

this Chamber contemplates premature retreat. All of October is already reserved for recess. Now, majority leadership is weighing the addition of 2 or even 3 more recess weeks in September, turning an already extended 5 weeks of absence into as much as 8 weeks of abdication.

Calamity does not pause for campaigns. Abroad, the war in Iran burns hotter by the hour. At home, millions face canceled care, punishing tariffs add thousands to family bills, and our national debt mounts.

From the West's wildfires to flooding and a fall full of hurricanes, natural disasters demand not our departure but our duty.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected not to flee friction but to forge solutions. Let us reject retreat, remain at our posts for September, and do the work for the American people.

STOP DATA SHARING BETWEEN ICE AND TSA

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, TSA is sharing passengers' names, birth dates, and private data with ICE, leading to a surge of unlawful arrests and detention at our airports.

Airports are becoming de facto detention centers, funneling humans into the ICE mass detention deportation agenda for profit. ICE agents are targeting immigrants who are in the process of changing their status, including those waiting for visa extensions, with employment authorization documents, or recently married to a U.S. citizen.

They are subjecting them to unconstitutional mass surveillance and creating a climate of fear for our immigrant neighbors. Why? Because ICE literally said immigrants at airports make for "easy targets" to fulfill our daily arrest quotas. That is disgusting. Enough is enough.

We can't allow TSA to become complicit in ICE's cruelty, and I am asking the TSA administrator to stop openly lying about the secret data-sharing agreement that was entered into with ICE.

Mr. Speaker, please support No TSA Data for ICE Act that I introduced with many of my colleagues.

PROTECT ECONOMIC AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM ACT OF 2026

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1499, I call up the bill (H.R. 4795) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit an institution that participates in a non-expressive commercial boycott of Israel from being eligible for certain funds under that Act, to require an institution that participates in certain programs under that Act to certify that students are not unreasonably obstructed from participating in aca-

demic programs in Israel, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Workforce, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-39 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4795

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 "Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. INELIGIBILITY OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION PARTICIPATING IN CERTAIN NONEXPRESSIVE COMMERCIAL BOYCOTTS.

Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(30)(A) The institution will not engage in a nonexpressive commercial boycott of a major strategic partner of the United States.

"(B) For purposes of this paragraph:

"(i) The term 'major strategic partner' means, with respect to the United States—

"(I) a country described in section 4 of Public Law 113-296; or

"(II) an entity licensed or regulated by, or organized under the laws of, such a country.

"(ii) The term 'nonexpressive commercial boycott of a major strategic partner'—

"(I) means a commercial action (including engaging in refusals to deal and terminating business activities) that—

"(aa) is intended to limit commercial relations with a major strategic partner; and

"(bb) is not based on a valid business reason; and

"(II) does not include actions described in regulations issued to provide for the exceptions described in section 1773(a)(2) of the Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4842(a)(2))."

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY FOR TITLE VI FUNDS.

Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"SEC. 639. INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.

"(a) ANNUAL REQUIREMENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY.—Not later than July 31 of each calendar year beginning on or after the date of enactment of the Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act of 2026, an institution of higher education participating or applying to participate in any program under this title shall submit to the Secretary the certification required under subsection (b). An institution that does not submit such certification by July 31 of a calendar year shall be ineligible to receive any funds under this title in the first fiscal year that begins after such July 31, including any funds under this title that would otherwise have been available to the institution in such fiscal year for a grant awarded during a previous fiscal year.

"(b) CERTIFICATION.—An institution shall certify to the Secretary that, for the period beginning on the date of such certification and ending on July 31 of the following year, the institution will—

"(1) permit students and faculty of the certifying institution to participate in academic programs, including conferences, teaching exchanges, cultural exchanges, study abroad programs, joint research, and other collaborative

educational activities, in a major strategic partner (as defined in section 487(a)(30)) of the United States in the same manner, and under the same terms and conditions, as students and faculty of the institution are permitted to participate in academic programs in other foreign countries; and

"(2) permit students and faculty of postsecondary educational institutions in such a major strategic partner to participate in academic programs offered by the certifying institution, including conferences, teaching exchanges, cultural exchanges, study abroad programs, joint research, and other collaborative educational activities, in the same manner, and under the same terms and conditions, as students and faculty of other foreign postsecondary educational institutions that are not in such a major strategic partner.

"SEC. 639A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

"It is the sense of Congress that limitations on cooperative efforts by institutions of higher education, consortia of such institutions, or partnerships between nonprofit educational organizations and institutions of higher education with a major strategic partner (as defined in section 487(a)(30)) of the United States do not serve the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States."

