



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2023

No. 198

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 4, 2023, at 3 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2023

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HINSON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 1, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ASHLEY HINSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

Pastor Jared Timberlake, Sandhill Christian Baptist Church, Wheelersburg, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come to You today thankful for another day. We are thankful for Your blessings and Your love. God, I ask today that You would bring guidance to all of our Representatives and elected officials.

As a Nation, may we always seek Your face and Your will. Lord, I pray that You will bring unity to this House and to those that serve. May they serve for the common good of our Nation.

God, I thank You that You have allowed us to live in the greatest country in the world. I thank You for blessing America for 247 years.

Now, God, it is my prayer that America will bless You in all that we do, and that we will always be one Nation

under God. Protect us and guide us in Jesus' 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 Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SEWELL 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.

### WELCOMING GUEST CHAPLAIN JARED TIMBERLAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Jared Timberlake and his family to the House Chamber.

Reverend Timberlake has dedicated his life to selfless service, first through his time as a fellow Army soldier and then later through his work as a youth

minister and pastor at Sandhill Baptist Church in Scioto County, Ohio.

As President George Washington said in his farewell address: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

Nearly 250 years later, I am glad we welcome our religious leaders to the people's House to open our work with prayer.

Madam Speaker, I thank Reverend Timberlake for his decades of service to our country and to the local Scioto County community.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

### CONGRATULATING LIBERTY UNIVERSITY FLAMES FOOTBALL

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of the Liberty University Football Team.

On November 25, my alma mater and hometown team earned their 12th straight victory and secured the first undefeated regular season in the program's 50-year history.

Led by new head coach Jamey Chadwell, the Flames set a new school

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.

H6053

record and became the first FBS football team in Virginia history to win 12 games.

As an alum, former student-athlete, parent of three graduates, and a former employee in the Liberty University Athletic Department, I am incredibly proud of this team.

The Flames' 12-0 record and current number 20 national ranking reflects the discipline, commitment, and work ethic of these talented young men.

Their individual sacrifice, unselfishness, and willingness to play for one another and give everything for a cause bigger than themselves has placed them in tonight's Conference USA Championship game, after which they will have the opportunity to play in a prestigious bowl game.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the Liberty Flames on their historic season, and I am honored to represent them in Virginia's Fifth Congressional District.

#### REMEMBERING BIG BROTHER HARRY W. DEAN

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is said that the Lord takes nothing out of season, and so in this season of Thanksgiving, I rise to give thanks for my big brother, Harry W. Dean.

After 74 years of life filled with adventure, love, and laughs, my brother Harry died on November 20.

Harry was the second eldest of our seven siblings, five boys and two girls; one for every day's grace, my parents proclaimed. We joked he was my mother's favorite. It turns out he was all of ours, too.

Harry was an exceptional athlete, a champion pole vaulter with a wicked fastball. He was effortlessly funny, a natural storyteller, king of the one-liners.

Harry was a Navy veteran, a good cook, a fisherman, surfer, a boater, a collector of cool and not-so-cool cars.

As we got older, Harry leaned into his quiet side. He was a careful collector of people, relics, and their memories.

He was a steward of our family's history, preserving the photos and legacies of those who came before. The same will be true for Harry.

Madam Speaker, in this season of Thanksgiving, Harry's brothers and sisters, alongside Claire; Adrienne, Joe; and his handsome, loving grandsons, Joey, AJ, and Jack, we are thankful for Harry. We are confident that we will see him on the other side. We love him.

#### CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL BOONDOGGLE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, if you want to look in the dictionary under the word "boondoggle," you would probably find the California High-Speed Rail project.

It was passed in 2008 by a narrow majority with \$9 billion worth of State funding by the taxpayers for this project to connect L.A. to San Francisco.

Fifteen years later, they still haven't laid any track. They have interrupted the flow of towns up and down the Central Valley and have put some causeways in so far, but many billions have been spent, and it is woefully over time. It was supposed to be completed by 2020.

They are going to seek more and more Federal funding. It started out to be a \$33 billion project, and now it is a \$128 billion project. At most, they would identify \$20 billion worth of funding. They are going to come here looking for the rest of it.

Instead, why don't we invest in something that can help all Americans, such as food supply and building water storage in California. That would help all Americans, not a boondoggle running up and down the valley stopping at an almond orchard near Bakersfield. That is why I am seeking to get help for Sites Reservoir, raising Shasta Dam, and other water projects that will grow the food that Americans use from California.

#### CONCERNS REGARDING HATE SPEECH AND THREATS IN OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise to share my concerns regarding the hate speech and threats throughout our country and the world.

We must speak loudly and clearly with one voice: Threats, harassment, and hate based on race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, or any other identity have no place in our communities, on our college campuses, and in our society.

The increase of these cases is serious and it demands action. Bills we have been voting on do not address all the rise of hate against all the protected groups, including the concurrent rise of Islamophobia and bigotry against Palestinians.

Let me be clear: I stand with our ally Israel. I condemn the violence committed against the Israeli civilians by Hamas. I speak out against anti-Semitism, but it is a glaring omission not to include other protected classes.

We are missing an opportunity to condemn hate in all its forms. I remain steadfast in condemning hate speech and the violence it inspires.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO A TRUE AMERICAN HERO, MIKE KUPER

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

Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and a true American hero.

Mike Kuper passed away on November 22, 2023, at the age of 70. He is survived by his lovely wife, Yong; his son, Thomas; his daughter, Melissa; and five grandchildren.

Mike dedicated his career and life to service. He served in both the Army and the Air Force. He protected our community for three decades working for the L.A. County Sheriff's Department. He influenced hundreds of young men and women as the Law Enforcement Explorer Mentor.

Mike even continued to work as a reserve deputy after his retirement. Simply put, he went above and beyond to help others his entire life.

Mike Kuper was a great father, a great husband, and a public servant. He will be missed by his family, his friends, the L.A. County Sheriff's Department, and the Lancaster communities.

Madam Speaker, may God bless Mike Kuper and all of our peacemakers.

