been criticized for their lack of understanding of the law, for their inability to provide speedy decisionmaking, and for their repeated errors in judgment. We should not compound this problem by giving him yet more nominations to fill.

I have long argued for more Federal judges. Twenty years ago we were already overdue, and the problem has only gotten worse. However, Republicans and Democrats, quite reasonably, have never wanted to give an opposing party's President more power. Presidential administration after Presidential administration went by with no new judgeships created. The JUDGES Act would have broken that impasse if it had been passed before the Presidential election this year.

The genius behind the JUDGES Act and the deal to pass it was that it was devoid of the politics that have plagued the Federal judgeship creation process.

We took recommendations made by the nonpartisan Judicial Conference of the United States. The nominees were spread out over three Presidential administrations and six Congresses. The judge allotments would begin with a future, unknown, next President.

In August, Senators from both sides of the aisle joined together and unanimously passed the JUDGES Act. We could have done the same thing here. We should have done the same thing here. If Republican leadership had brought the bill to the House floor in September, then we could have passed it on suspension in no time. Back then, the President would still have been unknown, and the underlying promise of the bill was still present.

Nevertheless, when S. 4199 arrived in the House, Republican leadership refused to touch it. As the days counted down before the election, my colleagues and I begged them to take it up. We explained the stakes. They knew that bipartisan support for creating desperately new judgeships would only exist if the bill was passed into law before November 5, but they refused.

Republican leadership was uninterested in taking the chance that their candidate might not win in November. It was a fair fight, and they wanted no part in it. Now they are here today during the narrow window when the central promise behind the JUDGES Act is broken, trying to force this bill through the House on a partisan basis.

What we are seeing today is a tragic breakdown in what should have been a bipartisan process. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who fought for this bill over the summer and in September. Our work together reminds me that there can be opportunities for collegiality and collaboration across the aisle.

This good, honest work is even more striking when juxtaposed with the political gamesmanship we are seeing today, as the majority takes a non-partisan bill and perverts it toward their own ends.

Mr. Speaker, 1 month and 8 days from now will be January 20, 2025. On Inauguration Day we will no longer know who the next President will be, and I would be happy to take up the promise behind the JUDGES Act that day and to give the additional judicial appointments to Presidents yet to come.

Until then, I must urge my colleagues to vote “no” on S. 4199, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), who is a member of the committee, a law enforcement specialist, and a decorated veteran.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bipartisan JUDGES Act, which would create 63 permanent Federal district court judgeships and 3 temporary judgeships, including 10 in the great State of Texas and 4 in my district, over the next 10 years.

This bill would also authorize additional courtroom locations in multiple States to improve access for rural residents in large districts, such as the Southern District of Texas.

Simply put, the JUDGES Act is a critical piece of legislation. The population of the United States has increased by 50 million people since the year 2000, and the number of cases pending in Federal trial courts has nearly doubled. Despite this, Congress has not added more Federal judges to the bench since 2004.

Unsurprisingly, this has led to staggering backlogs in Federal courts across the country, which has, in turn, led to litigants losing access to timely justice and a severely overworked judicial bench.

In the Southern District of Texas alone, which encompasses my district, there are over 6,082 civil cases pending and 8,928 criminal cases as of June of this year. A lack of rural courtroom locations also forces Americans to commute for hours a day when called for Federal jury duty or to access the courts. This is unacceptable for our country, and it is incumbent upon Congress to address it.

As a Republican co-lead of this House companion version of the bill, alongside my colleague Representative ISSA, this legislation will not only address multiyear case backlogs but will also ensure the administration of justice in a reasonable timeframe.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake. The sudden opposition to this bill from my friends on the other side of the aisle is nothing more than childish foot stomping. The Democrats know that this is a fair bill, and my colleagues know that it doesn't give any President or party an advantage in appointing judges since they are to be added in six segments over 10 years.

That is why my bill passed out of the House by unanimous consent, why it is supported by Federal judges across the political spectrum, and why House Republicans support this bill regardless of electoral results. Since Democrats are angry over the results of this election, the official Democrat position now seems to be that our Federal trial court system should be left to languish under the weight of crippling backlogs.

This bill is common sense. One of our most basic obligations as a Congress is to oversee the judiciary and ensure it functions well.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to fulfill that obligation and support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), the distinguished gentleman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 4199.