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 Education and Workforce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4795.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4795, Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act.

In recent years, we have seen campaigns to boycott Israel spread across American campuses. These campaigns have pressured colleges and universities to cut financial, commercial, and academic ties with Israeli companies and institutions. That can mean restricting study abroad opportunities, research partnerships, academic exchanges, conferences, and other programs involving Israel.

We cannot ignore the role these campaigns have played in fueling the alarming rise of anti-Semitism on college campuses. It is no coincidence that some of the largest supporters of these campaigns have applauded the October 7 attacks and continue to use anti-Semitic language.

The Boycott, Divest and Sanctions, or BDS, movement singles out and demonizes Israel. It rejects the truth that Israel is a close friend and strategic

partner of the United States. Our universities should not use taxpayer-funded Federal programs to discriminate against Israeli students, faculty, institutions, or businesses simply because they are Israeli.

H.R. 4795 would prohibit participating institutions from engaging in boycotts of Israel that are not based on legitimate business reasons. It would also require colleges and universities to treat academic opportunities involving Israel the same as those involving other countries, ensuring Israeli students and faculty have the same access to academic programs and opportunities as their peers from around the world.

This is about fairness. It is about justice. It is about protecting academic freedom. It is about accountability for Federal taxpayer dollars.

The Federal Government provides significant support to higher education. American taxpayers should not be funding institutions that utilize Federal programs while simultaneously pursuing discriminatory boycotts or unequal academic treatment based solely on ties to Israel.

H.R. 4795 passed the committee with bipartisan support, 24-9. That vote reflects what should be an important bipartisan consensus. Our institutions of higher education should be welcoming places for scholarship and exchange, not hotbeds of anti-Semitism and discrimination.

□ 0920

I hope the floor vote reflects this principle.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4795 and send a clear message that academic and economic freedom must be protected on our campuses.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we find ourselves here, again, purportedly to address anti-Semitism in American higher education. While we should be able to agree that there is no place in higher education for anti-Semitism, the fact is my colleagues on the other side have been curiously quiet, or selectively quiet, about addressing anti-Semitism when it actually does occur.

Recall when President Trump declared that there were fine people on both sides when a bunch of White supremacists and their Unite the Right rally marched on the University of Virginia's campus chanting: "Jews will not replace us."

My colleagues on the other side were also silent as numerous reports regarding chapters of the College Republicans openly promoted their hatred of Jewish people among other groups.

All the while this has been going on, my colleagues have not told the President to stop firing lawyers at the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education, the agency responsible for

investigating claims of anti-Semitism in education.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are certainly mum about how this administration is dismissing Title VI disparate impact analysis, the very tool necessary to address practices and policies that may appear facially neutral but, in fact, discriminate against protected classes under the law.

I have not heard them comment on the whistleblower allegations, and many investigations into anti-Semitism on college campuses, led by the Department of Justice's Anti-Semitism Task Force, were based not on fact patterns or legal analysis but political priorities.

With that said, we have the bill before us, the so-called Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act, which would amend the Higher Education Act by imposing new conditions on colleges and universities that receive higher education funding. Under the bill, institutions receiving Title IV Federal student aid would be legally required to certify that they are not engaged in a nonexpressive commercial boycott of Israel.

I will begin with an important distinction: there is a difference between actions, or views of students, or even recognized student organizations and the official policy of the colleges and universities they attend.

Students have the right to express their political views, but that does not mean that their university has adopted those views, such as the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, or BDS, movement. We have yet to see a single college or university in the United States adopt the BDS movement or institutional boycott policies contemplated in the bill.

Simply put, the bill does not address any ongoing or existing higher education policy boycotting Israel. Nonetheless, this would create new Federal requirements intended to prevent institutions from adopting such policies in the future.

Moreover, as we examine the bill, Members should be careful to consider how these Federal requirements would operate in practice, the potential of negative effect on institutions receiving Federal funds, and whether the bill is misusing the power that we have from the Constitution's Spending Clause to illegally sanction First Amendment-protected speech, particularly those of students.

As written, the bill presents serious First Amendment problems and improperly limits academic freedom.

I had hoped these problems could have been resolved before we got to the floor, but they weren't, so I will be opposing the bill. For these reasons, I ask Members to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the sponsor of this good legislation and necessary legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 4795, bipartisan legislation to combat anti-Semitic, discriminatory commercial and academic boycotts of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALBERG for yielding me time, and I thank him for advancing this critical bill out of committee.