#### CELEBRATING THE LEGACY OF ROSA PARKS

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

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on all of my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 308, the Rosa Parks Day Act.

Today, December 1, Americans across the Nation are celebrating the legacy of Rosa Parks. It was on December 1, 1955, when Rosa Parks was arrested in Montgomery, Alabama, for refusing to give up her seat on a city bus. This simple but bold act of resistance to Jim Crow segregation laws inspired the historic Montgomery bus boycott.

For 481 days, spurred by Rosa Parks' courage, thousands of African Americans peacefully protested the Montgomery City Bus System until the United States court ruled in *Browder v. Gayle* that the segregation ordinances were unconstitutional.

Rosa Parks was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1966, the Congressional Gold Medal in 1999, and was the first woman to ever lie in state at the U.S. Capitol rotunda.

In addition, many States, including Ohio, California, Missouri, and Oregon already observe Rosa Parks Day at the State level. Her legacy continues to inspire new generations of Americans to advance justice and equality.

Madam Speaker, now is the time to pass this legislation and to declare December 1 as a Federal holiday, as Rosa Parks Day.

GOVERNOR PILLEN'S GREAT WORK  
FOR NEBRASKA

□ 0915

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

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the success of Governor Jim Pillen in Nebraska to help reduce property and income taxes while expanding educational opportunities across our State.

Less than a year ago, Governor Pillen took office as Nebraska experienced historic levels of tax revenue. His first budget poured billions of dollars into property tax relief, helping alleviate Nebraska's high property taxes.

He cut income taxes and sped up the total repeal of Social Security taxes. He also increased the amount of funding the State provides for special education and created an education future fund which committed \$1 billion to help Nebraska's schools.

Along the way, he made history by bringing school choice to Nebraska by establishing a scholarship tax credit to help families access more educational opportunities.

This is really just a snapshot of what Governor Pillen had accomplished in less than 12 months, and there is more to come.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Governor Pillen on his great work.

ADVANCING THE WELL-BEING OF  
THE LATINO COMMUNITY

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I had the honor of hosting our Vice President KAMALA HARRIS in my district as part of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus On the Road series just this week.

Together with our Caucus chair, NANETTE BARRAGÁN, we delved into critical issues, such as reproductive rights, mental health, gun violence, small businesses, and the challenges ahead impacting Latinos in Texas and across America.

This visit also provided a platform to discuss the remarkable programs achieved under the leadership of the Biden-Harris administration, emphasizing the positive impact on our Latino community.

As we reflect on the progress achieved, we are reminded that there is yet still so much work to do, and that every issue is a Latino issue.

Our commitment to advancing the well-being of the Latino community remains steadfast, and we are determined to tackle the challenges ahead, putting people over politics. As I always say, "si se puede," "yes, we can."

WHAT WE CAN TAKE TO THE  
AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, one of our colleagues recently asked what our House majority has been doing that we can campaign on, things we can take back to the American people.

In addition to JAMES COMER and JIM JORDAN exposing Biden's corruption, all committees have exposed Federal agencies, keeping them in check. It is not just here in D.C. We have been taking our hearings all over the country to learn what needs fixing from the American people.

We have passed bills to unleash our energy sector, secure our border, and cut spending. We have sent bills over to the Senate to modernize Federal agencies and reduce regulations. We have passed 7 of 12 appropriations bills that cut spending and rein in unelected bureaucracies. We would have had all 12 of our appropriations done by now if Members would not stop making perfect the enemy of the good by taking down rules and bills that cut spending.

To those who want to make more cuts, I do, too, and we can work on that. Let's at least start by getting off the Pelosi budget and cutting something. That is something we could campaign on, but only if we do it.

RECOGNIZING THE INCREDIBLE  
SERVICE OF JOHN SHINHOLSER

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible service of John Shinholser.

Since 2004, John has served as the president and cofounder of The McShin Foundation, a substance use disorder recovery organization that provides lifesaving resources to Virginians who are struggling with substance use disorder. These services range from medical detox to sober living and from providing peer-to-peer mentorship to advocating for more support for reentry services in jails and prisons.

John is a leader in this space, and from the day I first started in politics, he wanted to make sure that helping those with substance use disorder was a priority of mine.

Last year, John marked 40 years in recovery himself. He achieved sobriety while he was serving in the United States Marine Corps in 1982, and he never looked back. For decades, he has used his own story to empower others, to help them and their families to sustain their recoveries.

He has treated substance use disorder as the illness that it is. With his philosophy that substance use disorder is an illness, not a character flaw, he and

his wife, Carol McDaid, have reached tens of thousands of Virginians. They have saved lives and saved families.

He might be retiring from leading The McShin Foundation, but I know that he is far from retired when it comes to making a difference in our community.

On behalf of a grateful Commonwealth and on behalf of every person whose life he has impacted, including mine, I stand before the United States House of Representatives in thanking John Shinholser for his lifelong mission of helping others and our Nation.

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. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up 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)", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)" (88 Fed. Reg. 35150 (May 31, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this joint resolution of disapproval. We must overturn the CFPB's small business lending rule to ensure small businesses across America, which are the backbone of our country, have continued access to affordable credit to support and grow our economy.

Access to affordable credit is key to ensuring communities across America remain vibrant. Unfortunately, the CFPB's small business lending rule undermines the goal of affordable and available credit, which I think we all should share.

Here is why. First, the CFPB's rule is overly broad. It will require lenders to collect massive amounts of data whenever a small business owner applies for credit. Most of the information is unnecessary to make a fair, equitable, safe, and sound loan. Requiring lenders to provide the information infringes on small business owners' rights to privacy about their personal and business information when applying for credit.

Second, the CFPB's rule is burdensome. Community banks and credit unions across America account for the majority of small business lending. They are doing their part. Despite claims from my colleagues across the aisle, this rule does not go after big banks. It will have the biggest impact on the small community financial institutions already operating under the thinnest of margins because of runaway inflation and increased interest rates through the Federal Reserve—in general, the Biden economy.

The rule also discourages banks and credit unions from expanding their lending portfolios. They might simply decide that the droves of new compliance officers they would have to hire to comply with this onerous rule would simply not be worth it, and Main Street is hammered again.

