



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2023

No. 196

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 29, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFFERSON VAN DREW to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WE DON'T HAVE THE LUXURY OF CHOOSING ONLY ONE THREAT AND ONE CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to remember history.

Over 80 years ago, the Greatest Generation fought the Second World War to keep tyrants from taking over the free world. They fought for freedom and democracy.

Today, we must honor their sacrifice by continuing to fight for the same principles.

Today's fight in Ukraine is for those principles—for the right of Ukraine and any other democratic nation and their people to exist. By aiding Ukraine, we are ensuring their continued existence.

Without that aid, Putin could have and probably would have wiped Ukraine off the face of the Earth, leaving it in a battle of insurgency.

Our aid has always been critical to the survival of nations far away. During the Second World War, President Franklin D. Roosevelt coined the phrase, "arsenal of democracy" to describe the U.S.'s role to providing weapons to democracies fighting to defend themselves.

Roosevelt argued that this assistance would enable our allies "to fight for their liberty and for our security." That is still true today.

Our continued aid is about preserving the liberty of vulnerable nations, but it is also about our national security.

In FDR's fourth inaugural address, he said, "We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away."

Those who argue that this is not our fight fail to remember this critical idea. They fail to remember that Ukraine's fight is for the same reasons we formed NATO and the United Nations.

Ukraine's fight is ours, for if Putin is not defeated, he would not stop at Ukraine. His greater aim is to reconstitute the former Soviet Union, imperiling freedom and democracy in the region and enveloping them in tyranny.

Putin's intention was to form a federation with Belarus and Ukraine, where he would have installed a puppet government, to overtake Moldova, the Baltics, and beyond. It would mean even more of the same devastation we have seen for well over a year.

When I traveled to Ukraine in July 2022, I saw the flattened maternity hospital and mass graves that Putin's

forces left in their wake. If not for our assistance, Putin's reign of terror would be happening on a much larger scale.

Following the Second World War, we vowed never again. Now our word is being tested. We must make good on that promise.

Our commitment is to that promise and our resolve is on display for the rest of the world. We must show leaders in Tehran and Beijing and elsewhere that we will not cower in the face of tyranny. That is why we must fund Ukraine's defense.

Now some would continue to present a false choice that we must fund Ukraine or Israel, but not both. They are wrong. We do not have to choose. In the words of NATO General Secretary Stoltenberg, "We have the capability, the strength to address different challenges at the same time. We don't have the luxury of choosing only one threat and one challenge."

The conflict in Israel and the conflict in Ukraine are tied together by Vladimir Putin. Just as Iran is supporting Hamas' attack on Israel, Iran is also assisting Putin in his assault on Ukraine. We can help Israel defend itself from terrorism while also helping Ukraine defend itself from an evil autocrat.

President John F. Kennedy said, "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Right now that price is the request that President Biden has made, enough to aid Ukraine for the next year of fighting.

It is a small price to pay for our national security and global security. Failing to do so will show Putin and the rest of the world our current level of dysfunction and our inability to govern. Our inability to govern is a national security threat and an international security threat.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5939

We are at a critical point in our history, not dissimilar to the years leading up to the Second World War. We and our allies built a liberal world order after that war. Now we must protect it.

As Churchill said, "Now is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

The choices we make now will influence the fate of the free world for generations to come. Let's make the right ones.

REDEFINING IMPEACHMENT IS A PERILOUS PATH FOR CONSERVATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, as Homeland Security Secretary, Alejandro Mayorkas has carried out the Biden administration's open border policy and deliberately produced the worst illegal mass migration in history.

Since he took office, he has released 3 million illegal immigrants directly into the country, a population the size of the entire State of Arkansas.

While the Border Patrol has been occupied changing diapers and taking names, an additional 1.7 million known got-aways have entered, as well. That is an additional illegal population the size of the State of Hawaii.

The impact on our schools, hospitals, homeless shelters, working families' wages, social programs, law enforcement, national security has been catastrophic.

The national security implications of 1.7 million illegal individuals about whom we know absolutely nothing are terrifying in light of the October 7 attack on Israel.

Now, in response, many are demanding Mayorkas' impeachment for "failing to maintain operational control of the border" as Congresswoman GREENE's resolution puts it. He is certainly guilty of that, and a whole lot more: maladministration, malfeasance, and neglect of duties on a truly cosmic scale, but these are not impeachable offenses.

We know this because the American Founders specifically rejected these terms at the Constitutional Convention.

As Madison explained, they feared that such imprecise grounds could be twisted into a weapon for political grievances and turned against the executive branch whenever Congress saw fit. This would make the President a mere minister of Congress and make his subordinates answerable to the legislative branch instead of the executive powers that are vested solely in the President. This would utterly destroy the separation of powers at the heart of our Constitution.

They chose, instead, very specific and limited charges of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

True, many politicians through the centuries have tried to pervert the term "high crimes and misdemeanors" into a similarly vague definition, but the Founders would not have substituted one vague term for another, and thus we are left with the plain meaning of the phrase, clearly defined crimes related to the duties of the office.

If Ms. GREENE is successful in redefining impeachment, then the next time Democrats have the majority, we can expect this new definition be turned against the conservatives on the Supreme Court and any future Republican administration. Furthermore, there will be nobody to stop them because Republicans will have now signed off on this new and unconstitutional abuse of power.

We must never allow the left to become our teachers. Theirs is a world of strictly situational ethics antithetical to our Constitution and to the rule of law. I vigorously opposed the sham impeachments of Donald Trump for exactly the same reason.

Now, what is the practical effect of impeaching Mayorkas, other than assuring that Republicans will have no defense when a future Democrat majority turns this new definition against them?

Even in the delusional fantasy where two-thirds of the Senate were to remove him, the same policies will remain in place as long as the Biden-Harris administration holds office.

This crisis was set in motion by voters who elected them and can only be fixed by voters replacing them with a President determined to secure our border as Donald Trump did.

Elections have consequences, sometimes terrible consequences, and this is one of them. The only Cabinet Secretary ever impeached was Ulysses Grant's Secretary of War for running a family bribery scheme. The House Oversight Committee is painstakingly assembling evidence that suggests the Bidens may have been doing exactly this for decades.

Such a serious inquiry can only have legitimacy and credibility if the rule of law is respected and the constitutional guardrails are observed.

By failing to abide by due process and constitutional constraints, Ms. GREENE is tainting this serious impeachment inquiry with a shoot-from-the-hip stunt that is reckless, partisan, and manifestly unserious.

In Robert Bolt's "A Man For All Seasons," William Roper vows "to cut down every law in England" to get at the Devil.

Sir Thomas More replies, "Oh? And when the last law was down, and the Devil turned round on you, where would you hide, Roper, the laws all being flat? This country is planted thick with laws, from coast to coast, Man's laws, not God's. And if you cut them down, and you're just the man to do it, do you really think you could stand upright in the winds that would

blow then? Yes, I'd give the Devil the benefit of the law, for my own safety's sake."

□ 1015

SUPPORTING PRETERM BIRTH PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that we are in the midst of a maternal and infant health crisis.

The United States remains one of the most dangerous places to give birth among high-income countries, and we are trending in the wrong direction.

According to the recently released "2023 March of Dimes Report Card: The State of Maternal and Infant Health for American Families," the United States maintained a D-plus grade for preterm birth for the second year in a row.

We saw only a modest 0.1 percent improvement in the preterm birthrate over the previous year, with the data showing persistent and compounding gaps in health equity that put moms and babies at risk.

Virginia is not far behind with a C grade. The preterm birthrate for 2022 was 9.7 percent, just 0.2 percent lower than the year before.

We must take decisive, comprehensive action to address these dual crises and improve public health outcomes for mothers and babies across the Nation. That is why, earlier this month, I introduced a bipartisan resolution with my colleagues to designate November as Prematurity Awareness Month. Our resolution aims to raise awareness about the risks and challenges associated with preterm babies and encourage communities to promote preterm prevention programs.

As is too often the case, minority populations, particularly Black women, experience disproportionately higher rates of preterm birth and other associated health challenges. The preterm birthrate among babies born to Black women is still 1½ times higher than the national average.

I am a Black mother to two young children, and I know this reality all too well. I was the first member of the Virginia House of Delegates to be pregnant and give birth while in office, and I almost died giving birth to my second child, Samantha.

Nine weeks prior to her due date, my placenta ruptured, and I was rushed to the emergency room for an emergency cesarean section. The last thing I remember is hearing my doctor say, "I am here, and I will take care of this." Samantha was born 9 weeks early and spent the first 6 weeks of her life in the NICU at Henrico Doctors' Hospital. I will never forget the fear and anxiety that I felt.

This experience inspired me to take matters into my own hands as a State

legislator to do everything in my power to improve healthcare resources for Virginians and tackle the maternal and infant health crisis.

Now, I am one of the few—less than 7 percent—mothers to young children in Congress. I am one of the even fewer 3 percent of Members of Congress who is a Black mother. I am proud to continue my efforts here in Congress on a bipartisan basis.

We can improve health outcomes and close longstanding health disparities by promoting awareness of this nationwide epidemic and encouraging parents and communities to take an active role in supporting preterm birth intervention programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, and I am grateful for the bipartisan group of legislators who are supporting this effort. Together, we can make real progress on these issues, but only if we keep it a priority. We must because our children's lives depend on it.

FARM BILL IMPACT SERIES NO. 24: FIVE-YEAR FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of reauthorizing a 5-year farm bill. America's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers deserve it; America's food and national security depend on it; and Congress must deliver it.

It has been said that the farm bill is like a Swiss Army knife: It does a little bit of everything. This 5-year bill tackles the whole scope of American food and agriculture policy, addressing things like how we conserve our resources to how we support research from our land grant universities to how we keep people fed.

Since it is a 5-year bill, the farm bill is long enough to provide certainty to ag producers, and it is short enough for Congress to respond to market changes and strengthen the farm safety net accordingly.

The farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers that provide us all with food, fuel, and fiber deserve a 5-year bill. The last farm bill was signed into law on December 20, 2018. That legislation was put in place to respond to the needs of producers at that time.

Since 2018, a lot has changed. We had a global pandemic that devastated the supply chain. War broke out between Russia and Ukraine, one of the top wheat-producing countries in the world. The Biden administration's failed trade agenda and delayed appointment of trade officials resulted in unprecedented market fluctuation. The list goes on and on, and we haven't even mentioned inflation or drought conditions yet.

Since 2018, when the last farm bill was signed, input costs on the farm have skyrocketed. At one point in 2022, when inflation was at its worst, fer-

tilizer prices were up 222 percent, and diesel fuel prices were up 115 percent. For the producers whose operations even survived through that time, they are still shouldering the burden of an 80 percent increase in fertilizer costs compared to 2018 and diesel that costs \$4.50 per gallon today compared to \$3 per gallon in 2018. If you hear people talking about how input costs and inflation are coming down, it is an illusion if you compare it to 2018 when Congress signed the last farm bill.

Our national and global security depend on a new farm bill. Ninety years ago, Congress recognized the importance of protecting and strengthening America's food security, on which our national security depends. That is why the farm bill exists.

We cannot afford to have ag producers going out of business because of one bad crop year. Crop insurance helps us avoid that, and this year's wheat harvest in Kansas is a perfect example of why the program is so important.

In 2023, drought and market conditions caused producers to abandon the highest number of acres of wheat since World War I. Right now, crop insurance is helping thousands of producers keep their operations afloat until next year when they roll the dice again with Mother Nature and put their livelihoods on the line, all so that we can have stocked grocery shelves.

Crop insurance is one of the most successful public-private partnerships we have. I have said all along that my top priority for the farm bill is to strengthen and maintain it. If we make any changes to crop insurance, we need to use a scalpel and not a sledgehammer. It is the most cost-effective way to deliver a safe, steady, robust food supply.

Trade and trade promotion also help America remain competitive and secure, and our trade programs are authorized through the farm bill. Back in February, I introduced the Agriculture Export Promotion Act, which would allocate additional resources to the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program for 5 years.

Trade programs, which have longstanding records of success in America, represent the partnership between the public and private sectors of our country. These programs are essential because they spearhead innovative market access and new market development and promote agricultural sales overseas.

Between 1977 and 2019, USDA export promotion programs added 13.7 percent of additional export revenue, or nearly \$648 billion, to the value of U.S. agricultural exports. These programs also created almost a quarter of a million American jobs between 2012 and 2019 alone.

The return on investment from private-sector contributions, which accounted for roughly 75 percent of export promotion between 2013 to 2019, is unparalleled. They must be addressed in a 5-year farm bill.

American agricultural producers already face endless hurdles as they work tirelessly to feed, fuel, and clothe the world, and a 5-year farm bill is our chance to support them with the tools they need to protect the future of America's food and agriculture.

As we work toward this, Congress must be brave enough to have difficult conversations and make smart compromises. If we aren't willing to do that, American agricultural producers will suffer the consequences.

If you think about a safety net, the higher the risk, the higher the fall, and the stronger the safety net that you need to survive. Producers' risk levels are at an all-time high because of inflation and input costs, which have shrunk their margins dramatically.

The livelihoods of American producers and consumers are on the line right now, and that means our food security and national security are on the line, too. America's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers need certainty like never before, and Congress must deliver for them with a 5-year farm bill.

HONORING CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to sports, many athletes will tell you that they play better when they play at home. It is referred to as the home-field advantage. Having that home advantage is just as important to kids as it is to athletes.

Kids do better and are more likely to succeed and thrive with family at home. Every child deserves a safe and loving home where they are supported and encouraged. Sadly, not all do. That is where the Children's Home Society of Florida comes in.

Today, I rise to honor the Children's Home Society of Florida, a champion in childcare that for 120 years has served as a place of refuge, providing abandoned and homeless children with safe homes and loving care.

Since 1902, this society has exemplified what it means to truly look after a community. Starting with a team of just two and caring for 24 children, the Children's Home Society of Florida now boasts over 1,000 team members empowering more than 80,000 children and family members.

Their services include mental health care, trauma-informed care, early childhood services, job training, and so much more. These wonderful people's work spans every aspect of the development of tomorrow's leaders, ensuring that Florida will still be the best State in the U.S. for decades to come.

These accomplishments and more are why I am proud, by the power vested in me, to announce that November 17, 2023, is now recognized as Children's Home Society of Florida Day.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask you and my colleagues to join me in

celebrating this significant milestone. I wish the Children's Home Society of Florida to continue to score touchdowns and home runs for kids in the years ahead because every child is worth fighting for.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR RON SAPP

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Ron Sapp for his decades of dedication and service to Fernandina Beach.

During Mayor Sapp's 24 years of civic service as mayor, vice mayor, and commissioner—spanning four decades—he has displayed an unwavering commitment to bettering our hometown of Fernandina Beach, Florida. I was proud to serve alongside him and the commission, as did my father.

Fernandina is proud of Ron Sapp not only because of his dedication to his community but also for his military service as an Air Force veteran. However, no true biography of Ron would be complete without a chapter on Mr. Sapp, the teacher.

Mr. Sapp didn't just teach students what to think. He taught them how to think, and that is something special. Generations of Pirates developed an interest in and love for public service, and for that inspiration, we are grateful.

Mayor Sapp sought to preserve the spirit of Fernandina Beach as a small island town. It is a better place because of his accomplishments. Ron has done all these things with his wife, Kasey, by his side, the support of his daughters, Sherri and Lori, and the love of his grandchildren.

On November 14, one of Mayor Sapp's greatest achievements is being named after him, the Ron Sapp Egans Creek Greenway. Mayor Sapp's introduction of the open space bond issue secured the funding for this greenway, which will leave this land untouched by development to be enjoyed by all for generations to come.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mayor Ron Sapp for his significant role in shaping Fernandina Beach into the beautiful town it is today.

RECOGNIZING NORMAN HEGE
JEWELERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of the Norman Hege family in Rock Hill, South Carolina, and their 72 years of outstanding service to generations of Rock Hill residents.

April 15, 2023, marks 72 years since Norman Hege Jewelers opened its doors in Rock Hill. Norman Hege Jewelers is the definition of a successful family-run business built on a commitment to quality service and a dedication to their community.

The watch repair business started with Norman Hege. As it grew, his

wife, Kathleen, began taking a more active role. Soon after, their children, Steve, Mike, and Linda, were old enough to work at the store. Linda and Mike now co-own the very store that their father started and successfully run it with values that were held so closely by their parents—to offer quality products, treat customers with respect, and earn trust by being open and honest. Now, Norman Hege Jewelers has employed four generations of the Hege family.

I also recognize the impact of the Hege family well beyond the customers who walk through their doors. The Heges have supported Rock Hill and York County throughout their 72 years in business. Norman Hege Jewelers donates homecoming crowns for local high schools, donates to a wide variety of causes in the Rock Hill area, and has built meaningful relationships with the entire community.

Businesses like Norman Hege exemplify what makes the United States the greatest nation in the world. The Hege family continues to be devoted to their business and is looking forward to passing it down the family line.

On behalf of the Fifth District of South Carolina, it is my most sincere pleasure to recognize Norman Hege Jewelers and the Hege family for this great service to our State. Please join me in recognizing this great family for its outstanding service in the jewelry industry and the legacy that they have built.

They exemplify the words of the late great Winston Churchill when he said: There will be a time when doing your best isn't good enough; you have to do what is required. The Norman Hege family has done what is required to earn the respect and admiration of people throughout the State of South Carolina.

□ 1030

HONORING DETECTIVE MIKE
WAGGONER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my dear friend, Detective Mike Waggoner, for his service with the Knoxville Police Department. You see Mike in this picture with that incredible moustache.

Detective Waggoner joined the department on November 11, 1974, and I note that I was in the fourth grade at that time. He is celebrating 49 years of service with the KPD.

Waggoner embodies all the characteristics the Knoxville Police Department likes to instill in future generations of officers.

As such, every year, an officer of the department is awarded the Mike Waggoner Leadership Award. This award is given to the officer that exhibits strong passion, dedication, and

thoroughness while inspiring those around them to do the same.

This award was named for Detective Waggoner as he has spent his career in service to the people of Knoxville and is a respected leader among his fellow officers.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Detective Waggoner on his 49 years of service. He is a great friend, a great father, and a great husband. I thank him for all he has done for our city.

HONORING CAPTAIN JACK GILLOOLY

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jack Gillooly, an American hero who served his country during World War II.

At 103 years old, he is believed to be the oldest living Navy football player and Navy aviator. He played in three Army-Navy football games and never lost to Army. Jack played in the last game held at West Point in 1943.

Jack had a long list of highlights, but most would say his best was his tackle of Glenn Davis, a Heisman Trophy-winning Army halfback.

After graduation, he was assigned to the USS *Columbia* and fought in the Battle of Leyte Gulf, the longest Naval battle in World War II. He survived three kamikaze attacks on his cruiser.

Jack wanted to get off the water and into the air, so he applied and was selected to become a Naval aviator. During the Cuban Missile Crisis in the early 1960s, he was the commanding officer of an antisubmarine fighter.

Captain Gillooly was also part of the Navy's first electronic countermeasure squadron during the Korean war, and he was the base commander at Orlando Air Base, which was later converted into the Orlando Naval Training Center.

Our country's heroes are the men and women of our Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker. It is my honor to recognize Captain Jack Gillooly as the Tennessee Second District's November 2023 Veteran of the Month.

HONORING COLONEL EDMUND MORRISEY

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Colonel Ed Morrissey who passed away on November 7 at the age of 94.

In 1952, Colonel Morrissey was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Reserves in the U.S. Air Force and placed on Active Duty as a weapons controller.

In 1968, the colonel became the first commander of the I.G. Brown Training and Education Center at McGhee Tyson Air National Guard Base. He went on to build the Air National Guard's premier professional military education institute, leading it for 15 years.

He is the only field officer in the National Guard to have earned the Order of the Sword, the enlisted force's highest honor to be bestowed on officers. The sword symbolizes truth, justice, and righteous power given to a leader among leaders.

Ed is survived by his wife of 41 years, Pauline; his son, John; stepdaughter,

Cindy; his grandchildren and his great-grandchildren. We won't forget Ed's service to this country and the impact he had on those he loved, Mr. Speaker.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROSS BAGWELL

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Ross Bagwell, Sr., who passed away on November 23 at the age of 91.

Ross grew up in east Tennessee where he watched his first television broadcast. He was not only a loving husband and father but also a trailblazer for television producing, bringing east Tennessee to the forefront of America's television production.

Most people think that it all happens in Los Angeles or New York; but, no, it happens right there in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee.

He originally worked on the Howdy Doody show. He produced hundreds of hours of programming, including "I-40 Paradise," "Club Dance," "America's Castles," and Nickelodeon's "Hey Dude," shows that I actually watched a lot of, especially the country music.

Ross was always very kind to me. He always catered in barbecue when I would visit him. He was a dreamer with a genuine love for creativity.

He always talked about wanting to build a waterfall in Knoxville on the Tennessee River, right there on the riverfront. I, of course, was the county mayor at the time. We couldn't make it happen because it would have been a city project.

Through CineTel and RIVR Media, the do-it-yourself concept, which you see so prevalent out there now, was actually a creation of Ross Bagwell.

He met the love of his life, Sue, in the eighth grade. They were together their whole lives until her passing in 2022.

Ross is survived by his daughter, Dee; brother, Joe; two grandchildren and six great-grandchildren. He will be missed by those who love him, Mr. Speaker, but he will not be forgotten.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, shine Your light in the darkness of our world, in our Nation, and in our lives. Illumine the hiding

places where evil resides and rout it out. Expose it to Your divine justice.

For malice breeds in the soul of humanity and takes hold of the hearts of nations and authorities who wield its destructive power against whole peoples and who care not for the suffering of the innocent in their path.

Show mercy on the hostages in the Middle East and free them from the grip of power and prejudice. Reveal Your peace in the conflict still raging in Ukraine and still the weapons of hatred and hubris.

Then examine our own hearts, O Lord. Judge our intentions and test our motives so that we ourselves would not be drawn into evil's attempt to hold sway over our lives. Let us not be overcome by evil, but may we serve You in committing ourselves to overcoming evil with good.

We give thanks that You would want to enfold us in grace this day and every day, and we offer our prayers in Your most holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TOKUDA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING STANTON MUSTANGS FOOTBALL ON FIRST STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Stanton High School football team for winning the first State football championship in their school's history.

The Mustangs hail from Stanton, Nebraska, a town of less than 2,000 people in Nebraska's First Congressional District. The Mustangs, with a roster of 29 players, went undefeated in their 2023 season and finished it off by winning State at Memorial Stadium in Lincoln.

This was Stanton's first State appearance in almost two decades.

With two Mustang touchdowns within 13 seconds in the fourth quarter, the 8-man team pulled off a comeback for the Stanton history books.

The team dedicated this season to their late coach, Patric Brechbill, who passed away just weeks before the season started. The boys said they knew he was with them through every tough play.

Congratulations to the Mustangs' players and coaches. They have made their hometown proud and Coach Brechbill very proud.

ADDRESSING THE DIRE HOUSING CRISIS ON MAUI

(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, even before the fires destroyed over 2,000 homes on Maui, our entire State faced a dire housing crisis.

Three months later, over 6,500 people find themselves living temporarily in hotels. While many have had to move multiple times, these hotels have served as respite from an uncertain future.

Yet, hundreds of survivors will be moved again today as some hotels opt against renewing their contracts. In the coming months, hundreds more will be moved, too. At the same time, efforts to secure long-term housing through existing short-term rentals on Maui have stalled. In both cases, the underlying motivation is the same—to accommodate the return of tourists to Maui.

This isn't "pono," "right." This also isn't about choosing one over the other. Rather, it is a challenge to us to prioritize what is the most important: taking care of our people. That includes giving them stability and security when it comes to having roofs over their heads.

For everyone in our Maui "ohana," "family," this is a time of shared sacrifice, but it is also a call to live aloha.

For too many, August 7 will be the day they lost their house to fire. Let's work together to make sure they know that they still have a place to call home.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN AND GERMAN PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our strong partnership with Germany. Our partnership runs deep, with Germany being the third largest foreign employer in the United States and Germans investing more than \$1.8 trillion in the U.S. from 2020 to 2022.

Today, there are more than 40 million Americans of German descent living in the United States, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania boasts one of the largest German populations in the country.

As co-chairman of the Congressional German American Caucus, I was proud to be joined today by my colleague, Congressman KEATING, in introducing the resolution on reaffirming German-American friendship and cooperation initiative. This resolution reaffirms the importance of the alliance between the United States and Germany, underscoring our shared commitment to democracy and freedom.

In addition, this resolution highlights the great connections between the United States and Germany. Our bond is based on friendship, historical ties, and shared values. These historical ties include the Wunderbar Together program as well as the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange program, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year.

Earlier this month, we celebrated the 34th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall. Let's continue our strong bilateral ties and close cooperation on the global stage.

CELEBRATING SIKH AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Sikh Awareness and Appreciation Month.

Sikhism is the fifth largest religion in the world, with over 250,000 Sikhs calling California home. The Sikh community has given so much to California and, in particular, to my district in San Joaquin County. In fact, the Sikh community helped build Stockton and San Joaquin County into what they are today. The very first gurdwara in the United States was founded in Stockton over 100 years ago.

Sikh farmers, truck drivers, doctors, and business leaders have contributed so much to making our community what it is today. My wife, Pam, and our daughter, Lillian, are proud of their Indian heritage.

The Sikh community has opened their arms to my family, sharing their traditions, warmth, and hospitality. I am eternally grateful.

As November comes to an end, I hope we can all take some time to celebrate our Sikh loved ones and recommit to our shared values of equality, justice, and religious freedom.

BORDER CROSSINGS AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of a northern border district, I rise today to address the bor-

der crisis impacting communities across the country, including those in my district.

What is unfolding at our southern border is a humanitarian and national moral crisis. Under the Biden administration's failed policies, every State has become a border State.

Border crossings are at an all-time high and include people on the terrorist watch list and child sex predators. Fentanyl flows freely over the border and then is trafficked across the country.

I have been to both the north and south borders and talked with border agents. They feel like the administration has abandoned them, as have our constituents.

In May, House Republicans passed the strongest border security package in history, yet the Senate refuses to vote on H.R. 2 or any other border solution.

We can't wait any longer, Mr. Speaker. The Senate must vote on H.R. 2, secure our border, and protect our communities.

CELEBRATING FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF WELDON'S YOUTH CENTER

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the grand opening and dedication of the youth center at the First Baptist Church of Weldon, North Carolina.

Faced with determining the best use of the church's parsonage, Pastor T.J. Walker and church leaders, who could have done many things with it, decided to renovate the parsonage and turn it into a youth center. The youth center includes game, pool, reading, and study rooms.

The First Baptist Church of Weldon realizes that children in small rural communities need opportunities. The youth center will be a safe haven for young minds, a place for them to flourish and to prepare them to live the American Dream.

Indeed, the First Baptist Church of Weldon has demonstrated through their actions that we must train up children the way they should go so they don't depart.

CONGRATULATING THE SALEM RESCUE SQUAD

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Salem Rescue Squad for being awarded the 2023 Volunteer EMS Service of the Year Award.

For the past 90 years, the Salem Rescue Squad has displayed selfless service to the city of Salem. Today, under the leadership of Chief Glen Gray and Cap-

tain Darlene Gee, the Salem Rescue Squad is the second oldest all-volunteer rescue squad in the United States.

Operating out of one station, the squad responds to approximately 2,000 calls per year and provides standby coverage for large events in addition to responding to any disaster in the area.

Recruitment and retention for a small volunteer service can often be a challenge, but due to aggressive efforts, the squad has successfully doubled its staff over the last 2 years and has 29 active members. The volunteers serve as paramedics and offer prehospital care, giving up their time and energy to help others in the community.

Congratulations again to Chief Gray, Captain Gee, and the entire Salem Rescue Squad on receiving this incredible award.

RECOGNIZING GUSTAVO CARUSO

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize the 2023 Army Congressional Fellow, Major Gustavo Caruso, for his service to the office of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina.

His yearlong service in Congress is ending, and Gus will be missed. He has been an indispensable contributor to legislative goals, including the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act. He has been a valued team member for the military and veterans.

Gus has received deserved awards in his 14 years of service, including combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. He was deployed to the Poland-Ukraine border to face the murderous invasion of Ukraine by war criminal Putin.

Gus hails from Georgia, has a bachelor's degree from the University of Hawaii, and holds two graduate degrees. His next assignment will be at the Pentagon, where Gus will continue his promotion of peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who have successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues, moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. Senator TOMMY TUBERVILLE is correct that there will be 9/11 attacks "every few days" due to Biden's open borders for terrorists.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of

Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Resolved, that Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors and that the following Articles of Impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

Article I. Rather than adhering to an oath he took to defend and secure our country and uphold the Constitution when he was sworn in as Secretary of Homeland Security, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas has engaged in a pattern of conduct that is incompatible with the laws of the United States as follows:

Article II of the Constitution requires that the executive branch, which today includes the Secretary of Homeland Security, ensures the laws passed by Congress and signed into law by the President are faithfully executed.

The Secure Fence Act of 2006, Public Law 109-367, requires that the Secretary of Homeland Security “maintain operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States.”

□ 1215

In his willful admittance of border crossers, terrorists, human traffickers, drugs, and other contraband, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas has failed to maintain operational control of the border, thereby violating the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

The Guarantee Clause set forth in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution dictates, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.”

The Guarantee Clause clearly dictates that the Federal Government has a constitutional duty and obligation to protect each of the States from invasion. As Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Alejandro Mayorkas has violated his oath to uphold this constitutional duty by allowing the invasion of approximately 10 million illegals across our borders. The ongoing invasion at our southern border is a direct national security threat against the States and against the citizens therein. Secretary Mayorkas has willfully abandoned his duty to secure the border and protect States against invasion, thereby violating Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution.