You don't get to pick the horse after that horse has already won the race, but that is exactly what my Republican colleagues are seeking to do today.

S. 4199 was bipartisan until just over a month ago. It was a bill that I was

proud to support, and it is one that I have been fighting for because there is no question that we need more Federal judgeships. We have been fighting this battle for years.

We haven't been able to pass a comprehensive bill on judgeships in over three decades because my friends on the other side of the aisle want to strangle the judicial system and privatize it, want to do forced arbitration, and want to clog up the courts. Then, when my colleagues do get a chance to appoint judges to the court, and Justices, Republicans appoint rightwing extreme ideologues to the bench.

When we look at the appointments that Donald Trump has announced so far, people like Stephen Miller, Matt Gaetz, Robert Kennedy, Pam Bondi, and Kash Patel, it is clear that Trump has said and has acted in ways to pervert the justice system.

Mr. Speaker, S. 4199 would give this incoming President 25 appointments to the Federal judiciary of extreme rightwing ideologues. It is just not something that is appropriate for us to support at this particular time, given his track record.

Mr. Speaker, we could have passed this bill before the lameduck session. In fact, that was what the intent was. It was to pass this legislation before the next President was known. That was why the bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

Since the Senate passed the bill before the election, they adhered to the precept that we would pass this without knowing who the incoming President would be. The Senate did its job. It held up to its end of the bargain and sent this bill to us way back in August, before the election.

When S. 4199 arrived in the House, Republican leadership injected politics right back into the bill. The majority tried to do a McConnell-type move here. My colleagues refused to bring the bill up before the election, despite our pleadings that this bill must pass in September to avoid politics and honor the agreement on the unknown next President, just as the Senate did.

Mr. Speaker, it is not about honoring the agreement or fairness, but it is about guaranteeing an outcome that will be in the majority's favor.

We stand here today knowing who the next President will be. That means that one party now will have a significant advantage under this bill. This is the exact outcome we intended to avoid. It is because of that broken promise that I can no longer support this bill.

I do not take this position lightly. Our judiciary is in dire need of independent judges who will make reasoned decisions based on the law, but if Republicans think giving 25 more district court seats to Trump is going to fix the problem, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are sadly mistaken.

Bringing this bill to the floor after the election isn't fair and is not right,

and this is rigging the game in the majority's favor. It makes it political. It brings MCCONNELL into the House.

I can't, in good conscience, support this bill, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, we often hear the term "country before party" here in the House and throughout our country. It is clear we didn't hear that here yet today on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

My colleagues should think about the minority's argument. The argument is very simple: We can't do it now because Trump won. We have to wait 4 years to fix something everyone knows needs to be addressed, but we can't do that. We have to wait 4 years because we don't like what the people chose.

Mr. Speaker, the people spoke loudly and clearly. President Trump won all seven swing States. He won 30 of the 50 States. He won the popular vote. The Democratic argument is: We can't do what the people want.

Even though we haven't addressed this in 20 years, after a population increase of 50 million people in our country, having hundreds of thousands of pending civil cases, the Judicial Conference saying we need it, and the bill coming out of the Senate unanimously, nope, we can't do it because Trump won. That is the argument of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The people have spoken.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to be as fair as possible. What the chairman did on this bill was great work. It allows 66 judgeships over the next 10 years. That will be three different Presidents who are going to get to weigh in on this. Six different Congresses are going to be in session over that timeframe.

In the first batch, I think California receives seven judges. Half of the first batch, 22 or 25 of the first judges that President Trump will get to appoint, come from States where both Senators are Democrats. It can't be any more fair. The minority just doesn't like what the American people did. That is the argument of the Democrats.

I say we pass this thing and address this situation that everyone knows needs to be addressed. We need more judges. Everyone understands that. It is bipartisan. When the Judicial Conference met, Republican and Democratic judges were all for it. They didn't say that they don't like what the people did. They just said let's fix what needs to be fixed in our judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. The chairman has worked very hard on it. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the

committee, says we don't like what the American people did. Well, obviously we don't. We lost the election.

Relevant to this bill is we don't like what Mr. JORDAN did. We don't like what the Republican leadership did in refusing to bring the Senate bill to a vote before the election.