The CFPB Director says he is trying to be sensitive to the needs of small community financial institutions, oftentimes advocating for relationship banking. However, in the rule, CFPB sets the transaction threshold at an incredibly low 100 loans in the preceding 2 calendar years. This means the smallest of banks, small businesses, and their owners will be the ones to bear the brunt of the unnecessary data collection, and Main Street is hammered again.

Third, the rule will be difficult to implement. The rule itself is nearly 900 pages and requires lenders to report 81 data fields. Developing compliance systems to achieve this will be extremely costly for firms, which takes resources away from actually lending to small businesses, and Main Street is hammered again.

The timeline for implementation is also insufficient for lenders to develop the necessary systems to comply with such a complex and burdensome regula-

tion. Each hour a lender spends on the overly broad data collection demanded by the rule is an hour not devoted to ensuring credit is available and affordable for small businesses, and Main Street is hammered again.

Finally, it is unclear what the Bureau intends to do with its exceedingly expansive data demands. What we do know is the CFPB plans to post the data publicly on the CFPB's website. This is concerning, given the Bureau's alarming record of facilitating the naming and shaming of companies whose business activities progressive activists want to attack, adding to the concerns of the CFPB's abysmal track record of protecting the highly sensitive data it already collects.

In fact, back in February of this year, there was a major unauthorized data breach by a CFPB employee, which included personally identifiable information and confidential supervisory information. Therefore, why should we ever trust them to protect sensitive information of small business owners this time around?

To sum it up, the rule is backward-looking, anti-small business, anti-capitalism, anti-competition, anti-free markets, and anti-risk and reward.

It is critical that we pass this resolution to overturn this reckless CFPB rule to protect small business access to the credit needed to continue to innovate and grow our economy. A new idea while we are at it: Let's put people back to work again.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S.J. Res. 32 would repeal the CFPB's small business lending rule, which was required by Congress in section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The CFPB's rule would simply require lenders to collect and report data on small business lending. This data will help drive competition in the market, lowering small business costs, and help combat discrimination.

I worked closely with my colleague, Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, who is the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, to ensure that this provision was included in the Dodd-Frank Act because we both knew how critical this data would be to helping small businesses.

Access to capital is a key challenge that many small businesses face. For example, Goldman Sachs found that over 75 percent of small businesses they surveyed were concerned about access to capital. Research has also shown that minority-, women-, and LGBTQ+-owned businesses are more likely to be denied loans and pay steeper interest rates.

Access to capital is an issue for many family farms, which don't have the same access that larger agricultural corporations have. In addition, access

to capital is an issue for our young people working in the gig economy seeking to start a business of their own but too often told "no" by banks.

Unfortunately, section 1071 of Dodd-Frank was not implemented for 13 years. In fact, small business owners had to sue the CFPB under the Trump administration to force implementation of this rule.

One of the small business owners who sued the CFPB was ReShonda Young, a Black woman who founded Popcorn Heaven, a small business selling gourmet popcorn in Waterloo, Iowa. Ms. Young explained that she was a victim of discriminatory lending practices, saying: "In several instances, there was just blatant discrimination, and in other cases, I found out about it later on. And it wasn't just me."

She further explained: "I had a regular hourly income. My personal expenses were pretty low, so it wasn't like I couldn't cash infuse from my personal [income] if I needed to. My credit score was good, but I couldn't get what I needed. . . . Enough of the disrespect. Enough with the blatant disrespect. When a bank says, 'We don't want your business for any good reason. Why don't you move your account elsewhere?' it was at that point, okay, something has to be done."

The CFPB, under the leadership of a Trump appointee, settled the case and agreed to a court-supervised timeline, resulting in the final rule that the CFPB issued this year.

Now that the CFPB's rule has been finalized after all of these years, so many other small businesses in Iowa, North Carolina, Texas, California, and all across the country will be able to reap the benefits of a more transparent lending marketplace that Ms. Young should have had.

Specifically, the CFPB rule will allow small businesses to comparison shop between lenders and see how much other small businesses are being charged for their loans. This price transparency is essential to a competitive and fair marketplace.

In designing the rule, the CFPB was mindful of its impact on community financial institutions. For example, the rule completely exempts lenders that originated fewer than 100 small business loans in each of the 2 preceding years. This fully exempts more than 80 percent of depository institutions, including 98 percent of credit unions. For lenders that originated more than 100 loans, they would have more than 2 years before they would need to begin to comply with the rule in 2026.

Make no mistake, S.J. Res. 32 is just another part of Republicans' relentless attack on the CFPB. They have erroneously claimed that the CFPB is unconstitutional and unaccountable and have even gone so far as to attempt to eliminate the agency altogether.

□ 0930

Our constituents disagree. A recent bipartisan poll found that 82 percent of

Americans, including 77 percent of Republicans, support the CFPB and its mission.

I will highlight three main points about the CFPB small business lending rule that this resolution would repeal. First, the data collected under the rule is very similar to data collected under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act or HMDA.

This data collection under HMDA has been going on for decades, successfully bringing much needed transparency to the mortgage market. Despite misleading claims by Republicans, I want to be very clear that small businesses are not—are not—are not required to provide demographic information about their ownership under the rule. It is completely voluntary.

I have to repeat that because too many on the opposite side of the aisle are telling people that it is a mandate. It is not. It is voluntary.

Second, this rule will help all small businesses thrive by providing greater transparency that will drive competition in the small business lending market ultimately increasing access to credit and lowering interest rates for small businesses.

Third, as I mentioned earlier, we have seen how HMDA data from mortgages have been instrumental to identifying discriminatory trends like modern-day redlining. The CFPB's rule would similarly help prevent discrimination in the small business lending market, giving our regulators and the public another tool to identify discriminatory trends.

Many of us also recall the challenges that too many small businesses faced during the COVID-19 pandemic. Unfortunately, when Congress stepped in to provide relief through the Paycheck Protection Program, or PPP, the big banks that were tasked with implementing the program chose to prioritize their concierge clients, including some Members of Congress, leaving small businesses, especially those owned by people of color, out in the cold.