To wit, since Mayorkas has headed the Department of Homeland Security,

there have been approximately 10 million illegal border crossers who have invaded our country at our border. This is broken down between 8 million encounters and approximately 1,800,000 known got-aways who have evaded United States authorities and are roaming the interior of the United States; at least 280 people on the terrorist watch lists caught while attempting to cross the border between ports of entry; approximately 400,000 unaccompanied illegal alien children encountered at the southern border, with at least 85,000 of these children having gone missing; at least 1,424 deaths of illegals at the southern border; approximately 73,000 special interest aliens arrested at our border, which are aliens from a nation that promotes terrorist activity, harbors terrorists, or poses a security threat to the United States. This is the number arrested at the border not counting however many of the 1,800,000 known got-aways are special interest aliens; approximately 659 special interest aliens from Iran; approximately 6,386 special interest aliens from Afghanistan; approximately 538 special interest aliens from Syria; approximately 3,153 special interest aliens from Egypt; approximately 12,624 special interest aliens from Uzbekistan; approximately 30,830 special interest aliens from Turkiye; approximately 1,613 special interest aliens from Pakistan; approximately 164 special interest aliens from Lebanon; approximately 185 special interest aliens from Jordan; approximately 123 special interest aliens from Iraq; and approximately 15,594 special interest aliens from Mauritania.

In fiscal year 2021, Customs and Border Patrol seized approximately 11,200 pounds of fentanyl. In fiscal year 2022, CBP seized approximately 14,700 pounds of fentanyl. In fiscal year 2023, CBP has seized a record of approximately 27,000 pounds of fentanyl. Over 70,000 Americans died from fentanyl in fiscal year 2022. Fentanyl is now the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45. Fentanyl kills approximately 300 Americans a day. This is the amount of fentanyl that has been seized at the border, yet 300 Americans are being killed by fentanyl poisoning every day. The amount of unseized fentanyl has not even been taken into account.

The Constitution also requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to observe the Immigration and Nationality Act, (8 U.S.C. 1101). This law requires Homeland Security to detain inadmissible aliens arriving in the United States or illegal aliens presently in the United States. Instead, the Department of Homeland Security under Secretary Mayorkas has practiced catch and release policies, whereby illegals are detained but then released without any mechanism to ensure they show up to court for processing.

By terminating contracts for border wall construction, ending the migrant protection protocols, which is remain

in Mexico, unlawfully granting categorical parole, and being complicit in ending title 42, Mayorkas has made it easier for illegal aliens and drugs to enter the United States, endangering American citizens, and has made it harder for CBP to expel such threats.

Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas in his inability to enforce the law has engaged in a pattern of conduct that is incompatible with his duties as a civil officer of the United States.

Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, in his failure to uphold the oath he took, has, by his actions, lost the trust of the citizens of the United States to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

Wherefore, Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from Georgia will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5283, PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES FROM FAILURE TO SECURE THE BORDER ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5961, NO FUNDS FOR IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 32, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO “SMALL BUSINESS LENDING UNDER THE EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY ACT (REGULATION B)”

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5283) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under

the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-15 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5961) to freeze certain Iranian funds involved in the 2023 hostage deal between the United States and Iran, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-14, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated

in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

House Resolution 891 provides for consideration of three measures: H.R. 5283, H.R. 5961, and S.J. Res. 32.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments.

Further, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5961, the No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule makes in order 12 amendments.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 32, a resolution of Congressional disapproval related to a rule by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on small business lending under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, since President Joe Biden took office, there have been 7.8 million illegal immigrant encounters, 1.7 million known got-aways, and hundreds of individuals on the terrorist watch list have been stopped at our southern border.

Instead of fixing this issue, the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats have placed illegal immigrants in our public schools, in our airports, our police stations, and now our Federal lands.

In New York City, the Biden administration and far-left New York Democrats are housing hundreds of illegal immigrants on National Park Service land.

H.R. 5283 revokes New York City's lease and prevents all national parks and Federal lands from becoming tent cities.

Additionally, H.R. 5861 blocks President Biden's \$6 billion ransom gift to the Iranian regime.

As an Iraq war veteran, I have seen firsthand Iran's death and destruction in the Middle East. They are responsible for the deaths of hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans in the Middle East.

Since Hamas' attack on October 7 against our number one ally, Israel, Iranian-backed proxies have attacked U.S. forces over 70 times in Iraq and Syria.

This is unthinkable. What is more unthinkable is that on the 22nd anniversary of 9/11, the Biden administration announced \$6 billion in sanctions relief from the number one sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

These billions in sanctions relief will undoubtedly lead to more terrorist attacks, more attacks on Americans, and more attacks on innocent Israelis. That is why House Republicans will take action to freeze the funding that the Biden administration wants to send to the Ayatollah.

Lastly, the underlying legislation we will consider this week will address the Biden administration's CFPB guidance that places burdensome regulations on lenders and small business.

This new CFPB regulation will result in more compliance costs, it will create privacy concerns for small businesses, and adds to the bureaucratic regulatory environment that hinders hard-working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, once again, House Republicans are spending a week on legislation that fails to solve many of the very real issues facing our constituents.

Last week, when I was in my district, my constituents shared with me their aspirations, their worries, and their vision for how to make our communities thrive for generations. Veterans from Hobbs described how hard it is to travel for access to healthcare and other services—services that they have earned.

Seniors from Hobbs described the concern about paying their bills on a fixed income and the need to reduce costs. The Lovington mayor led us on a tour of the wastewater plant as he described the need to invest in water infrastructure in rural communities and thanked us for doing that and promoting such investment.

In Taos, New Mexico, ranchers and farmers working with the New Mexico Acequia Association, which for those of you who don't know, is a centuries-old system of providing irrigation to farmers and ranchers in New Mexico.

They talked to me about their concerns about growing their business amid the climate crisis that we are seeing and the drought conditions. These are real challenges that our constituents want us to fix, challenges that Congress has the ability and responsibility to address.

Does this rule make in order any bills to help address veterans' need to access healthcare?

Does it make in order any bills to help seniors pay their bills?

Does it help our rural communities access rural clean water systems?

Does it help our farmers keep their heritage and grow our foods?

Nope. It doesn't.

What are we doing this week?

We have a bill that prevents the use of Federal lands to provide temporary shelters for certain noncitizens, including migrants who are legally applying for asylum. It is a bill that fails to address the humanitarian crisis or security needs at our border.

Our colleagues across the aisle have consistently repeated harmful theories, like the invasion theory, where they seek to demonize the communities I represent and from which I come. Their talking points simply inflame the issue rather than looking to solve it.

This is just more of the same from a majority that is unable to govern effec-

tively. Instead, we should pass legislation that actually improves our immigration system and acknowledges and upholds the dignity of immigrant communities.

There are real solutions to deal with the border. The Republican majority just doesn't want us to vote on them on this floor.

For example, the Dream and Promise Act has vast support from Americans, but will we see Republicans put it on the floor?

Nope.

The Farmer Workforce Modernization Act that has bipartisan support would help agricultural communities and help farmworkers, but will we see Republicans put it on the floor?

Nope.

We could move these bills, if only Republicans would stop blocking them. We will also consider today a resolution to reverse a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau rule. That rule would require lenders to collect and report information about the small business credit applications they receive, including geographic and demographic data, lending decisions, and the price of credit.

We know that many rural small businesses struggle with access to financial resources. It is important to know whether or not the banks, especially the big banks, are serving them.

Americans, the middle class, and small businesses want somebody on their side because they know the big banks and corporations aren't. That is why Americans across the political spectrum overwhelmingly support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Despite the strong public support, Republicans continue to attack the Bureau. The Democrats are on the side of small businesses when we stand up for the Bureau and its work.

We should support initiatives to bring capital to entrepreneurs and innovators, especially in rural America. A lot of that work happens because of credit unions, I might add. I support efforts to address the credit unions' concerns about the smaller entities.

A CRA, though, as proposed by the Republicans, is an overly broad and blunt tool that prevents an agency from promulgating any regulation in an area that it addresses.

This CRA that they have put forward would tie the hands of the Bureau. It would prevent them from rulemaking regarding data for small businesses, women- and minority-owned businesses.

We need access to this data to make sure that small businesses, women- and minority-owned businesses, rural businesses have access to capital. Investing in these small businesses is how we grow the middle class, and that is what Democrats are focused on. How do we grow the middle class.

Lastly, H.R. 5961 would freeze certain Iranian funds involved in the 2023 hostage deal between the U.S. and Iran. We must acknowledge, and do acknowl-

edge, that Iran is dangerous and a state sponsor of terrorism. We cannot allow the terror to continue.

I must remind my Republican colleagues that the Rules Committee already reported a rule for this bill. Their own party blocked the House from voting on this bill when they voted down the rule on the floor.

This week we should be debating a bill with aid for our allies, including Israel, Ukraine, Taiwan, and others around the world, but I guess we are not.

I guess we should not be surprised with this rule. This is just a continuation of the chaos and closed process that has been a hallmark of this Republican-led House. We have seen over 40 closed rules on the floor that have blocked two-thirds of bipartisan amendments, including blocking half of all Republican amendments.

Republican leadership clearly hasn't made good on their promise to make the legislative process more open, inclusive, and accommodating.

This year, Republicans will have wasted nearly a month on internal politics just to elect a Speaker—time that could have been spent lowering costs for seniors and helping those veterans I mentioned earlier, time that could have been spent helping our farmers and ranchers, time that could have been spent helping to grow our middle class.

As Republicans continue to press forward legislation that seeks to further destroy and divide, House Democrats are working to improve the lives of everyday people.

House Democrats are committed to putting people over politics, to do what is right for everyday Americans; lowering costs, growing the middle class, and defending fundamental freedoms.

As we have all year, House Democrats continue to extend the hand of partnership to get things done for the American people, including passing legislation that invests in working families and keeping our Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule and a "no" vote on the underlying bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are about to witness a real-time fact check here. My colleague from New Mexico is talking about the amount of closed rules. I would remind my friends across the aisle that in the 117th Congress—and that is when they were deciding which rules were going to be run—58 of their rules out of 89 were closed rules; that is approximately 61 percent. Spare me the lecture on closed rules.

We also have one bill coming to the floor that has 12 separate amendments. It is kind of rich hearing that criticism. What is even richer is the criticism that we, as Republicans, have done nothing about the border. Absolutely laughable.

As the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats have ignored the southern border crisis, we passed H.R. 2 twice. Twice we passed it. I would invite any Democrat that actually wants to do something about the southern border to just vote for this underlying legislation that we are running.

Again, House Republicans have passed the Secure the Border Act of 2023. I will remind my friends across the aisle that act restarts construction of the border wall. It deploys advanced technology to the southern border. It increases Border Patrol agents and their pay. It strengthens and protects those provisions for unaccompanied minor children. It protects them from human trafficking, and it ends the disastrous policy of catch and release. It ends the catch and release policies of the far-left Democrats.

We have passed the FY24 Homeland Security Act as well that provides—wait for it—over \$2 billion for the border wall. It provides almost a half million dollars for 22,000 Border Patrol agents and billions in funding to remove dangerous criminals who have entered the United States interior illegally.

Now, this week, House Republicans will block the Biden administration and far-left radical Democrats from turning our Federal lands into the illegal immigrant housing that the Biden administration and far-left Democrats in our cities have turned them into.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYN).

Ms. VAN DUYN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and to call attention to the ongoing crisis at our southern border.

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have turned our southern border into a land of lawlessness, triggering one of the worst national security, humanitarian, and public safety disasters our country has ever seen.

On day one, President Biden immediately repealed strong border security policies that were working. Under Biden and Mayorkas, we have shattered every illegal immigration record on the books, even as Mayorkas knowingly deceives Congress and the American people by saying, “our border is closed.”

This administration’s policies deliberately unleashed chaos by turning control of the border over to Mexican cartels and human traffickers, while simultaneously obstructing States’ efforts to secure the border and denying CBP and law enforcement officers the resources necessary to stop the flow of deadly drugs, human slaves, and, very likely, terrorist cells into our country.

As a Representative of the great State of Texas, I see the results, the consequences of these deadly policies every day throughout my State.

This bill is crucial for ensuring public policies and public spaces that are paid for with taxpayer dollars do not

become vast encampments for unvetted migrants, many of whom will be indebted to violent cartels.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important national security reform. It is clear that Secretary Mayorkas has no regard for the rule of law, and he does not take securing our border seriously.

Make no mistake, as long as Mayorkas remains in office, our border will remain unsecured and vulnerable to human and drug trafficking.

I stand firm in advocating for his impeachment, and I call on the Biden administration to offer border States the support they need to keep our communities safe.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This entire Congress, Republicans have tended to use titles for their bills that are extremely misleading. For example, today’s rule includes the so-called Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act. Interestingly, though, this bill does not actually secure the border. In fact, it does not include any resources for States to deal with migrants who are awaiting processing. How is that protecting our communities? Let’s invest where we need to address this issue.

Instead of addressing real problems at the border, Republicans are bringing up this unnecessary legislation to attack vulnerable migrants under the guise of protecting public lands. Remember, this is a public lands bill. It came out of the Natural Resources Committee. If they really cared about protecting public lands, they wouldn’t have passed an Interior appropriations bill out of their committee that cuts nearly a billion dollars from the Federal land management agencies that are tasked with protecting these public lands.

The concern really isn’t about protecting public lands, and it is not really about addressing the real immigration concerns. If they were really, truly interested in that, they would work with us to address the root causes of migration.

The most effective way to control the number of asylum-seekers arriving at our ports of entry is to help them stay in their home countries. They talk about that in some of their bills, but look at what they say and what they do.

Let’s focus on what they actually do. They have put forward appropriations bills that actually cut funding for customs and border officers. They cut CBP funding. They cut money for fentanyl interdiction. That is what they actually do.

They may have bills with fancy titles and all this talk, but what happens when it comes to what they are funding? They are not funding with the necessary resources to address these issues.

For example, the last time we were in the Rules Committee, they were cutting funding for the FBI, DEA, and law enforcement agencies that we need to work on these issues. They are not supporting the kind of cutting-edge inspection machines that we need to detect fentanyl at our southwestern border ports of entry, like in the President’s national security supplemental request.

I asked them if they were going to support the national security supplemental request with those provisions in it, if they were going to support the Democratic amendments in the border package earlier this year that would have made that bill better.

It is not a great bill. They focus on that wall. They are fixated on that wall. It is not what we need. We have seen report after report that it does not work. They just keep using migrants to score political points. This is the third bill we have seen this year, but none of them are true solutions.

If they were serious about solving the issues at our border, they would work with us on comprehensive legislation instead of these things that do absolutely nothing to fix the problem.

The problem isn’t in New York City. It is their failure to work with us on legislation that would solve the issue.

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

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

It is time for another real-time fact check, Mr. Speaker. Homeland FY 2024 increased funding for border agents, \$496 million for 22,000 new Border Patrol agents. That is the highest ever funded.

It is rich when I hear my colleagues from across the aisle talk about bills that are named one thing and do another. This is from a party that hung their entire term on the Inflation Reduction Act, which neither reduced inflation nor helped the economy. They later said that it was about preventing global warming. Again, it is rich coming from a party that often misnames their key legislation.

Let’s talk about sanctuary cities because there is one thing that we can do. We can end sanctuary city policies. For years, Democrats have criticized House Republicans and President Trump for wanting to secure our border and protect our communities. They criticize us when we say that. When the crisis comes to their own backyard instead of a small rural town on the southern border, when it comes to their sanctuary cities, Democrats are the first ones to declare an emergency.

Look at Martha’s Vineyard. When Ron DeSantis sent a few illegal immigrants to Martha’s Vineyard, it took those woke yuppies less than 12 hours to call the National Guard to remove the illegal immigrants. I am willing to bet there were more “Hate has no home here” signs in the pristine, well-manicured yards at Martha’s Vineyard

than actual illegal immigrants, but they still called the National Guard to remove those immigrants from Mar-tha's Vineyard.

Don't just take my word for it. Take New York City Mayor Eric Adams'. Over 110,000 migrants have reached New York City. Mayor Adams decried: "The national government has turned its back on New York City."

When illegal migrants showed up in Massachusetts, Governor Maura Healey declared a state of emergency and said the quiet part out loud: "Massachusetts has stepped up to address what sadly has been a Federal crisis of inaction that is many years in the making."

One thing is clear. Even Democrats now, in their sanctuary cities, are realizing that Biden has created this border crisis.

Democrats have ignored it for years. Republicans, thankfully, are finally stepping up and leading where they failed.

Any of my friends from across the aisle who want to help us, if they want to end this crisis, can vote for the rule today and vote for the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my good friend.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding the time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER talked about sanctuary policies. That is really at the root of what we are talking about here today, these so-called sanctuary policies of President Biden and Governor Kathy Hochul in New York and Mayor Eric Adams, who refuse to pull those sanctuary cities back. These policies have failed, and the American people are paying the consequences.

Millions of illegal immigrants have flooded across our border since President Biden took office. His administration has refused to even acknowledge the crisis that has unfolded.

Two years ago, it was only the communities along our southern border that seemed to almost exclusively carry this burden for this self-inflicted humanitarian crisis. Now, that burden is shared by cities, towns, and villages as far north as my own State of New York, where communities in my own district, very far from the southern border, in upstate New York, have declared a state of emergency as their limited resources are stretched to the breaking point to handle the influx of illegal immigrants.

Now, here we are, with thousands of migrant families, including children, shivering in tent cities at Floyd Bennett Field in Staten Island in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, moving forward, I hope my Democratic colleagues will think twice before accusing House Republicans of cruelty, callousness, or inhumanity when it comes to securing our border and fixing our broken immigration system.

Opening our borders to human traffickers and drug cartels, cramming migrant families into broken-down motels and freezing tent cities, and failing to account for 85,000 unaccompanied minors is the textbook definition of cruel, callous, and inhumane.

No longer will we allow this administration to divert and squander Federal resources, including our public lands, to shore up a crisis of their own making.

The solution to this crisis before us is extremely simple: Secure our border and uphold our immigration laws. Stop the invasion that has inundated the southern border and created a crisis in cities and towns across this country.

I strongly support this underlying legislation to end the Biden administration's encampments on America's public lands and hold this administration and those in our States and cities who have promoted so-called sanctuary policies accountable.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter of support for proposed section 1071, CFPB rule, which highlights the benefits of collecting lending demographic data for small farmers and farmers of color.

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

There was no objection.

NOVEMBER 27, 2023.

Support for CFPB Section 1071 Rule and Opposition to Congressional Review Act to Overturn 1071 Rule

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

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We, the 84 undersigned organizations, write to express strong support for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)'s Section 1071 rule on Small Business Lending Data Collection under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and also to express strong opposition to any Congressional Review Act resolutions that would overturn CFPB Rule 1071.

Section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act amended the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) to require financial institutions to compile, maintain, and submit to the Bureau certain data on applications for credit for all defined small businesses, including women and minority-owned small businesses. To be clear, Section 1071 is not optional—it is legally required by Dodd-Frank. CFPB's regulatory updates are designed to implement section 1071 as intended by Congress, and our organizations strongly support this effort.

The CFPB's regulatory updates are common sense efforts to improve the public's understanding of the impacts of lending, including agricultural lending, on-the-ground, and ultimately inform policy that is good for farmers, consumers, and our food and farm systems.

RULE 1071 IS PRO-FARMER AND PRO-MARKET

The Section 1071 rule is pro-farmer. Young, beginning, and small farmers have consistently demanded more transparent and fair markets. Having accurate and public data concerning the demographics primarily served by agricultural lenders will help farmers and consumers make better-informed financial decisions.

The Section 1071 rule is pro-market. The data required by Section 1071 will help lenders identify unmet credit needs and expand to new markets, especially in underserved communities. The rule contains no mechanism to penalize lenders based on the demographic data reported. Collecting loan applicant demographics is not new to the vast majority of lenders covered by this rule and many Farm Credit System lenders already collect home loan borrower demographics as required under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

WHY AGRICULTURAL LENDING DATA IS CRITICAL

Creating effective and fair policy requires data. To help ensure collection of more robust data, it is critical that agricultural lenders—including those regulated by the Farm Credit Administration, whose mission is to "ensure that Farm Credit System institutions and Farmer Mac are safe, sound, and dependable sources of credit and related services for all creditworthy and eligible persons in agriculture and rural America—participate in demographic reporting.

Two Government Accountability Office reports support the application of Section 1071 to agricultural lending: *Agricultural Lending: Information on Credit and Outreach to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers is Limited, and Fair Lending: Data Limitations and the Fragmented U.S. Financial Regulatory Structure Challenge Federal Oversight and Enforcement Efforts*, which note that "Congress should consider requiring additional data collection and reporting for non-mortgage loans."

Transparent demographic data from agricultural lenders may provide insight on such trends as the dramatic decline of Black representation in farming and farmland ownership, as chronicled in several government records:

Federal Register announcement in Section 1002.104(A), "the share of minority representation in farming, particularly that of Black farmers, has declined sharply over the last 100 years." The precipitous decline is due in part to historical lack of access to credit for Black farmers from agricultural lenders. Yet, the absence of data collection requirements make evaluation challenging in the extreme.

Census Bureau 2019; USDA 2019: 90 percent of land accumulated by Black Farmers has been lost, and even though Black, Indigenous and other People of Color represent nearly one-quarter of the U.S. population, they operate less than 5 percent of the nation's declining number of farms, and cultivate less than 1 percent of its farmland.

Additionally, we also oppose H.R. 2423, the Farm Credit Administration Independent Authority Act, which would exempt the Farm Credit Administration from the CFPB Section 1071 rule.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned organizations urge you to support the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's strong support for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)'s Section 1071 rule on Small Business Lending Data Collection under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and also to express strong opposition to any Congressional Review Act resolutions that would overturn CFPB Rule 1071.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

Americans for Financial Reform
Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment

CDFI Coalition
Center for Responsible Lending & Self-Help

Consumer Federation of America
 Farm Aid
 Farms to Grow, Inc.
 Fair Food Network
 Food Animal Concerns Trust
 Food Culture Collective
 Friends of the Earth
 HEAL (Health, Environment, Agriculture, Labor) Food Alliance
 Health Care Without Harm
 Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
 Jubilee Justice
 National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders
 National Black Food and Justice Alliance
 National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC)
 National Family Farm Coalition
 National LGBTQ Task Force
 National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition
 National Young Farmers Coalition
 North American Marine Alliance
 Not Our Farm
 Opportunity Finance Network
 Organic Farming Research Foundation
 Pesticide Action Network North America
 Real Food Media
 Revolving Door Project
 Rural Advancement Foundation International-USA (RAFI-USA)
 Rural Coalition
 Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Funders
 Union of Concerned Scientists
 Women, Food and Agriculture Network (WFAN)
 Woodstock Institute

LOCAL/STATE/REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

ALABAMA

Alabama State Association of Cooperatives
 CALIFORNIA

Avila Fund
 California FarmLink
 CAMEO (California Association for Micro Enterprise Opportunity)
 Community Alliance with Family Farmers
 Feed Black Futures
 Rise Economy (formerly California Reinvestment Coalition)
 San Diego Food System Alliance
 Urban Tilth

COLORADO

4th World Farm
 Nourish Colorado

DELAWARE

Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council, Inc.

FLORIDA

Farmworker Association of Florida
 Florida Veterans for Common Sense

GEORGIA

Georgia Watch

ILLINOIS

Chicago Food Policy Action Council
 Illinois Food Justice Alliance

IOWA

Climate Land Leaders

MAINE

Coastal Enterprises, Inc.
 Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association

MASSACHUSETTS

HCC Consulting
 Springfield Food Policy Council

MINNESOTA

Appetite For Change
 African Immigrant Farmers Alliance
 Bois Forte Food Sovereignty Group (Bois Forte Tribal Communities at Nett Lake and Lake Vermilion Reservations)
 Climate Land Leaders

Global GreenBiz
 Midwest Farmers of Color Collective
 Minnesota Farmers' Market Association
 Multicultural Kids Network
 Land Stewardship Project
 Renewing the Countryside
 Roots Return Heritage Farm LLC

NEW MEXICO

Agri-Cultura Cooperative Network
 La Semilla Food Center

NORTH CAROLINA

American Indian Mothers Inc
 Carolina Farm Stewardship Association
 Hawk's Nest Healing Gardens, LLC
 Toxic Free North Carolina

NEW YORK

Empire Justice Center
 Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York (NOFA-NY)
 Our Core Inc.
 Soul Fire Farm

OHIO

Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association

PENNSYLVANIA

Pasa Sustainable Agriculture

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carolina Farm Stewardship Association

SOUTH DAKOTA

Climate Land Leaders

VIRGINIA

Cultivate Charlottesville

WEST VIRGINIA

Partner Community Capital

WISCONSIN

Climate Land Leaders
 Midwest Farmers of Color Collective

Ms. **LEGER FERNANDEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This letter tells us a lot about how Democrats see the issues in rural America, how Democrats see the issues affecting our small businesses, our women-owned businesses, and our minority-owned businesses. It is one of wanting to make sure that the playing field is level, that there is transparency and fairness at the same time that we use the market to build up thriving communities.

This is a letter that comes from ranchers, farmers, cooperatives, our rural areas. It is signed by dozens of organizations, and they read that the section 1071 rule is profarmer. Young, beginning, and small farmers have consistently demanded more transparent and fair markets.

Having accurate and public data will help farmers and consumers make better-informed financial decisions.

For some reason, the Republicans don't want to make sure that we have access to this data. What are they hiding? If big banks aren't serving our rural farmers, let's find that out.

This isn't just about that. This is about promarket. They say section 1071 is promarket. The data required by section 1071 will help lenders identify unmet credit needs and expand new markets.

This is important if we are going to grow the middle class. Once again, I was a small business owner. I had a woman-owned business. I went and

sought credit. I filled out those forms. It wasn't that hard. I wrote down that, yes, I am a woman-owned business, and, yes, I am a minority-owned business. I am a Latina. I am proud of it. I am from a State capital, by the way, the oldest State capital in the United States, which is very pro-immigrant because we know of the economic benefits it provides.

We know that having access to this information is good for our small businesses. It is good for rural America. Therefore, we are very much in support of this rule, despite the fact that, once again, Republicans want to hammer and beat up the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau despite the great work it does for our consumers, the great work it does for our small businesses, the great work it does for Americans, which is why they support it the way they do.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a measure that clearly states that the people's House will keep its solemn promise to American seniors and workers. We will protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these crucial programs that so many of our constituents depend on.

Reaffirming our promise is more important than ever. Republicans on the Budget Committee today, as we speak, are holding a hearing about fiscal commissions that could slash Social Security and Medicare. We cannot allow that to happen.

The top candidates for President in the Republican Party are also calling for cuts to Social Security. The House must stand against that. Democrats in the House will stand against that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. **LEGER FERNANDEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the grandmas and grandpas and moms and dads and neighbors and beloved community members who spent their entire lives paying into Medicare out of their own paychecks on the sacred promise that they could retire with health and dignity only to have that promise betrayed by today's Republican Party.

I stand here on behalf of our aging parents and sons and daughters fighting mental illness, loved ones who are cancer patients and stroke survivors, workers injured on the job, orphaned children, and siblings with disabilities, whose access to food, shelter, medicine,

and dignified retirement depends on Social Security that Republicans are hellbent on tearing away.

□ 1300

In Pennsylvania alone, 2.8 million folks depend on Medicare—227,727 in Allegheny County—and 2.9 million depend on Social Security—nearly 150,000 in my district alone. Every one of them deserves to retire in dignity with access to healthcare. Every one of them deserves a Congress where every Member has the decency to honor that sacred promise not to leave our families behind at the hardest moments of their lives.

The reality is that just about every American agrees, no matter where we come from, how we vote, or what our skin color is—we all deserve those things.

The Republican Party, bought out by greedy CEOs, billionaires, and lobbyists, have always been terrified of that reality. They are so terrified that instead of facing it they have chosen to lie, scapegoat, and defraud even the folks who elected them, assuming we are too foolish to see what is going on.

Let me break it down. First, Republicans passed tax handouts for their filthy rich donors promising a trickle-down miracle that never has and will never happen from Reaganomics to the Trump tax scam.

When their tax scam causes the economy to slow and deficits to grow, they refuse to correct their mistake. Instead, they blame immigrants, poor folks, Black folks, and Brown folks.

Next, Republicans pretend to panic and call for devastating cuts to Social Security and Medicare that would force Americans to work longer for less and tear away their hard-earned retirement and end Medicare as we know it—reducing spending.

They call for more handouts for their billionaire donors and corporate polluters. They hope that you will settle for tearing away your neighbors' lifelines to protect your own right to retire in dignity, forcing us to the brink of catastrophic shutdown or debt ceiling crisis until we clean up their mess.

They repeat the cycle hoping enough of us will forgive and forget their scheme to tear away Medicare and Social Security and believe their lie that they were only after food assistance, healthcare, or housing for poor folks—not your earned benefits. The truth is that they always were and always will be after it all.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as I speak, Republicans on the Budget Committee are holding a hearing to establish a death panel commission to gut earned benefits where their chairman called his party's fight to tear Social Security our generation's world war.

At a time when the majority of Pennsylvanians say they struggle to afford healthcare and half are delaying getting the medical care they need because they can't afford it, we as Democrats have an obligation to fight to not only protect Social Security and Medicare but expand them.

If we preserve the retirement age, increase benefits to keep up with inflation, expand Medicare to include vision, dental, and hearing, and hold Big Pharma price gougers accountable and pass Medicare for All, that is how we fulfill our sacred promise and move our country and our economy forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up legislation that reaffirms the House of Representatives' commitment to protecting and strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my colleague from Pennsylvania was talking about the party as in 2003 or 2023 because the last time I checked, the Republicans are the party that supports the guys that shower after work not before.

The Chamber of Commerce has picked its side. It is with the Democrats. The billionaires that my friend from Pittsburgh was talking about—check how they are registered to vote. I am pretty sure—and I am willing to bet—that they all registered as Democrats, and far-left, extreme Democrats, by the way. All the Big Tech CEOs, Apple and Amazon, you name it, they are all far-left Democrats.

So this nostalgia for the day when Republicans supported big business and Democrats supported the little guy, it is just that, it is nostalgia. It is 2023, and we need to realize the new political realities.

When we are talking about numbers, I noticed that my friend from Pennsylvania didn't talk about the numbers relating to the destruction of Hamas during the over 3 minutes she had to address the Chamber. Let's talk about those numbers.

Hamas has killed over 1,500 Israelis since October 7, 2023. They have killed over 1,500 Israelis. They have injured over 6,900. Over 230 hostages were taken by Hamas in the Gaza Strip. Over 9,500 rockets have been fired from Gaza toward Israel. There were 32 Americans killed and several Americans are still missing.