I also thank Ranking Member SCOTT for his vote in committee to advance the bill on a bipartisan basis.

In addition, I also thank the co-author of this bill, Representative GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey, for his tireless work on this bipartisan achievement.

I thank the groups that we worked with and those that support this legislation, the American Jewish Committee and the Combat Antisemitism Movement, for their steadfast support.

Mr. Speaker, for decades now, the State of Israel, Israelis, and the people of Jewish faith have been internationally subjected to deplorable boycotts of their identity, their livelihoods, and their vitality.

As others have stated, these boycotts are anti-Semitic in their design and discriminatory in their effect, and after October 7, universities have become the epicenters of these campaigns.

Let me just quote the cofounder of the modern BDS movement, Omar Barghouti, emphasis mine: "The ending of Israeli control in the territories is but the first stage of the road to fulfilling the vision of the dismantling of Israel."

You heard that correctly, "the dismantling of Israel," as stated by the founder of this deplorable movement.

I want every Member of the House that is about to vote on this measure to reckon with this fact: the very founder of the BDS movement wants to dismantle the Jewish state. That is why the American Jewish Committee has characterized BDS leadership as seeking nothing less than the elimination of Israel as a Jewish state.

Every Member here should let that sink in and every Member should understand that this bill represents the House's opportunity to stop this anti-Semitic, discriminatory, and inhuman campaign from being fueled by American taxpayers and stop it in its tracks.

Commercial and academic boycotts like the ones we see, when fueled by taxpayer funds, represent concrete discrimination against the people's national origin. They are discriminating against people of the Jewish faith. They result in discrimination against and marginalizing of Israeli students. No matter how you slice it, these anti-Semitic boycotts should have no place in higher education and deserve zero intersection with the Federal Government.

Now, let me speak to the chief argument from opponents of this bill: that these boycotts are illusionary, non-events, or they haven't yet been actualized by administrators, so there is no

reason to address possible taxpayer funding.

These boycotts are manifest. They are coordinated. They are real. They marginalize Jewish students. They harm Israel, Israelis, and Jewish students economically.

Case in point, the Evergreen State College in Washington, at the administrative level, reached an agreement to address divestment from companies that profit from the "occupation of Palestinian territories." You can read this commitment to boycott and divest from Israel online as we speak.

The Committee on Education and Workforce's investigation last Congress revealed that faculty members and Northwestern's provost—administrators, mind you—were openly willing to appease encampment organizers in their efforts to demand that the university boycott Sabra hummus. These demands were only rejected after Congress threw its full weight and investigative power against such appeasements.

The lack of successful commercial boycotts isn't due to a lack of trying. During the 2023-2024 academic year, at least 86 BDS resolutions were considered across graduate, undergraduate, and professional student organizations and faculty unions.

Academic boycotts have a record of taxpayer support. Keep in mind, they can be stealthily executed at the programmatic level and can be accomplished without the expressed support from university administrators.

One leading professor at Georgetown's Title VI supported National Resource Center has actively pursued a full academic boycott of Israel.

In 2013, the American Studies Association, the largest academic—

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 0930

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, the American Studies Association, the largest academic group in the United States, adopted a policy endorsing an academic boycott of Israel. In 2014, six taxpayer-supported NRC directors signed a letter endorsing an academic boycott of Israel. These academic boycotts contravene the purposes of the title VI funding they received.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, but now is not the time for talk. The facts are evident. Now is the time for action. This Congress needs to codify this preventive measure to protect students and taxpayers from this disgusting discrimination.

Again, I thank Chairman WALBERG and Representative GOTTHEIMER for their work on this bipartisan legislation. I urge the Chamber to draw a line in the sand against these harmful campaigns against the State of Israel, Israelis, and our Jewish students at home.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an attack on free speech and academic freedom, all in the name of defending a genocidal apartheid state.

While the Trump administration is stripping universities of their funding, deporting international students, and pressuring universities to shut down their Black and African-American studies departments, Congress is voting today to force universities to pledge their loyalty to what? To a foreign government.

That is right. Support the Israeli Government and their war crimes or lose Federal student aid.

Boycotts are protected free speech and an important tool for social change, from the civil rights movement to today. Academic boycotts had helped bring down the apartheid state in South Africa, as well as abolish segregation right here at home.

This is not about protecting our Jewish neighbors because many of the boycotts and the divestment movements on campuses are led by Jewish students who were yelling: Not in our name.