It is perhaps not a coincidence that the same big banks who misused PPP to the detriment of small businesses during the early stages of the pandemic are now pushing for the passage of this Senate Joint Resolution 32 opposing the CFPB, which would help them continue to operate with a lack of transparency and avoid accountability.

However, the big banks are alone in their support for this misguided resolution. In fact, more than 230 organizations representing small businesses, family farmers, community leaders, and others strongly oppose S.J. Res. 32.

There is a lot of talk in Congress about how we love small businesses, how we support small businesses, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Therefore, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to actually do something to help small businesses.

Stop talking about how you support small businesses when you know they

need access to capital that they don't have. We want to do something real for small businesses. If you do, vote down this harmful resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. DE LA CRUZ).

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to express my strong support for S.J. Res. 32, a resolution disproving of the CFPB's overreaching and burdensome rule under section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

This rule is nearly 900 pages long. It imposes onerous data collection requirements on small business lenders in places like south Texas.

This regulatory overreach is not just impractical; it directly threatens the lifeline of America's economy—our great small businesses.

Mom-and-pop shops are the backbone of our communities and need access to create, to grow, and to thrive. This rule, with its misaligned definitions and excessive demands, will only hinder their access to the necessary financial resources.

By supporting this resolution, we stand for common sense, for small businesses, for community banks, for local families, and for a regulatory environment that fosters economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to safeguard the health of our Nation's economy.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee who has been working on the Small Business Committee for over 30 years and served as the chair before the last election and who has been fighting for small businesses all of her career.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding.

I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution. As one of the central architects of section 1071, I understand better than most what this provision does and doesn't do.

During my time as ranking member of the Small Business Committee and as a senior member of the Financial Services Committee, I have seen women- and minority-owned small businesses struggle to access capital due to the lack of data and transparency related to small business lending.

The scant data that does exist continues to show these businesses lack the same access to financing compared to White-owned firms.

Section 1071 attempts to remedy this by requiring financial institutions to collect and report on the demographics of small business owners applying for financing.

Doing so facilitates the enforcement of fair lending laws and identifies busi-

nesses and community development needs.

Supporters of this resolution claim it will excessively burden smaller institutions. However, CFPB Director Chopra recently testified that approximately 2,000 banks will be exempted from the rule's reporting requirements.

Others claim the rule is too intrusive. Yet, safeguards like voluntary reporting—and you are going to hear time and again that this is a mandate even when I took the text in the manual and read it to the Members. It is voluntary. It is not a mandate. Unique identifiers are included in the rule. Without this information, discriminatory lending will continue.

When crafting this rule, the CFPB conducted considerable outreach to small firms and considered thousands of public comments from entrepreneurs.

During a recent Small Business Committee hearing, we received testimony that this rule will help the market better address both the lack of access to affordable capital and the rise of irresponsible lending.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I will not yield.

It will allow lenders to help tailor their products and services to meet their borrower's needs and spur additional investment in small businesses without creating another government program.

If you are for smaller government spending, look right here. Let's remedy this situation where we have empirical data that minority women, small businesses, female-owned businesses, and rural businesses do not have the same access to affordable capital.

It has been 13 long years. We cannot reverse course now. To do so would be an insult to the minority-owned businesses that are counting on our support.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 32, which would repeal the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) 1071 rule, which mandates burdensome personal data collection from small businesses when they apply for loans from financial institutions.

I very much thank Mr. WILLIAMS, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, for introducing a similar resolution here in the House for which I am a cosponsor.

Madam Speaker, we are hearing some information that should be of great interest to us all, that there is no need for small businesses to comply with the 1071 rule if, in fact, what we just heard is accurate.

I will take it a little bit further here. It is clear in Dodd-Frank at section

1071 that any applicant for credit may refuse to provide any information requested pursuant to subsection B in connection with any application for credit.

However, the CFPB 1071 rule says a low response rate to this rule may indicate a failure to comply. Therefore, the CFPB gets the statute wrong, and this is another example of their overreach. If the statute is clear that any applicant may refuse, then how can refusal somehow be a sign that a lender is not complying with the statute? Lenders know and are rightfully concerned that failing to get a high response rate will likely result in running afoul of the CFPB or being publicly named and shamed by progressive activists. Regulating to generate fear among law-abiding businesses is terrible public policy, Madam Speaker.

I urge us to be real here, to deal with the real world, to actually engage small businesses as the CFPB should do along with consumers, along with homeowners, along with small businesses.

We need to support this resolution, and I urge all Members of this House, as well as President Biden, to stand with small businesses.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in fierce opposition to this resolution of disapproval.

For the record, I was a former small business owner for decades. Let me also thank Ranking Member WATERS for clearly clarifying the language.

The CFPB rule seeks to increase transparency in small business lending to increase competition, to lower borrowing costs for small businesses, and to detect and deter lending discrimination and create new lending opportunities, particularly for small businesses owned by women, by people of color, LGBTQ individuals, and rural businessowners.

This rulemaking is long overdue, as we heard. By requiring lenders to provide information about loan applications, including whether they were approved or denied, as well as pricing data in applicant demographics, the rule will enhance accountability, which we talked about, and ensure financial institutions are meeting the needs of the entire community.

Wouldn't we want to know if we had a loan that was denied?

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I think it is very important. I can't imagine any one of us applying for a loan and getting it denied that would not call that lender and say, tell me

why my loan was denied. That is a part of this, Madam Speaker.

Lastly, this transparency will not only benefit small businesses but also family farms, financial institutions, and the economy overall. I strongly recommend that we support this and go back and re-read the language.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, of course, I rise in favor of S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution to disapprove this dumb idea from the CFPB.

I am proud to stand with our chairman of the Small Business Committee who is a humble small business man from Texas.

I know the ranking member of the full committee knows that Mr. WILLIAMS, being a humble small business person, knows how to borrow money, knows how to be turned down for a loan, have a loan accepted, and he knows that banks tell him and explain that to him. I am proud to stand here.