While we are throwing out numbers, let's not forget to talk about the destruction Hamas has brought.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, actually the debate around Social Security, similar to the debate about the Consumer Protection Bureau and its regulations, does highlight the policies that the Democrats

and Republicans pursue and who are the beneficiaries of those policies.

Let's look at Social Security and what the Republican Budget Committee is looking at. They are looking at raising the retirement age. Who actually pays for that?

When you raise the retirement age, it is going to be the janitors, nurses, educators, and the people doing the hard work in our manufacturing plants that are going to be required to work longer. They are going to be the ones who are going to have a hard time because they don't have additional savings like the wealthy. Right?

The wealthy aren't going to care about whether you raise the age to 67, 68, or 72 because they have the assets and they are not relying on Social Security. It is our workers who have paid into Social Security who have earned it and deserve it. They deserve to receive the benefits that we promised them when they started working and paying into the system.

What can we do to make sure that Social Security is solvent in the future?

Well, Democrats have a bill that we introduced last year, and we supported it this year. You make sure everybody pays—no matter how much money you make—into the system. Right now we know that the wealthy stop paying into the system at about \$147,000.

Why doesn't everybody pay Social Security taxes on all their earnings?

Why aren't the wealthy paying their fair share?

That is a policy difference. It is the policy distinctions that we are focused on.

Once again, Democrats are standing with working Americans who are not earning \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000, or \$1 million a year. We say you should pay your fair share of your Social Security taxes rather than doing what they want to do, which is gut benefits. When you raise the Social Security age, you are gutting the benefits.

That is an example of the distinction of when you are standing with working Americans and when your policies that you support are increasing the middle class instead of standing with the wealthy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, here is another real-time fact-check for you. Obama under ObamaCare took \$700 billion from Medicare. You tell me who is trying to protect Medicare and Medicaid. It certainly wasn't the Obama administration when they were taking billions of dollars from the fund.

It is amazing the amount of time that my colleagues across the aisle talk about working families. Have they actually talked to working families?

When I am in my district talking to working families, not the woke yuppies

that my friends across the aisle represent, but actually working Americans, they are talking about inflation. Let's look at the numbers.

When President Biden took office, President Trump had inflation where it was just 1.4 percent. Since then, prices have risen by 17 percent. By the way, real wages are going down, hurting working families and working Americans.

Prices have risen 17 percent and real wages are down. Credit card, auto loan, and consumer loan delinquencies are at the highest levels since the Great Recession. Just this morning, CBS News—the conservative news bash—reported that Americans need an extra \$11,400 today just to afford the basics when compared to when President Trump was in office.

You tell me who is looking out for the working American. Something tells me it is not extreme, far-left Democrats that are looking out for their woke, affluent suburbs. All the while, the President has been misleading the American people.

Last week, our 81-year-old leader claimed Thanksgiving dinner was the fourth cheapest ever on record. Of course, that was false. Maybe it is his age showing, I don't know, but the truth is that it was the second most expensive Thanksgiving dinner ever.

If you want to talk about an all-time high, last year's inflation under the President's watch is an all-time high. It is clear, Bidenomics is broken economics. Democrats do not care about working Americans. Republicans do.

Let's talk about some more Bidenomics statistics. With the economy adding just 1,500 jobs in October, coming in below expectations, this is the second worst jobs report of the Biden Presidency.

The unemployment rate rose to 3.9 percent in October where the labor force participation rate actually declined. The average middle-class household has lost over \$33,000 in real wealth in just this past year. That hurts people that are driving to work, driving to construction sites, and driving to work shifts at diners. It is not hurting the woke, yuppie base that the Democrats represent sitting at home on Zoom all day, having their EVs charging in their garage.

The average rate for a 30-year fixed mortgage is now at the highest level since 2000. This is bringing a disastrous effect to the housing market. Homeownership has been deemed unaffordable in 99 percent of the country. There are 73 percent of Americans that believe the economy is in bad shape, and more voters trust Republicans over Democrats to handle inflation, according to a recent AP-NORC poll.

Mr. Speaker, 58 percent of the Americans believe the economy is getting worse, and 69 percent believe the country is on the wrong track, according to an Economist/YouGov poll. That is not exactly a far-right polling outfit.

Half of Americans say their financial situation is worsening, according to a recent Harvard CAPS/Harris Poll. Biden's approval rating on the economy is at just 32 percent, the lowest of his Presidency, according to CNBC's All-American Economic Survey.

It is very clear that the American people know that Biden and far-left Democrats are hurting not only their job prospects, not only their ability to afford a home, but the entire economy and their ability just to afford the basics.

Mr. Speaker, I question any time a Democrat tells me they are watching out for the working American.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to remember why we faced inflation in the first place. We need to remember that this country and the world faced down a pandemic that threatened to destroy our economy.

Let's go back to those dark days when we moved from the Trump Presidency to the Biden Presidency. Our businesses were closed. Our Main Streets were going to fall apart. Our city, local, and State governments were worried about whether they would be able to keep people on the payroll.

The Democrats passed the American Rescue Plan, and we did rescue the economy indeed. I go to my working-class district because my entire district is like that. That is my family. I come from those roots. I speak to those people on a regular basis.

Every town I go into, I look at the number of loans, the PPP, the Restaurant Revitalization Fund, the Shuttered Venue Operators Grant, and they are open now. Those communities are thriving because of the work we did. That was not the reason we saw inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Review.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City]

HOW MUCH HAVE RECORD CORPORATE PROFITS CONTRIBUTED TO RECENT INFLATION?

(By Andrew Glover, José Mustre-del-Río, and Alice von Ende-Becker)

Inflation ended 2021 at a 40-year high and rose further in 2022. Policymakers, politicians, and pundits have considered many possible explanations for this burst of inflation, from transitory supply chain disruptions to “wage-price spirals” to mismatches between demand and supply. However, one potential explanation that has received significant public attention is “greedflation”—that is, the idea that firms are capitalizing on their market power by raising their prices higher and faster than the growth in their production costs. This idea is well captured by Robert Reich's May 17, 2022, testimony to

Congress, during which he said, “When corporations are so flush with cash, why are they raising prices?” They are not raising prices solely because of the increasing costs of supplies and components and of labor. . . . Corporations enjoying record profits in a healthy competitive economy would absorb these costs. Why? Because they can. And they can because they don't face meaningful competition” (p. 2).

Although higher corporate profits have received attention recently, profits and inflation do not have a direct accounting relationship. However, inflation is directly affected by growth in the markup—the ratio between the price a firm charges and the firm's current marginal cost of production. Inflation in a firm's prices is therefore the sum of the growth in the marginal cost of production and the growth in the markup.

Economic theory posits many ways that markups can change over time. For example, markups could change due to a decrease in the price sensitivity of consumer demand or an increase in monopoly power that arises from reduced competition. However, markups could also rise if current marginal costs become less important for a firm's pricing, either because current firms expect higher costs to replace current inventory as it is sold or because firms expect higher marginal costs in the future and want to smooth out price increases over time rather than raise prices sharply and abruptly. In this article, we estimate the 2021 growth rate of markups and discuss likely contributors to this growth. We find evidence that markup growth was a major contributor to inflation in 2021. Specifically, markups grew by 3.4 percent over the year, whereas inflation, as measured by the price index for Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE), was 5.8 percent, suggesting that markups could account for more than half of 2021 inflation. Such high markup growth is especially striking given that markup growth contributed almost nothing to inflation in the decade leading up to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Although our estimate suggests that markup growth was a major contributor to annual inflation in 2021, it does not tell us why markups grew so rapidly. We present evidence that the timing and cross-industry patterns of markup growth are more consistent with firms raising prices in anticipation of future cost increases, rather than an increase in monopoly power or higher demand. First, the timing of markup growth in 2021, as well as earlier in the pandemic, does not line up neatly with the spike in inflation during the second half of 2021. Instead, the largest growth in markups occurred in 2020 and the first quarter of 2021; in the second half of 2021, markups actually declined. Therefore, inflation cannot be explained by a persistent increase in market power after the pandemic. Second, if monopolists raising prices in the face of higher demand were driving markup growth, we would expect firms with larger increases in current demand to have accordingly larger markups. Instead, markup growth was similar across industries that experienced very different levels of demand (and inflation) in 2021. This finding suggests that an increase in markups may provide policymakers with a signal of future inflationary pressures, especially if it occurs during periods where expectations of near-term future inflation are heightened.

Section I reviews the microeconomic theory of price setting by monopolists while holding constant marginal costs and demand. Section II presents our estimates of markup growth across time and industries. Section III extends the theory of pricing to one where firms must consider future marginal costs when setting current prices and demonstrates how an increase in expected future marginal costs translates to inflation

through markup growth in the present followed by negative markup growth in the future.

1. PRICES, COSTS, AND MARKUPS IN THE MODEL OF MONOPOLISTIC COMPETITION

Rising monopoly power among firms has been a popular explanation for the 2021 spike in inflation, buttressed by a coincident rise in corporate profits. To help illustrate the mechanisms through which monopoly power can raise markups, Figure 1 first shows how markups are determined in a standard monopolistic model of price setting holding a firm's marginal costs fixed. The solid blue line shows that consumers' maximum willingness to pay (that is, their demand for the good) declines as they purchase more of a monopolistic firm's product. The dashed blue line shows that the marginal revenue a monopolist receives from each additional sale declines as they increase output. Finally, the solid green line plots the marginal cost of producing each unit sold.

A profit-maximizing monopolist chooses the price that equates marginal revenue to marginal cost, so any change in price would lead to a loss in profits. For example, in Figure 1, if the monopolist sets a unit price equal to \$4, consumers will demand (and purchase) three units. Because the monopolist's production cost is only \$1 per unit, they earn \$3 profit per unit for a total profit of \$9 and a markup equal to 4 ($\$4/\$1 = 4$). This price equates marginal revenue to marginal cost and maximizes the monopolist's profit. If the monopolist decides to lower the price to \$3, they would sell four units instead of three, but their profit per unit would fall to \$2 for a total profit of \$8 instead of \$9 and a markup of 3. Similarly, if the monopolist raised the price to \$5, then they would make \$4 profit on each unit but sell only two units at that price for a total profit of \$8 and a markup of 5.

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate how markups and costs jointly determine inflation by showing how the monopolist will increase their price in response to either an increase in the marginal cost or an increase in demand. Figure 2 shows that an increase in the firm's marginal cost from \$1 to \$5—represented by the solid orange line—will raise the unit price by \$2, from \$4 to \$6. In this case, the firm's markup declines from 4 to 1.2 ($\$6/\$5 = 1.2$); even though the price level increases, it is driven by the increase in marginal cost and markup growth is actually negative. In contrast, Figure 3 shows that an increase in demand—represented by the solid orange line—causes prices to grow from \$4 to \$5. In this case, the firm's markup increases from 4 to 5, so the increase in the price level in Figure 3 is entirely due to the firm's markup growing.

In summary, changes in firms' current marginal costs or demand for their products can contribute to inflation as firms adjust their prices to maximize profits. The total change in prices can always be understood as the combined effects of changes in the marginal cost of production and changes in the firm's markup. Our simple model shows that markups may or may not contribute to inflation: when a monopolist's marginal costs increase, markups decline, but when demand for a monopolist's products increases, markups rise.

II. ESTIMATES OF AVERAGE MARKUPS

Although the figures in the previous section provide simple illustrations of arm markups, measuring the growth rate of these markups in the real economy can be challenging. First, data on a firm's marginal cost of production are not available; instead, we can only observe measures of total costs in nominal values. Second, data collected at the firm level do not report the prices that firms charge or the quantity of goods they produce, but rather their total sales.

To overcome these challenges, we estimate the growth rate in markups by assuming that firms equate their marginal cost to a constant proportion of the production costs that they can control—specifically, variable costs, which include things like labor and utilities, rather than fixed costs, such as depreciation on previously installed capital. This assumption allows us to proxy a firm's markup growth using the growth in its ratio of sales to variable costs. We estimate markup growth using Compustat data, which consist of quarterly data at the firm level for publicly traded corporations in the United States. These data have been used widely to estimate markups (as in De Loecker, Eeckhout, and Unger 2020) and have two main benefits. First, they allow us to estimate markups at the firm level and then calculate averages at different sectoral levels of aggregation. Second, they include a direct estimate of total variable costs, “cost of goods sold,” which is our basis for estimating markups.

The blue line in Chart 1 plots average markup growth across all firms from 2011 through 2021, weighted by share of total sales. The chart shows that after remaining roughly flat in the decade preceding the pandemic and falling by 0.5 percent in 2020, markups grew by about 3.4 percent in 2021. This is more than half of the 5.8 percent PCE inflation rate, suggesting markup growth played a major role for inflation in 2021. Furthermore, the burst in markup growth seen in 2021 stands in marked contrast to the decade before the pandemic, when marginal cost growth drove inflation and markup growth averaged only 0.42 percent (less than one-third of average PCE inflation over that period).

Looking at the timing of markup growth tells a more nuanced story. Chart 2 shows quarterly markup growth plotted against quarterly PCE inflation. We estimate that quarterly markup growth was highest in 2021:Q1, when it neared 16 percent (annualized), while quarterly inflation was only 4.6 percent. Furthermore, markups fell in the second half of 2021, while inflation accelerated. This suggests that the source of high markup growth in recent years was not a steady increase in monopoly power.

As shown in the previous section, changes in demand can also drive markup growth, even if monopoly power is unchanged. However, if high-frequency changes in demand were generating fluctuations in markup growth, then we would expect industries with higher demand to have both higher inflation and higher markup growth than those with less demand.

We check for this pattern using the industrial detail of our Compustat markup measure. Goods and services experienced different rates of inflation in 2020 and 2021, as shown in the first three bars in Chart 3. Durable goods inflation spiked sharply to nearly 11 percent, nondurable goods inflation grew by 7.4 percent, and services inflation remained relatively low at 4.3 percent. These differences likely reflect shifts in relative demand in the face of ongoing COVID-19 risk in 2021, as spending on durable goods has a relatively low risk of infection compared with spending on services. However, the green bars in Chart 3 show that the pattern for markup growth in roughly comparable industries was much more similar. Markups grew only slightly more in manufacturing (2.90 percent) than in services (2.20 percent), and retail saw the smallest growth in markups (0.33 percent). The similarity of markup growth despite large differences in inflation speaks against a simple demand-based explanation in which markups drove inflation most for industries that experienced the strongest increase in relative demand due to the pandemic.

III. HIGHER FUTURE MARGINAL COSTS INCREASE MARKUPS WHEN PRICING IS DYNAMIC

Although markup growth was high in 2021, the evidence from the previous section casts doubt on the simple explanation of “greedflation,” understood as either an increase in monopoly power or firms using existing power to take advantage of high demand. Instead, this evidence may be consistent with an alternative explanation: that firms are raising markups in the present to smooth price increases they expect in the future. Indeed, both the hump shape of aggregate markup growth and similarity in markup growth across industries arise naturally in standard macroeconomic models where firms adjust their prices slowly over time and expect high marginal costs in the near-term future.

To understand how markups can rise in response to an increase in firms' expectations of higher marginal costs in the future, we extend our theory of price setting to one with multiple periods of production and sales as well as “sticky” prices. We consider a firm that has a marginal cost of \$1 at the beginning of the year (as in Figure 1) but expects their marginal cost to rise to \$5 in the next year (as in Figure 2). However, we assume that this firm will only set its price once for both years, either because it is costly to adjust prices or because consumers dislike frequent price changes. Of course, this illustrative model cannot also generate inflation after markups have fallen, as we see in the data, but we extend it to a longer horizon below.

Figure 4 demonstrates profits as the firm considers prices between \$4 (which maximizes profits given a constant marginal cost of \$1) and \$6 (which maximizes profits given a constant marginal cost of \$5). Using either price of \$4 or \$6 for both periods generates a total profit of \$6. However, if the firm sets a price of \$5, then profits rise to \$8. Effectively, this balances the average of the marginal cost between the two years to the marginal revenue, thereby maximizing total profit. Markups are therefore higher initially—when the marginal cost is \$1, firms set a price of \$5, leading to a first-year markup of 5 rather than 4. However, markups fall in the second year—when marginal costs rise to \$5 and the price remains at \$5, then the markup is equal to 1. In other words, the firm just breaks even on the last unit sold in the second year.

Although this simple example illustrates how higher future marginal costs can increase inflation in the present via markups, it is much simpler than the dynamic equilibrium models used by policymakers, which allow firms to engage in many periods of price setting, households to make consumption and labor supply decisions (which determine firms' demand and wage costs), and monetary policy to change interest rates in response to inflation (which affects household spending). Figure 5 demonstrates inflation (blue line) and markup growth (green line) from such a model in which prices, output, and interest rates are all determined jointly in equilibrium following a monetary policy rule that leads the central bank to raise interest rates when inflation rises. In this simulation, firms realize that marginal costs will rise by 10 percent in a year and then shrink slowly, returning to normal after two years. In anticipation, they begin raising prices immediately, which translates into markup growth and inflation. Furthermore, in the model, the increase in inflation elicits an increase in interest rates by the central bank, which in turn lowers employment and reduces marginal costs (through lower real wages). The result is that markup growth initially accounts for more than 100

percent of inflation, which is why the green line is initially above the blue line. Once marginal costs rise, however, inflation is higher than markup growth, and eventually markups begin to shrink. The qualitative pattern of markup growth's contribution to inflation is remarkably similar to the quarterly pattern of inflation and markup growth in 2021. Furthermore, the initial markup-driven increase in inflation foreshadows the later increase in marginal costs and signals a persistent rise in inflation. Overall, this example's accordance with the quarterly data from 2021 suggests that the large contribution of markups to inflation in 2021 may have been a harbinger of the continued inflation observed in 2022.

CONCLUSION

As inflation has remained stubbornly high, economists and policymakers have sought to better understand the contribution to price gains from direct increases in marginal costs versus increases in firms' markups. We show that markup growth likely contributed more than 50 percent to inflation in 2021, a substantially higher contribution than during the preceding decade. However, the markup itself is determined by a host of unobservable factors, including changes in demand but also changes in firms' expectations of future marginal costs. The decline in markups during the first half of 2022—even as inflation remained high—is consistent with firms having raised markups during 2021 in anticipation of future cost pressures. Furthermore, the growth in markups was similar across industries with very different relative demand and inflation rates in 2021, which is also consistent with an aggregate increase in expected future marginal costs. We conclude that an increase in markups likely provides a signal that price setters expect persistent increases in their future costs of production.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is an article titled: "How Much Have Record Corporate Profits Contributed to Recent Inflation?"

Firms raised markups to 2021 in anticipation of future cost pressures contributing to about 60 percent. Every American knows that record profits added to inflation. They just keep on trying to blame it on the fact that we kept our small businesses open. That is not the case. We made sure that people did not get thrown out of their homes.

It is the big corporations that they protect with their policies, and they want to make sure that they can cheat on their taxes. They bring that up every little while. He brought up issues with regard to Israel. Well, you know, they didn't allow a clean bill to come to the floor because they wanted to make sure that tax cheats could continue cheating on their taxes. They wanted to cut that funding.

□ 1315

We know that those kinds of things hurt America. We know that part of the reason for inflation was because of Putin's war, Putin's invasion of Ukraine, and what happened to the markets from that.

On that side of the aisle, we have the Putin protectors who are fighting back and do not want to provide any resources to Ukraine.

So, the majority should not start talking to me about inflation when the

majority's policies are continuing to add to those problems.

You might know, Mr. Speaker, that neither this Congress nor this Presidency controls interest rates. That is the Federal Reserve. We do not control that. The President does not control that.

I would love to see interest rates come down because they do impact jobs. The fact that we had the lowest job growth of the Biden administration tells you—oh, my God, you had to compare it just to the Biden administration because the job growth has been phenomenal under this administration. It has been phenomenal based on the policies of what we did in the last Congress. We have added so many jobs.

We are seeing that the Inflation Reduction Act is bringing down inflation. Inflation is lower now than it was 1 year ago. Fact-check that. Yes, indeed, we have brought down inflation.

We are creating good manufacturing jobs. In New Mexico, we are creating manufacturing jobs. We are now manufacturing wind turbines. We are manufacturing solar facilities. We are manufacturing more now in New Mexico than we have done in the past.

Those are the kinds of things that are being created with the policies that Democrats supported and were signed into law last Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is time for another real-time fact check. By the way, let's not conflate interest rates with inflation. They are two totally separate things.

Let's talk about inflation. My friend from New Mexico said that inflation started during COVID. We know that when President Trump left office, inflation was at 1.4 percent. In June 2022, when Biden was in office, it was 9.1 percent. That is almost a record high. Yes, inflation is slightly less than it was, coming down from the all-time high.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, facts don't care about your feelings, and they don't care about your political persuasion. Try arguing the difference between 9.1 percent inflation and 1.4 percent inflation. Good luck with that.

We all know who is to blame: Biden and far-left, radical Democrats.

Also, to talk about how great the economy is and unemployment, the unemployment rate actually rose in October to 3.9 percent while the labor force participation rate declined. It is actually worse than 3.9 percent if you are reading into that statistic, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this is quite amazing. Not only has President Biden totally botched the economy and Bidenomics, but he has repeatedly botched foreign affairs. Obama's own Defense Secretary, Robert Gates, once said that Joe Biden has managed to get every single foreign policy decision wrong in his entire career.

One of the big mistakes that Biden made, when we talk about foreign affairs, was when he decided to delist the Houthis as a terrorist organization. Here is a quick history lesson. In 2021, due to pressure from the Iranian regime, and for whatever reason the Biden administration is fixated on appeasing the Iranian regime, the Iranian regime was putting pressure on the Biden administration to delist the Houthis as a foreign terrorist organization. For those who don't know, the Houthis are an Iranian-backed proxy group that wreaks havoc across the Middle East.

In recent weeks, the Houthis have carried out drone and missile attacks against Israel. They have attacked and seized commercial vessels in the Red Sea. They have fired rockets at the U.S. Navy, including the USS *Mason*, the USS *Thomas Hudner*, and the USS *Kearny*.

It is past time for the Biden administration to get tough with Iran and designate the Houthis as the foreign terrorist organization that they are.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the comment about not talking about interest rates. The gentleman talked about mortgage rates, and mortgage rates are tied to the Federal Reserve. So, once again, understanding how our economy works and which agency and entity has control over that is very important.

I also want to talk about the idea of who is trusted. He mentioned some polls with regard to who is trusted on the economy. The reality is that we are right now in the people's House. We are the Representatives who are closest to the people and who are out there meeting with them. This is what the Founders intended. When the Founders created the House of Representatives, they wanted to make sure that we were a miniature of America and that we were in constant communication.

I know that that is what we do. I know that is what my colleagues do and what I do. We go out and talk with them. We listen to their stories and bring them back. We decide, based on what we hear, what we are going to prioritize.

I like the fact that Democrats, that my party, those of us on this side of the aisle, go out to listen and come back and push for policies that are going to lower costs, like the Inflation Reduction Act did where we lowered the cost of prescription drugs and where we made sure that nobody is going to pay more than \$35 a month for insulin. People have been asking for that.

For the first time, we are going to negotiate with Big Pharma to bring down those costs where there is going to be a \$2,000 out-of-pocket limit for

prescription drugs. These are important ways in which we are lowering costs.

We are lowering costs by making sure that we are providing homeowners and renters with the ability to lower their energy costs, whether that is putting in renewable energy facilities and solar panels or insulating homes.

Those are the kinds of things that my colleagues across the aisle, my good friends, might not understand, like how important it is to insulate your house. I am from where it is cold, so getting those insulation credits is important. It lowers costs.

Because of this work that we have done, I know that there is an aggregated poll out that points to the fact that Democrat incumbents are trusted in the House at a rate that is so further beyond our Republicans. They are underwater by 14 points. Their own constituents know that they are not fighting for their economic benefit.

Nevertheless, what we have seen this year is chaos and dysfunction take over the House under Republican leadership. While Democrats have been ready to put people over politics and deliver for America through bipartisan legislation, our colleagues across the aisle continue to introduce bills like we are considering today that focus more on culture wars and nonsolutions.

Today, we have an immigration bill that does not address the root causes of migration, offer solutions for our broken systems, or provide any resources to help the U.S. citizenship or immigration system or Customs and Border Patrol address an increase in migrants.

In this bill, they might talk about a lot of things, but that is not what this bill does. This bill does not address any of those key issues. Instead, it restricts the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture's ability to manage their lands. These agencies are in charge of managing our public lands, and we need to let them do their job.

We have a bill that fails to help our small businesses even when we know that SBA low-interest loans have helped thousands of entrepreneurs grow their businesses and the economy. Instead, they would seek to make those Federal loans less transparent and would cripple the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's ability to address disparities in lending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that, once again, I am here on the House floor explaining to my friends across the aisle that there is a difference between interest rates and inflation. They are two separate things. They shouldn't be conflated. I am shocked that I have to explain this to Members who are elected to Congress. It is quite amazing.

It is very clear, the difference between inflation and interest rates.

There is another thing that is very clear that Democrats don't seem to understand, and that is that President Biden's foreign policy agenda benefits our foreign adversaries and not the American people. From the failed withdrawal from Afghanistan to the \$6 billion in sanctions relief to Iran, to the draining of our Strategic Petroleum Reserve and also the fast-tracking of Putin's Nord Stream 2 project, it has been disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, look at the invasion of Ukraine, a terrorist safe haven in Afghanistan, an emboldened China, and a destabilized Middle East. This legislation before us will protect our service-members in the Middle East. It will place additional pressure on the Iranian regime.

Additionally, we have another Biden-fueled disaster right here at home at our southern border. The White House now wants to exacerbate this crisis further by placing tent cities on Federal lands.

In Pennsylvania, our Commonwealth is home to several national parks, including the Flight 93 National Memorial, Fort Necessity National Battlefield, and Friendship Hill National Historic Site, all of which are in my congressional district. These are places for Americans and their families, not camps for those who broke our laws and are here illegally.

The underlying legislation will protect our national parks from the Biden administration's and the Democrats' radical, far-left immigration policies.