Do you know what this is about? I will show you. This is about protecting an image like this from Israel's National Security Minister this week. This is what he put up on social media, showing the fate that he has planned for the Palestinian people.

What is this? This is an image of Palestinians walking into a gas chamber. This is what students are boycotting.

Yet, here we are, punishing them for speaking out against this, speaking out against ethnic cleansing, genocide, and bombings of hospitals, schools, and refugee camps.

This bill is a clear assault on higher education for millions of working-class students who depend on Federal student aid to get an education. A vote for this bill is a betrayal of those promising young students, denying them the right to an education. Why? Because they want to save lives, no matter their faith or ethnicity.

The Trump administration is committed to dismantling higher education and public education in our country. We all see it, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. First, it is a ban on boycotting an apartheid government state, and then it is going to be a ban on divesting from fossil fuels, or maybe teachers will be banned based on what teachers are teaching now.

We need to stand against this attack on academic freedom and stand up for students. They are doing what is right in our history, and I am not going to wait a decade for people to apologize for it, because they are trying to save lives. It is their constitutional right to be able to boycott and run campaigns that are peaceful and saying: Enough is enough. Not with our dime, and not in our name.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah

(Mr. OWENS), the vice chairman of the House Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4795, the Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act.

Anti-Semitism on American campuses is not a fringe problem, and it is not slowing down. Across the United States and our institutions of higher learning, we have seen a concerted and coordinated effort to isolate Jewish students and faculty.

In fact, as we have heard, the Combat Antisemitism Movement reported 531 incidents in the U.S. on college and university campuses in 2025.

I am incredibly proud of the work that the Education and Workforce Committee has done to combat the spread of this vile ideology, and American taxpayers' dollars should not go to subsidize universities that are actively singling out one of our closest allies to discriminate against them.

This isn't an issue over protests or slogans. In too many instances, this hatred has become a form of institutional discrimination supported by our colleges and universities. When that line is crossed, Congress has every right to intervene and demand that if you receive Federal dollars, there are basic standards that must be met.

I am grateful for Dr. Foxx and her leadership in this space, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this measure.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bad idea. It tramples on the rights of Americans in order to protect a foreign government from the consequences of its own actions.

Let me give you some context. The West Bank is currently experiencing the worst year of settler violence ever recorded. Israeli settlers have committed violence, terrorism, and many other things against Palestinians, with the goal of driving them out of the lands they have lived in for generations. It is an ethnic cleansing. They have assaulted and killed Palestinian Americans and laid siege to their homes.

The Israeli Government has turned a blind eye to this violence and, in many cases, has actively supported it, protecting the criminals and not the victims.

The same government has orchestrated a record expansion of illegal Israeli settlements, a violation of international law and a crime against the Palestinians who live there.

Americans see this. The world sees this. Yet, what is the priority of our House of Representatives right now? It is not to stop the violence, not to stop the displacement, and not to protect the children. The priority of this House today is a bill that threatens to take Federal student aid away from American citizens and to protect this activity in these settlements.

Don't let anyone convince you that this bill is about anti-Semitism or even just about Israel. The bill's language is written to include Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank. It is in defense of an illegal act by a foreign government, and the victims will be American students.

If this House should be debating anything on this issue, it should be sanctions on these settlements and not a bill that protects them.

Let me lay out a scenario so that we understand exactly how this piece of legislation would work.

If a university in Texas decided tomorrow to stop doing business with a company in South Carolina, California, or Idaho, it would face no consequences under American law. Make the same decision about Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank, and this bill strips American students of their Pell grants and American veterans of their hard-earned benefits. This bill holds American students' education hostage to protect a foreign government.

We would be doing this in flagrant violation of the United States Constitution. In the landmark decision *NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware Co.*, the Supreme Court held that a politically motivated boycott is protected expression under the First Amendment. This isn't an obscure case. It is the reason the sponsors of the bill wrote the word "nonexpressive" into the text.

Yet, every example that the sponsors point to is plainly political. A boycott is a political act. It is protected under the First Amendment, and you don't have to even agree with the boycott to support an American's right to engage in it.

Every Member of this body raised their hand and swore an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, and I urge every Member of this body today to take that oath seriously and vote against this bill.

□ 0940

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the *RECORD* a statement from J Street, which says in part: "This means infringing on constitutionally protected free speech and academic freedom by penalizing institutions (and thereby unrelated research) for participation in certain boycott or divestment efforts targeted at Israel or Israeli settlements. There is a fundamental distinction between the State of Israel and the territory that it occupies over the Green Line, and penalizing universities for expressing their opposition to activities that further annexation sets a dangerous precedent."