We begged them to. DARRELL ISSA begged them and begged Mr. JORDAN. I did. HANK JOHNSON did. We said to bring it to the floor before the election. It will pass unanimously, and we will have the judges that we need because if it is not brought to the floor until after the election, one party or the other is going to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, we are objecting to this bill not because we object to what the American people did but because we object to what Mr. JORDAN and the Republican leadership did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 4199, the JUDGES Act.

I appreciate the comments that have come from the Republican side this morning, Chairman JORDAN in particular. We have had a chance to pass bipartisan legislation out of that committee. In fact, a couple of those bills have been mine, cosponsored with Republican WESLEY HUNT. I know we can get it done. I know we can work in a bipartisan fashion and get legislation out of the committee when we choose to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the idea behind this bill was to take the politics out of judicial nominations and selections. I think it is pretty clear. I think everyone would agree that this system has been broken for some time.

The Republicans point to the Bork nomination. On the Democratic side, we look at what happened with Merrick Garland and his Supreme Court nomination, which was blocked. He had to wait almost a year and wasn't even given a hearing during that time.

Then, after that, Justice Amy Coney Barrett was confirmed by the Senate in about a 3-week period, if I recall correctly, even though that happened just before the election and President Biden would have been in place to make the selection for the Supreme Court at that time.

This bill was aimed at trying to get around that and take the politics out of the selection process by having the decision made with respect to the passage of the legislation before we knew who the President was going to be. I thought that was a good way to go. I didn't cosponsor this bill, frankly, because I was a little worried that we would end up in exactly the place where we are today.

After the election was held, even though this bill came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in June and was passed unanimously in the Senate in

August, the House Judiciary Committee had several markups in September and August, so we could have taken the bill up then, but it never happened.

In fact, it didn't happen until after the election and President Trump was selected. Guess what happened then. Now that we are at the eleventh hour, we didn't even bother to have the committee markup process happen. My colleagues brought it straight to the floor and are now asking us to vote for it today on this expedited basis now that Republicans know who is going to win.

Mr. Speaker, we know how to do bipartisan legislation. Mr. ISSA, the gentleman on the other side, I know has done excellent bipartisan legislation, working with members of this committee on the Democratic side, and he has a long history of doing that. I think we can replicate that again.

Today, I ask that we not pass this bill. I ask my colleagues to vote against it. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's take another crack at making sure that we do this in a bipartisan way.

I agree that we need more judges. In fact, the courthouse that I practiced in, D.C. Superior Court, is short 10 judges. We need them there. We need them in other courts that I practiced in. We need them all over the country, but let's do it in the right way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time.

Mr. Speaker, we know how to do this the right way. The American people want us to do it the right way. We know the judicial nomination selection process has been broken for some time. This could be a way to take a step in the right direction for fixing that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" today, and let's get back to the drawing board and find a way to work together in a bipartisan fashion, yielding an apolitical result.

Elections have consequences. Mr. Trump is going to have his chance to put nominees on the court, for sure, but let's try to do it in a way that looks out over time and makes it more equitable over time so that we can have a balanced judiciary that the people believe in and have confidence in and don't feel that it is political and partisan.

□ 0945

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), a member of the committee, a member of the subcommittee, a cosponsor of this legislation, and an active proponent for the justice that we require by having Federal judges added to the bench.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I hope we are not getting a taste of what is to

come. The American people are watching. They have identified correctly that Washington is broken. There are a lot of problems that have arisen over the last 4 years because of the mismanagement from this White House and from the Democratic leadership of this House.

They wanted a President and a Congress, a House and a Senate, who are going to fix the problems facing this country.

Let me tell you, with the JUDGES Act, we are fixing a problem and we are seeing Democrats, once again, throwing a temper tantrum because they can't get their way. If this is what is to come over the next 4 years, get ready because it is going to be temper tantrum after temper tantrum by the Democrats because they are not getting their way.

They deserve the time-out that they are getting over the next 2 years. The American people have given Democrats a time-out for a reason.

This legislation responds to the findings of a nonpartisan policymaking body, the Judicial Conference of the United States, by creating the recommended judgeships during future Presidential administrations, addressing a long overdue critical issue facing our Federal judiciary and offering a meaningful solution.