Finally, the Biden administration's attempt to burden our local lenders with extra costs would do irreparable harm to our Nation's 33 million small businesses. During a time when Bidenomics is failing the American people, it is critical we support efforts to make the American Dream more achievable, not insert partisan politics into small business lending. That is why the House will nullify this far-left, radical rulemaking by the Biden administration and Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 891 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 678]

YEAS—213

Aderholt	Fry	Meuser
Alford	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Allen	Gallagher	Miller (OH)
Amodei	Garbarino	Miller (WV)
Armstrong	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Arrington	Gimenez	Mills
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Balderson	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Banks	Granger	Moore (UT)
Barr	Graves (LA)	Moran
Bean (FL)	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Bentz	Green (TN)	Nehls
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Newhouse
Bice	Griffith	Norman
Biggs	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Bilirakis	Guest	Oberholte
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Ogles
Boebert	Hageman	Owens
Bost	Harris	Palmer
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Pence
Buchanan	Hern	Perry
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Pflugger
Bucshon	Hill	Posey
Burchett	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Cammack	Hunt	Rose
Carey	Issa	Rosendale
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	James	Roy
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Ciscomani	Jordan	Scallise
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Self
Clyde	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kiley	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kustoff	Spartz
Crenshaw	LaLota	Staubert
Curtis	LaMalfa	Steel
D'Esposito	Lamborn	Stefanik
Davidson	Langworthy	Steil
De La Cruz	Latta	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaTurner	Strong
Donalds	Lawler	Tenney
Duarte	Lee (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lesko	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Timmons
Edwards	Loudermilk	Turner
Ellzey	Lucas	Valadao
Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Estes	Luna	Van Duyen
Ezell	Luttrell	Van Orden
Fallon	Mace	Wagner
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Walberg
Ferguson	Maloy	Waltz
Finstad	Mann	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Massie	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Westerman
Fleischmann	McClain	Williams (NY)
Flood	McClintock	
Foxx	McCormick	
Franklin, Scott	McHenry	

Williams (TX) Wittman
Wilson (SC) Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—205

Adams Golden (ME)
Aguilar Goldman (NY)
Allred Gomez
Amo Gonzalez,
Auchincloss Vicente
Balint Gottheimer
Barragán Green, Al (TX)
Beatty Grijalva
Bera Harder (CA)
Beyer Hayes
Bishop (GA) Higgins (NY)
Blumenauer Himes
Blunt Rochester Horsford
Bonamici Houlihan
Bowman Hoyer
Boyle (PA) Hoyle (OR)
Brown Huffman
Brownley Ivey
Budzinski Jackson (IL)
Bush Jackson (NC)
Caraveo Jacobs
Carbajal Jayapal
Cárdenas Jeffries
Carson Johnson (GA)
Carter (LA) Kamlager-Dove
Cartwright Kaptur
Casar Keating
Case Kelly (IL)
Casten Khanna
Castor (FL) Kildee
Castro (TX) Kilmer
Cherfilus- McCormick Kim (NJ)
Chu Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA) Kuster
Clarke (NY) Landsman
Cleaver Larsen (WA)
Clyburn Larson (CT)
Cohen Lee (CA)
Connolly Lee (PA)
Correa Leger Fernandez
Costa Levin
Courtney Lieu
Craig Lofgren
Crockett Lynch
Crow Magaziner
Cuellar Manning
Davids (KS) Matsui
Davis (IL) McBath
Davis (NC) McClellan
DeGette McCollum
DeLauro McGarvey
DelBene McGovern
Deluzio Meeks
DeSaulnier Menendez
Dingell Meng
Doggett Mfume
Escobar Moore (WI)
Eshoo Morelle
Espallat Moskowitz
Evans Moulton
Fletcher Mrvan
Foster Mullin
Foushee Nadler
Frankel, Lois Napolitano
Frost Neal
Galleo Neguse
Garamendi Nickel
Garcia (IL) Norcross
Garcia, Robert Ocasio-Cortez
Omar

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santos

NOT VOTING—15

Dean (PA) Kelly (PA)
DesJarlais LaHood
Gaetz Sarbanes
Garcia (TX) Lee (NV)
Garcia Mast
Jackson Lee Pelosi

□ 1356

Mses. CLARK of Massachusetts and MANNING, and Mr. ESPAILLAT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. POSEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

AYES—212

Aderholt Garbarino Miller-Meeks
Alford Garcia, Mike Mills
Allen Gimenez Molinaro
Amodei Gonzales, Tony Moolenaar
Armstrong Good (VA) Moonney
Arrington Gooden (TX) Moore (AL)
Babin Gosar Moore (UT)
Bacon Granger Moran
Baird Graves (LA) Murphy
Balderson Nehls Graves (MO)
Banks Green (TN) Newhouse
Barr Greene (GA) Norman
Bean (FL) Griffith Nunn (IA)
Bentz Grothman Obernoite
Bergman Guest
Bice Guthrie Ogles
Bilirakis Hageman Owens
Bishop (NC) Harris Palmer
Boebert Harshbarger Pence
Bost Hern Perry
Brecheen Buchanan Hill Pfluger
Buchanan Posey
Buck Hinson Reschenthaler
Bucshon Houshin Rodgers (WA)
Burchett Hudson Rogers (AL)
Burgess Huizenga Rogers (KY)
Burison Hunt Rose
Calvert Issa Rosendale
Cammack James Rouzer
Carey Johnson (OH) Roy
Carl Johnson (SD) Rutherford
Carter (GA) Jordan Salazar
Carter (TX) Joyce (OH) Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer Joyce (PA) Schweikert
Ciscomani Kean (NJ) Self
Cline Kelly (MS) Sessions
Cloud Kiggans (VA) Simpson
Clyde Kiley Smith (MO)
Cole Kim (CA) Smith (NE)
Collins Kustoff Smith (NJ)
Comer LaHood Smucker
Crane LaLota Spartz
Crawford LaMalfa Stauber
Crenshaw Lamborn Steel
Curtis Lamborn Stefanik
D'Esposito Langworthy Steil
Davidson Latta Steube
De La Cruz LaTurner Strong
Diaz-Balart Lawler Tenney
Lee (FL) Thompson (PA)
Donalds Lesko Tiffany
Duarte Letlow Timmons
Duncan Loudermilk Turner
Lucas Lucas Valadao
Edwards Luetkemeyer Van Drew
Luna Luna Van Duyn
Emmer Luttrell Van Orden
Estes Mace Wagner
Ezell Malliotakis Walberg
Feenstra Maloy Walt
Ferguson Mann Waltz
Finstad Massie Weber (TX)
Fischbach McCarthy Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald McCaul Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick McClain Westerman
Flood Fleischmann Williams (NY)
Foxy McHenry Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott Meuser Wilson (SC)
Fry Miller (IL) Wittman
Fulcher Miller (OH) Womack
Gallagher Miller (WV) Yakym
Zinke

NOES—205

Barragán Blunt Rochester
Beatty Bonamici
Bera Bowman
Beyer Boyle (PA)
Bishop (GA) Brown
Blumenauer Brownley

Budzinski Houlihan Peters
Bush Hoyer Pettersen
Caraveo Hoyle (OR) Pingree
Carbajal Huffman Pocan
Cárdenas Ivey Porter
Carson Jackson (IL) Pressley
Carter (LA) Jackson (NC) Quigley
Cartwright Jacobs Ramirez
Casar Jayapal Raskin
Case Jeffries Ross
Casten Johnson (GA) Ruiz
Castor (FL) Kamlager-Dove Ruppertsberger
Castro (TX) Kaptur Ryan
Cherfilus- Keating Salinas
McCormick Kelly (IL) Scanlon
Chu Khanna Sánchez
Clark (MA) Kildee Sanchez
Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schakowsky
Cleaver Kim (NJ) Schiff
Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schneider
Cohen Kuster Scholten
Connolly Schrier
Correa Landsman Scott (VA)
Costa Correa Larsen (WA) Scott, David
Craig Larson (CT) Sewell
Crockett Lee (CA) Sherman
Crow Lee (PA) Sherrill
Cuellar Leger Fernandez Slotkin
Davids (KS) Levin Smith (WA)
Davis (IL) Lieu Sorensen
Davis (NC) Lofgren Soto
DeGette Lynch Spanberger
DeLauro Magaziner Manning Stansbury
Deluzio Matsuui Stanton
DeSaulnier McBath Stevens
Dingell McClellan Strickland
Doggett McCollum Swalwell
Escobar McGarvey Sykes
Eshoo McGovern Takano
Espallat Meeks Thanedar
Evans Menendez Thompson (CA)
Fletcher Meng Thompson (MS)
Foster Mfume Titus
Foushee Moore (WI) Tlaib
Frankel, Lois Morelle Tokuda
Frost Moskowitz Tonko
Galleo Moulton Torres (CA)
Garamendi Mrvan Torres (NY)
Garcia (IL) Mullin Trahan
Garcia, Robert Nadler Trone
Garcia, Robert Napolitano Underwood
Neal
Frost Neguse Vargas
Galleo Nickel Vasquez
Garamendi Norcross Veasey
Garcia (IL) Ocasio-Cortez Velázquez
Garcia, Robert Omar Wasserman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santos

NOT VOTING—16

Biggs Gaetz Pelosi
Courtney Jackson (TX) Phillips
Dean (PA) Jackson Lee Sarbanes
DelBene Kelly (PA) Scott, Austin
DesJarlais Lee (NV)
Fallon Mast

□ 1403

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "AYE" on rollcall No. 679.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 679.

Stated against:

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall No. 679 on the Rule (H. Res. 891) for three bills under consideration on the floor this week:

H.R. 5283, "Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act; H.R. 5961, "No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act"; and S.J. Res. 32, "Providing for congressional disapproval, relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act".

Had I recorded my vote, I would have voted "no" on the Rule, H. Res. 891.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 678 and "yea" on rollcall No. 679.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call votes on the motion on ordering the previous question (H. Res. 891) and H. Res. 891, the Rule for H.R. 5283, H.R. 5961, and S.J. Res. 32, my vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 678 and "nay" on rollcall No. 679.

PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES FROM FAILURE TO SECURE THE BORDER ACT OF 2023

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5283.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5283.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1412

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5283) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies, with Mrs. McCLAIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, today I rise in support of H.R. 5283, legislation sponsored by my colleague from New York City, Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS.

This legislation would protect our national parks, prevent wasteful spending, and hold the Biden administration accountable for its failed border policies.

The Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023 would prohibit the use of any Federal funding, leases, or contracts to construct housing facilities for illegal immigrants on our Nation's Federal lands.

It would also put an end to the legally questionable lease that the Biden administration signed with New York City to house thousands of migrants at Floyd Bennett Field, which is owned and managed by the National Park Service.

Madam Chair, our national parks have been described as America's best idea. They are places we go to experience the outdoors and spend time with our friends, family, and community.

That was true of Floyd Bennett Field, which drew an average of 1 million visitors per year for its ice skating rinks, petting zoos, UC cadet programs, bird watching, bike races, and much more.

□ 1415

If you go to Floyd Bennett Field today, you wouldn't see any children on playgrounds or fishermen dotting the shoreline. Instead, you would see massive tents, hastily thrown together over the last few weeks to house 2,000 migrants in semi-congregate facilities.

This tent city has been called a recipe for disaster.

Local Democrat and Republican elected officials, the U.S. Park Police Union, the Legal Aid Society, and the Coalition for the Homeless have all spoken out against using Floyd Bennett Field as a migrant housing facility.

The Park Police Union testified before the Committee on Natural Resources that it was a, "law enforcement nightmare and public safety disaster in the making."

Numerous organizations have raised concerns about inadequate bathroom facilities, cramped sleeping areas, and hazards for children.

The local fire department said the area is a fire trap and lacks basic safety features, like fire hydrants. If that wasn't enough, the entire facility is located in a flood plain that floods even on days with light rain.

Maybe the Biden administration would have known about these issues ahead of time had they not tried to get around the National Environmental Policy Act by improperly declaring this as an emergency.

Perhaps it is no surprise that when the first busloads of migrants started

arriving at Floyd Bennett Field, they turned right back around and refused to stay there.

Migrant families are now warning each other against staying there, saying that the site is freezing cold, babies are suffering, it is not suitable for children, and believe it or not, there are no televisions.

This entire boondoggle has been a colossal waste of time and American tax dollars.

Why are we here? Because of failed Democrat policies.

President Biden has failed to secure our border leading to a record number of migrant apprehensions last month.

Liberal New York Democrats have turned New York into a sanctuary city whose right-to-shelter laws will cost an estimated \$12 billion over the next 3 years just to house undocumented immigrants.

The mission of the National Park Service is to conserve the natural and cultural resources for the enjoyment of future generations, not bail out the failed border policies of the Biden administration.

The use of emergency declarations at Floyd Bennett Field is a result of a man-made problem that President Biden is responsible for.

The border crisis is now everywhere in America, and what is happening at Floyd Bennett Field is something that highlights the failures at the southern border. This is the Biden administration's legacy for the National Park Service.

Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS' legislation will ensure that Federal lands throughout the country, including parks such as Hot Springs National Park in my district and the Grand Canyon in the ranking member's home State, remain natural wonders, not tent cities for illegal immigrants.

Madam Chair, I thank Representative MALLIOTAKIS for her strong leadership on this effort. I support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter confirms our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 5283, the "Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023". Thank you for collaborating with the Committee on Agriculture on the matters within our jurisdiction.

The Committee on Agriculture will forego any further consideration of this bill. However, by foregoing consideration at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Agriculture also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees should it become necessary and ask that you support such a request.

We would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 5283, and request a copy of our letters on this matter be published in the

Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2023.

Hon. GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on October 26, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and appreciate your willingness to forgo action on the bill. I acknowledge that the Committee on Agriculture will not formally consider H.R. 5283 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on Agriculture to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

BRUCE WESTERMAN,

Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the legislation. I am disappointed that today we once again are discussing the continued Republican insistence that immigration is a Federal land emergency.

I will continue to dispute this claim because instead of focusing on the root causes of our Nation's immigration crisis and challenges, my colleagues have chosen to double down on a distraction.

I oppose this bill because it is a political stunt that will invite even more hateful anti-immigration rhetoric from the extreme MAGA wing of the Republican Party.

The case of Floyd Bennett Field does not represent a threat to our public lands. Rather, it encapsulates the humanitarian crisis that we are facing caused by failed immigration policies from the past administration and from the failure of Congress to take any action to reform a broken immigration system.

The crisis can be solved but only with real comprehensive immigration reform.

Madam Chair, former President Trump, as I understand it, is still the frontrunner for the Republican Presidential nomination.

News flash: Nothing has changed. He has stated that he intends to return to the White House with his supercharged plan that one of his closest confidants and noted white nationalist Stephen Miller described as a "blitz."

Miller went on to say that, "Trump will unleash the vast arsenal of Federal

powers to implement the most spectacular migration crackdown."

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD The New York Times article, "Sweeping Raids, Giant Camps and Mass Deportations: Inside Trump's 2025 Immigration Plans."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 2023]

SWEEPING RAIDS AND MASS DEPORTATIONS:
INSIDE TRUMP'S 2025 IMMIGRATION PLANS
(By Charles Savage, Maggie Haberman and Jonathan Swan)

Former President Donald J. Trump is planning an extreme expansion of his first-term crackdown on immigration if he returns to power in 2025—including preparing to round up undocumented people already in the United States on a vast scale and detain them in sprawling camps while they wait to be expelled.

The plans would sharply restrict both legal and illegal immigration in a multitude of ways.

Mr. Trump wants to revive his first-term border policies, including banning entry by people from certain Muslim-majority nations and reimposing a Covid 19-era policy of refusing asylum claims—though this time he would base that refusal on assertions that migrants carry other infectious diseases like tuberculosis.

He plans to scour the country for unauthorized immigrants and deport people by the millions per year.

To help speed mass deportations, Mr. Trump is preparing an enormous expansion of a form of removal that does not require due process hearings. To help Immigration and Customs Enforcement carry out sweeping raids, he plans to reassign other federal agents and deputize local police officers and National Guard soldiers voluntarily contributed by Republican-run states.

To ease the strain on ICE detention facilities, Mr. Trump wants to build huge camps to detain people while their cases are processed and they await deportation flights. And to get around any refusal by Congress to appropriate the necessary funds, Mr. Trump would redirect money in the military budget, as he did in his first term to spend more on a border wall than Congress had authorized.

In a public reference to his plans, Mr. Trump told a crowd in Iowa in September: "Following the Eisenhower model, we will carry out the largest domestic deportation operation in American history." The reference was to a 1954 campaign to round up and expel Mexican immigrants that was named for an ethnic slur—"Operation Wetback."

The constellation of Mr. Trump's 2025 plans amounts to an assault on immigration on a scale unseen in modern American history. Millions of undocumented immigrants would be barred from the country or uprooted from it years or even decades after settling here.

Such a scale of planned removals would raise logistical, financial and diplomatic challenges and would be vigorously challenged in court. But there is no mistaking the breadth and ambition of the shift Mr. Trump is eyeing.

In a second Trump presidency, the visas of foreign students who participated in anti-Israel or pro-Palestinian protests would be canceled. U.S. consular officials abroad will be directed to expand ideological screening of visa applicants to block people the Trump administration considers to have undesirable attitudes. People who were granted temporary protected status because they are from certain countries deemed unsafe, allowing them to lawfully live and work in the United States, would have that status revoked.

Similarly, numerous people who have been allowed to live in the country temporarily for humanitarian reasons would also lose that status and be kicked out, including tens of thousands of the Afghans who were evacuated amid the 2021 Taliban takeover and allowed to enter the United States. Afghans holding special visas granted to people who helped U.S. forces would be revetted to see if they really did.

And Mr. Trump would try to end birthright citizenship for babies born in the United States to undocumented parents—by proclaiming that policy to be the new position of the government and by ordering agencies to cease issuing citizenship-affirming documents like Social Security cards and passports to them. That policy's legal legitimacy, like nearly all of Mr. Trump's plans, would be virtually certain to end up before the Supreme Court.

In interviews with The New York Times, several Trump advisers gave the most expansive and detailed description of Mr. Trump's immigration agenda in a potential second term. In particular, Mr. Trump's campaign referred questions for this article to Stephen Miller, an architect of Mr. Trump's first-term immigration policies who remains close to and is expected to serve in a senior role in a second administration.

All of the steps Trump advisers are preparing, Mr. Miller contended in a wide-ranging interview, rely on existing statutes; while the Trump team would likely seek a revamp of immigration laws, the plan was crafted to need no new substantive legislation. And while acknowledging that lawsuits would arise to challenge nearly every one of them, he portrayed the Trump team's daunting array of tactics as a "blitz" designed to overwhelm immigrant-rights lawyers.

"Any activists who doubt President Trump's resolve in the slightest are making a drastic error: Trump will unleash the vast arsenal of federal powers to implement the most spectacular migration crackdown," Mr. Miller said, adding, "The immigration legal activists won't know what's happening."

Todd Schulte, the president of FWD.us, an immigration and criminal justice advocacy group that repeatedly fought the Trump administration, said the Trump team's plans relied on "xenophobic demagoguery" that appeals to his hardest-core political base.

"Americans should understand these policy proposals are an authoritarian, often illegal, agenda that would rip apart nearly every aspect of American life—tanking the economy, violating the basic civil rights of millions of immigrants and native-born Americans alike," Mr. Schulte said.

Since Mr. Trump left office, the political environment on immigration has moved in his direction. He is also more capable now of exploiting that environment if he is re-elected than he was when he first won election as an outsider.

The ebbing of the Covid-19 pandemic and resumption of travel flows have helped stir a global migrant crisis, with millions of Venezuelans and Central Americans fleeing turmoil and Africans arriving in Latin American countries before continuing their journey north. Amid the record numbers of migrants at the southern border and beyond it in cities like New York and Chicago, voters are frustrated and even some Democrats are calling for tougher action against immigrants and pressuring the White House to better manage the crisis.

Mr. Trump and his advisers see the opening, and now know better how to seize it. The aides Mr. Trump relied upon in the chaotic early days of his first term were sometimes at odds and lacked experience in how to manipulate the levers of federal power. By

the end of his first term, cabinet officials and lawyers who sought to restrain some of his actions—like his Homeland Security secretary and chief of staff, John F. Kelly—had been fired, and those who stuck with him had learned much.

In a second term, Mr. Trump plans to install a team that will not restrain him.

Since much of Mr. Trump's first-term immigration crackdown was tied up in the courts, the legal environment has tilted in his favor: His four years of judicial appointments left behind federal appellate courts and a Supreme Court that are far more conservative than the courts that heard challenges to his first-term policies.

The fight over Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals provides an illustration.

DACA is an Obama-era program that shields from deportation and grants work permits to people who were brought unlawfully to the United States as children. Mr. Trump tried to end it, but the Supreme Court blocked him on procedural grounds in June 2020.

Mr. Miller said Mr. Trump would try again to end DACA. And the 5-4 majority of the Supreme Court that blocked the last attempt no longer exists: A few months after the DACA ruling, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg died and Mr. Trump replaced her with a sixth conservative, Justice Amy Coney Barrett.

Mr. Trump's rhetoric has more than kept up with his increasingly extreme agenda on immigration.

His stoking of fear and anger toward immigrants—pushing for a border wall and calling Mexicans rapists—fueled his 2016 takeover of the Republican Party. As president, he privately mused about developing a militarized border like Israel's, asked whether migrants crossing the border could be shot in the legs and wanted a proposed border wall topped with flesh-piercing spikes and painted black to burn migrants' skin.

As he has campaigned for the party's third straight presidential nomination, his anti-immigrant tone has only grown harsher. In a recent interview with a right-wing website, Mr. Trump claimed without evidence that foreign leaders were deliberately emptying their "insane asylums" to send the patients across America's southern border as migrants. He said migrants were "poisoning the blood of our country." And at a rally on Wednesday in Florida, he compared them to the fictional serial killer and cannibal Hannibal Lecter, saying; "That's what's coming into our country right now."

Mr. Trump had similarly vowed to carry out mass deportations when running for office in 2016, but the government only managed several hundred thousand removals per year under his presidency, on par with other recent administrations. If they get another opportunity, Mr. Trump and his team are determined to achieve annual numbers in the millions.

Mr. Trump's immigration plan is to pick up where he left off and then go much farther. He would not only revive some of the policies that were criticized as draconian during his presidency, many of which the Biden White House ended, but also expand and toughen them.

One example centers on expanding first-term policies aimed at keeping people out of the country. Mr. Trump plans to suspend the nation's refugee program and once again categorically bar visitors from troubled countries, reinstating a version of his ban on travel from several mostly Muslim-majority countries, which President Biden called discriminatory and ended on his first day in office.

Mr. Trump would also use coercive diplomacy to induce other nations to help, includ-

ing by making cooperation a condition of any other bilateral engagement, Mr. Miller said. For example, a second Trump administration would seek to re-establish an agreement with Mexico that asylum seekers remain there while their claims are processed. (It is not clear that Mexico would agree; a Mexican court has said that deal violated human rights.)

Mr. Trump would also push to revive "safe third country" agreements with several nations in Central America, and try to expand them to Africa, Asia and South America. Under such deals, countries agree to take would-be asylum seekers from specific other nations and let them apply for asylum there instead.

While such arrangements have traditionally only covered migrants who had previously passed through a third country, federal law does not require that limit and a second Trump administration would seek to make those deals without it, in part as a deterrent to migrants making what the Trump team views as illegitimate asylum claims.

At the same time, Mr. Miller said, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would invoke the public health emergency powers law known as Title 42 to again refuse to hear any asylum claims by people arriving at the southern border. The Trump administration had internally discussed that idea early in Mr. Trump's term, but some cabinet secretaries pushed back, arguing that there was no public health emergency that would legally justify it. The administration ultimately implemented it during the coronavirus pandemic.

Saying the idea has since gained acceptance in practice—Mr. Biden initially kept the policy—Mr. Miller said Mr. Trump would invoke Title 42, citing "severe strains of the flu, tuberculosis, scabies, other respiratory illnesses like R.S.V. and so on, or just a general issue of mass migration being a public health threat and conveying a variety of communicable diseases."

Mr. Trump and his aides have not yet said whether they would re-enact one of the most contentious deterrents to unauthorized immigration that he pursued as president: separating children from their parents, which led to trauma among migrants and difficulties in reuniting families. When pressed, Mr. Trump has repeatedly declined to rule out reviving the policy. After an outcry over the practice, Mr. Trump ended it in 2018 and a judge later blocked the government from putting it back into effect.

Soon after Mr. Trump announced his 2024 campaign for president last November, he met with Tom Homan, who ran ICE for the first year and a half of the Trump administration and was an early proponent of separating families to deter migrants.

In an interview, Mr. Homan recalled that in that meeting, he "agreed to come back" in a second term and would "help to organize and run the largest deportation operation this country's ever seen."

Trump advisers' vision of abrupt mass deportations would be a recipe for social and economic turmoil, disrupting the housing market and major industries including agriculture and the service sector.

Mr. Miller cast such disruption in a favorable light.

"Mass deportation will be a labor-market disruption celebrated by American workers, who will now be offered higher wages with better benefits to fill these jobs," he said. "Americans will also celebrate the fact that our nation's laws are now being applied equally, and that one select group is no longer magically exempt."

One planned step to overcome the legal and logistical hurdles would be to significantly expand a form of fast-track deportations

known as "expedited removal." It denies undocumented immigrants the usual hearings and opportunity to file appeals, which can take months or years—especially when people are not in custody—and has led to a large backlog. A 1996 law says people can be subject to expedited removal for up to two years after arriving, but to date the executive branch has used it more cautiously, swiftly expelling people picked up near the border soon after crossing.

The Trump administration tried to expand the use of expedited removal, but a court blocked it and then the Biden team canceled the expansion. It remains unclear whether the Supreme Court will rule that it is constitutional to use the law against people who have been living for a significant period in the United States and express fear of persecution if sent home.

Mr. Trump has also said he would invoke an archaic law, the Alien Enemies Act of 1798, to expel suspected members of drug cartels and criminal gangs without due process. That law allows for summary deportation of people from countries with which the United States is at war, that have invaded the United States or that have engaged in "predatory incursions."

The Supreme Court has upheld past uses of that law in wartime. But its text seems to require a link to the actions of a foreign government, so it is not clear whether the justices will allow a president to stretch it to encompass drug cartel activity.

More broadly, Mr. Miller said a new Trump administration would shift from the ICE practice of arresting specific people to carrying out workplace raids and other sweeps in public places aimed at arresting scores of unauthorized immigrants at once.

To make the process of finding and deporting undocumented immigrants already living inside the country "radically more quick and efficient," he said, the Trump team would bring in "the right kinds of attorneys and the right kinds of policy thinkers" willing to carry out such ideas.

And because of the magnitude of arrests and deportations being contemplated, they plan to build "vast holding facilities that would function as staging centers" for immigrants as their cases progress and they wait to be flown to other countries.

Mr. Miller said the new camps would likely be built "on open land in Texas near the border."

He said the military would construct them under the authority and control of the Department of Homeland Security. While he cautioned that there were no specific blueprints yet, he said the camps would look professional and similar to other facilities for migrants that have been built near the border.

Such camps could also enable the government to speed up the pace and volume of deportations of undocumented people who have lived in the United States for years and so are not subject to fast-track removal. If pursuing a longshot effort to win permission to remain in the country would mean staying locked up in the interim, some may give up and voluntarily accept removal without going through the full process.

The use of these camps, Mr. Miller said, would likely be focused more on single adults because the government cannot indefinitely hold children under a longstanding court order known as the Flores settlement. So any families brought to the facilities would have to be moved in and out more quickly, he said.

The Trump administration tried to overturn the Flores settlement, but the Supreme Court did not resolve the matter before Mr. Trump's term ended. Mr. Miller said the Trump team would try again.

To increase the number of agents available for ICE sweeps, Mr. Miller said, officials from other federal law enforcement agencies would be temporarily reassigned, and state National Guard troops and local police officers, at least from willing Republican-led states, would be deputized for immigration control efforts.

While a law known as the Posse Comitatus Act generally forbids the use of the armed forces for law enforcement purposes, another law called the Insurrection Act creates an exception. Mr. Trump would invoke the Insurrection Act at the border, enabling the use of federal troops to apprehend migrants, Mr. Miller said.

"Bottom line," he said, "President Trump will do whatever it takes."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, apparently, the plan that has Mr. MILLER salivating includes mass roundups, mass incarceration, permanently ending DACA, and the construction of camps to hold migrants waiting to be processed and presumably later expelled from the country.

This is the leader from the Republican Party—his platform on immigration.

I wonder if MAGA Don thinks that he will build these camps on public lands. I hope not, but who knows, perhaps he even thinks Mexico will pay for it.

Seeking asylum is a human right. We should be discussing how we can best support migrants in this time of crisis by providing additional resources to guarantee safety and well-being during the immigration process.

We should be supporting cities like New York that are responding proactively to this crisis. Instead, we are taking up a bill that micromanages and limits local decisionmaking authority.

If the Republicans wanted to protect our parks, they would have passed an appropriations bill that would not cut nearly half a billion dollars from the National Park budget. Such a cut would result in the loss of 1,000 park staff and will reduce the agency's maintenance and preservation funding.

These extreme cuts are going nowhere in the Senate, and President Biden has promised to veto, so why waste that time.

To protect our parks, we should empower our Federal land management agencies by providing them with the necessary resources to fulfill their mission and the mission to the American people. Instead, this bill would interfere with that work.

Historically, the National Park Service has the authority to lease its property if the agency head determines that the lease will not obstruct the preservation of the property. Well, in the case of Floyd Bennett Field, the temporary lease will have minimal environmental impact.

New York City will be investing millions of dollars to address the deferred maintenance and improve visitor amenities, leaving the site actually better than before. This idea that leasing the field this way will somehow degrade it is a red herring.

The temporary lease will also have minimal impact on recreation. The

park at Floyd Bennett Field we are talking about in this instance is the disused runway at an abandoned airport. That is why the site has a long history of leasing for nonrecreational purposes.

It has been used for emergency responses, like during Hurricane Sandy, and even now it is used by NYPD and the New York City Department of Sanitation for exercises, including training their drivers in the use of heavy-duty vehicles.

Madam Chair, New York City is urgently responding to a humanitarian crisis. We need to support that effort. Evicting the migrants at Floyd Bennett Field with no plan for keeping them from being homeless is not a real solution for New Yorkers. It is not a real solution for our national immigration debate. We need real immigration reform, not more unserious attempts to distract from the root of the problem.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS), the lead sponsor of this bill.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

On September 15, 2023, against the strong public outcry from the local community in Brooklyn and across New York City, the lease signed by the Biden administration proposes to house at least 2,000 migrants at Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn, at a monthly rent of \$1.7 million.

Under the terms of the lease, the city, who will be reimbursed by the State, will pay the first 3 months up front and the city will be able to use 30 acres of land at the location. The total cost of the agreement is over \$20.8 million.

According to the mayor of New York City, Eric Adams, who himself has said this migrant crisis will destroy New York City, so far in fiscal year 2023, New York City has spent \$1.4 billion to deal with this crisis. It is estimated that the taxpayers will be forced to pay \$12 billion by 2025 if this crisis is not handled, meaning, if we do not stop the unsustainable and unsafe flow of individuals coming through our southern border.

Additionally, the mayor has said because of this crisis, he has to propose a 15 percent across-the-board cut for New York City services for our actual citizens. He wants to bring the number of cops to 1990 levels; thousands of fewer cops on our streets than we had on September 11, 2001.

We are having a hiring freeze for not just the cops, but the school safety officers. There is no difference than the left's defund the police agenda than this. This is defunding the police to pay for citizens of other countries to receive free housing and services. They are just not calling it that.

The gentleman who spoke prior on the other side of the aisle says that we

have to get to the root of the problem. You are absolutely right. Our mayor, by the way, is misinterpreting the right-to-shelter decree, which is intended for homeless New Yorkers, mandating the city to house homeless New Yorkers, not citizens of other countries.

Madam Chair, if there is any question about that, we sued, and a judge on Staten Island reaffirmed what we have been saying, that the city has no obligation to house citizens of other countries, and the decree was meant for homeless New Yorkers.

However, the mayor continues to use luxury hotel rooms, crushing tourism in New York. They are using school spaces, whether they are former Catholic schools—and they have even used public school gyms and cafeterias at one point—or public and open spaces such as park land, and even assisted living facilities. They actually went so far as to kick a bunch of seniors out of assisted living facilities in my district and then turned around and made it a migrant shelter.

How is that fair for the citizens of New York?

Let's get to the root of the problem. The root of the problem is that the President of the United States chose to put in place executive orders that dismantled public safety, that took away the tools of our Customs and Border Patrol agents, that allowed for a free flow of individuals into the country, 1.7 million of them.

We don't know who they are, where they are, or what their intention is. Then the other 6-million-plus that applied for asylum, guess what, 50 percent of those cases are denied in court. People are abusing the asylum system to gain entry into this country, to be released into this country. Most don't show up to court. When they do, 50 percent of those cases are denied.

We need to go back to enforcing the laws, making sure there is a proper process in this country for people, yes, to apply for asylum.

My mother is a Cuban refugee. I support people coming to this country and applying for asylum the right way.

What is the right way? The right way is you go to the next safe country.

We have people from over 120 countries coming through the southern border. We only have two countries bordering the United States, yet we have people from 120 countries, which means the process is not being followed.

Madam Chair, I will tell you something else. This is very unfair to immigrants. I don't know if the other side understands what this President is doing. He has a "last in, first in approach," which means that the people coming over the border are having their cases heard first.

So the people who have been waiting in line for years—and there is a 10-year backlog right now because of this crisis the President created—those people are not being heard and they are having their cases pushed back even further. How is that right?

Maybe you are the party that is anti-immigrant, that you are letting people who applied the right way, who came to this country the right way, to be stuck and pushed to the back of the line.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a distinguished member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member GRIJALVA for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this disingenuous bill introduced under the guise of protecting National Park Service land.

If Republicans were really concerned about protecting our national parks, why did they vote to cut the National Park Service budget by approximately half a billion dollars in the appropriations bill that they passed less than a month ago?

□ 1430

The point here is not to protect the National Park Service. The point here is cruelty.

If extreme MAGA Republicans really wanted to preserve public lands, why have they passed bills that include shameless giveaways of our public lands and waters to the destructive oil, gas, and mining industries?

If Republicans really cared about our Federal lands, why have they continuously tried to gut bedrock environmental laws, like the Endangered Species Act, since taking the majority?

Republicans do not care about our national parks. They are simply looking for more excuses to spread anti-immigrant rhetoric.