I think it is so interesting that I have heard from the opposition today, Madam Speaker, well, this is a voluntary thing.

Well, if it is voluntary, then you should vote for this resolution because it is obviously unnecessary because it is voluntary.

Mr. MEUSER makes a very good point, because he says that a sign that a bank has constant small business lending where they don't report because every customer for that bank voluntarily said they don't want to provide that data, it will be a sign of noncompliance. The bank will be out of compliance. They will be in trouble. They will have an exam. They will fail that exam.

This rule, Madam Speaker, is not the right approach.

□ 0945

I have spent 30 years of my 40-year career lending money to small businesses, raising equity capital for small businesses.

We want every loan we can make and the bank made. We are in the business to make loans. We are not in the business to turn down loans. We want them for Black people, White people, LGBTQ people—all people—banking in our bank, helping us make a profit, helping us serve the community.

This is overdoing bureaucracy. It is applying a set of rules to collect a bunch of data that is not going to make small business loans more affordable or more available in this country. It is not.

Madam Speaker, Republicans are standing here and in the Senate. Democrats in the Senate voted for this resolution. They know this is governmental overreach. It shouldn't be imposed on the private sector. It is going to hurt small business, raise the cost of small business. This body stands on the side of those community lenders and

those borrowers who want available capital at a reasonable cost to bring their idea, their dream to life.

So five Democratic Senators joined with Republicans to say: Bad idea, send it back to the drawing board.

We are standing on this side of the aisle asking our friends on the other side of the aisle: Bad idea, send it back to the drawing board.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" for this resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman, your arguments show that you are here to support the big banks who do not want small business in the banks. They don't want to be bothered. As a matter of fact, you try to be convincing that it is not voluntary, but it is voluntary.

They are asked: Do you want to give this information? It is voluntary, and you can't get away from that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), who is also the vice ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, the beginning of so many great American stories is built around starting a small business in your family name, becoming a foundation in your local community—making it in America.

Small businesses are major drivers of wealth creation in our overall economy. They account for two-thirds of net new jobs and nearly half of our U.S. economic activity.

For many of them, that dream starts with going to a bank and getting a small business loan. For many Americans, the sound of their name, the color of their skin, the language that they speak or who they love can doom that dream if a bank says that they are at risk.

This isn't hypothetical. I, too, was born and raised in south Texas. I can tell you that when I go home and I see some businesses that have closed, I ask my family whether it was due to the pandemic, or no demand for the cost of services that they had. I am told that they just had trouble with finances and they couldn't get a loan.

In some small rural areas, because I did grow up in rural south Texas, there aren't credit unions everywhere like there are in the city of Houston where I live now. In the city of Houston, many small businesses during the pandemic in round one couldn't even get a PPP loan. We had to go in and do a carve-out to literally force the banks to provide loans to small businesses.

I am glad that one of my colleagues was openhearted and gave people a lot of loans. I just hope that that included some to minority small businesses.

Madam Speaker, this is real. It is not hypothetical. We know that minority-owned small businesses were less likely to receive a loan during the pandemic compared to White firms.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Regrettably, Madam Speaker, racism and discrimination flourish in the darkness. We need to shine a light and allow the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to make lending more transparent.

Madam Speaker, a transparent market will be a competitive market. With transparency in lending, banks are driven to compete and offer better terms.

With this resolution, extreme MAGA Republicans are protecting the secret discriminatory practice of banks and lenders. Repealing this rule would harm all those who stand to benefit.

We want to put profits over people. We want to put light over darkness.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 32 providing congressional disapproval of the CFPB's Small Business Collection Rule.

I am a businessman myself, and I am proud to say that I have made a payroll every 2 weeks since I was 24 years old.

I will tell you what happens in a situation like this. I am also a borrower. I am a borrower of small community banks across the State of Nebraska.

If you pass something like this, if you go from 7 statutory data points to 81 data points, I am going to have to pay an accountant to sit down and sift through all of our business data to put this together for my bank, my lender, and hope that I get it right so that on the next bank exam, they are not calling me wanting a whole bunch more information.

That is the real cost to small business. That is the real cost to businesses in this Nation. That is what people in this town forget. It is small businesses. It is small-town employers that make this country run, that make the money work, so that people can wake up and have cash in their pocket.

I will say this: If you go from 7 points to 81 points, this is just another example where the CFPB has expanded the scope of the rule as far as possible.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), the vice ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, who has been working on this issue for a long time.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I thank our ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the resolution that they are attempting to use to overturn this rule is about small business lending.

We know that, but what is the problem?

We are now afraid of data? We don't want to collect data? This is even voluntary.

You are opposing a process that would help create more transparency, more information gathering, competitiveness, and a fair marketplace for lenders and small businesses. It is voluntary.

We are scared now? We are scared of voluntarily collecting data?

Section 1071 allows lenders to collect and report lending data, including voluntarily self-reported by businessowners. This rule does help small business, and I will give you some examples, particularly those owned by women, people of color.

We are even going to collect data, especially in my district, of veterans, many of them Black men and women, who have started businesses after they served our country. They are all lacking access to credit that they need to build up their businesses.

Study after study has documented that small business owners, especially the small business owners in my district, continue to face discriminatory practices by banks.

We already know for a fact that Black-owned business are less likely to obtain financing and are offered smaller loans.

Section 1071 will make it easier to eliminate such practices and enforce our fair lending laws—again, to enforce our fair lending laws. Maybe that is why. Maybe that is why the banks are crying about this voluntary process. They are scared. Why?

Had the CFPB Small Business Lending Rule been in place during the Paycheck Protection Program, Madam Speaker, the transparency required by this rule would likely have reduced the racial disparity in lending outcomes that we saw.

There is also a clear precedent for what such a rule can accomplish. These are real people—and folks can laugh. They can think that this is not real. These are people that are literally putting their whole life savings into a small business, and hoping and praying that they have the investment from the Federal Government.

When the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act established reporting processes for mortgage lenders that are similar to those in the CFPB rule, did you all know that lending to Black borrowers for conventional home purchases increased by 70 percent in 3 years? In 3 years we increased Black homeownership.