[From J Street, Aug. 31, 2026]

J STREET STATEMENT OPPOSING H.R. 4795

WASHINGTON, DC—J Street opposes the Protect Economic and Academic Freedom

Act of 2025 (H.R. 4795), which would condition federal funding on a university's choices regarding investments, procurement, partnerships, and other institutional activities in Israel and the West Bank.

While we oppose the Global BDS Movement and strongly support academic engagement between American and Israeli institutions, we believe this legislation takes the wrong approach to these issues.

Specifically, the legislation would penalize any institution that chooses to engage in a nonexpressive commercial boycott against Israel and "an entity licensed or regulated by, or organized under the laws of," Israel, which would include Israeli settlements in the West Bank.

This means infringing on constitutionally protected free speech and academic freedom by penalizing institutions (and thereby unrelated research) for participation in certain boycott or divestment efforts targeted at Israel or Israeli settlements. There is a fundamental distinction between the State of Israel and the territory that it occupies over the Green Line, and penalizing universities for expressing their opposition to activities that further annexation sets a dangerous precedent.

Furthermore, this bill does not keep American Jewish students on campus safe, nor does it address the lived experience of anti-Semitism that American Jewish students encounter. Instead, by changing US code to to exceptionalize the treatment of Israel at American universities, this bill runs the risk of inflaming antisemitism.

J Street believes the most effective way to counter antisemitism on college campuses is through open debate, education, and renewed efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—not through punitive legislation aimed to curb the freedom to boycott.

We urge Members of Congress to vote against this bill and instead cosponsor the Antisemitism Response and Prevention Act (H.R. 6806). This bill would implement a whole-of-government approach to fighting antisemitism by funding the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education and mandating the designation of a Title VI coordinator on every college campus in order to provide students with additional resources in hopes of preventing antisemitism and other hate on campus.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the *RECORD* a statement from the American Federation of Teachers which says in part: "The AFT has long fought for academic freedom, the safety and dignity of all students and educators, and policies that keep higher education accessible. H.R. 4795 undermines those goals rather than advancing them."

AFT, AFL-CIO,

Washington, DC, September 1, 2026.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.875 million members of the AFT who work in education, healthcare and public services, I am writing to urge you to oppose H.R. 4795, the Protect Economic and Academic Freedom Act of 2026, when it comes before the House. Conditioning federal student aid—which millions of low- and middle-income students depend on to afford college—on an institution's compliance with a vague and sweeping prohibition on "nonexpressive commercial boycotts" will not have the desired effect. All it will do is hurt students.

The AFT has historically taken a position against the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement for several reasons. First, it

undermines the Israelis and Palestinians who are on the ground working in favor of coexistence. It also could end critical relationships with universities, nongovernmental organizations, businesses and unions that foster Israeli-Palestinian cooperation and stop any assistance from going to the very people who are pushing back against Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his government's response.

At the core of our union's values—and, I would argue, of American values—is the commitment to fighting hate and discrimination while protecting our nation's first freedoms: free speech, peaceful protest and association, and due process. AFT members work every day to model this balance in our schools and communities, striving to create welcoming and safe environments for all students and educators—free from anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and hate of every kind—while ensuring that people can speak, organize and protest peacefully.

H.R. 4795, however, does not advance that goal, nor does it accurately represent what is going on at most campuses. Assuming the definition is directed at the BDS movement, ending student aid will not in and of itself protect any students or staff—Jewish, Muslim or LGBTQIA+ or any other minorities—from discrimination and harassment. That requires vigorous enforcement of existing civil rights laws and meaningful campus-climate initiatives—not financial penalties that have no direct connection to whether an institution has discriminated against or harassed members of its community.

Moreover, tying federal financial aid to an institution's position on a foreign-policy issue risks sweeping in a broad range of protected institutional and academic decisions that have nothing to do with antisemitism. Instead, the bill will simply infringe on the First Amendment and free speech.

Most significantly, the bill punishes students, not institutions. Cutting off federal aid because of decisions made by college and university administrators—which individual students have no control over—is the wrong way to advance any policy goal. Those who can least afford it could be forced to leave college or forgo higher education altogether.

I write not only as AFT president, but as a lawyer, civics teacher and deeply engaged Jew—as someone married to a rabbi and who has experienced antisemitism firsthand. I understand the challenge of striking the right balance, and I know it must be approached with care. I have no doubt that Congress can and should take affirmative steps to combat antisemitism without undermining the civil rights and liberties of others or putting students' access to higher education at risk. But H.R. 4795 doesn't accomplish this.