I know firsthand that the situation in New York is a humanitarian crisis and not a partisan issue. If you want to tackle the root cause of this, let's get together to draft legislation. We have legislation that has been introduced—in many instances, bipartisan legislation. Let's get real and deal with the broken system that we have in this country and address comprehensive immigration reform.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. We must ensure that people fleeing violence and persecution, regardless of nationality or other demographics, can access asylum and the refugee resettlement system in this country, as required by law.

New York City is doing all it can to accomplish this, but it cannot do it alone. The real solution here is to increase support for the city and the individuals exercising their protected right to seek asylum in the United States.

The bill before us today is performative and vilifies migrants, making it harder for New York City to meet this moment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this legislation, which would prohibit the housing of illegal immigrants on Federal lands. I only wish it was not necessary.

Unfortunately, thanks to the open borders policies of the Biden administration, America's public lands are now in danger of being converted into public flophouses for foreign migrants. Here we are.

In an effort to house the exploding number of foreigners illegally flooding into our country, the Biden administration is already allowing the construction of an encampment at the Floyd Bennett Field in Brooklyn's Gateway National Recreation Area.

They even waived NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, to permit it. You do not see any of the environmental groups raising a ruckus like they normally do when productive companies in the United States of America want to do something with natural resources. Where is the Sierra Club? Where is the National Resources Defense Council? Where is the Center For Biological Diversity when NEPA is being flouted once again?

What is next? Illegal alien Bidenvilles on The National Mall here right in Washington, D.C.? Makeshift migrant towns on the rim of the Grand Canyon? Maybe they are going to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in my district to build encampments there on Lake Superior.

As the President is fond of saying, this is no joke, folks.

For decades, we have worked together across party lines to protect our iconic national parks, pristine wildlife refuges, and resource-rich national forests and rangelands. We have done so to conserve these areas for the wise use and future enjoyment of the American people.

We can do that again by passing this bill and ensuring that the public lands we all cherish are not transformed into squatting grounds for a never-ending stampede of migrants.

I will close with this. On January 20, 2021, the first day that President Biden was in office, he closed down energy independence in America by shutting down the Keystone pipeline, and he opened up the pipeline down to Panama to be able to bring millions of illegal immigrants into America.

It is amazing to me to watch my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they twist themselves into pretzels as we advance bill after bill, including the Floyd Bennett bill here, and they are in complete denial. "Hey, America, everything is just fine." It is not.

Mr. Chair, I support this bill, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, Mr. GRIJALVA, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chair, this bill does nothing to address the immigration crisis facing our Nation. It does not help New York City, and it doesn't help the asylum seekers.

I represent Portland, Maine, which, like New York, has welcomed an influx of asylum seekers this year. Portland has also struggled to find sufficient housing for our new neighbors.

If Republicans are serious about getting asylum seekers out of shelters, then we should be debating my amendment to replace this misguided bill with my plan to get asylum seekers to work faster. Currently, asylum seekers must wait at least 6 months before they are eligible to receive work authorization. The bipartisan Asylum Seeker Work Authorization Act would cut this waiting time to 30 days, allowing asylum seekers to get to work faster and no longer rely on social safety net programs to survive.

I have spoken to countless asylum seekers who are anxious to get to work and start supporting themselves and their families and contribute to their communities. We just need to get out of their way.

I have also heard from employers from across the country who would jump at the chance to hire asylum seekers. At present, there are 9.5 million job openings in the United States and only 6.5 million unemployed workers. That leaves a gap of 3 million job openings that businesses need asylum seekers to fill. That is why business groups like the United States Chamber of Commerce have endorsed my bill.

My commonsense proposal would make no changes to the asylum process. It would simply reduce the amount of time that asylum seekers are barred from filling critical job openings.

As President Reagan once said, immigrants are one of the most important sources of America's greatness.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join me in supporting this commonsense, bipartisan solution.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act, which I am proud to cosponsor.

Plenty of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will stand here today and protest that this bill is unnecessary. They will complain Republicans shouldn't be taking up this piece of legislation. The truth is, if it weren't for the disastrous policies of this administration, I don't think we would find ourselves even considering this bill. It is plain and simple: Republicans are taking action to address our southern border crisis because the Biden administration has failed to do so. They have failed to protect the American people.

Mr. Chair, 2 weeks ago, they broke a record. In just 1 week, 15,000 illegals came across our southern border.

The district I represent in northern Minnesota contains hundreds of miles of northern border with Canada. The 547 miles of border shared with Canada are patrolled by only two mobile agents right now because the current agents are being reassigned to in-process the illegals coming through our southern border. Now, our northern border is not secure because of this administration. There are 547 miles of border that are wide open, and the cartels and coyotes have figured it out.

Earlier this fall, in Bemidji, Minnesota, an 11-year-old girl was sexually assaulted, and 11 illegal immigrants were found at the scene of that crime.

For those of you who don't know where Bemidji is, it is not along our southern border. It is over 2,000 miles away. Bemidji and every community across this Nation have been turned into a border community, putting Americans at risk.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Now, even our Federal lands meant for conservation, recreation, and development of our great natural resources are being turned into campgrounds for traffickers and terrorists who are marching into our country and breaking our immigration laws.

Northern Minnesota is also home to vast amounts of public lands, including the Chippewa and Superior National Forests, Voyageurs National Park, and the Grand Portage National Monument.

It is a shame that we even have to consider this piece of legislation because of the Biden administration's open border policy that is making our Nation less secure. We have no idea who is coming into this Nation, and it is not appropriate that we keep this open border.

Mr. Chair, I support this piece of legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think a soft reminder is important now, as we point to these asylum seekers and those who are seeking refugee status in this country and those who are going through the immigration process.

It is important to note that they are not the first. Almost everybody who speaks on this floor today can trace their lineage to somebody who wasn't here in this country when the indigenous people, the first Americans in this country, were here.

I think we need to be careful not to stereotype, not to be ugly, and not to be abusive about a crisis and human tragedy that we see before us that we should be attending to rather than exploiting.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), a valued colleague.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend and colleague from Arizona

for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise today because while House Republicans vilify families that are coming to the United States for refuge, House Democrats and the Biden administration are working to address immigration challenges with real solutions.

As many cities are welcoming asylum seekers and migrant families, House Democrats are fighting to provide resources to local governments that are processing migrant arrivals. House Democrats are fighting to relieve the immigration court backlog and provide stability for those stuck in the system. House Democrats are fighting to allow people to work and support their families. House Democrats are fighting to improve processing at the border.

To be clear, this bill does not provide any solutions for our communities. This bill does not address the core issues driving migration. It does not provide resources to local governments that are handling migrant arrivals. It does nothing. In fact, it does the exact opposite of being productive by limiting available facilities to house migrants while they go through a process to which they are legally entitled. This bill has no purpose other than to score cheap political points for House Republicans.

When House Republicans are ready to discuss real solutions, we will be ready to work with them. Right now, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 5283.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Chair, as if Biden's border crisis isn't bad enough, this administration is now seeking to convert our national parks, America's most cherished national treasures and historical sites, into tent cities for illegal aliens.

Such actions not only debase our national heritage but blatantly violate numerous Federal statutes, including those covering management and protection of our national parks, NEPA, and the Administrative Procedure Act.

How bad is this latest move to convert our national parks to ungovernable tent cities? While Wyoming's efforts to prevent catastrophic wildfires destroying our national forests are met with intensive scrutiny from the unelected bureaucrats in this administration, President Biden is categorically exempting the housing of thousands of individuals in our national parks from any type of environmental review.

This double standard is indefensible, and the Biden administration's refusal to engage with Congress on this bill only confirms that fact. We need serious reforms to end the flood of illegal immigrants into our Nation, not half measures that fail to correct the disaster of this administration's own making and endanger what is the very best idea America ever had.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to protect our national parks by voting in favor of the bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to this extreme anti-immigrant bill put forward by my colleague from New York.

I represent Chicago, a city founded by an immigrant and a city that to this day welcomes immigrants. Although this year has tested us, Chicagoans have stepped up to embrace our new neighbors.

As a proud immigrant representing a predominantly immigrant, diverse district, I take offense to the blatant attacks against my constituents. Outrage about public lands is just another excuse for Republicans to vilify immigrant communities. If they really cared, they wouldn't bulldoze through public lands and wildlife habitats while destroying our environment in their zeal for a border wall. They also wouldn't try to sell our public lands off to the highest corporate bidder.

There are many ways to create a more just immigration system. This bill is certainly not one of them, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. KIGGANS).

□ 1445

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act.

For 3 years, Americans have experienced the repercussions of the Biden administration's failed border policies.

In fiscal year 2023 alone, over 2.4 million migrants were apprehended illegally crossing our southern border with drug smugglers, human traffickers, terrorists, and other dangerous criminals taking advantage of our porous border.

This crisis has affected every facet of our Nation, including our National Park Service.

In September, the Biden administration signed a lease with New York City to house at least 2,000 illegal migrants in a tent encampment at Floyd Bennett Field in Brooklyn which sits on Federal land.

This encampment conflicts with Federal law, takes away from the field's taxpayer-funded recreational activities, and raises serious safety concerns both for those who would be housed there and for those who live nearby, as it puts an undue burden on law enforcement.

A couple of months ago in the Natural Resources Committee, we actually heard from people who represented the Park Service and lived and worked in New York City, including law enforcement. I feel that it is our job as Representatives to be listening to the people who actually live and work in those communities to have legislation that makes an impact there.

They are the ones that told us about the security concerns and the concerns from tourists. What were the children and people who are encamped there doing on a daily basis?

Some of the issues they had were with criminal activity and how it interfered with the recreational purposes of that park. Americans shouldn't be deprived access to national parks and lands paid for by their tax dollars because of this administration's destructive immigration policies.

This bill, that I was proud to work on as a member of the Natural Resources Committee, would reverse the decision to lease Park Service land to New York City to house illegal migrants and prohibit the Biden administration from doing so with any Federal lands in the future.

Mr. Chair, I came to Washington to restore commonsense leadership, and with this bill we have an opportunity to do just that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5283.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, boy, you would think this was the Congress of New York State, given how much focus my colleagues on the other side of the aisle put on New York State. I will tell you, as a Member of Congress from New York City, we are doing just fine.

This bill, however, is not at all just fine. It is yet another ploy by the Republicans to score political points without actually addressing the desperately needed reforms to our immigration system.

Immigration is a Federal issue, yet New York City, where both this bill's sponsor and I come from, is bearing the financial burden of this issue.

This bill would make it harder for cities and States to get Federal support for immigrants who, like so many of our descendants, are fleeing horrible conditions in their home countries to seek a better life in the United States.

On both sides of the aisle, we agree we have to fix our broken immigration system. Defunding migrant housing sites is not the solution.

Instead of closing down these sites and sending children potentially into the street and the cold, let's focus on legislation that actually does make our communities safer. Let's focus on fixing the fentanyl trade problem we have and the human trafficking problem that is plaguing our southern border.

That is why, as an amendment to this bill, I proposed my Disarming Cartels Act, that would stop the flow of more than 500,000 American-manufactured guns into the hands of the drug cartels in Mexico, who are responsible for the bulk of the crime that occurs on the southern border.

Over 70 percent of the guns recovered from crime scenes in Mexico come from the United States. Hundreds of thou-

sands of American-made guns are sent to Mexico every year because you cannot get a gun quickly in Mexico. That, of course, is too much common sense. That would actually solve the problem. That doesn't score political points.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Chair, that does solve the problem. This does not solve the problem. This is just a political ploy, a messaging bill, that does nothing to solve our open borders.

Every single Republican witness that has come before the Homeland Security Committee this Congress has acknowledged that the outflow of American-made weapons of war to the cartels in Mexico is a massive cause of crime at the border.

Why won't you address it? Why won't you join it?

Why won't you even allow the bill to come to the floor?

Is it the gun lobby?

Is it because you just want to use immigration as a political cudgel, and you don't want to find solutions?

Instead of fear-mongering, let's get some solutions together. Let's work together. We are ready. We just need a partner that will stop messaging and start solving problems.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, it sounds like we have bipartisan support for H.R. 2, the Secure our Borders Act, which was passed out of this Chamber that would secure our border and would address the fentanyl crisis. Maybe some of our colleagues weren't paying attention when we brought that up and debated it and passed it. Hopefully, they can go talk to Senator SCHUMER who represents New York, and get that bill through the Senate and on President Biden's desk.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the effort here today. Now it is a gun problem. I believe we are moving illegal immigrants into national parks in New York, and I suppose around the rest of the country, because we have a numbers problem. No, it isn't a gun problem.

It isn't even that the immigration system is so broken, it is just not being enforced. We have laws in place that would actually work if they were enforced. It is crazy. No wonder people think Congress is out of its mind with some of the stuff that goes on because we, oh, are going to fill up the parks, starting in New York and other areas of the country, and it will end up in the West because we don't have enough space.

There is a green light at our open border. We have had sanctuary cities inviting them in, and now they are seeing the results, finally, of Democrat policies that have put us in this place.

Indeed, this is not a long-term problem, so much as it has been intense the last 3 years during the Biden administration. This is not a commonsense solution I hear on the other side about guns or filling the parks with illegal immigrants. It is about controlling the border where the root cause is and not trying to gloss over it with this sort of policy.

Mr. Chair, this is a good policy to get started in the right direction.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this bill.

If MAGA Republicans want a real, bipartisan solution for our broken immigration system, they should sign up and support my American Dream and Promise Act.

Today, our country is home to millions of Dreamers. These are people who were brought to the United States as children and grew up here. In their heart, in their mind, and in their soul they are Americans except on paper.

This is their country. This is their home. If Congress does nothing, we will lose our neighbors, our family members, and friends. We will lose fellow Americans.

With the American Dream and Promise Act, House Democrats have a plan—with bipartisan support—to finally create a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers and immigrant families.

Make no mistake, this is not a partisan issue. Over 70 percent of Americans favor a law providing permanent legal status to Dreamers. This is a real solution. The American Dream and Promise Act will have a life-changing effect on every single district in this country.

Take it from me, I was born and raised in south Texas. I recognize the importance of securing our border to protect the integrity of our Nation.

Extreme MAGA Republicans have introduced a pitiful excuse to spread anti-immigrant rhetoric. Their bill fails to protect this country. It will not make us safer.

Their bill weaponizes the Federal Government against those who have the least. It mocks what this country stands for.

The gentlewoman from New York should look out into the New York Harbor to the statue that embodies the American promise: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

In America, we welcome those fleeing harm. We welcome those who believe in the American Dream. Americans support Dreamers and Dreamers support America. I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL).

Mr. CARL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important bill, H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure our Border Act of 2023.

In a time where the security of our Nation is at great risk because of illegal immigrants, this bill takes huge steps to address the challenges we face at our borders and prohibits the housing of illegal immigrants on federally managed lands, including those under the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

We have got a real crisis in this country. We can't wait any longer to address it.

Since President Biden has taken office, there are over 6.5 million illegal crossings in the U.S. that we know of—that we know of is the important part.

It is absolutely critical we secure our borders and enact measures that discourage further waves of illegal immigrants. We can't keep encouraging further waves of illegal immigrants to come here by offering free housing on Federal lands.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to say to my Republican colleagues: Stop the xenophobic rhetoric about asylum seekers and draft some meaningful policy that addresses the migrant crisis in New York and across this country.

Deception and extremism are what my colleagues across the aisle are spewing. In this so-called piece of legislation, they claim that Federal land will be hurt. The Floyd Bennett Field lease does not put any of our public lands in harm's way.

In fact, this same field was used 11 years ago during Superstorm Sandy as a disaster relief center for New Yorkers displaced by the hurricane. Republicans had zero opposition to that.

Those who are voicing their feigned concern for our public lands are the same people who have repeatedly pushed policies to defund and degrade our public lands. In this Congress alone, Republicans are trying to slash the National Park Service's budget by nearly half a billion dollars. These are not ideas of a party that has actual concerns about our public lands and parks.

Instead, this is an example of extremists trying to push policies that vilify migrants rather than provide sensible solutions to a real crisis.

□ 1500

Democrats, on the other hand, are working every day to put people over politics. The Biden administration, for example, granted temporary protected status to one-half million Venezuelans so they can financially support their families and join the American workforce as they await their asylum court dates. Now those are real results in putting people over politics.

Democrats are ready to work on legislation that addresses the migrant crisis in a humanitarian manner, but we

need Republicans to stop wasting time with their terrible and extreme bills and join us in getting back to work.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, you would think by just listening to this debate that we were sitting here debating funding and we were debating guns, and that is actually not the case.

You see, Mr. Chair, what the Biden administration is trying to do is just another glaring example in a long list of glaring examples of what they have done to destroy the American fabric as we know it.

Mr. Chair, you can look at inflation, and you can look at the wokeness in the military, but this is actually about an invasion, and now they are wanting to take a national park and turn it into a migrant camp.

I want to tell you something, Mr. Chair: If you give this administration an inch, they will take a mile. That is just the beginning of this.

People want to go see their national parks. They want to go see the Grand Canyon. They don't want to see a grand caravan.

Instead of punishing Americans for its failures, the Biden administration should look to actual long-lasting solutions to the border crisis. House Republicans, Mr. Chairman, knew exactly right. We have already acted by passing H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act.

Mr. Chair, I want to urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and protect our national parks.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, as a reminder, seeking asylum is a human, legal right protected by international law and United States law, period.

Instead of wishing that that was not the case, Republicans should work with Democrats and the administration to move a meaningful response to this humanitarian crisis and dealing with the issue of comprehensive immigration reform. Unfortunately, we are here debating a senseless stunt of a bill instead.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Chicago, Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chair, we just got back from a week with family. Many of us sat around the table, and we thanked God for the family, for the children, and for the ability to have a roof over their head. Some of you remembered that your family came 100, 200 years ago. In my case they came 40 years ago from Guatemala, and now we are back here with the same rhetoric that we continue to play over and over. Republicans are using human beings as bargaining chips to try to realize their extreme and their very harmful policies.

Despite their efforts to cut funding for land protection, cut social safety net services, and bankrupt our Federal infrastructure, they also want us to believe that providing emergency refuge and services to asylum seekers is what is causing all our economic problems.

Now, let me talk about that for a second. Immigrants are not the problem. They are an asset. They are actually a solution to improve our economy.

If you go to the neighborhood ALDI like I do, Mr. Chair, I see three people working there, and when I talk to the cashiers, they say to me: Congresswoman, get those work permits. We need workers.

There are 11.5 million people ready to help fill the almost 9 million open jobs right now. Those open jobs are disrupting the supply chain, and they are increasing inflation. These immigrants are ready to support the 245 million Americans, many of them living in our own communities, living in counties with shrinking populations. They are ready to invest in housing markets, and they are ready to grow our local economies.

Mr. Chair, if you actually ask our people: What keeps you up at night?

It is not being able to pay rent.

What keeps people up at night is that they have to work two jobs just to raise two children.

What keeps people up at night is that they can't afford milk and they can't afford other things.

It is not an undocumented person.

So let's talk about the economy because that is exactly what people want us to be able to address.

Immigrants are ready to increase our national GDP by up to \$1.7 trillion over the next decade.

We should be working to address the root cause of this issue by ensuring their successful resettlement and integration instead of shaming them and then going back home and thanking God for family, community, and country.

I ask my colleagues to reject this bill. Let's get to the real work of delivering work permits for all and establishing pathways to citizenship today and improving our economy.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would first remind the Democrats that illegal immigration is not a human right. It is a Federal crime.

Now, the national parks were set aside for the use and enjoyment of the American people, but President Biden is now expropriating these lands for the benefit of the 3 million illegal immigrants whom he has deliberately released into our country. This bill would halt that abomination, and I wholeheartedly support it.

Nevertheless, the misuse of our public lands is, frankly, the least of our problems. The impact this is having on social services, our schools, our hospitals, our homeless shelters, the safety of our neighborhoods, the security of our country, and the rule of law itself has been catastrophic.

Elections have consequences. The American people need to decide whether they want this to continue or whether they will replace this President with

one who is determined to recover not only our Nation's lands but our Nation's sovereignty.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, yes, elections do have consequences, and one of the responsibilities that elections provide to the United States Congress and the House of Representatives, let me remind my colleagues, is our broken immigration system, and that is a problem only Congress can solve.

We have seen what happens when Republicans try to solve this from the White House. The Trump administration set an unprecedented pace for executive action on immigration. These restrictive policies did not solve the crisis. Instead, they increased the backlog in immigration proceedings, separated children from their families, banned foreign nationals from predominantly Muslim countries, and cut refugee numbers to the lowest in decades, among other things. So this is on Congress to fix.

Unfortunately, as long as Republicans refuse to support real, substantive reform that is fair, humane, and equitable for all parties, then we will continue to see immigration-related crises of the makings of Congress and in this particular instance of the making of the House majority Republicans.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI).

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this bill in my district which includes parts of the Tucson sector where we are currently seeing record levels of illegal crossings of over 15,000 per week.

The administration's efforts to turn our national parks into shelters not only does not solve the problem or even address it, but it only further exacerbates and furthers the crisis which is both one of national security and one of humanitarian consequences, as well.

Migrants are literally dying as they make their journey into the United States. Turning these national parks into shelters only encourages migrants to make this dangerous journey.

As an immigrant myself, I can say that this is no way to help immigrants seeking asylum. The reality is that the asylum system has been abused.

My State, along with every State in the country, is feeling the impact of this administration's failures.

I support this bill, as I cannot stand for migrants and asylum seekers being treated inhumanely and sheltered in national parks while our local communities bear the burden of this administration's failures.

Our CBP agents are undermanned, underserved, overwhelmed, and unsupported. Our security is threatened, and migrants continue to be abused. This is unacceptable. We are better than this, Mr. Chair, and this bill begins to address this crisis.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to hear my Republican counterparts wax eloquently about their concerns for our national parks during this debate. They didn't say a word about the tremendous damage done to cultural resources by Trump's disastrous border wall along the southern border in Arizona primarily. They did not speak to that issue at all.

In fact, now they want to condition aid to Ukraine and possibly Israel, who are key U.S. allies, on the construction of even more miles of an ineffective and destructive border wall.

It is one thing to have a debate about a basic philosophical difference and policy difference that we have in terms of immigration reform. It is another to use half-truths and disinformation and to be disingenuous in presenting what is a reality. The reality on the southern border in Arizona is serious, and I have not denied and will not deny that it is a crisis.

Nevertheless, this is a crisis that must be worked on humanely and not by stereotyping and profiling people because of their country of origin as the reason that we make the harsh comments that are being heard today.

Pandering is not the solution. Constructive and pragmatic immigration reform is what we need to do. That is not being done, and this bill doesn't do it.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA).

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Protecting Our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023.

Since President Biden took office and Secretary Mayorkas took charge of the Homeland Security Department, the United States has seen 7.5 million encounters nationwide, 6.2 million encounters at the Southwest border, and 1.7 million known got-aways who evaded U.S. Border Patrol.

New York City is where many of these 1.7 million got-aways now live, and that is because of two policy choices: the administration's open border policy and New York's sanctuary city policies.

Instead of changing his open border policies, President Biden has decided the way they are going to fix this mess is to lease Federal land, national parks, to build tent cities.

Are they kidding me?

Mr. Chair, this is not the solution. We also need to be disincentivizing sanctuary city policies, and I believe we should end Federal funding for the purpose of aiding this crisis in those jurisdictions.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, may I get an update on the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLINE). The gentleman from Arkansas has 6 min-

utes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard the argument today, and indeed for years now, that migrants crossing our border are the primary ones responsible for the tens of thousands of American lives tragically lost to fentanyl overdoses each year. It is a tragedy that we can all not only sympathize with but want to do something desperately about.

Nevertheless, that story is simply false. Fentanyl is overwhelmingly smuggled into the United States by American citizens where it is then also consumed by American citizens. That is a fact.

In 2021 more than 86 percent of convicted fentanyl traffickers were U.S. citizens. More than 90 percent of fentanyl seizures occur at legal crossing points and interior checkpoints, not illegal immigration routes, and just 0.02 percent of migrants arrested by Border Patrol are found to possess fentanyl.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a piece from The American Prospect exploring how customs loopholes allow smugglers to ship fentanyl and its precursor chemical to the United States without inspection or law enforcement.

[The American Prospect, Nov. 27, 2023]

THE AMAZON LOOPHOLE IS DRIVING THE
FENTANYL CRISIS
(By David Dayen)

One of the more frustrating things about public policy in the United States is how the dominance of corporate interests makes simple reforms that could save thousands of lives impossible. To wit: Here is the story of how Amazon and other retailers are facilitating the epidemic of deaths from fentanyl.

We know that fentanyl deaths rose 279 percent from 2016 to 2022. Two-thirds of the 110,000-plus overdose deaths in America last year were due to fentanyl. It is the leading killer of Americans aged 18 to 49, and it has devastated communities across the country.

Drug enforcement efforts in the U.S. have historically targeted supply through a so-called "war on drugs." But reducing the amount of fentanyl on the street need not involve military-style operations in Central and South America. China is the source of most of the chemical compounds that cartels use to make fentanyl in illicit drug labs. Without these raw materials, much of the fentanyl trade would be stopped.

Now, of course this would not halt opioid addiction or use by itself; traditional smuggled heroin would likely fill in the gap. But fentanyl is orders of magnitude more dangerous than heroin thanks to its extreme potency, which is a principal cause of the overdose epidemic. The tiniest of measurement errors can lead to an overdose, and black-market drug dealers are not exactly known for their responsible metrology.

Customs enforcement officials have begun to charge Chinese firms that produce and ship these precursor chemicals (and produced fentanyl as well, and President Biden, in a summit earlier this month, pressured Chinese President Xi Jinping on the matter. The U.S. and China agreed in principle to a deal where China would limit the flow of fentanyl

in exchange for the U.S. rolling back restrictions on China's forensic police institute.

But while Chinese cooperation is welcome, the bigger problem is that the vast majority of fentanyl chemicals sent from China are not inspected at all. That's because of something called the "de minimis" rule.

Section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930 allows for goods under a certain value to be shipped into the U.S. without tariffs, fees, or inspections. Anyone who has flown on international travel is familiar with this from their declaration card when they return to the U.S.; if you got some trinkets from abroad that are of a nominal value, you don't have to submit them to customs officials.

In 2016, that nominal, or de minimis, value, went up from \$200 to \$800. There are only two countries in the world that have a higher de minimis value than the U.S.; China's de minimis value is less than \$10.

Why did this change happen? Because e-commerce firms, primarily Amazon, wanted to be able to bring in goods from China to their warehouses or even directly to their customers without any taxes or tariffs. In fact, it's often been characterized as the "Amazon loophole."

Chinese shippers have been known to package shipments in separate boxes to keep under the \$800 threshold, or send goods to distribution centers just outside the United States, where packages are broken up to get under the de minimis threshold and sent into the country.

These small shipments have exploded in frequency. In fiscal year 2018, 410.5 million de minimis packages were sent. By fiscal year 2022, that number was up to 685.1 million. Some experts put that number much higher. One analysis estimates that the official figure for the trade deficit with China last year was short by \$188 billion after accounting for de minimis shipments.

While there's practically no information available about these shipments (many have no data at all except for a mailing label), there is mounting evidence that one of the most common de minimis items is fentanyl, as Michael Stumo of the Coalition for a Prosperous America has written. This stands to reason, as fentanyl's potency means it is highly valuable by weight. "The overwhelming volume of small packages and lack of actionable data," the U.S. Office of Customs and Border Protection wrote earlier this year, "impacts CBP's ability to identify and interdict high-risk shipments that may contain narcotics, merchandise that poses a risk to public safety, counterfeits, or other contraband." It's highly likely that precursor chemicals are moving from China to Mexico under de minimis rules as well.

It was not the original intention of de minimis rules to build a parallel, off-the-books customs system, used often for illegal goods shipping. But that's what the Amazon loophole has facilitated. Congress is aware of the problem. A bill from Sens. Tammy Baldwin (D-WI) and Bill Cassidy (R-LA) would reduce de minimis thresholds to the level of trading partners (meaning that the de minimis threshold on Chinese goods would fall to under \$10). A separate bipartisan, bicameral bill would simply ban de minimis shipments from "non-market" economies, as well as countries on a priority watch list for using de minimis, which would target China.

The House Select Committee on China has investigated rampant use of the Amazon loophole from fast-fashion companies using forced labor. One textile industry official described de minimis as akin to "handing a free trade agreement to China and the rest of the world." The chairman of the China committee, Rep. Mike Gallagher (R-WI), has expressed optimism that legislation reforming

de minimis would pass this year (though passing anything in Congress is incredibly optimistic).

Of course, this is terrible news for the companies exploiting the loophole for tax benefits, like Amazon and other online retailers. So they are firing up their lobby engines. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Foreign Trade Council (a trade group of importers) deny that counterfeit goods or fentanyl enter the U.S. through de minimis shipments at all, while arguing that CBP gets plenty of information about what's in the packages. Lobbyists and their allies are also complaining about higher CBP costs for inspections of small packages, while not mentioning that it would be the importer who would have to pay those charges.

Keep in mind that when indictments were handed down on the companies sending precursor chemicals for fentanyl to drug cartels, they were reportedly packaged to appear as dog food, nuts, or motor oil. The "benefits of free trade" are hard to discern in a recently expanded loophole intended mostly to save Amazon money that is now facilitating the fentanyl crisis.

There's another beneficiary of the de minimis loophole: digital advertising companies, which benefit from ads from Chinese fast-fashion firms like Shein and Temu that make liberal use of the loophole. Financial Times reporter Rana Foroohar reported recently that one-third of the revenue growth from Meta this year is due to these two fast-fashion firms.

The Biden administration could actually use executive authority to remove certain de minimis exceptions. But in a meeting last week about combating the entry of fentanyl, administration officials actually claimed that reauthorizing the warrantless spying provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was critical to stopping the supply. There isn't much evidence that surveillance dragnets would deal with the fentanyl trade, and Congress is highly unlikely to rubber-stamp government spying once again.

Drug addiction is largely a medical issue, and expanding treatment is likely to pay higher dividends than a loser's game of trying to stem the flow of supply. But the fact that fentanyl is coming in through ordinary shipping services without inspection seems to be the low-hanging fruit here. The process of customs inspection has been almost totally circumvented, to the benefit of two groups: e-commerce companies raking in cheap goods from China, and drug traffickers. The latter may be a universally hated scourge, but the former is quite powerful. And so abuse of the loophole continues.