All Americans, not just some, deserve access and fairness, especially when we continue to bail out these banks for their continued failure and their discriminatory practices.

Section 1071 promotes transparency, competition, and fairness. Overturning this is a disservice to our small business owners everywhere.

I thank our ranking member and others that continue to advocate for this. This is the right thing to do. This is how we make sure that all Americans have access.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my good friend and colleague, the small business owner from Texas, Congressman WILLIAMS, and I support his resolution under the Congressional Review Act to nullify the CFPB Small Business Lending Rule, or section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

The small business lending rule that was finalized in March is incredibly onerous. It imposes massive burdens on financial institutions. It will be misleading and confusing for borrowers. It will ultimately harm the very small business owners, the minority- and women-owned small business owners, that they say they want to help because those are the businesses that will not have access to capital—certainly not affordable capital.

While the Dodd-Frank Act does charge the Bureau with adopting rules regarding small business lending, Director Chopra's rule goes far beyond Congressional intent. By requiring the collection of 81 data fields, it greatly exceeds what is mandated by statute.

As has been said very eloquently, it will be extremely burdensome on financial institutions, leading to increased costs and less availability of credit for millions of Main Street borrowers and entrepreneurs.

I have to address this absurd argument about the voluntary nature of the disclosures here. If this is really voluntary—and I want the CFPB to hear this, the advocate of this rule, I want them to hear.

If this is totally voluntary, when my constituents do not provide the CFPB with this information, I want the CFPB to go back and watch the tape, because I don't want my constituents to then be punished by the CFPB when they are not given the information they want. I am going to tell my constituents who are being harassed by this bureaucracy to go back and listen to the ranking member because she said it is voluntary. I want them to quote the ranking member to CFPB when the CFPB harasses them for bureaucracy.

Then, I want everyone here in this Chamber to recognize that this week, in the Committee on Financial Services, I asked Director Chopra if he recognizes that if a small business owner fails to understand why demographic information—irrelevant, by the way, to creditworthiness of the borrower—demographic data is being collected, it could lead to confusion and misunderstanding and potential liability for the financial institution.

For example, the rule requires small business owners to disclose their race, their ethnicity, and their gender or sexual orientation when applying for that loan. They have to give this information prior to underwriting. If that loan is denied, the applicant could be reasonably led to believe that that demographic information was the basis for the denial and not the myriad of other legitimate factors which play into lending decisions.

Madam Speaker, Director Chopra agreed with me that this could be confusing to the borrower.

Clearly, there are a lot of important factors that were not been properly considered prior to the finalization of this rule.

Does this make sense?

I thought we got to a point in the country where race was not supposed to matter, but the other side of the aisle thinks race is the only thing that matters, and that is wrong. That is wrong.

This rule's requirement will force many community banks and credit unions across the country to exit small business lending altogether. That is what my constituents tell me.

Small banks across Central/Eastern Kentucky tell me this is so burdensome; the requirements are so ridiculous that they are just going to exit small business lending altogether.

Now, how does that help the minority-owned small business on Main Street USA? It hurts them.

This is absurd that we would actually hurt minority-and women-owned small businesses by burdening them with massive amounts of red tape.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1000

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, finally, I want to address this ridiculous argument from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who constantly cite this poll that they keep talking about, which Democrats wanted. They say, oh, the American people love the CFPB because it describes the CFPB as the Salvation Army or something.

The truth of the matter is, if the poll was asked with the truthful information—that this agency drives up the cost and decreases the availability of credit, increases regulatory costs for small businesses, increases interest costs for Americans for their credit cards when they pay on time, decreases access to consumer credit, and is completely exempt from the appropriations process and totally unaccountable—if you ask the question the truthful way, the American people overwhelmingly say the CFPB is a failure.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we have these Members on the opposite side of the aisle spending all of this time supporting the biggest, most profitable banks in the country, yet these Members won't stand up for small business lending. They don't want the data so that we can understand what is going on and why people in this country, minorities in particular, farmers, small farmers, family farmers, et cetera, can't get loans.

In the last decade, these megabanks made so much money: J.P. Morgan,

\$215 billion; Wells Fargo, \$197 billion; Bank of America, \$105 billion; Citigroup, \$93 billion. They repeatedly broke the law, even though they were making all of this money. I want you to know they consider this just the cost of doing business.

We have even more here when we take a look at some of the other banks that paid fines instead of lending money. They would rather pay fines instead of lending to small businesses. What kind of fines are we talking about here? We fined them for all kinds of fraudulent activity.

In the last decade, megabanks made so much money, and then they repeatedly paid fines. For example, the Bank of America paid \$66 billion in fines. They could have been lending this to small businesses. J.P. Morgan paid \$43 billion in fines. They could have been lending this to small businesses. Citigroup paid \$19 billion in fines. They could have been lending this to small businesses. Wells Fargo paid \$12 billion in fines.

Some of our Members want to say that we just want to shame these big banks. Yes, I do because it is a shame that they are so profitable that they do not want to spend time with small businesses. It takes up too much time. Small businesses don't earn as much money for the bank, et cetera. They don't even want them in their banks, and we have to do something about that.

We are shining a light on the existing practices of lenders, and if those lenders are charging minorities and small family farmers, et cetera, exorbitant interest rates, there is no reason that we should not get the transparency that we need to stop this.

I will tell you, one of the reasons you hear us being so passionate over here is because the big banks don't need you to defend them. They don't need you to stand up for them. You should be putting your time and effort into what you can do about the small businesses.

I am not going to go into a lot of information. We have Members on the opposite side of the aisle who felt they needed capital. When we did PPP, they came to the government, competing with real small businesses that could not get capital. Not only did they take out the money, but they have been forgiven for it. They didn't have to pay it back.

I am not going to talk about everybody, but I am going to mention MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE because she is everywhere talking about everybody, claiming she is for small business. She took out \$180,000, and she has been forgiven.