The AFT has long fought for academic freedom, the safety and dignity of all students and educators, and policies that keep higher education accessible. H.R. 4795 undermines those goals rather than advancing them. We urge you to vote no.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,

President, AFT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will close by returning to the central point: that we must distinguish between student or faculty expression in university policy.

A student organization or individual faculty member supporting BDS is not the same thing as the university administration adopting BDS as policy. A faculty member expressing a political opinion is not the same thing as the institution imposing a boycott.

Importantly, we have yet to see a single American college or university adopting BDS in the way the bill suggests. Furthermore, we know the bill is intended to target the BDS movement. Yet it is not clear whether a school that even joined the BDS movement would be covered by the text of the bill.

The bill implicates “nonexpressive boycotts” as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) just pointed out. If it is expressive, it is protected by the First Amendment. BDS by its very nature is designed to express disapproval of the actions of the State of Israel. If a college or university came out and publicly said it was joining BDS, most people would agree that that announcement and any activity that flowed from it would clearly be expressive, and therefore, out of the scope of the bill.

As an expressive activity, the statement would be protected under the First Amendment, and therefore, the First Amendment would protect the funding from being removed. But, again, no college or university has embraced the BDS movement anyway.

We should combat anti-Semitism wherever it occurs, but we should not do so by punishing protected speech or conflating students’ views with university policies.

For those reasons I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is about a simple principle: Our colleges and universities should not discriminate against Israel, Israeli institutions, or Israeli students; and Federal taxpayer dollars should never support institutions that engage in such discrimination.

Academic freedom means students and faculty should be free to study, conduct research, collaborate, and exchange ideas without boycotts closing doors based on nationality.

H.R. 4795 protects that principle. It ensures that colleges participating in Federal higher education programs do not engage in certain unjustified commercial boycotts of Israel and that academic opportunities involving Israel are treated fairly and equally.

This is particularly important at a time when Jewish students and faculty are facing an alarming rise in anti-Semitism on American campuses.

Our universities should be places where every student can learn without fear of discrimination or hostility and where academic partnerships are evaluated on their merits, not on campaigns that target one country.

The United States has a strong and enduring partnership with Israel. Our colleges and universities should not be undermining that relationship while asking American taxpayers to support their institution.

H.R. 4795 passed our committee with bipartisan support. Now it is time for

the full House to stand for academic freedom, equal treatment, and responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

I thank Representative VIRGINIA FOXX for her leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 4795.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, 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.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 237, nays 169, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—237

Aderholt	Evans (CO)	Joyce (OH)
Alford	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Allen	Fallon	Kean
Amodei (NV)	Fedorchak	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Feenstra	Kelly (PA)
Auchincloss	Fine	Kennedy (UT)
Babin	Finstad	Kiggans (VA)
Bacon	Fischbach	Kiley (CA)
Baird	Fitzgerald	Kim
Balderson	Fitzpatrick	Knott
Barr	Fleischmann	Kustoff
Barrett	Flood	LaHood
Baumgartner	Fong	LaLota
Bean (FL)	Foxx	Landsman
Begich	Frankel, Lois	Langworthy
Bentz	Franklin, Scott	Latimer
Bergman	Fry	Latta
Bice	Fulcher	Lawler
Biggs (AZ)	Fuller	Lee (FL)
Biggs (SC)	Gallagher	Lee (NV)
Billirakis	Garbarino	Letlow
Boebert	Gill (TX)	Lucas
Bost	Gillen	Luna
Brecheen	Gimenez	Luttrell
Bresnahan	Golden (ME)	Mace
Buchanan	Goldman (TX)	MacKenzie
Burchett	Gonzalez, V.	Malliotakis
Burlison	Gooden	Maloy
Calvert	Gosar	Mann
Cammack	Graves	Mannion
Carey	Griffith	Mast
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McClain
Carter (TX)	Guest	McClintock
Castor (FL)	Guthrie	McCormick
Cisneros	Hageman	McGuire
Cline	Hamadeh (AZ)	Messmer
Cloud	Haridopolos	Meuser
Clyde	Harrigan	Miller (OH)
Cole	Harris (MD)	Miller (WV)
Collins	Harris (NC)	Moolenaar
Comer	Harshbarger	Moore (AL)
Costa	Hern (OK)	Moore (NC)
Courtney	Higgins (LA)	Moore (UT)
Crane	Hill (AR)	Moore (WV)
Crank	Hinson	Moran
Crawford	Houchin	Moskowitz
Crenshaw	Hudson	Murphy
Cuellar	Huizenga	Nehls
Davis (NC)	Hunt	Newhouse
De La Cruz	Hurd (CO)	Norcross
DesJarlais	Issa	Norman
Diaz-Balart	Jack	Nunn (IA)
Downing	Jackson (TX)	Onder
Edwards	James	Owens
Ellzey	Johnson (LA)	Palmer
Emmer	Johnson (SD)	Panetta
Estes	Jordan	Patronis