The question for lawmakers and the White House then becomes: How many Americans are they willing to sacrifice so Amazon doesn't have to pay a little bit in import fees?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, U.S. citizens are providing both the supply and the demand for fentanyl and other illegal drugs. The organized criminal syndicates on both sides of the borders are the ones profiting off the billions and billions of dollars from the misery and deaths that fentanyl has caused.

Instead of addressing these root causes that have led to the tragic opioid epidemic, Republicans want to lay the blame on migrants seeking a life in this great Nation of ours, being free from persecution and free from hatred and fear.

That is another piece of disinformation. I think it is important

to know that we are talking about an issue where that bitter taste and that deadly taste was introduced to the American people by Big Pharma, nice homegrown American corporations that provide pharmaceuticals to this country.

They introduced the habit to the country. Organized crime has taken it over. American citizens are being hurt, and American citizens are hurting other citizens.

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

□ 1515

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 5283, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023.

Mr. Chair, these days, every State is a border State, even New York State. Our national parks are treasures that should be enjoyed by the public, not used to house illegal immigrants. That is what the Biden administration wants to do, and we have already seen this unfolding on Federal land in New York. Not only is this unsightly, but there are tremendous security concerns given the lack of oversight; not to mention that this is a horrible misuse of taxpayer dollars, which should be used to enhance our Federal lands for our citizens.

Under this bill, President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas will no longer be able to use your tax dollars to shelter illegal immigrants who could be threats to our national security and personal safety.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO).

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Chair, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 5283, Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act, and I thank my fellow New Yorker, Congresswoman MALLIOTAKIS, for introducing this critical legislation.

President Biden's border crisis has made every State a border State, every city a border city, every county a border county.

As the crisis continues, we have seen migrants being housed in a facility at JFK Airport and, more recently, we have witnessed migrant shelters being erected at Floyd Bennett Field. The Floyd Bennett Field shelter will house hundreds and eventually thousands of migrants on land owned and operated by the National Park Service, a plan I continuously have been critical of.

I am proud to be a former member of the NYPD, having spent well over a decade investigating crimes in the Big Apple. Floyd Bennett Field houses

many critical components of the NYPD, and as the NYPD works to negotiate a new lease to stay on Floyd Bennett Field for years to come, the city is moving in thousands of migrants. This decision is both unwise and unsafe.

We must find solutions to the migrant crisis, and the answer is securing our border.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 5283 by Representative MALLIOTAKIS, the Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure our Border Act of 2023.

Our national parks should be used by our families for recreation. They should not be used as a cover-up for President Biden's failed border policies. Since President Biden took office, there have been over 6.4 million illegal crossings of our southern border, including 169 on the terrorist watch list. Yet, instead of implementing more border security and reinstating the policies that worked, this administration is housing migrants in our schools and now in our national parks.

Meanwhile, there are ICE facilities that are sitting empty, such as the Adelanto ICE processing facility in California. This 2,000-bed facility, which is already fully funded, has sat empty since April 2020 due to a court injunction.

We must be fully utilizing the ICE facilities we already have that are prepared to care for migrants versus burdening our communities that don't have the proper resources or facilities.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stop this lawlessness at our southern border and protect our national parks from becoming tent cities for illegal immigrants.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, the Biden administration has failed to secure our border and has allowed historic levels of illegal migrant crossings. Now, they have decided to house migrants on America's public lands. This is simply unacceptable.

Our national parks should serve as areas of recreation for Americans to enjoy. Instead, our lands are being used as a backup plan for housing migrants because of a failure to secure the border and a refusal to work with Congress to find commonsense solutions.

As chairman of the Western Caucus and as a member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, I am proud to support this legislation to ensure America's public lands serve the American people, their interests, and to prevent the misuse of our national parks.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chair, our Nation's security is at risk. This is due to the Biden administration's failure to secure our southern border. Since he took office, over 6.4 million illegal immigrants have entered our country from the South. There are at least 279 on the FBI's terrorist watch list and that is just what we know of.

Terrorists from across the world see our southern border as an easy way to enter the U.S. Lord only knows what other threats are coming into our country with bad intent. My home State of Idaho is comprised of over 62 percent Federal land, so this is beyond just concerning to me. Idaho has also been gravely impacted by this border crisis, despite its geographical separation from the South.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to support Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I believe I have about as much time left as the Biden administration put into the permitting process on Floyd Bennett Field. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, in closing, we are having a debate on a piece of legislation that is not really the intent of the legislation. The intent of this legislation is to begin to continue to develop the narrative anti-immigrant, xenophobic rhetoric that the Republican majority feels is going to be their pathway to electoral success in 2024.

I think the American people are going to be able to see that if you want to talk about our national parks and the public use as being the priority, Democrats are prepared to work with the Republican majority to protect them and to enhance those resources.

If we are going to talk about immigration and we are going to talk in an atmosphere where the dog whistles don't become barks on this issue, Democrats are prepared to do that. We are prepared to sit down and look at the aspects of legalization, security, and fighting the syndicated crime that is causing much hurt in this country and in Mexico. We are prepared to do that, but we are not prepared to deal with this issue as a ruse, as a stunt, as a political performative act leading to 2024.

If they are serious about immigration reform, if we are serious about protecting our public lands and waters, we are serious about it, too.

Mr. Chair, I urge all Members of the House to vote "no" on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, again, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5283, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-15, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

H.R. 5283

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 "Protecting our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING HOUSING TO SPECIFIED ALIENS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—No Federal funds may be used to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies, including through leases, contracts, or agreements.

(b) *REVOCAION OF LEASE.*—The lease between the United States of America/United States Department of the Interior/National Park Service and the City of New York for the Premises known as Portions of Floyd Bennett Field, in the Jamaica Bay Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area (NPS Lease# L-GATE912-2023, Commencement Date - September 15, 2023) is hereby revoked.

(c) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.*—The term "Federal land management agencies" means the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service.

(2) *HOUSING.*—The term "housing" means a temporary or permanent encampment used for the primary purpose of sheltering specified aliens.

(3) *SPECIFIED ALIEN.*—The term "specified alien" means an alien who has not been admitted, as such terms are defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in Part A of House Report 118-280. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for the division of the question. All points of order against such further amendments are waived.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-280.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that includes—

(1) the number of specified aliens that have been provided housing on any land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies; and

(2) information regarding the countries of origin of such specified aliens.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, \$451 billion, that is the cost of the American taxpayer of caring for illegals who broke our laws and unlawfully entered our country.

My amendment simply requires the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly submit an annual report, just a report, to Congress that includes the number of aliens that have been provided housing on federally managed lands and information regarding such aliens' countries of origin.

This will be critical data, Mr. Chairman, and this amendment should have bipartisan support.

This administration is extending an open invitation for foreign nationals to invade our country and undermine the sovereignty of the United States. As a reward, they are going to have their housing, education, and every cost taken care of. If these illegal aliens need a trip to the hospital, they don't need to meet a deductible because the American taxpayer pays for it.

Between 16.8 million and 29 million illegals currently reside in the United States, an incentive for more to come freely. There were 341,000 apprehensions at U.S. borders to the north and southwest made in September. That is 1 month; setting an all-time record. There were 309,000 apprehensions calculated in October.

Mr. Chairman, this has to stop. We are a sovereign Nation. We have a right to manage our lands. We have a right to say no.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment is, frankly, completely unnecessary. It would require preparation

and submission of an annual report in perpetuity regarding the migrants housed on certain public lands. Yet, the underlying bill would essentially ban any such housing.

It is a permanent requirement for reporting on nothing, paid for by the taxpayer.

Over the years, I have heard plenty of skepticism from my Republican colleagues about some of the reports that Congress requires of the executive branch. Usually, though, I can at least see the argument for those other reports, but I have to say it is interesting to see my Republican colleagues in favor of this one.

That said, I don't think this amendment is worth fighting over either. Having these reports would not be useful, but it would not be actively harmful either. I only hope that House Republicans would change their minds about slashing the budgets of these departments and will instead give Federal workers the funding they need to carry out their missions, which will now also include generating these annual reports.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge my colleague's comment regarding laws; that this bill, if passed, would essentially ban folks from being housed on Federal lands. It should also be noted that there are laws on the books that require our border to be secure, and, yet, this administration ignores those laws. This amendment requires accountability to the aforementioned.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. This good amendment will provide transparency and hold the Biden administration accountable for their ongoing failure to secure the southern border.

Now, it is unfortunate that this amendment is necessary, but the Biden administration has refused repeated requests from the committee over the past several months to produce documentation regarding the exact number of illegal immigrants housed on our Federal lands.

We must ensure that our Federal lands, which have been specifically set aside for the enjoyment and benefit of American people, are not used to bail out the Biden administration from their manmade crisis and emergency and their unwillingness to secure our southern border.

The Biden administration has allowed millions of illegal immigrants to flood into our country, staggering figures that have strained communities from our border all the way to New York City.

As Republicans continue to push for border security measures, it is vital that we ensure that our Federal lands

are not being co-opted as housing for massive floods of illegal immigrants.

□ 1530

This amendment and the underlying bill will ensure that our Federal lands are not misused.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for offering this thoughtful amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, again, in our view, this amendment is unnecessary, but it is not actively harmful, either. I hope we can move on. I hope that everybody is satisfied, that they got their little clips done in terms of being strong, hard, anti-immigrant people and got those little sound bites done already. I think it is time that we move on.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, with this bill, part of what we are trying to accomplish is securing our border, securing our country. There are hard-earned taxpayer dollars being sent to house illegals.

In New York alone, Mayor Adams has said that housing illegals could cost up to \$12 billion. That is \$12 billion that could be used for children in need, to educate our children, for children who are underperforming in school. That is \$12 billion that the city of New York could use for our veterans.

We have to prioritize Americans. We have to prioritize the security of our border.

I was in Tucson in August, and I was in an area that was even then controlled by the cartel. Now, we hear because of the war, the shooting, the lawlessness in that very sector, that the Border Patrol has had to pull back.

There is a war going on at our southern border, and it could be stopped, Mr. Chairman. It is time to close, to secure, our border. You have women and children who are being raped daily at our southern border, and this administration is doing nothing about it. I have had enough. All this amendment does is require a report. It requires accountability.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HUNT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 118-280.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply to housing that

the Secretary of the Interior certifies meets the following criteria:

(1) The proposed housing is for specified aliens who were transported to the State of the proposed housing (the "Destination State") from another State (the "Originating State").

(2) Such transport was funded, arranged, or otherwise assisted by the Originating State.

(3) The Originating State—

(A) failed to provide more than 48 hours of notice to the Governor of the Destination State of such transport;

(B) failed to provide the specified aliens being transported with full and truthful information regarding their destination and regarding the Destination State's assessment of the likely conditions for the specified aliens at their destination;

(C) willfully, knowingly, or recklessly misrepresented, including through omission, to the transported specified aliens their destination, their right to refuse the transport, and the expected conditions for them at their destination; or

(D) otherwise inveigled the specified aliens into such transport.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would allow the Secretary of the Interior to provide housing when States sending asylum seekers to New York City fail to meet certain conditions.

Today, there are over 65,900 asylum seekers currently in the care of the city. To respond to this influx, our city has opened 213 sites, including 18 large-scale humanitarian relief centers.

A guiding principle of New York City's response has been that people fleeing violence and persecution deserve a functioning asylum and refugee resettlement system in this country.

To my colleagues who are intent on labeling these people illegal, I ask, do they not have the legal right to seek asylum enshrined under the Geneva Refugee Convention and U.S. law?

Asylum seekers are human beings who have fled disaster, conflict, and persecution to come to the United States for a better life. They deserve to be treated with respect and dignity. They should not be used as pawns in cruel political stunts.

Politicians from States like Texas and Florida have bused asylum seekers to New York to get on cable news. These buses are often sent with little to no communication from officials in those States. Tens of thousands of migrants have been sent to New York from various originating States, no matter if they wanted to come or not. They may not have a clue about the conditions they will find in New York or the resources available to them.

As temperatures fall below freezing, there are lines of asylum seekers waiting outside of centers because they have reached their 30-day limit at city-run shelters. They have nowhere else to go. However, here we are, debating a

bill that will close Floyd Bennett Field.

My amendment will ensure that asylum seekers—not illegal aliens but asylum seekers—who are bused from State to State without support, scant information, and no other options can access the resources they deserve. Specifically, my amendment allows the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the use of land controlled by the National Park Service for the purpose of housing migrants when a State fails to provide 48 hours' notice to the receiving State or provide truthful information to the migrants about where they are being transported to or provide the opportunity to refuse the busing.

We have heard hundreds of migrant stories about not knowing where they are being sent. We cannot allow this practice to continue without consequences. My amendment will help create an accountability system for the States that decide to deceptively bus migrants to other States like New York.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Chair, the sponsor of this amendment asked the question: Do these individuals have a legal right to apply for asylum? The answer is yes. The thing is, they are supposed to be applying from the next safe country. We have over 120 countries represented at our southern border. We are only bordered by two. Therefore, they are not following the process and are coming illegally.

The cartels are the ones benefiting from the current process as it is. I hope the other side understands that these individuals, every single one of them, are paying the cartels thousands of dollars to be trafficked into the United States. That money is then used to continue to pump fentanyl into the United States, killing Americans. Let's stop bankrolling the drug cartels that are profiting from this human trafficking.

Next, let me point out that this process is not safe for anyone—not the migrants, either. That is why I don't understand why my colleagues want to continue to encourage people, instead of applying from the next safe country, to take this treacherous journey at the hands of the drug cartels.

By the way, my colleague TONY GONZALES, who represents Eagle Pass, just told me that 14 individuals drowned this Thanksgiving weekend alone in Eagle Pass.

We have the Doctors Without Borders report that says in Panama alone, in just 1 month, hundreds of women and children were raped. We know that is a common occurrence, so why are we encouraging people to take that treach-

erous journey instead of applying from the next safe country?

Lastly, Floyd Bennett Field, it was mentioned that it was unsafe, as indicated in the lawsuit brought by the councilwoman and others. I am a party to that lawsuit. It floods. There was no NEPA process. All of a sudden, my colleagues on the other side don't want to conduct a full, thorough NEPA environmental impact statement as required by law.

Why did they bypass that? If they didn't, they would know that it is a flood zone and unsafe for people to be living there.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

If this amendment were adopted, it would make this bill probably worse than where we are with the status quo because it would require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide housing when the States couldn't provide the housing.

Therefore, States that have declared themselves sanctuaries, like New York, could just say they are not providing housing. It is then back to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to provide the housing, which would probably result in more migrant shelters on Federal lands.

Our Federal lands were not designed or intended to encamp migrants, especially not our national parks. Again, the mission of the National Park Service is to conserve these areas "in such a manner and by such a means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Nothing about constructing tent cities for illegal migrants protects this land for the enjoyment of current or future generations.

The mission of the National Park Service also specifies conserving unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System. Nothing about constructing tent cities for illegal immigrants conserves the natural and cultural resources of Floyd Bennett Field or the Gateway National Recreation Area.

This amendment cannot be implemented in a practical manner. It creates a complex verification system based on subjective standards for which the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture have no expertise. This amendment would entangle these agencies further into our immigration debacle rather than acknowledging they should never have been included in this debate in the first place.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Chair, the bottom line here is that we need to secure the border. We passed H.R. 2, which can stem this unsustainable flow. Unfortunately, a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

voted against H.R. 2. That is the real solution. We need to secure our border.

Let's revert to the policies that were working previous to Joe Biden dismantling our border and making it open. It is unsafe and unsustainable for both American citizens as well as the individuals who are taking the treacherous journey at the hands of the drug cartels, which are profiting off of this human trafficking. Our government should not allow it to continue.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment draws attention to the dubious and deceptive strategy of placing migrants on buses under false pretenses and without any coordination or even a courtesy call.

Both Governor Abbott and Governor DeSantis have demonstrated that they are more interested in ginning up the MAGA base on Twitter than finding meaningful solutions to the challenges facing our immigration system, the refugee crisis both nationally and particularly in their States.

Migrants are people, not political pawns. We can have disagreements over immigration policy. That is fair game. However, the dehumanizing games and political stunts need to stop.

Mr. Chair, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York, the sponsor of the amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LAMALFA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HUNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAMALFA, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5283) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide housing to specified aliens on any land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal land management agencies, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1545

BORDER SECURITY IS NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as the conversation has been, we know that border security actually is national security.

President Biden's open border policies have incentivized a historic surge in illegal immigration at our southern and northern borders and the impact we are seeing lately on our national parks.

Since President Biden taking office, there have been over 6.4 million illegal crossings of our southern border and 1.7 million known got-aways who evaded U.S. Border Patrol.

Every State is now a border State. Every town is now a border town. Democrats are using the national parks to house illegal immigrants—think how absurd that is—which only further encourages this crisis.

Republicans and Democrats alike have condemned Biden's border crisis. We must stop incentivizing further waves of illegal immigrants by providing them with free housing—again, the latest scheme being housing them in our national parks.

We will continue to fight to secure our border and eliminate the financial burdens these illegal immigrants are putting on American taxpayers and our towns.

That is why earlier this year we passed H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act, which is the strongest border security package in American history.

HONORING XINH DWELLEY

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, my region just lost an extraordinary woman, Xinh Dwelley, after her lengthy battle with cancer.

Xinh was so many things to so many people. She was an outstanding chef who treated so many people to amazing meals, who published cookbooks and took immense joy in feeding people.

She was an inspiration, someone with a powerful immigrant story who loved America mightily. In fact, one of my favorite moments in this job was gifting her a flag that was flown over the United States Capitol in her honor, and she was just so proud.

She was a community icon who supported local people and local causes with a generous heart and a warm smile. Perhaps most importantly, she was a friend to so many.

She was kind and caring. She treated me and others like family. She would give you a long, loving smile and say, I want to cook for you. I last saw Xinh in August and feel lucky to have been able to celebrate and appreciate her.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in offering condolences to Xinh's family and to all who loved her. She will be missed by so many.

NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. TOKUDA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today as co-chair of the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus to commence hosting the Special Order hour in celebration of National Rural Health Month.

Every year, National Rural Health Month is a time for us all to bring attention to the unique healthcare needs in rural America and honor the incredible efforts of rural healthcare providers, organizations, and other stakeholders.

It has been more than a decade since Congress last had a bipartisan coalition focused on promoting and advancing healthcare solutions for our Nation's rural and remote communities.

Sadly, during that time, the prognosis and progress has only gotten worse for those who live in rural America. The health and wellness of our people has not improved.

Especially given the divisions in our country and in Congress today, we need to find more ways that we can come together around common issues and common ground and develop solutions that ensure rural Americans do not get left behind.

That is one of the reasons why earlier this year, I re-launched the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus with my distinguished colleague from the great State of Tennessee, DIANA HARSHBARGER.

Earlier this year, we came together with a shared desire for Congress to play a more active role in improving and promoting life and access to healthcare in rural America.

Today, nearly 50 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, have joined the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus, representing rural areas across the country from Guam to West Virginia to the Upper Peninsula of Michigan down to central Texas.

Whether political, demographic, or geographic, the diversity of our caucus is our strength because rural America is America.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER), my distinguished co-chair.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Rural Health Month and to highlight the work of the congressional Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus, which I am proud to cosponsor with my colleague, Representative TOKUDA from Hawaii.

Over 60 million hardworking, everyday Americans live in rural communities throughout the United States. As my co-chair, Representative TOKUDA, is fond of citing, nearly 97 percent of our Nation is designated as rural.

Compared to their counterparts living in urban and suburban areas, rural Americans experience lower life expectancy, poorer health status, and more difficulty accessing quality and affordable healthcare.

Rural patients face these challenges due to a limited number of rural healthcare providers and professionals, higher rates of uninsurance and underinsurance, and long journeys to care providers, sometimes lacking transportation entirely.

Having served as a community pharmacist for over 30 years in east Tennessee, which is a rural area, I understand the unique healthcare challenges and obstacles faced by our patients and healthcare providers each and every day.

It is crucial that Congress takes action to address the issues that rural healthcare providers grapple with such as workforce shortages, supply scarcities, reimbursement challenges, limited access to telehealth, and difficulties ensuring their patients receive the care they need.

The congressional Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus is here to provide a forum for Members of Congress to advocate for legislative action that will help increase access to quality, affordable healthcare and mental health services for all rural Americans.

As co-chair, I will continue my work to advocate for legislation and policies that will ensure long-term sustainability of rural communities.

Earlier this year, I introduced the bipartisan Rural Physician Workforce Production Act, which improves Medicare reimbursement and enhances the current structure of the Medicare-funded graduate medical education program, bringing more medical residents and doctors to rural areas in need.

I also worked with my fellow colleagues from the Tennessee delegation to introduce the Rural America Health Corps Act, which would provide incentives for healthcare professionals to work in rural health facilities in exchange for forgiving medical student loans.

In addition to these bills, I am a proud cosponsor of the Save Rural Hospitals Act, bipartisan legislation that will aid in curbing hospital closures in rural communities by ensuring fairness in Medicare hospital payments.

This legislative work is absolutely critical and complements House Resolution 870, which I introduced with the

majority of the Members of the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus to support the goals and ideas of National Rural Health Day.

National Rural Health Day, the third Thursday of each November, was established to honor rural communities and the contributions and efforts of rural healthcare providers to address the unique challenges faced by the patients they serve.

Given the aforementioned healthcare disparities faced by rural Americans and the continued difficulty experienced by rural healthcare providers in keeping their doors open, it is vital that Congress prioritizes improved patient care and access in rural areas.

Our rural healthcare professionals and patients showcase a selfless and community-minded spirit. It is altogether fitting and proper that we celebrate rural healthcare providers and the millions of Americans that rural healthcare providers serve, and to express a commitment to advancing policy to improve healthcare accessibility and affordability in rural areas in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TOKUDA and my colleagues for joining in this cause.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, mahalo to my co-chair, Representative HARSHBARGER, for providing leadership and insight for many, many years in this particular area and serving on the front line as a pharmacist in her own community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 49 years ago in Port Angeles, Washington, I was born in what was then called Olympic Memorial Hospital. Over the years, members of my family and I received good, quality care from what is now known as Olympic Medical Center and its well-trained physicians and nurses, and from a staff that genuinely cares about the community.

The future of healthcare in rural communities faces extraordinary challenges that threaten the ability of folks to access the care that they need and that they deserve.

Unfortunately, the reality for many Americans in rural areas when it comes to healthcare is a story of gaps and barriers.

This isn't just a problem for the Olympic Peninsula. Rural populations often bear the brunt of healthcare disparities. They are usually older, have less income, and often have complex health issues.

These factors burden rural hospitals, many of which are already buckling under pressure. In fact, today the rural hospital closure crisis threatens more than 400 rural hospitals nationwide with imminent closure.

For folks on the Olympic Peninsula, quality care should be readily accessible, not a service only available in the shadow of the Space Needle.

No matter who you are or where you are from, you ought to be able to find quality, affordable medical care close to home.

This rural-urban healthcare divide is a crisis that demands attention from Congress. An important piece of the puzzle is addressing the site neutral payment policy, which has significantly impacted rural hospitals like Olympic Medical Center.

This policy, originally intended to equalize payment rates between hospitals and outpatient clinics, often disadvantages rural hospitals, which rely on higher reimbursement rates to maintain operations and provide essential services.

By advocating for an exemption for rural Sole Community Hospitals from this policy, we can ensure these vital institutions receive adequate funding.

In addition, in July I introduced a bipartisan bill known as the Rural Hospital Technical Assistance Program. This bipartisan effort would provide targeted, in-depth technical assistance to vulnerable hospitals and communities struggling to maintain healthcare services.

That means helping to prevent closures, strengthening essential healthcare services in rural communities, and improving financial and operational performance.

Our bill seeks to alleviate the strain felt by many rural providers by authorizing new Federal funding to support improvements to these crucial facilities, aiming to ensure that everyone, regardless of where they live, can stay just as healthy as someone living in a big city.

Consider the hypothetical, but very real situation, of an older patient in Port Townsend who receives chemotherapy multiple times a week at Jefferson Healthcare or the pregnant mother in Elma receiving prenatal and obstetric care at Summit Pacific Medical Center.

Without strong rural hospitals, these patients and others may face a long and burdensome commute to an urban hospital or go without care entirely.

The Rural Hospital Technical Assistance Program aims to mitigate these very real scenarios and keep facilities open and thriving, ensuring that everyone can access medical care near home.

Our bill is important in bridging the gap of healthcare disparities that we see every day. It aims to prevent the unfortunate and unnecessary closure of rural hospitals and to ensure that folks in rural communities receive the care that they need and that they deserve without the necessity of long-distance travel or facing financial ruin.

It isn't just about keeping open facilities like Olympic Medical Center in Port Angeles and Peninsula Community Health Services in rural Kitsap, Mason, and Pierce Counties.

It is about keeping people healthy, employed with good-paying jobs, and improving care in rural areas where the need is most critical.

The Rural Hospital Technical Assistance Program is a commitment to equity, a promise of access, and a crucial step toward ensuring that going forward, quality healthcare isn't a privilege confined to big cities.

We deserve a future where care is not constrained by geography but is easily affordable and accessible for all. Again, I thank my colleague for organizing this Special Order.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

□ 1600

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Hawaii for yielding.

I would chime in as well on the importance of improving and expanding rural health and the challenges faced in the most rural areas of our country, including my own northern California district.

We have several high country hospitals that are out on their own pretty much. The connectivity that they need and the challenges that pertain to some levels of equality on reimbursements is extremely important, so I would be happy to join with Representative TOKUDA's efforts and that of the Rural Healthcare Caucus.

Indeed, as we expand and get more and more telehealth opportunities, something that has worked pretty well for us in our district is teaching health centers; getting young folks as students, and maybe young doctors, interested in working in our communities here, as well.

It just helps extend the opportunities for people that do live in these rural areas and don't have nearly the choices. That is part of the cost, I guess, of living in a rural area.

We have done a lot of good work with the USDA, expanding fiber optic, getting more and more connectivity. We need to keep doing that in order to be more successful for rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this effort, and a bipartisan effort it is.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I say mahalo to Representative LAMALFA, and I will extend a great deal of gratitude for helping to guide us through a crisis that is hitting rural America far too often, natural disasters, as we are seeing it.

I look forward to also now working with you to make sure that when a disaster strikes, our healthcare system will be able to support them every step of the way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who often says "food is medicine." I appreciate his guidance and wisdom on this particular issue.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership with this bipartisan Rural Healthcare Caucus.

It is incredibly important and really defines my life. Prior to coming to Congress 15 years ago, I spent 28 years

working in rural healthcare as a non-profit community healthcare therapist, rehab service manager, a manager within rural hospitals, and a licensed nursing home administrator. I witnessed firsthand the challenges that individuals that live in rural America, rural communities face when it comes to healthcare.

I am acutely aware of the challenges many face when it comes to obtaining reasonably priced healthcare. It is especially critical for rural America, much like the 15th Congressional District of Pennsylvania that I have the privilege of serving today.

As a Member of Congress representing nearly one-third of the land mass of Pennsylvania, one of the most rural districts east of the Mississippi, I am keenly aware of the problems my constituents face when accessing medical services.

I always say that when I see rural hospitals in dire challenges, and we are struggling with some of that right now in our district, that the end results in a commute that can mean the difference between life and death to be able to get the services they need within the time frame that is required.

I saw that firsthand, quite frankly, as a volunteer firefighter and emergency medical technician for several decades. The importance of being able to get from that accident scene or from their home to a healthcare setting, a hospital setting in a timely manner, especially for those eventually requiring some type of surgery.

We talk about the golden hour. It is not an hour in many parts of rural America. We are facing a healthcare crisis in our Nation's rural areas. These often disadvantaged populations are still struggling to access affordable, quality care. Many remain uninsured. Most are underinsured. However, access to quality care remains the largest challenge.

Even if it is not the bricks and mortar, and we have seen so many of those closed over the past 15 years, it is the talent, the skill, the expertise within that bricks and mortar, the physicians, the nurses, the technicians. It is difficult.

As someone who used to participate in recruiting this talent into our rural hospitals, it is very challenging to get that, to be able to be successful with that. That is why I am a big fan of telemedicine.

I am really excited about the advances that we have made in telemedicine over the past decade or so. There is more that needs to be done.

Even when people gain access to health insurance, it does not equal access to healthcare. Rural hospitals across the country are closing, leaving patients without access to the emergency rooms and long-term care facilities. Quite frankly, where they are not closing, they are always struggling for staff. If you don't have access to qualified healthcare professionals, I don't care how we pay for healthcare, what

kind of shiny package, what ribbon we put on it, there is no access to healthcare without those qualified, highly skilled providers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to work with the gentlewoman as a part of this caucus, and proud to be a founding member of the Rural Health Caucus. I am proud to work with the gentlewoman as a great member of the House Agriculture Committee, where under the Rural Development title, we support facilities like nursing homes and rehabilitation centers and hospitals and provide communities reasonable funding to be able to address that need.

This is a problem. It is a multidimensional problem that requires multidimensional solutions. I think that the formation of this caucus is one of the first best starts to address this.

This bipartisan group will bring awareness to these unique challenges, to other members, and actively work to find solutions to these problems.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, we have strong leadership across this great country that is making sure that the health and wellness of rural America is taken care of. I am so appreciative of all the members of our caucus that have stepped forward and stepped up, not just now but in so many years past and will definitely be part of that leadership going forward.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like it is a great day for the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the co-chairs of this caucus for forming the Rural Health Caucus, something that is long overdue and very much needed.

Mr. Speaker, this Rural Health Month, I am thrilled to join my colleagues in the bipartisan Rural Health Caucus to advocate for quality, affordable healthcare in every community. Our neighbors living in rural areas face unique health challenges, a substantial one of those being medical personnel shortages.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 26 percent of residents live in federally designated Health Professional Shortage Areas, meaning that nearly one-third of Pennsylvanians live in an area without sufficient medical personnel.

I don't know the last time you went to Pennsylvania, but it is a big State. If you are in a part of the State that doesn't have a lot of healthcare professionals, you are looking at long drives before you can get to a doctor or hospital.