It includes important updates to the structure and timing of new judgeships and introduces enhanced transparency requirements and provisions to ensure greater access to justice in high-need areas nationwide.

As of March 31, 2023, Federal district courts were facing a backlog of 686,000 pending cases, over half a million pending cases. That is an average of 491 filings per judgeship over a single year.

These represent delayed justice for countless individuals and businesses seeking resolution to their legal disputes. That is why the Judicial Conference recommended these 66 new district court judgeships. That is why the Senate passed it unanimously.

While some targeted legislation added 34 district court judgeships between 1999 and 2003, it has been 20 years since Congress last acted to address this issue comprehensively, and the Democrats are now arguing that we should wait another 4 years.

No. No. The Democrats can sit in their time-out; Republicans are going to lead. We deserve to have this legislation acted on so that the American peoples' wishes to have the problems identified and solved are implemented.

Given the severity of this issue, I can't believe that President Biden opposes this important bill. I hope he will reconsider. This act allows Congress the opportunity to modernize and strengthen our judiciary to ensure that justice is not delayed, but delivered.

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

Mr. Speaker, had the Republican leadership taken this bill up in Sep-

tember, we could have been celebrating a true bipartisan victory right now.

There is no question that it is necessary to authorize new Federal judgeships for the growing caseload in the Federal courts. That is why I fought to take up this bill earlier this year when the next President was unknown. That is why the Senate passed the bill in August. That is why Mr. ISSA and I and others urged Mr. JORDAN and the Republican leadership to take up the bill before the election, when the central arrangement of the bill they were setting up, 66 new judges across three unknown Presidential administrations and six unknown congressional majorities, would have been there. Now, it is too late for that.

Now we can wait for the new Congress in January and pass the bill, but it will have to be delayed 4 years. Why? Because the Republican leadership refused to take up the bill when it should have, when it would have gotten a unanimous vote here as it got a unanimous vote in the Senate.

I will continue to fight for more Federal judges, but we must do it at a time when the identity of the next President is not known. That is the fundamental bargain that is fair to both parties. Until then, we should reject this bill as nothing more than partisan gamesmanship.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, normally, when you know a bill is going to pass, you close quickly. I am going to break that rule for a few minutes today because I want to make one last plea. I wish the plea was to the American people as it should be. I wish the plea was to the Speaker as it will be from a standpoint of where I look and where I speak, but the plea is to the President of the United States not to be petty. It is to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to consider the long-term impact of this decision that has been spoken of today.

As the ranking member and my friend, JERRY NADLER, said, this was bipartisan. This was something that was worked out, not just now, but the gentleman from New York and I worked this out in 2017 and similarly, we couldn't get it across the finish line.

After that, people decided to be partisan for a while, and JERRY and I—if I may call the gentleman from New York my friend (Mr. NADLER), JERRY—we said no. We are going to go back to being men of the House. We are going to go back to doing what is good, putting country first, and particularly putting the needs of Article III, the other body, the one that we control, but only until they are appointed. Then once appointed, they serve for life. They serve in any way they choose for good behavior and as a result they become very independent and very much nonpartisan.

I am going to appeal in a couple of ways, for a moment, to my colleagues who have to make a vote that is not immediately to their party's benefit and for which the first 2 years are not unknown. It is easy to talk about 6 congressional periods, more than 10 years, 3 Presidents, and say, but I am not getting it the first 4 years.

Well, President Trump doesn't have 4 years; President Trump has 2 years in which we know that there is currently a Senate majority. Senate majorities come and go. Very easily 2 years from now the Senate could be under the other party's control. That would mean that no judge would be brought in those second 4 years, and half of those 25 seats that have been talked about here today, and probably more than half because of the time it takes to get through the process, more than half would be under a Senate that would say, no, we want to compromise.

I am a Californian. I have only had in my 24 years Democrats as my Senators. I have had quite a few, different status, different dedication. One of them is the current Vice President KAMALA HARRIS. I know how they use the blue slip. I know how in my State you don't get a super Trumper.

The fact is, you don't get anyone without a process of going through those Senators and getting compromise. I know that the seven that are to be produced over these next 4 years—none of them, by the way, in my home district where I desperately need them, but that was also part of the consideration and compromise—those will be, in fact, with two Democrat Senators who insist on moderate Republicans.

But let's go behind the nuances.