Perez	Shreve
Perry	Simpson
Pfleger	Smith (MO)
Reschenthaler	Smith (NE)
Riley (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (AL)	Smucker
Rogers (KY)	Soto
Rose	Stauber
Rouzer	Stefanik
Roy	Stell
Rulli	Steube
Rutherford	Stevens
Salazar	Strong
Scalise	Stutzman
Schmidt	Suozzi
Schneider	Taylor
Scholten	Tenney
Schrier	Thandekar
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)
Scott, Austin	Tiffany
Self	Timmons
Sessions	Titus
Sherman	Torres (NY)

NAYS—169

Adams	Garcia (CA)	Mrvan
Aguilar	Garcia (IL)	Mullin
Amo	Garcia (TX)	Nadler
Ansari	Goodlander	Neal
Balint	Gray	Neguse
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Beatty	Grijalva	Olsewski
Bera	Harder (CA)	Omar
Beyer	Hayes	Pallone
Bishop	Himes	Pappas
Blair	Horsford	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hoyer	Peters
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Pettersen
Brown	Huffman	Pingree
Brownley	Ivey	Pocan
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Pou
Bynum	Jacobs	Pressley
Carbajal	Jayapal	Quigley
Carson	Jeffries	Ramirez
Carter (LA)	Johnson (GA)	Randall
Casas	Johnson (TX)	Raskin
Case	Kamlager-Dove	Rivas
Casten	Keating	Ross
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Ryan
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Salinas
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Scanlon
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conaway	Lee (PA)	Simon
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Liccardo
Craig	Levin	Lieu
Crockett	Liccardo	Lofgren
Crow	Lieu	Lynch
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Magaziner
Davidson	Lynch	Massie
Davis (IL)	Magaziner	Matsui
Dean (PA)	Massie	McBath
DeGette	Matsui	McBride
DeLauro	McBath	McClain Delaney
DelBene	McBride	McClellan
Deluzio	McClain Delaney	McColum
DeSaulnier	McClellan	McDonald Rivet
Dexter	McColum	McGarvey
Dingell	McDonald Rivet	McGovern
Doggett	McGarvey	McIver
Elfreh	McGovern	Meeks
Escobar	McIver	Mejia
Espallat	Meeks	Menefee
Evans (PA)	Mejia	Menendez
Fields	Menefee	Meng
Figures	Menendez	Mfume
Fletcher	Meng	Moore (WI)
Foster	Mfume	Morelle
Foushee	Moore (WI)	Morrison
Friedman	Morelle	
Frost	Morrison	

NOT VOTING—27

Bell	Houlahan	Moulton
Ciscomani	Kaptur	Obernolte
Cleaver	Loudermilk	Ogles
Donalds	McCaul	Schakowsky
Dunn (FL)	McDowell	Smith (WA)
Garamendi	Miller (IL)	Spartz
Goldman (NY)	Miller-Meeks	Strickland
Gomez	Mills	Velazquez
Gottheimer	Min	Wilson (SC)

□ 1024

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed her 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:

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I was unable to make the vote due to a funeral. I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 295, H.R. 4795.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote No. 295 on H.R. 4795 I mistakenly recorded my vote as NAY when I should have voted YEA.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE 25th ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, next week, the country will observe a solemn anniversary. Twenty-five years ago, on September 11, this Nation suffered the deadliest terrorist attack ever to occur on American soil.

We stand together today as Democrats and Republicans united to honor the 2,977 victims who lost their lives that day, and those who are continuing to die today from the toxic dust inhaled at the World Trade Center, to lend our support to those who were injured, to comfort those who are grieving the loss of a loved one, and to recognize the courage and sacrifice of all those who came to our aid on September 11 and in the days to follow.

The deadly attacks targeted the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. We also remember the tremendous courage of the passengers on United Airlines Flight 93 who sacrificed themselves to prevent another attack and crashed the plane into a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. There are many who believe that the intended target of that flight was the very Capitol building in which we are now standing.