Preventive care is critical to overall health and well-being, and access to preventive care relies upon having an adequate number of medical professionals. Having an adequate number of medical professionals relies upon not being penalized for serving as a teaching hospital.

It is unbelievable to me that this is a problem that Pennsylvania rural hospitals are facing. That is why I

partnered with Representative MEUSER to introduce the bipartisan Fairness for Rural Teaching Hospitals Act.

This bill would allow rural hospitals, including St. Luke's Hospital Easton Campus in my district, and St. Luke's Miners Memorial Hospital, a stone's throw away, to receive fair reimbursements from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

This legislation is critical for allowing our rural hospitals to attract, train, and retain talented healthcare professionals to our communities.

I firmly believe that access to high-quality, affordable healthcare should not depend on your ZIP Code, and this bill is a step toward making that a reality.

I am so proud to join my colleagues in the bipartisan Rural Health Caucus to find ways to ensure that Americans in every corner of our Nation have access to the care and resources they deserve. I will keep up the work until that mission is fulfilled.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the sad reality is that if you are living in rural America, you are more likely to experience lower health expectations, lower health quality, and lower life expectancy simply because of your ability to access healthcare that you need.

I have sat with constituents in my community of Wainiha who have asked me if it was fair that people that live right down the road in urban Honolulu live 10 years longer than they do. While at times it may seem that they may require more medical attention and care, rural Americans often have more access to healthcare because of such things as you have heard of today: physician shortages, lack of reliable and affordable transportation options, insufficient health insurance coverage, and an increased exposure to environmental and occupational hazards.

As a Representative in Congress for one of the most rural and remote districts in the country, I know that many of my constituents are often just one diagnosis away from a serious illness and the difficult financial and family decisions that often come with this.

Across the country, more than 60 million Americans, about one in five Americans live in rural areas. While they make up just 18 percent of the total U.S. population, they are scattered, as we have heard, across 97 percent of our country's land area.

Rural Americans face numerous health disparities as compared with their urban counterparts. Rural Americans are more likely to die from heart disease, cancer, unintentional injury, chronic lower respiratory disease, and stroke, as compared to their urban counterparts.

Unintentional injury or death. You heard Representative THOMPSON talk a little about this and the "golden hour." They are more likely, by 50 percent higher rates, to die in rural areas as compared to urban areas often be-

cause of their ability to access emergency care when involved in a motor vehicle crash or opioid overdose.

There are so many steps that we can continue to address, but I would have us hear from another part of our great country and a rural caucus, that of the great State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. DAVIS), another distinguished member of our Rural Health Caucus.

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and our co-chairs for leading this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of eastern North Carolina to address my highest legislative priority: improving access to healthcare in rural America.

In honor of National Rural Health month, I join my colleagues here to speak about how we can fund commonsense bipartisan solutions to the most pressing challenges facing our healthcare system.

Since taking office in January, healthcare has been my number one legislative priority, having led, co-led, or cosponsored more than 60 bills in this space.

As we are here today, the people of eastern North Carolina are hurting, and at the root of this pain is the lack of access to healthcare.

To tackle these health disparities, I joined two colleagues in restarting the State Medicaid Expansion Caucus to demonstrate the overwhelming public support for basic access to healthcare.

After more than a decade of waiting, or in some cases dying, over 95,000 eastern North Carolinians will gain access to lifesaving healthcare starting this Friday, December 1.

As co-chair of the State Medicare Expansion Caucus, I will continue leading the charge in Congress to expand Medicaid across the country.

Beyond Medicaid expansion, I have championed the cause of rural hospitals. In the past decade, four rural hospitals in eastern North Carolina stopped operations, creating significant barriers to lifesaving medical care.

Martin General is the most recent example of suspending operations in the East.

While we have limited tools at our disposal, especially in communities where the payer mix skews toward Medicare and Medicaid, the Rural Emergency Hospital Designation Authority is a critical part of the solution.

As eastern North Carolinians grapple with limited access to care, the opioid epidemic continues to plague the region.

To combat this crisis, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Congressman JOHN RUTHERFORD to stem the flow of counterfeit substances, including fentanyl, that have flooded the drug market.

H.R. 4988, the Modern Authentication of Pharmaceuticals Act, will come

down hard on counterfeit controlled substances by requiring on-dose identifiers to guarantee the legitimacy of pharmaceuticals. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and put a dent in the fentanyl crisis.

While eastern North Carolinians and Americans across the country suffer from opioid addiction, patients recovering from injuries face their own barriers to treatment.

To ensure our most vulnerable patients get the care they require and deserve, I will soon introduce legislation to cut red tape for physical and occupational therapists, streamlining the delivery of care for patients recovering from debilitating injuries.

□ 1615

If passed, the legislation would ease the burdensome plan of care requirements that currently prevent payment for physical therapy services until the therapy provider receives a physician-signed plan of care within 30 days of a first evaluation. No patient should ever have to wait unnecessarily for vital healthcare services, including outpatient services.

As a member of the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus, you can count on me to champion the causes of patients, healthcare workers, and providers alike.

We all have a responsibility in the greatest Nation on Earth to deliver a standard of healthcare befitting this greatness.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, as you heard, across our country, we have strong leadership on rural health, much action to be taken, and many opportunities that we need to make sure that we seize.

We have talked a lot about rural America, from California to Pennsylvania to North Carolina. I would like to bring us back to Hawaii now. It is the most isolated archipelago in the world, with the nearest landmass over 2,300 miles away. I can tell you, it is a long distance, given that I travel it pretty much every weekend, crossing that great, beautiful, blue Pacific Ocean.

My district represents all the islands in Hawaii. On our neighboring islands, patients often have to fly to Oahu, our main island with Honolulu, to get emergency or even routine medical, dental, or mental health care. Many Oahu-based providers often spend their weekends, if they can even reach the availability of air transportation, traveling back and forth between our islands just to try to make sure our patients get the medication and services they need to survive.

I know a lot of people are thinking we have telehealth now, so that should be no problem. Again, consider the remoteness of our islands and the remoteness of so many of our rural communities. Broadband speed and access are not equal everywhere across this great country and our territories. Oftentimes, people are just asking folks

to pick up a phone to be able to triage and immediately start to provide care and scripts, which, in many cases, people need because they are living in isolated and remote parts of rural America.

As in many other parts of this country, in Hawaii, we are seeing providers, hospitals, and clinics struggle to keep their doors open because of high operating costs and insufficient reimbursement rates. As was alluded to earlier in this discussion, since 2010, 155 rural hospitals have closed their doors, making the difficult decision to leave their patients behind.

Often these patients aren't just patients. These are family members, neighbors, and friends. With limited healthcare options and access, we know that for many of these individuals, those hospitals, those providers closing their doors, it is a life sentence.

You would think, after these last 15 or so years, that we are out of the woods. Well, think again. Over 40 percent of all rural hospitals are operating with negative margins and are vulnerable to closure. This is on top of the fact that rural communities often have fewer healthcare providers. Over 50 percent of rural communities and counties have no access to hospital-based maternal care. That means just being able to go somewhere to be able to have your child safely. Seventy percent are lacking even a single psychiatrist in their county.

Looking at the stats, when we think about it, just basic physicians, general internists, and doctors in rural communities, you have 13.1 physicians per 10,000 people as compared to 31.2 in urban areas, less than half the amount that urban America is able to enjoy.

When we are talking about specialist care, think of our own situations and how often you would need that specialist or a loved one has needed a specialist to provide lifesaving care for them. Rural America has 30 specialists per 100,000 individuals as compared to 263 specialists per 100,000 people. We can see the disparity, and sadly, we can see the great need that exists in rural America right now.

High costs have also proven to be a significant barrier. Whether it is providing housing for recruiting and retaining healthcare workers in our State, covering medical transport via medevac airplane or helicopter, considering even the wages of professionals, these are all things, as you have heard today, that we have legislative bills we are trying to focus on, making sure that these barriers no longer exist and reducing the challenges to accessing healthcare in rural America.

Mr. Speaker, we will soon hear from another great State in this country, so let me at this particular time take this back to my home State of Hawaii.

As I mentioned earlier when Mr. LAMALFA came up, we have seen such devastation in my district with the Maui fires. The response in the wake of this disaster has really highlighted to

us the importance of making sure we have a strong and robust healthcare system. From critical access care personnel and medical countermeasures and supplies, you have to have them ready and onsite because in so many cases in our rural communities, whether you live on islands or there are hundreds of thousands of miles that separate you from the nearest access point, help can often be days away.

At the onset of our fires, I remember our chief of police telling us that we have often been told—sadly, now we see it—that if we are in a crisis, we are 72 hours away from help. We have to make sure, especially when it comes to critical access care and healthcare, that we have the supplies and personnel in all of our communities to be able to help respond to disaster once she strikes.

My district also has one of the most racially and ethnically unique populations in the country, and these communities often experience, sadly, some of the highest healthcare costs and suffer from some of the highest health disparities that we see across the country.

Mr. Speaker, again, one of the wonderful aspects of this caucus is that it is both bipartisan and represents all of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is so interesting to walk in and wonder if you have walked into the middle of something.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I am honored to join my colleagues today in highlighting the accomplishments and ongoing challenges facing high-quality healthcare access in rural and remote parts of our country. Believe me, it covers a lot of our geography.

Healthcare providers in areas like Michigan's First District face unique struggles in maintaining financial stability while providing the best possible care, struggles unlike anything facing those in urban or suburban regions.

As a result, we have seen a significant increase in rural clinic and hospital closures over the past decade, and many of those still operating today are doing so at the razor's edge. A single provider closing their doors could result in patients having to travel hundreds of miles farther to receive any kind of care.

While the situation remains serious, we have seen promising improvements for rural health, especially when it comes to telemedicine. The pandemic underscored the need for and the efficacy of telehealth, especially for those in rural areas who would otherwise be forced to travel multiple hours just to receive a routine checkup or consult with their doctor.

Congress must act to permanently extend pandemic telehealth flexibilities, help providers and their patients get the tools they need to utilize telemedicine, and continue to reduce government-imposed barriers.

Let me also highlight the importance of the 340B drug pricing program, which provides discounted pharmaceutical products to providers that care for a disproportionate share of uninsured and at-risk patients.

In my district alone, we have 20 340B hospitals helping to care for our most vulnerable populations. These hospitals provide the best care available.

The 340B program has been a critical component of healthcare for so many Michiganders since its inception, and I hope to continue to work with my colleagues to ensure its lasting success, especially as the program faces new challenges that threaten its integrity.

I know our rural and remote providers will continue to do everything in their power to provide top-of-the-line care to their patients. In turn, Congress must continue to address rural health priorities and remove the barriers to their success.

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, you have heard today so many tales of tragedy and disparity across our country in rural America, but also through the legislation, bills, and advocacy that we have seen from our Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus members, so many opportunities for us to do good by rural America.

As I close today, I appreciate all of our Members who have come forward to share their stories from across this great country. Let me highlight an article that was recently run in *The Washington Post* that focused on the fact that more people in Puerto Rico are dying at higher rates because of these healthcare disparities and lack of access to a health system.

As we take a look at the numbers, as we know, Puerto Rico has been devastated by natural disasters, compounded by COVID-19 already stressing a very strained healthcare system. They are lacking professionals in the community to be able to serve their residents. The fact is that they only have one working ambulance for 25,000 people in a town. Too often, by the time the call is made and the ambulance shows up at the home, those people have already passed away.

The fact is that they had 35,400 deaths last year in 2022 for a population of 3.3 million, thousands more than researchers could ever have expected, historical highs that they are seeing compounded as a result of a strained healthcare system that is unable to take care of its people.

There are stories and examples of veterans who have served and fought under our flag that you stand before right there not being able to access the critical care or even the basic care that they need, deserve, and fought for.

Too many people are dying as a result of a lack of access to healthcare. When we take a look at the numbers, there are disparities in terms of increases in Alzheimer's, substance abuse, mental health conditions, and chronic health conditions like blood pressure, diabetes, kidney failure, respiratory failure—all of these things.

To me, when I read this article and all the problems they cite—lack of facilities, lack of professionals, too many of the young ones leaving their community to go to work in the United States or take on other professions—this was a cautionary tale to all of rural and remote America that if we don't get our act together soon in our States and our territories to make sure that no matter where you live in this great country, especially in rural and remote America that makes up over 97 percent of this great country's land mass, we will continue to see people die.

The stakes could not be higher when it comes to making sure that the Bipartisan Rural Health Caucus continues to stay together and fight for those most basic things for every single one of our constituents. No matter where you live, no matter what district, each one has a touch of rural. We need to make sure that the healthcare access and mental health services they need will be there for them when they need it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing us this critically important Special Order hour to highlight rural health in our country. I look forward to working very closely with all of my colleagues to make sure that rural America has the healthcare that they need and deserve.

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

FOCUSING ON REPUBLICAN PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As vice chair of the House Republican Conference, it is shaping up to be a busy, productive week for House Republicans. I am looking forward to hearing from my colleagues to discuss the issues our Conference is focused on this week, including the crisis at our border, support for Israel, and investigations into the Biden family's alleged illegal financial dealings with foreign nations.

□ 1630

We have an energized and diverse conference, eager to make the American Dream possible for the next generation.

My team and I are ready to help Members shine and deliver their message straight to their constituents and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN), for the first remarks of the evening.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our newly-elected vice chair. Congratulations. I look forward to working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because accountability is finally here.

For years, Joe Biden has used his name and influence for personal gain, all while serving in office and receiving a salary funded by taxpayer dollars. He has deceived the Nation by posing as a trustworthy family man, only to be bought and paid for by foreign nationals.

The Biden family has embedded themselves in a web of lies, spreading deceit to the Nation to cover up their shady dealings. We are not fools and we cannot be fooled.

For months, House Republicans have followed the facts, and more importantly, followed the money. It has all led right back to President Biden. Despite stonewalling attempts at every turn, we have persisted. From the DOJ to the FBI and the White House, cohorts of the Biden family have done everything they can to stop the truth from coming to light. These lies cannot stay hidden forever.

House Republicans in the Oversight Committee have unearthed over \$240,000 in direct payments to the President and his family. What about that money?

That money has direct ties to foreign nationals and our adversaries. These same adversaries President Biden swore to defend America against are actually lining his pockets and influencing his decisions.

It is past time that the American public know the truth. It is time for the Biden family to be held accountable for their corruption.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House Republicans that accountability is finally here.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative McCLAIN. I appreciate the comments and I appreciate the clarity and work that the Oversight Committee does on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, our new vice chairman, and congratulate him, as well.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden consistently has stated that he never discussed business with Hunter Biden's associates. This is a lie. Let me repeat that for my colleagues across the aisle. It is a lie.

Throughout our extensive investigation and from the lips of credible witnesses, it is abundantly clear that the Biden family business is Joe Biden. Let

me emphasize, there is no Biden family business except for Joe Biden's 40-plus-year career in Washington, D.C. That has been the family business.

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, we have followed the paper trail and we have conducted our investigation by the book. We have discovered damning evidence and we continue to do so every day.

Our investigation has led to some alarming and eye-opening findings, which point to the President's knowledge and involvement in illegal business transactions.

For example, in 2018, James Biden, the President's brother, received \$600,000 in a loan from Americore, a financially distressed and failing rural hospital operator. Bankruptcy court documents suggest that James Biden received these loans based upon representations that his last name, Biden, could open doors in the Middle East based on his political connections. We all know James Biden doesn't have political connections, Joe Biden, his brother, has political connections.

Specifically, Americore wired a \$200,000 loan into the account of James and Sara Biden. Here is what makes the evidence damning. On the same day, James Biden wrote a \$200,000 check from the same account addressed to his brother, Joe Biden. For the American people, the brother of James Biden is the President of the United States.

The next example is an email obtained by the Committee from a Hunter Biden associate mentioning that 10 percent of the relevant joint venture be held by Hunter for the big guy. Ten percent of a relevant joint venture was held for the big guy.

At this point in the Committee's investigation, we have established that Joe Biden is the big guy. Through the web of transactions that purposefully tried to hide the big guy's involvement, let me stress again that Joe Biden is the Biden family business.

Let me illustrate an example of the confusing web of transactions. A Chinese company sent \$5 million to a joint venture between Hunter and an associate. That same day, the joint venture sent \$400,000 to an entity that Hunter Biden controls alone. Less than a week later, Hunter Biden wired \$150,000 from this entity to a company owned by James Biden and Sara Biden. James Biden, the President's brother.

Sara Biden later withdrew \$50,000 from the same company. Less than a week later, Sara wrote a personal check to Joe Biden, aka the big guy, aka the President of the United States, for \$40,000—the 10 percent of the \$400,000 that was mentioned in the email by the associate to Hunter Biden.

Another example is when a confidential human source overheard a Burisma executive claiming to have bribed then-Vice President Joe Biden for \$5 million. As I stated earlier, Joe Biden

consistently says that he never discussed business with Hunter Biden's associates. This was a blatant lie by the Commander in Chief and the American people deserve to know the truth.

Joe Biden never thought that the Oversight Committee would get this far in its investigation, and additional damning evidence will soon be revealed to the American people.

This leads me to my next point. The Foreign Agents Registration Act, more commonly known as FARA—to be clear, Hunter Biden has never registered as a foreign agent, despite his lucrative work being done on behalf of foreign interests and his many travels on Air Force Two. That wasn't just because he missed his dad.

Specifically, Hunter has been documenting business transactions with a Chinese Government-based energy company called CEFC. Interestingly enough, the same company, CEFC, is the same one that is affiliated with the company that sent \$5 million to Hunter Biden.

How is this not the definition of being and acting as a foreign agent?

Paul Manafort was convicted for far less.

The time is now to open up an impeachment investigation pertaining to the President's direct link to blatant corruption, pay-for-play tactics, and acting as a co-conspirator to crimes committed by his family on behalf of Joe Biden himself.

The Committee will continue to do our due diligence. We will not be worried about the distractions from the Democrats and from the press. We will dig through the confusing web of Biden LLCs.

Mr. Speaker, the confusion of these companies and the confusion of these transactions were done on purpose to conceal this money from the American people and to conceal the money from the Internal Revenue Service.

Joe Biden likes to talk about everybody paying their fair share, except him and except his son. They are not concerned about a fair share. We are going to continue to uncover all of this.

We are going to answer and uncover all of the information that is going to outline exactly why, in my opinion, as I represent the 19th District of Florida, why Joe Biden deserves to be impeached.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has taken money from foreign sources. Meanwhile, the world is on fire. Is the President compromised?

Do agents in the Chinese Government have the upper hand on the President of the United States while our enemies are on the move?

These are serious questions that the House of Representatives has a responsibility to have answered. The way to get all that information is through the impeachment inquiry, which will continue here in the people's House.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida who has a strong and clear message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah. I couldn't think of a better person to serve as vice chair.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrat from Maryland, who is also the ranking member of the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, is claiming hypocrisy when talking about Hunter Biden not being asked to testify publicly, but rather to testify behind closed doors.

If you want to talk about hypocrisy, the ranking member should find a mirror because when the Democrats were in the majority and they wanted President Trump and his American allies to testify, they wanted to have them testify behind closed doors.

To be honest, I don't think Hunter Biden wants to testify publicly because he is going to have to explain quite a bit.

First of all, what business were you in? What product or service did you provide or sell?

I think he would also have to explain why he got \$24 million, and counting, from sleazy foreign businessmen, oligarchs, and corrupt politicians.

He will have to explain why Yelena Baturina, who was married to Yuri Luzhkov, who has now passed away and was the mayor of Moscow—he was described by Michael McFaul, the U.S. Ambassador to Russia under Barack Obama, as the poster child of corruption.

Yelena Baturina gave Hunter Biden, Joe's son, \$3.5 million. Then, interestingly enough, a few months later had dinner with Joe Biden, the then sitting Vice President.

When President Biden's administration sanctioned some Russian oligarchs, she was conveniently left off the public list.

What did Hunter Biden do for Ms. Baturina?

We don't know.

What about Kazakhstani nationals, Kenes Rashikev and Karim Massimov?

Massimov used to be the Prime Minister, he is now in jail. His right-hand man is Rashikev. Rashikev wired to Hunter Biden \$142,300. The very next day, Hunter happened to purchase a Porsche in New Jersey for—say it with me now—\$142,300. His own business partner, Devon Archer and best friend at the time, had no idea why he got that money. We don't know either.

We would like to ask him privately and publicly why? What did you do for them?

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, those two gentlemen also had dinner with none other than sitting Vice President Joe Biden and his son Hunter. Coincidence?

Scratch your head.

How about Vadym Pozharsky and Mykola Zlochevsky? Who are these guys?

One is the CFO, and one is the CEO of Burisma, which was an energy com-

pany out of Ukraine. They hired Hunter Biden, the then son of the sitting Vice President, to be on their board of directors. They paid him a million dollars a year. They paid him and Devon Archer in total nearly \$3.5 million.

What experience did Hunter Biden have in the energy sector prior to that hiring?

I would like him to answer that question. We know the answer, which is none. Zero. Bubkes. He was given all that money. Why?

We have an FD-1023. What is that?

That is a form for confidential informants that the FBI agents fill out when they have human sources that give them information. It just so happens that this informant—because an FD-1023 is only as good as the source—and this source, according to the FBI, was impeccable. They have been working with him for 10 years and giving him hundreds of thousands of dollars. Every bit of information he has ever given them has checked out.

What did he say?

He said that Hunter Biden received a \$5 million bribe and so did his father, Joe. It makes sense because why? Who gave him the bribe?

It was Mykola Zlochevsky, the CEO of Burisma.

Why did he need to give him \$10 million?

Because he wanted to get the prosecutor in Ukraine off his back. What happened?

We know what happened because Joe Biden bragged about it. He got that prosecutor fired. He withheld a billion dollars of loan guarantees to Ukraine until he was fired.

What was that prosecutor doing? I don't know. He was going after Zlochevsky. He seized two homes, a Porsche, and a plot of land that he owned. He did get fired a few months thereafter and Ukraine got their billion dollars.

That prosecutor, when he was fired, the President of Ukraine called Joe Biden and said: Hey, he has done nothing wrong. In fact, we were happy with the job he was doing. You wanted him fired, so he is gone. It all fits together, these pieces of the puzzle.

We would ask him about the WhatsApp message that wasn't supposed to be released. He said: I am sitting here with my dad. He was shaking down a Chinese businessman.

Was he really with his dad or was he lying to that fellow? Is he lying to us now?

We don't know.

Will he give up his geolocation?

When you got these phones now, they know where you are. If you voluntarily give it up, we can find out for sure.

Was he with his dad at that moment?

We don't know.

Will he do that?

Mr. Speaker, what the American people need to know, once and for all is: Is the President of the United States corrupt? Is he compromised? Is he a national security threat?

The Committee on Oversight and Accountability, at least on the Republican side, is going to find that out for the American people to make sure justice is served.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for a passionate speech, laced with facts that have been identified for months and months and months. I appreciate the communication.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), my good friend and colleague.

□ 1645

Mr. OWENS. First of all, congratulations to the vice chair.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Protecting Our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act.

Biden's open border policies have led to a historic surge in illegal border crossings, affecting not only traditional border communities but every community across the country.

Last year alone, the Customs and Border Patrol reported a record-shattering 2.4 million illegal crossings at our southern border. This year, a shocking 21,000 pounds of fentanyl were smuggled into our communities, with a staggering 90 percent seized at U.S. ports of entry.

These alarming statistics paint a vivid picture. The White House has failed to enforce our immigration laws, securing the border, and safeguarding families in Utah and across the Nation from the deadly influx of fentanyl.

Equally concerning is the President's wrongheaded policy of housing illegal immigrants in our national parks. This disastrous policy endangers the safety of local communities and strains resources meant for families to enjoy safe and wholesome activities on our Federal lands.

House Republicans are taking a stand against these reckless policies. This week we will bring to the floor H.R. 5283, the Protecting Our Communities from Failure to Secure the Border Act. This is crucial legislation that will prohibit Federal funding from being used to provide housing for illegal immigrants on any Federal land.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 5283 and send a clear message that we are united in our commitment to protecting our communities and securing our borders.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, waiving regulations on Federal land is a dangerous precedent, and this piece of legislation is very, very important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MOORE for yielding, and I congratulate him on his new position, as well.

Mr. Speaker, more than 10 million illegal aliens have entered America under the negligent watch of this administration, which is a number higher than the individual population of 40 of our 50 States. It is incredible.

Migrant women and children from every corner of the globe are being raped and murdered on the dangerous journey to our southern border. Americans are dying from overdoses of fentanyl and other deadly drugs that are pouring into our country at an alarming rate from Mexico. Over 100,000 Americans just last year have died of overdoses. In fact, earlier this month, I spoke with a father from my district who lost his only son to fentanyl overdose last January.

While these horrible things happen to Americans, my colleagues across the aisle still dare to call Republicans immoral for wanting to build and finish the border wall, which is just one commonsense solution that can be used to eliminate the crisis claiming thousands of lives down at our southern border.

Instead, they would rather abandon logic and continue to blindly accept everyone who shows up at our border without properly vetting them—criminals and all. They think that we should allow illegals to roam freely across all of our great States because they believe that one day they will be great voters for them and their party.

To every American I have spoken to, enabling the death of a U.S. citizen or migrant is, without question, an immorality.

Nevertheless, if the deaths aren't enough to warrant action by Democrats in Congress and the White House to secure the Nation, then how about the historic number of suspected terrorists who have been caught attempting to sneak into our country?

There have been nearly 300 since Biden has taken office, Mr. Speaker, and you can bet that some, and God only knows how many, made it successfully into the interior and are planning for another 9/11-style attack on America. It is a matter of when and not if.

The President knows this, DHS Secretary Mayorkas knows this, and the Democrats in this sacred Chamber know this as well, and still they do nothing to stop or even address the worsening border catastrophe that is plaguing and endangering our Nation.

However, this administration seems to have no qualms whatsoever about turning the American people into second-class citizens. While law-abiding Americans deal with inflation and high prices, illegal aliens are given free transportation from the border to the city in America of their choice, free medical attention when they are hurt or get injured or are ill, free schooling for their illegal children, and much more.

If that isn't enough of a disgrace, the administration is now using public schools, airports, and national parks to house illegal aliens all paid for by the taxpayers' dollars.

What kind of President puts his own people last?

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. It is President Joe Biden.

It will not be tolerated, which is why I am supporting H.R. 5283, to prohibit Federal funds from being used to shelter illegals on U.S. land under the jurisdiction of Federal land management agencies, illegals whom we should be deporting.

I have been fighting for border security since my very first day in Congress, and I will not give up until this vital task is accomplished. This bill is a step in the right direction.

Border security truly is national security, and the property and safety of U.S. citizens must always come first in my book, if it were only so with our President and the Democratic Party.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BABIN for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, our Texas delegation, as we are all in border States and as we see this piece of legislation this week is geared toward what is going on in New York, as we are all border States, I am from Utah, other States, we relied on the testimony and the experience from our Texas delegation, our Arizona delegation particularly, they have been through the worst of it, and we appreciate that.

We will continue to hear from our Texas delegation and someone who has been a very consistent voice on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is in crisis. One cannot overstate the absolute border disaster and national security threat that we have been living under as a direct result of Biden's, Mayorkas', and the Democrats' deliberate actions.

None of this is an accident. On day one, they got to work eliminating successful Trump border policies that had us at the lowest levels of illegal immigration in years, actually, probably illegal immigration in our history. From that first day, the Biden administration made clear that they would not enforce our laws and that they would not protect our country. They did this knowing the consequences.

They ignored Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement whose officers warned that these actions would create an unprecedented disaster and dangers for Americans.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker?

That is exactly what happened.

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas have opened our borders to more than 10 million illegal immigrants, including millions of known got-aways and God knows how many potential terrorists and narco gang members into our country. By the way, that is more than the population of 38 States.

Mr. Speaker, we have had enough. Cities all across America are being overrun. Mexican cartels own the southern border. They are causing tens of thousands of fentanyl deaths in our country ushering in a new era of human slavery and crushing our cities and towns.

We are feeling the pain of Biden's border crisis not just in New York City where the border crisis is defunding the police department and other city services, but all across the Nation where it is driving up crime rates in our communities, letting fentanyl kill our children, and allowing terrorists into our Nation.

What is happening in New York City should be a wake-up call for cities all across America, but it is just the tip of the iceberg. Texas right now is being particularly hit hard and continues to have to fight its own Federal Government to be able to take care of its citizens.

Our Nation is less safe because our borders are not secure, and President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas continue to make things worse. It is clear. They have no regard for the law, they don't want to secure our borders, and they don't care about keeping us safe.

If they cared about keeping Americans safe, why would they want our public spaces, which are paid for with taxpayer dollars, to become massive encampments for unvetted illegal immigrants, many of whom are indebted to dangerous and violent cartels?

Although this national security bill is an important reform, it is clear that as long as Secretary Mayorkas remains in office, our border will remain unsecured and vulnerable to human and drug trafficking.

Taxpayers in cities all across the country are footing multimillion-dollar bills. Hundreds of thousands of families are losing loved ones in fentanyl-related deaths.

The American people deserve better. I stand firm in calling for Secretary Mayorkas' impeachment. I urge the Biden administration to work with border States like Texas to offer the support that we need to keep our communities safer.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks and her clear communication and the heartfelt pleas to solve this issue. There are so many simple policies. If we put them in place, they are wins for everybody. They are political wins, and they are policy wins. We don't understand why we don't take to see what has worked well in the past and try to reimplement it.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome another border State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. LAMALFA) to share his remarks.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleague from Utah in this role here tonight. I appreciate his stepping forward to take this on.

It is very important to help communicate what we are up to here. We have had much discussion this afternoon on the border and the effects of a non-border policy since the Biden administration has been in charge. It has been difficult enough as it is over several years when President Trump very strongly attempted and had some level

of success in securing our border with more fencing and more personnel. Since then it has been completely undone by the Biden administration.

We have personnel going down there and actually welding the gates open and doing everything they can, suing the State of Texas to remove barriers in the river there that would normally help deter this illegal immigration, this massive wave that is coming in, indeed, it is called an invasion by many. I will echo that.

Why is it?

It is not because we don't have enough laws or, oh, we need immigration reform. Maybe there is something that we could be doing.

H.R. 2 that we passed earlier this year in this House would actually help supplement the laws that are already on the books and funding and some of the other measures that would help modernize what flaws there might be, but make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this is a flaw in the enforcement of our border.