I am not going to talk about the rest of them, some of my friends over there, but I have a whole list of Members on the opposite side of the aisle who took out PPP money and didn't need it, some of them as rich as cream. They took this money, and they are not paying it back. Then, they come in here and talk about why we should not have

transparency and do everything that we can for these small businesses that are desperate for capital.

You can sing the song that you love small business all that you want. You can have the Small Business Saturday with a big, fake kind of operation on small business lending in your community, but it doesn't do any good if they don't get the capital. They need the money. They need to be treated fairly.

Yes, I want to shame the big banks. I want to shame them. You have one of these banks that even took out false accounts, made up accounts, and we had to stop them. We fined them, but do you know what? They are too big to fail, and they keep doing what we are fining them for.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, small businesses are the lifeblood of the American economy. When you burden small business, you limit job growth, economic gain, economic opportunity, and American growth. With more regulation on businesses, it drives up the cost of doing business.

I commend the chair of the Small Business Committee for this resolution that we have on the House floor today that is in support of American small business. This resolution would stop the CFPB's small business data collection rule, which is onerous, overly complex, and difficult to implement. All American businesses would be burdened by it—disproportionately, the small businesses that create most of the jobs in America.

This rule would stifle American businesses' access to affordable credit, and it will facilitate the naming and shaming of lenders whose business practices are legal, nondiscriminatory, and safe and sound.

The progressive activists on the left want to use that database so they can call out the things that they don't like for political activism. I don't think that is responsible. I don't think that is in the interest of the American economy, and it surely is not in the interest of consumer protection.

Madam Speaker, let's support this resolution. Let's oppose the rule. Let's support small business.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Yes, I am a political activist. I am an activist for the people who send us here to represent them. I am an activist for the least of these. I am an activist for small business. I am an activist for veterans. I am an activist for children. I am an activist for education, for better healthcare, and I am very proud of it.

I tell you, it is shameful for us to continue to be dominated and controlled by the biggest banks in America, taking time on the floor of the people's House to defend them and to vote



against the very people who send you to this House to represent them. It is absolutely shameful.

It is time to get out from under the influence and control of the biggest banks in America and stand up for the people who really need to make these banks do what they should be doing rather than saying: No, we are not going to comply with the law, and yes, we will pay the fines because we are rich. We have so much money we can do that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 32. This is a CRA resolution to rescind the final rule implementing section 1071 of Dodd-Frank. I thank Chairman WILLIAMS and Senator KENNEDY for their leadership to rescind the CFPB's harmful proposal.

The rule is nearly 900 pages and requires lenders to report 81 data fields. If the CFPB's proposal is enacted, small financial institutions will be forced to devote more of their time to comply with burdensome regulations rather than focusing on providing loans for small business owners.

With credit tightening for small businesses due to persistent inflation, higher interest rates, and an uncertain economic environment, the CFPB's 1071 rule would impose higher costs for small businesses and lead to a decrease in lending to small, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses.

Earlier this year, the CFPB suffered a major data breach when an employee forwarded consumer information of more than a quarter million to a personal email account. How can we trust the CFPB to properly manage the collection of additional data when it cannot efficiently safeguard existing data?

I urge Director Chopra to go back to the drawing board on section 1071 and issue a rule that gets it right without punishing small banks and small credit unions with higher compliance costs and burdensome requirements.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution and access to credit for small businesses by voting in favor of this resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

When we started this debate, I mentioned ReShonda Young, who happens to be a young, Black woman from Waterloo who had many challenges getting a small business loan and sued the CFPB to complete the section 1071 rule. After CFPB settled the case with her,

Ms. Young said: "I am just humbled to be part of the process. Sometimes we feel so small, but this is one of those things that shows if we are willing to speak up, we actually can make a difference."

Ms. Young has since sold her business and is now working with other investors to try to open up the first minority bank in Iowa, with the goal of being certified as a CDFI, offering the kind of small business loans to others that she had such a time obtaining.

Let me just tell you something. We support CDFIs, the community development financial institutions. Why do we support them? Because they could not get loans from the banks in America. Here we are, the taxpayers, further trying to help small businesses by supporting these community development financial institutions. They were developed because small businesses couldn't get loans.

Then, on the opposite side of the aisle, we have people who are opposing how we can support these small businesses by getting the transparency that we need to have done. They would rather support the biggest banks in America and have the taxpayers try to do something about small businesses with CDFIs than give their small businesses an opportunity.

I tell you, I don't know how they are going to vote on the other side, but this issue is not going to go away. I tell you that the constituents are going to learn in this country who is supporting small businesses. All of this talk and this rhetoric about "I love small businesses," "I support small businesses," will not continue to work.

The fact of the matter is, small businesses are shutting down, closing, because they don't have access to capital.

For all those Members on the opposite side of the aisle who took out PPP loans that have been forgiven, you ought to be ashamed and not oppose the CFPB from trying to protect these small banks, as the courts have told them to do.

□ 1015

Madam Speaker, there is a lot more that can be said. We are going to continue to unveil this information about who is simply spouting rhetoric and who is actually doing something for small businesses.

It is unfortunate that we have to fight this hard. We have to do everything that we possibly can because the banks don't want them in their banks. They don't want to be bothered with them. They are too small.

We have small businesses who only need \$50,000 or \$75,000 to improve their technology to take their businesses to a place where they can earn more money.

We can't even start to talk about startup capital. None of them get startup capital. If they are able to convince anybody for a little capital to expand their businesses, they will do that. Otherwise, small businesses do

not have the support of the Republicans in the House of Representatives as it is seen here today.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues and I have stated today, my biggest fear is that many lenders may decide to fully exit small business lending due to the overly burdensome collection requirements, or because they don't want to put their small business customers in an uncomfortable situation.

I do not believe this is the outcome Congress, or the CFPB, intended with the implementation of this section of Dodd-Frank. However, I know, as a small business owner myself, that if this rule goes into effect it will not bode well for small businesses seeking the credit needed to grow and support their communities. That is the bottom line.