After those first 2 years, we have 8 more years. It could be that most of those years could be with a Democrat President and a Democrat Senate. Maybe not, but let's talk about the benefit or damage that if the President—because this bill is going to pass, hopefully with bipartisan support and, hopefully, with many people that aren't here today who have heard from their judges.

If the President signs it, yes, he will be signing saying that a few judges will be appointed and likely confirmed under this united government that currently is forecast.

Let's look at the scope.

There are 890 judges, including our appellate judges, 677 at the district court alone. In my district, almost half of the judges hearing cases are senior status. They don't even count. That means that there are over a thousand judges, including those who are on senior status, still working, essentially for free because they could retire and get the same money.

They, in fact, are working because the backlog is over three-quarters of a million cases. They are working because otherwise patents and other civil cases that cost tens of millions of dollars often, if delayed, cost millions of

dollars a year. They are trying to keep the system working.

The damage to our country, to our economy if we choose not to have this bill signed into law could be great, and the savings could be even greater for the efficiency.

Lastly, let's ask the real question. Over 1,000 judges, 890 not on senior status, and we are talking about 25 that could be appointed if the President holds the Senate for his 4 years, 25 out of 890. That isn't very many.

In the opening remarks, my good friend from New York did mention that there could be 100 judges appointed by the next President and confirmed by the Senate. That is true. That is going to happen whether we expand this or not.

The question is, for example: For the three temporary judges in Oklahoma, will the backlog of cases for Native Americans that prompted those temporary positions, will that continue?

Will we continue to have judges constantly getting on airplanes and running around almost like a riding circuit in order to fill a gap here or there because they don't have enough judges but they try to find a judge that they can move around a little bit?

Will we continue to have justice denied because justice delayed is justice denied, or will we alleviate some of this?

Will we work with the Chief Justice and all the Justices of the Supreme Court? By the way, there are nine of them and not one of them has called the ranking member or the chairman and said, don't do this bill now because it might be partisan.

The Justices of both parties, the judges appointed by both parties, are still calling all of the offices and asking, please move this bill.

Lastly, in closing, I will share with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. I wish we had brought this sooner. I know that it would have been more likely to have been broadly passed and signed by a President who thought his Vice President was going to replace him or even earlier when he thought he was going to get a second term, but we are not there.

We are in a position where I am going to ask as many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote for this, to put country before the obvious politics of it.

Lastly, the plea I make to the former Senator that I served with, the former Vice President that I served with, and the President I now serve with, don't be petty. Don't put politics ahead of the good of the country.

Before considering the signing of this bill, which I know will go to his desk, talk to the court, talk to Members that he, in fact, as a Senator from Delaware helped put on the bench and ask them: Should I sign this bill or should I veto it and hope that you can put up with 2, 4, or 20 more years before we send you enough judges to adjudicate the cases, particularly civil, that are pending?

That is the plea I make here today. It is not a plea I have ever made before, and I hope I don't have to make it again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all our colleagues to please put country first ahead of the obvious politics that are here and vote for this bill.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I vote in favor of S. 4199, the Judicial Understaffing Delays Getting Emergencies Solved Act of 2024, to allow for the creation of additional judgeships in under resourced district courts across the country. However, this is not the version of the bill I would have preferred due to the temporary nature of the additional judgeships slated for the State of Oklahoma. As the only state to receive additional temporary judgeships in this legislation, I believe this not only ignores the ongoing need for more long-standing, dependable resources across the state but also jeopardizes the longevity of these essential positions and creates uncertainty in the judicial system. Temporary judgeships will not satisfy the long-term need for judicial resources following the permanent jurisdictional shifts in criminal and civil proceedings in the state and subsequent backlog of cases pending in the justice system. Any new judgeships should be made permanent to reflect the drastic expansion of federal jurisdiction and to enact swift justice on behalf of the people of Oklahoma.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1612, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 173, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]
YEAS—236

Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Castor (FL)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar

Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong

Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, V.
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Letlow
Lopez
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Nickel
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Panetta
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Posey
Reschenthaler

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Suozi
Tenny
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wied
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—173

Adams
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Burchett
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro

DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster

Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (PA)
Lee Carter
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Pelosi
Peltola
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter

Pressley	Scott, David	Tlaib
Quigley	Sewell	Tokuda
Ramirez	Sherman	Tonko
Raskin	Sherrill	Torres (CA)
Ross	Smith (WA)	Torres (NY)
Roy	Sorensen	Trahan
Ruppersberger	Stansbury	Underwood
Salinas	Stanton	Vasquez
Sánchez	Stevens	Veasey
Sarbanes	Strickland	Velázquez
Scanlon	Swalwell	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Sykes	Schultz
Schneider	Takano	Waters
Scholten	Thanedar	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Williams (GA)
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Armstrong	Evans	Rodgers (WA)
Burgess	Ferguson	Slotkin
Chavez-DeRemer	Granger	Trone
Cherfilus-	Grijalva	Wagner
McCormick	Lee (CA)	Waltz
Clarke (NY)	Molinaro	Wexton
Dingell	Moskowitz	Wild
Duncan	Newhouse	

□ 1029

Mr. VARGAS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for roll call votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 501.

Stated against:

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 501.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2024, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 7840

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 7840, a bill originally introduced by Representative Jackson Lee of Texas, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING MAJOR SUZANNE MULET

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

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate my incredible Marine Corps Fellow, Major Suzanne Mulet, for her tremendous work this past year in my office.

Suzanne has been instrumental in helping prepare for defense events and legislation, especially when it comes to the Defense Appropriations and MilCon/VA portfolios. Her tireless work, wealth of knowledge, experience, and expertise has been crucial in crafting legislation that directly benefits our servicemembers in Oklahoma's Fifth District. Her hard work in my office and service to our Nation is applaudable.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Sue's leadership during Marine Corps Day. She led a group of Hill staff through numerous exercises, and my office still talks about it to this day.

I can't thank her enough for her dedication, not only to her country but to her office, her family, and her horses. She will be truly missed.

I thank Sue for everything she has done for America and for Team Bice.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 5301. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicate reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5646. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing incidents, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1351. An act to study and prevent child abuse in youth residential programs, and for other purposes.

S. 5060. An act to reauthorize the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, and for other purposes.

CONGRATULATING COMMANDER KEVIN DORE ON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF COMMAND

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Commander Kevin Dore, on the successful completion of his command of the USS *Daniel Inouye*. Under his leadership, the USS *Daniel Inouye* embarked on its maiden deployment, a 9-month tour that demonstrated the strength, skill, readiness, and resilience of our Navy.

Initially deployed to the Pacific, the USS *Daniel Inouye's*, mission was extended when tensions in the Middle East flared. Commander Dore and his crew rose to the occasion and headed to the Red Sea where they exemplified

our Nation's commitment to helping others in need when they provided timely rescue assistance to Iranian mariners in distress.

I wish Kevin fair winds and following seas wherever life may take him. Please know that for all he has done for our State and our country, he will always be a “son of Hawaii,” “kamaaina,” and Hawaii will always be his home.

I say to Erin and the kids, John-Michael, Andrew, Lily, and Samuel, “thank you,” “mahalo” for sharing your husband and father with us and for being the rock of support he has always needed to truly go for broke.

SUPPORTING PASSAGE OF THE WATER RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

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

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the House passed the Water Resources and Development Act which includes essential protection for property owners on Table Rock Lake in my district.

Table Rock Lake is more than just a body of water. It is beloved as a landmark in southwest Missouri and a crown jewel of the Ozarks.

The provisions in this bill will ensure that property owners who have inadvertently encroached parts of their homes on corps land or rely on septic systems do not have to remove these essential structures.

I extend my gratitude to Chairman GRAVES, a proud fellow Missourian and a steadfast advocate for this cause. I also wish to thank Subcommittee Chairman ROUZER for his unwavering support of these critical provisions.

Together, we are standing up for the rights and the livelihoods of the residents of Table Rock Lake. This is a proud, proud moment for southwest Missouri, and I am so honored to be leading this effort.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF GERALD WOMACK

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

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Gerald Womack, a distinguished leader and native son of Houston, Texas.

For over three decades, Mr. Womack has been at the forefront of community revitalization, serving as the president and CEO of Womack Development & Investment Realtors.

His work has brought economic opportunity and housing improvement to an area rich in cultural heritage in the heart of the 18th Congressional District.

As of December 2022, his firm was ranked number three by the Houston