We already have immigration policy on the books. In the good old days you might say that we welcomed people to this country, but under our rules. We had rules as to who the new immigrants are going to be here, whether they are to be citizens or folks just seeking permits for work or for tourist visas or student visas or this or that. The rules are pretty much out the window.

Mr. Speaker, how do you have a country and how do you have sovereignty if you don't have any rules and the laws are not followed that are presently already in place?

It is not that tough.

What has changed has been the Biden administration to make what already has been kind of difficult many times worse, and that is where the problem lies.

Our border could be enforced within a short amount of time by building the barrier and having the personnel be able to do their actual job instead of horrific accusations of what they have done. We saw that false narrative put out that the mounted border personnel were somehow whipping people with the reins and the whips or something while horseback. It was a complete lie. That is part of the whole problem with this administration is that they don't get the truth out to the American people. They hide and distort what it is their horrific policies have been doing.

The same applies to the Hamas situation and our friend and ally Israel. The barbaric attack by Hamas on October 7 on Israel didn't actually come out of nowhere. It was a planned attack funded by Iran which is, of course, we know the largest sponsor of terrorism.

Biden's failure to put pressure on Iran for the last 3 years has emboldened Iran and enabled Hamas to launch its deadly assault. Indeed, they go back to the Obama administration where that horrific policy and that agreement was put in place.

President Trump tried to peel it back and take it back. Indeed, he did get a pause on that situation. We are right back at it again, empowering Iran to do what they do.

So the latest was unfreezing \$6 billion worth of assets in this country to help foster and fund the cause of Iran's doing. It was very reckless. It just gives more incentives to foreign adversaries. It also gives weird messages and weird signals to our allies, of course, Israel, and also others with whom we are forming the Abraham Accords alliances with including in process with Saudi Arabia.

Now, what are they supposed to think is America's position on all of this?

So when we have an opportunity, as we do in this House with this Republican majority, to say "no" to unfreezing \$6 billion worth of assets to Iran, we need to do that. So we will consider a No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act which imposes immediate mandatory sanctions on any financial institution that engages in a transaction with the Qatari banks holding the \$6 billion of Iranian funds which will effectively freeze the money.

□ 1700

Of course, the Biden administration needs to get this idea through their head already without us having to do this.

Whether it is the Middle East situation in Israel or our own border here, they need to get their act together. They need to put some commonsense goggles on for a moment and just really look at what the problem is.

Politically, how they go into 2024 thinking this is good with the lack of energy policy, the driver of inflation, mass amounts of government spending, and the horrific energy policy, shutting down the pipeline, shutting down the ability to drill, and forcing people into electric cars. It is just a well-rounded discussion here what the Biden administration has put upon the American people and our allies around the world.

We can do a lot to improve the situation and help Israel bring stability back to the Middle East, bring stability to our border by just simply enforcing our border and putting those things in place and not having a green light to come across our border and get all the benefits of being a U.S. citizen without having to be a citizen, including putting them into the national parks in New York City and others. It just an unbelievable policy or lack of policy, lack of foresight.

It rests in the Biden administration and there is really lot of incompetence. Let's take step A with the No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act and also a very important step on the border with finishing the fencing. We have material laying around that we are paying for storage. Let's allow the border personnel to do their job instead of running a welcome wagon. Wouldn't that be something?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time here tonight.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, he makes one really important point and I highlight this quite a bit: We, as a Republican majority, have to so many times force President Biden to do very commonsense things and that is so important. His comments actually highlight that well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to share these messages. I thank my colleagues for being here to communicate such clear messages on such important aspects of legislation that we are going to be focused on this week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

THE SYSTEMIC THREAT TO THIS REPUBLIC IS THE MATH

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, as I am getting myself organized here, I am going to try something tonight as a variance of something I have done now for years. I am going to try to walk through some of the math, but please understand to anyone who is insane enough to watch this, particularly to staff here on Capitol Hill, I am trying to treat people like adults.

I am not spinning you. I am not going to give you the latest poll talking point. I am not going to give you magic math. This is a moment where we desperately need to understand the scale of the problems.

Mr. Speaker, let's also please understand that the people you see come behind the microphones here on the floor—and there are a lot of issues. There are a lot of problems—but I will argue, though, the systemic threat to this republic is the math.

First off, for anyone who actually doesn't have a life, I strongly encourage you to go to our office's website—I think it is Rep David—and sign up for text messages. We call it the daily debt update. Every single day, 5 days a week, you will get a text message from me that says what we borrowed today per minute and the interest costs. I break it out per year. Then I also say what we borrowed so far this fiscal year.

We give you 364-day clock, so we get rid of timing effects. Then I am going to show you what we have taken in, or what we call receipts. Some people call them tax revenues. That is wrong, technically. Government doesn't have revenues; we have tax receipts. We now have several hundred people who have signed up for this.

The point is, if you got yesterday's text message, you would see we are borrowing about \$78,000 a second.

Now, try to explain to me there is not something horribly wrong. One of the points I am going to try to make here off these charts is the scale.

Now, my brothers and sisters on the left basically turn to us and say, just tax rich people more. That will take care of it. They want to tax rich people more. They can read. It is their own economists who do these reports saying that that actually doesn't get you anywhere close to reality to deal with the gap, and I am going to show you their own numbers.

Now, I need to throw some of my own side under the bus. A lot of my brothers and sisters here on the Republican side, we are going to say if you would just cut this portion of discretionary spending, that would make a big difference. No, it wouldn't.

We were playing with some math—and it is not done yet because I haven't vetted it—that almost everything we have been debating here for the last 3 or 4 months, at the end of 10 years, it would basically be a rounding error. You would have trouble even seeing it.

We were playing with one bit of math that in 10 years, we are functionally scheduled with these new interest rates, borrowing about \$3.1 trillion in a single year and if all of our cuts actually happen, it might actually not be 3.1, it might just be 3.

It is real money. I think we should still do it, but stop pretending that it is saving the Republic.

Let's start from the beginning. Let me get my charts organized. This is important, and I am going to keep doing it till I start hearing fellow Members say this out-loud repeatedly.

Let's ignore 1965, but do you see this here? This is last year's fiscal year—23 percent was on autopilot, mandatory, earned benefits. You turn 65, you have worked your 40 quarters, you get Social Security. You get Medicare. You might be part of a certain Tribal group that might be a contractual part of a treaty obligation. There are certain benefits you get out there that aren't earned if you fall under a certain income, but they are part of mandatory.

We as Members of Congress don't get to vote on it. That is on autopilot purposely. It was the intention of the left to put it on autopilot so it just happens.

Do you see the green? That is what you call nondefense discretionary. That is what you all think of as government. That is the FBI. That is the State Department. That is our salaries. That is the Supreme Court. That is everything.

The blue, 13 percent of the budget is Defense. The punchline you need to understand is last year every dime of non-defense, that green part, was borrowed. Every dime of the blue part was borrowed. Plus, about \$400 billion of the red part was borrowed. Every dime a Member of Congress votes on is borrowed money, plus a chunk of mandatory.

If you said I am going to balance the budget, God bless you. First, you got to

shut down all the Defense system. Defense Department is gone. You have to get rid of all of government and you have to figure out what \$400 billion you have to remove from Medicare. That is the math. The math will win. The math is the truth, and we make crap up around here. You got to understand the scale.

If someone tells you that we are not taxing rich people enough or someone will tell you it is foreign aid and waste and fraud. Fine. Then go after waste and fraud. We should be vicious on it, but don't pretend that it does anything. I think we did a calculation last year and foreign aid was like 7, 8, 9 days of borrowing.

Remember, we are borrowing \$6½ billion a day. That is several times more than most of what we have been debating here for months. I know it is great theater, but the math is the math.

The point I am going to try to make in this presentation, if anyone is listening, is the left saying just tax rich people more, doesn't get you there. For my brothers and sisters—I am one of them—who want to reduce spending because government is too big—also doesn't get you there anymore.

You are going to have to deal with policy. You are going to have to deal with policy ideas that make healthcare less expensive. You are going to have to deal with policy that makes it so it is something you want to stay in the labor force. You have to do things that not only reduce the cost of surviving in our society, but also make this economy grow, and those are policy. One thing we are almost incapable of doing here because it is complex and the armies of lobbyists in the hallways get upset because they don't want us messing with their current business model. Same thing with the bureaucracies. The bureaucracies here go to war with us when we say you could use technology to do that.

Let's actually walk through last year's budget. This is real. Seven weeks ago, we closed the books on the 2023 fiscal year. We spent \$6.371 trillion. Tax receipts were only \$4.436 trillion.

Does anyone see a math problem?

This is why it is important to understand those numbers.

That means we borrowed 8.4 percent of the entire economy was borrowed just last year—8.4 percent of GDP was borrowed last year.

In a couple slides here, I am going to show you that taxing the rich, the Democrat proposals when you actually adjust for its economic effects, you might get 1½, maybe 1.6, 1.7 percent of GDP, but you borrowed 8.4 percent of GDP last year.

I know that sounds geeky, but the reason you often speak in percentage of GDP instead of dollar amount is because of the amount of inflation we have had.

Remember, if you live in my area, I think I have the highest inflation in the continental United States. In the last 30 months if you are not making 22

percent more, you are poorer in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. You want to know why the working middle class and the working poor are so cranky, because it is brutal out there for them.

The economy is actually okay. We are seeing some uncomfortable signs of really slowing down, which worries me. If you get my daily debt update, you are going to see something is wrong on tax receipts. The FICA numbers are falling, and it looks like they are about 5 percent where they should be which should be an alarm bell that something is happening in the labor markets, but if you are from the Phoenix-Scottsdale area and you haven't had about a 22 percent pay hike in the last 30 months, you are poorer today. Then you wonder why there is such stress out there in our society.

If I came to you right now and said what is the number one spend in the United States Government? It is Social Security. This year we are going to spend about I think—well, I have it on the chart—\$1.450 trillion will go out in Social Security this year.

The punchline on this slide is, I want you to understand gross interest. That is interest we paid to people that bought U.S. bonds. It is also the interest, when the Treasury borrows money out of Social Security, we pay it interest. Interest will be over \$1 trillion this year.

Interest in the United States this year is the second biggest spend. The third biggest spend is not Defense, it is actually Medicare now. The growth rate of Medicare and interest are the primary drivers of future spending.

Then we will talk about how many people lie about what is happening in Social Security, but we will get to that.

Defense is now the fourth. Defense is now number four. Every time you run into a leftist that goes just cut defense, could you remind them it is actually number four now on the hierarchy of spending.

If I had shown you this chart a couple years ago, you would have thought I was out of my mind. It has happened. Gross interest this year will top \$1 trillion and the net interest, which just means to outside bond holders, now is well over \$800 billion.

□ 1715

You do realize that just the net interest, if you just want to play the game and say, well, I am not going to count interest we pay to borrow from our trust funds, the net interest is going to be more than defense.

Why is this not our fixation? Why are there people who are terrified of a debt and deficit commission to actually tell the truth about the math?

When I come to you and start saying \$1 trillion is just interest, understand why that is so dangerous. This week, interest rates are down a bit. Three weeks ago, they were up. Our best guess is that this year looks like we are going to bring about \$9.6 trillion to the bond market.

This is going to be not borrowing internally. This is going to be issuing bonds out to whoever will buy them. We guess about \$2 trillion will be virgin. We have excess spent this year, so we are going to have to issue \$2 trillion of bonds to cover our excess spending. The rest of it is refinancing because the idiots—excuse me, that is not fair.

There is a video of me, going all the way back to Secretary Lew, screaming: Interest rates are low. Go longer on the curve. Go longer on the curve. Sell 30-year bonds. Get us out on the curve. Lock in the low-interest rates.

The arrogance of the Treasury: No, you don't know. You are a Member of Congress. You are an idiot. What do you know?

Now, we are going to pay the price for it. We are getting our heads kicked in because of the short-term thinking that is Washington, D.C.

What you see here in blue, that is refinancing. That is all the 30-day paper, the notes, the bonds, much of which is coming due.

You are going to bring \$9.6 trillion to market at interest rates that are how many times higher than we would have financed 1 to 2 years ago? Welcome to our world. That is why this math is having such trouble.

I just want to make a point. I will get behind these microphones and sometimes when there is a chance to do a colloquy with one of my Democrat colleagues, they will say, "Well, you supported that 2017 tax reform, and it was going to cost \$1.7 trillion." Then, we start to talk through that. "But tax receipts went up dramatically in 2018, 2019, first quarter of 2020. Income inequality shrank at its fastest in U.S. history."

It was in many ways the ultimate Goldilocks economy before the pandemic. We were having to rescore, rescore.

Then, you will get, "But you were going to spend \$1.7 trillion. That is what you voted on whether or not more tax receipts came in." Okay, fine. In the first 2 years they ran around here, in the first 20 months, they voted for \$4.8 trillion of additional spending. Let's see, end of 2017, we did tax reform that grew the economy and made the United States competitive in the world. We shrank income inequality and had some of the greatest growth in income and wages without inflation. The tax receipts and revenues were coming in dramatically overprojected before the pandemic.

Step up and be intellectually honest. In 20 months, they spent \$4.8 trillion of spending, and we are already finding it is rolling over already. Take a look at the tax receipts from the Treasury over the last couple of quarters. Even when you make the adjustments for the California declaration of emergency, there is something going wrong. This type of stimulus is not working. Keynesian economics is not working, for anyone who pays attention to that stuff.

Let's go back once again to interest rate fragility. In 2022, interest was \$475

billion. In 2023, interest was \$569 billion. Remember, this projection was only from a couple of months ago. We were going to spend \$805 billion. Now, it is almost \$840 billion. If you do gross interest, it is over a trillion.

If you see this chart, interest went up 38 percent last year in cost. I haven't done the math, but with the scale of the refinance, we think it is going to be up another 30, 40 percent in spend this year.

Aren't you thrilled? This is the brain trust here. Our growth and spending is going to be healthcare costs and then interest. That is going to really help the economy.

Once again, just to reinforce it, because I am finding if I don't say it over and over, there is almost this pathological avoidance of math and the truth around this place: Social Security, number one; interest, number two; Medicare, number three; defense, number four. I can't wait to see how many of our fellow Members and staff can repeat this.

For a bit of the punchlines, my brothers and sisters on the left keep saying the solution to everything is we are going to tax people over \$400,000. Let's pretend we all agree that is what we are going to do, that is how we are going to save Social Security. Remember, when you have a Member—and there are a couple of clowns around here holding up little whiteboards and doing these things saying Social Security doesn't add a dime to the debt and deficit. They are absolutely right that it doesn't—yet.

I think it was some of the folks who are involved in AARP and those things who wrote letters to the editor over the last month saying to not blame Social Security for the debt. They are absolutely right. They are telling the truth, and I hope that is intellectually where they are at, that no money from Social Security should ever go into the general fund, but no general fund money should ever go into Social Security. Is that our deal?

In 9 years, 2033—so that is like 8.5 fiscal years—there is a 25 percent cut in Social Security checks. If you are the average couple in America, \$17,400 is going to be your cut. We will double senior poverty. That is the moral imperative we are being given by the left. You can't talk about Social Security. When they do put something on paper, it doesn't come close to closing the gap.

We are doing some scoring on a couple of the Social Security bills. I was going to bring the charts, but we are not done with the math yet. We think it might close 50 percent, 60 percent. However, the punchline is, you have to understand, if we do that, there is no more capacity.

There is this concept if, let's say, you are a high-income earner and have done really well in life and are making over \$400,000 a year, today, if you live in Connecticut, New York, or California, you are probably already paying

at a 50 percent tax rate. If Congress adds another 12.4 percent, which would be just Social Security on that, now you are at 62 percent.

There is actually lots of great economic data that say if we take it beyond that, your incentive, you are going to say: "Screw it. I am not working. I am going to cut back my hours. I am going to find other ways. I am just going to live off my savings, my investments."

If you do just pieces of these legislations, they actually take that \$400,000 population and push them into the mid-60 percent of their income. Maybe that is the Democrats' plan, but they need to look at their own economic literature written by their own leftist economists that basically say when you get into that low, mid-60 percent tax rate, the revenues go down. It is called a tax maximization concept.

There is a good paper out there if anyone wants to read it. It is probably about 3 months old. Brian Riedl, Manhattan Institute, basically took a series of economic papers and said, what is the highest capital gains tax you can do before it rolls over, the highest estate tax you can do before it rolls over, the highest income tax?

It is a nice paper. It is a little long, but it is a really simple read. They add it up, saying take people over \$400,000 and maximize every single one of their taxes. Let's do it. When you worked up all the numbers—go read it for yourself—and then do the economic effects because you will change the economy, you are going to get maybe 1.5 percent, maybe 1.6 percent of GDP.

It is from the U.S. Treasury, the Tax Policy Center, OMB, CBO. I mean, this isn't rightwing Republican math.

Does anyone remember what we borrowed last year? 8.4 percent of GDP was borrowed last year. Tax maximization on over \$400,000, let's say you get 1½ because that makes the math easy. Does anyone see the math problem?

Social Security and Medicare, when you start to look at it over the next decade and a half, go out to 2040, the best projection is it is running about 5½ percent of GDP short of cash. Does anyone see the math problem? You get 1½ percent by taxing rich people. Fine. However, just the shortfall in Social Security and Medicare is over 5½ percent of the economy.

Come on, guys, stop lying. Stop making crap up. I know it is great politics. It is great wedges, but at some point, we have a moral obligation not to have the doubling of senior poverty. How many baby boomers are you willing to put on the street by making crap up on the math?

For our own side, I know every time we mention Social Security, I will get ads beating me up at home. Go online in the Phoenix market right now, and there is probably already an ad up saying: Schweikert talked about Social Security. Beat him up.

I am trying to save it. Chart after chart, the reality of the math.

Take a look at BERNIE SANDERS' oligarch tax, which is taxing unearned capital gains, taxing the wealth. It graduates up so that if you are really rich, they take a big portion of your wealth. With everything, it gets you up to a little less than \$4 trillion over 10 years. Great, except the shortfall is like \$18 trillion, \$19 trillion in that time.

Great talking points. It gets you on MSNBC. You can say crazy things. No one is going to audit your math. Does anyone actually care about what is going on, or is it more important to win the next election?

We go back and forth over and over. Taxing the rich wouldn't pay for the deficit in 2033. We have done the tax maximization, and this slide is actually already out of date. We went back several months ago. The projection was that we were going to be borrowing about \$2.5 trillion in the 2033 year. Now, we think it is \$3.1 trillion, and most of that change is just interest.

If you tax the rich, as proposed by the President, it doesn't even get you \$500 billion when you do the economic effects. If you are someone on the left side and your answer to everything is just tax the rich, grow up.

I mean, it makes it really hard to say, "Don't you care about the elderly? Don't you care about these programs? Don't you care?" If you care, pay attention to the actual math.

Understand, just Social Security spending, this was earned. We owe this. We have no idea how we are going to cover the shortfall because even 2100 and some of the other bills will raise a bunch of taxes. They still don't cover the shortfall, and you have taken away all the optionality that was going to be—that tax hike was going to be used to cover the shortfall of Medicare. It was going to cover the shortfall of everything else in government.

At some point, you have hit the wall, and understand, Social Security last year went up 11 percent. Our model right now says it goes up slightly under 9 percent this year. When you start seeing double digits—9s, 7s, 8s—on a program that this year will be \$1.45 trillion, you start talking real money, and you have a math problem.

This is the slide that gets the most angry calls to my office, so let's do it because it happens to be accurate. As a matter of fact, it is already out of date, but this is the last official update. From today through the next 30 years, Medicare and Social Security are pretty much 100 percent of all borrowing. The last update was about \$116 trillion in borrowing. If you add in today's interest rates, our numbers come up closer to \$130 trillion. If you add in today's interest, our number is getting closer to \$130 trillion of borrowing.

□ 1730

The discretionary part of the budget, because of its slower growth than tax receipts, is estimated to have almost \$2 trillion to the positive over those 30 years.

Medicare is \$80.5 trillion when you add in the interest; cash shortfall. Social Security over the next 30 years is \$35.8 trillion short.

Shouldn't we fix these?

Don't we have a moral obligation to keep our promises?

Is the scam here—and, Mr. Speaker, this is the point of this floor time. I am trying to figure out a way to say, here is your policy split. The left wants tax hikes. The right—and I am one of them—wants spending cuts. You can maximize both of those, and it doesn't get you close.

You have to do policy. Policy is hard. Policy requires thinking. Policy requires saying "no" to people that might contribute to you. Policy says, I need you to actually read something. There are things you can do.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PFLUGER). The gentleman from Arizona has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I will talk faster and not do all the boards.

I have come to this mike how many times over the last few years and done things, saying, let's talk about the policy revolution.

Cures are part of the solution: Cure disease, change technology, adopt things. If healthcare and interest are our fragilities, then do things to bend that cost of healthcare.

I have come here and shown things where you could use technology to functionally, dramatically disrupt the cost of healthcare.

We have come here and talked about things like this where you can blow into it. It is a breath biopsy. It is like having a medical lab home in your cabinet.

Yes, we make things like that illegal because this place often is a protection racket. It is a protection racket for incumbent bureaucracies and business models.

If we could disrupt the cost of so many things in our society, whether it be healthcare, whether it be the way we do regulation, you could actually set off GDP growth. You could lower the cost drivers of this government.

By doing that, you lower the cost of the financing. You tell the bond markets how serious we are. Maybe they give us some love and credit on our interest rates.

There is a path where this can work. You just need Members of Congress to deal with the reality. Tell the truth about the math.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow,

Thursday, November 30, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. Submission to the U.S. House of Representatives of Documents Protected Under Internal Revenue Code Section 6103 (Rept. 118-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House, on the state of the Union.

Mr. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 357. A bill to require the head of an agency to issue and sign any rule issued by that agency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3315. A bill to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days (Rept. 118-283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BOST: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 542. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for home and community based services for veterans, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3209. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Texas and New Mexico portions of the future Interstate-designated segments of the Port-to-Plains Corridor as Interstate Route 27, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. MOYLAN, Mrs. PELTOLA, Mr. CARL, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 6492. A bill to improve recreation opportunities on, and facilitate greater access to, Federal public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 6493. A bill to limit the involvement of Federal agencies in voter registration ac-

tivities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Accountability, Science, Space, and Technology, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 6494. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that low alcohol by volume kombucha is exempt from any excise taxes and any regulations under chapter 53 of such Code which are imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 6496. A bill to require the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to apply the final rule relating to valve installation and minimum rupture detection standards to Type A gas gathering lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. FLOOD):

H.R. 6497. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to improve that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BUSH, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PORTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CASAR, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 6498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a minimum tax on certain wealthy taxpayers that takes into account unrealized gains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 6499. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to issue guidance and recommendations for institutions of higher education on removing criminal and juvenile justice questions from their application for admissions process; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania (for herself and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 6500. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish an Office of Prison Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 6501. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to improve the calculation and reduce the taxpayer cost of payment errors under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. OGLES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CLINE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. BEAN of Florida):

H.R. 6502. A bill to prohibit representatives of the United States from voting at the International Monetary Fund for any Special Drawing Rights allocations, quota increases, or policy modifications that would benefit certain countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 6503. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ALFORD, and Mr. DUNN of Florida):

H.R. 6504. A bill to prohibit actions to carry out the Department of Commerce's pause in the issuance of new export licenses for certain exports under the Commerce Control List; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself and Ms. PETERSEN):

H.R. 6505. A bill to amend the Fentanyl Sanctions Act to strengthen the imposition of sanctions under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOONEY, and Mr. DELUZIO):

H.R. 6506. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating Washington's Trail - 1753 as a national historic trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 6507. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish or replace a headstone, marker, or medallion for the grave of an eligible Medal of Honor recipient regardless of the recipient's dates of service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. FLOOD, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H.R. 6508. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that flexible fuel vehicles may use certain gram per mile carbon dioxide values for purposes of determining fleet average carbon dioxide standards for certain vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOLINARO (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 6509. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a confidential voluntary information-sharing system to encourage the sharing of pipeline safety data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOLINARO (for himself and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 6510. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study certain composite material pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H.R. 6511. A bill to prohibit the United States from soliciting or accepting funds from United States citizens or lawful permanent residents of the United States as a condition of their repatriation from Israel and other nations during the period of evacuation, as a result of the Hamas terrorist attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 6512. A bill to prohibit the sale of food that is, or contains, unsafe poppy seeds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.J. Res. 104. A joint resolution proposing a Federal debt limit amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution recognizing that Federal law does not prohibit elementary school or secondary school students from discussing or sharing information about non-dairy milk alternatives; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 896. A resolution reaffirming German-American friendship and supporting continued cooperation between the United States and Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States:

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the designation of areas as Health Disparity Zones to reduce health disparities and improve health outcomes in such areas, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 6492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve recreation opportunities on, and facilitate greater access to, Federal public land.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 6493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill strikes Executive Order 14019 and any contracts or arrangements made by agencies in connection with its implementation.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 6494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reauthorize the Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxation

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 6496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Pipeline Safety

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 6497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Modification of the PL-566 program.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 6498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Taxes

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Removing barriers to education

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Education for incarcerated individuals

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 6501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve the calculation and reduce the taxpayer cost of payment errors under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

By Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 6502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is granted the authority to introduce and enact legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit representatives of the United States from voting at the International Monetary Fund for any Special Drawing Rights allocations, quota increases, or policy modifications that would benefit certain countries, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 6503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, clause 1, clause 2, clause 3, and clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibits certain actions taken by the Department of Commerce's pause in the issuance of new export licenses under the Commerce Control List.

By Mr. JAMES:

H.R. 6505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Affairs

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating Washington's Trail—1753 as a national historic trail.

By Mr. LUTTRELL:

H.R. 6507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is: Veteran Affairs

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 6508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that flexible fuel vehicles may use certain gram per mile carbon dioxide values for purposes of determining fleet average carbon dioxide standards for certain vehicles.

By Mr. MOLINARO:

H.R. 6509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Infrastructure

By Mr. MOLINARO:

H.R. 6510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Infrastructure

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 6511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: Impose taxes, and spend the money collected to pay debts and provide for the "common Defence" and "general Welfare;

The single subject of this legislation is:

Providing assistance to victims of Hamas terror attacks

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 6512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among States, and with the Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the sale of food that is, or contains, unsafe poppy seeds.

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.J. Res. 104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would propose a debt-to-GDP amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 205: Ms. PETERSEN.
H.R. 236: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 533: Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 561: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
H.R. 648: Mr. MILLER of Ohio and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 655: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 700: Mrs. SYKES.

H.R. 726: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 727: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 790: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 793: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 898: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 906: Mr. BOST and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 914: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 953: Mr. GOLDMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 994: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1103: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1128: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1200: Mr. WALBERG and Mrs. STEEL.

H.R. 1213: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1247: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1310: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1342: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1381: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1385: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1413: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 1488: Mr. MCGARVEY and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1492: Mr. BRECHEEN.

H.R. 1499: Mrs. SYKES and Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 1582: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1610: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1624: Mr. NEAL and Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1694: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H.R. 1705: Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1716: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 1729: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1818: Mrs. BICE and Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 1831: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1838: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 2389: Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2423: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 2447: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 2539: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 2620: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2663: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2696: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2726: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 2760: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2766: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 2809: Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT Franklin of Florida, and Mr. BENTZ.

H.R. 2871: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2891: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 2940: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2955: Mr. LALOTA.

H.R. 2989: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 2996: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3005: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 3032: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 3036: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 3090: Mr. NEHLS.

H.R. 3106: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 3145: Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 3161: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 3165: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 3170: Mr. MILLS and Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 3183: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 3194: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3240: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3331: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. CHU, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CROW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 3333: Ms. CROCKETT.

H.R. 3350: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3382: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3408: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 3413: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. ROUZER, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3433: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. LIEU, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3435: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. NICKEL, and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 3456: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 3475: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3503: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 3507: Ms. PEREZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 3519: Mr. IVEY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Ms. PETERSEN.

H.R. 3847: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 3850: Mr. IVEY and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 3870: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 3894: Ms. PEREZ and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 3904: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 3949: Mr. BALDERSON and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 3970: Mr. IVEY, Mr. LIEU, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mrs. SYKES.

H.R. 4034: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4035: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4068: Ms. NORTON and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4117: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 4121: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 4157: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4182: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4293: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey and Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 4323: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4326: Mr. LIEU, Ms. OMAR, Mr. IVEY, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4389: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 4396: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4399: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 4422: Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. SYKES, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 4438: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4460: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4541: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4551: Mr. FLOOD.

H.R. 4581: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4583: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 4612: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 4632: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4663: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 4721: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 4752: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4756: Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 4769: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4815: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 4829: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 4851: Ms. PORTER and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 4886: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 4907: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 4918: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 5035: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 5041: Ms. CHU, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CASAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 5077: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 5113: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 5138: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 5182: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 5184: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 5295: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 5351: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 5375: Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5399: Mr. IVEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SORENSEN.

H.R. 5403: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 5433: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.

- H.R. 5455: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 5484: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 5488: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5506: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5530: Mr. DUNN of Florida and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5532: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5555: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5560: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 5569: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5580: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 5585: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 5610: Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5683: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5756: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 5778: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 5804: Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 5820: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5863: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 5864: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5920: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 5928: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H.R. 5973: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5985: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 5989: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 5995: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
- H.R. 5999: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 6001: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
H.R. 6007: Ms. SCHOLTEN.
H.R. 6031: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. IVEY, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. SYKES, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 6041: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6046: Mr. DAVIDSON, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 6049: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. WILD, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 6063: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 6089: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 6159: Mr. CARL.
H.R. 6199: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 6213: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania and Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 6221: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 6224: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 6227: Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. PETTERSEN, and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 6244: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 6271: Mr. KUSTOFF and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 6302: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6312: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 6314: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6332: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 6361: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 6362: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 6373: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
- H.R. 6393: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 6405: Mr. BEYER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 6412: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 6415: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6430: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6439: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6451: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 6459: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 6460: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 6461: Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 6469: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 6477: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 6485: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.J. Res. 72: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H. Res. 185: Mr. KHANNA.
H. Res. 617: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H. Res. 802: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 815: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H. Res. 837: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 859: Mr. WALTZ.
H. Res. 874: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H. Res. 875: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. RUIZ.