We mourn the loss of all those who gave their lives on September 11, and we give our thanks to the many first responders who risked their own lives to save others. Many of them continue to live with the scars today.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that where the Twin Towers once stood, a memorial and the new World Trade Center have arisen. It is a testament to our resiliency and resolve in the face of tragedy and a resounding message to the terrorists that the United States continues to stand tall.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, every American of a certain age can remember exactly where they were on 9/11, when the deadliest terrorist attack on U.S. soil in history happened, killing 2,977 of our fellow Americans.

Fueled by hate, darkness, and evil, Islamic terrorists hijacked and weaponized commercial airplanes, turning them into suicidal missiles. The terrorists aimed at the heart of American exceptionalism. Two planes hit the World Trade Center, a symbol of world-leading capitalism and limitless economic opportunity; one hit the Pentagon, our Nation's headquarters of military might and patriotic service; and one was likely headed for this very Capitol, aiming for the people's House, symbolizing we the people of our constitutional Republic.

In fact, this historic Capitol might not even be here today were it not for the brave 40, the heroes who took back control of the hijacked plane that was brought down in a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, arguably the first Americans to fight what would become the global war on terror.

What the terrorists did not realize that day and the days after is that they would never bring the American people to our knees. On 9/11, you saw unbelievable acts of heroism from law enforcement, first responders, and everyday Americans who ran into the fire to save their fellow countrymen and -women. Many sacrificed their lives in the course of duty. You saw flags on every block and building, and tremendous acts of community service with neighbor helping neighbor simply because they were fellow Americans. Our country was more unified on September 12 than any day in modern history.

In the quarter century since that fateful day, we must always honor and remember those whose lives were cut short when they were killed by terrorists, and we must also remember and honor the thousands of 9/11 workers who cleaned up the rubble to rebuild and subsequently suffered and died because of 9/11 health-related illnesses.

We honor the veterans and military families who served countless tours in the global war on terror, and we thank our dedicated intelligence officials around the world working to keep us safe every day.

One hundred million Americans have been born since 9/11. They do not have a lived memory of that crystal blue sky the morning of the day that the world changed. It is up to our generation to teach them about September 11, to ensure we never forget, and to ensure it never happens again. We must teach them that out of the ashes on our darkest day, fellow Americans will always rise and meet the moment to protect, defend, and honor our country.

Mr. Speaker, next week, as we commemorate 9/11 in ceremonies big and small all across our great Nation, may God bless the innocent souls killed on that day, the first responders, 9/11 workers, and the veterans who served. May God continue to bless and keep safe the United States of America.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members and staff rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the victims of September 11.

□ 1030

HONORING FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES HATCHER OF GEORGIA

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, Georgia lost a true public servant and leader. Former Congressman Charles Hatcher was born in Georgia, served our country in the United States Air Force, earned his law degree, and returned to Southwest Georgia to practice his profession.

He served in the Georgia House of Representatives from 1973 to 1980 and subsequently in the U.S. House of Representatives, this House, from 1981 to 1992. He loved rural, Southwest Georgia. During his years of public service, he was a champion for agriculture and rural development.

While we competed in the 1992 Democratic primary for Georgia's Second Congressional District, which I won, I was glad to have his support and counsel, nonetheless, as I started my tenure on Capitol Hill. He and his wife, the Honorable Krysta Hardin, became friends of longstanding, and I will always cherish that friendship.

He continued to serve Americans as a Presidential appointee in the U.S. Department of Agriculture during both Clinton administrations, and he continued to serve the Virginia community in which he resided thereafter, volunteering his time with a number of local charities, including Meals on Wheels, and through his local church, the Washington Street United Methodist Church in Alexandria.

He leaves behind a legacy of love and compassion through his work and the relationships that he built.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife, Krysta; his children; his grandchildren; and loving family; as well as all of those whose lives he touched and helped make better. I will miss him dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), my colleague and friend.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BISHOP for yielding.

Charles Hatcher was a good man. He was a good Representative, and my family supported him in his last election.

I remember him on the farm with my Uncle Dan Raines and with many of our friends and colleagues. He was good for agriculture. He was from Doerun, Georgia, right down the road from where I live.

He joined the State bar, and he practiced law in Albany, Georgia. I will just tell you, he was just a good, solid man, and he was also replaced by a good, solid man.

I honor the life and the legacy of Charles Hatcher, and my condolences go out to his family.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Members of this House and all persons in the Chamber rise for a moment