We need to help small businesses. We need to help them create jobs but also to create net worth among their employees.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 878.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 202, answered "present" 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 690]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Boebert	Cloud
Alford	Bost	Clyde
Allen	Brecheen	Cole
Amodei	Buchanan	Collins
Armstrong	Buck	Comer
Arrington	Bucshon	Crane
Babin	Burchett	Crenshaw
Bacon	Burgess	Cuellar
Baird	Burlison	Curtis
Balderson	Calvert	D'Esposito
Banks	Cammack	Davidson
Barr	Carey	De La Cruz
Bean (FL)	Carl	DesJarlais
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Donalds
Bice	Case	Duarte
Biggs	Chavez-DeRemer	Duncan
Bilirakis	Ciscomani	Dunn (FL)
Bishop (NC)	Cline	Edwards

Ellzey Kelly (MS)  
Emmer Kiggans (VA)  
Estes Kiley  
Ezell Kim (CA)  
Fallon Kustoff  
Feenstra LaHood  
Ferguson LaLota  
Finstad LaMalfa  
Fischbach Lamborn  
Fitzgerald Langworthy  
Fitzpatrick Latta  
Fleischmann LaTurner  
Flood Lawler  
Foxy Lee (FL)  
Franklin, Scott Lesko  
Fry Letlow  
Fulcher Loudermilk  
Gaetz Lucas  
Gallagher Luetkemeyer  
Garbarino Luna  
Garcia, Mike Luttrell  
Gimenez Mace  
Golden (ME) Malliotakis  
Gonzales, Tony Maloy  
Good (VA) Mann  
Gooden (TX) Manning  
Gosar Masie  
Granger Mast  
Graves (LA) McCaul  
Graves (MO) McClain  
Green (TN) McClinton  
Greene (GA) McCormick  
Griffith McHenry  
Grothman Meuser  
Guest Miller (IL)  
Guthrie Miller (OH)  
Hageman Miller (WV)  
Harris Miller-Meeks  
Harshbarger Mills  
Hern Molinaro  
Higgins (LA) Moolenaar  
Hill Mooney  
Hinson Moore (AL)  
Houchin Moore (UT)  
Hudson Moran  
Huizenga Murphy  
Hunt Nehls  
Issa Newhouse  
Jackson (TX) Norman  
James Nunn (IA)  
Johnson (SD) Obernolte  
Jordan Ogles  
Joyce (OH) Owens  
Joyce (PA) Palmer  
Kean (NJ) Peltola

Pence Morelle  
Perez Moskowitz  
Perry Moulton  
Pfluger Mrvan  
Posey Mullin  
Reschenthaler Nadler  
Rogers (AL) Napolitano  
Rogers (KY) Neal  
Rose Neguse  
Rosendale Nickel  
Rouzer Norcross  
Roy Omar  
Rutherford Pallone  
Salazar Panetta  
Scalise Pappas  
Schweikert Pascrell  
Scott, Austin Payne  
Self Peters  
Sessions Pettersen  
Simpson Pingree  
Smith (MO) Pocan  
Smith (NE) Porter  
Smith (NJ) Pressley  
Smucker Quigley  
Spartz Ramirez  
Staubert Raskin  
Steel Ross

Ruiz Sykes  
Ruppersberger Takano  
Ryan Thanedar  
Salinas Thompson (CA)  
Sanchez Thompson (MS)  
Sarbanes Titus  
Scanlon Tlaib  
Schakowsky Tokuda  
Schiff Tonko  
Schneider Torres (CA)  
Scholten Torres (NY)  
Schrier Trahan  
Scott (VA) Underwood  
Scott, David Vargus  
Sewell Vasquez  
Sherman Veasey  
Sherrill Velazquez  
Slotkin Wasserman  
Smith (WA) Schultz  
Sorensen Waters  
Soto Watson Coleman  
Spanberger Wexton  
Stansbury Wexton  
Stanton Wild  
Quigley Williams (GA)  
Stevens Wilson (FL)  
Strickland  
Swailwell

Calvert Higgins (NY)  
Caraveo Himes  
Carbajal Hinson  
Cárdenas Horsford  
Carey Houchin  
Carson Houlihan  
Carter (GA) Hoyer  
Carter (LA) Hoyle (OR)  
Cartwright Hudson  
Casar Huffman  
Case Ivey  
Casten Jackson (NC)  
Castor (FL) Jacobs  
Castro (TX) James  
Chavez-DeRemer Jayapal  
Cherfilus-Jeffries  
McCormick Johnson (GA)  
Chu Johnson (SD)  
Ciscomani Joyce (OH)  
Clark (MA) Joyce (PA)  
Clarke (NY) Kamlager-Dove  
Cleaver Kaptur  
Clyburn Kean (NJ)  
Cohen Keating  
Cole Kelly (IL)  
Comer Khanna  
Connolly Kiggans (VA)  
Correa Kildee  
Costa Kiley  
Courtney Kilmer  
Craig Kim (CA)  
Crenshaw Kim (NJ)  
Crockett Krishnamoorthi  
Crow Kuster  
Cuellar LaHood  
Curtis LaLota  
D'Esposito Landsman  
Davids (KS) Langworthy  
Davis (IL) Larsen (WA)  
Davis (NC) Larson (CT)  
De La Cruz Latta  
Dean (PA) LaTurner  
DeGette Lawler  
DeLauro Lee (CA)  
DelBene Lee (NV)  
Deluzio Lee (PA)  
DeSaulnier Leger Fernandez  
Diaz-Balart Letlow  
Dingell Levin  
Doggett Lieu  
Duarte Lofgren  
Dunn (FL) Lucas  
Edwards Lynch  
Ellzey Magaziner  
Escobar Malliotakis  
Eshoo Maloy  
Españat Mann  
Estes Manning  
Evans Matsui  
Feenstra McBath  
Ferguson McClain  
Fitzpatrick McClellan  
Fletcher McCollum  
Flood McGarvey  
Foster McGovern  
Foushee Meeks  
Foxy Menendez  
Frankel, Lois Meng  
Franklin, Scott Meuser  
Frost Mfume  
Gallego Miller (OH)  
Garamendi Miller-Meeks  
Garbarino Molinaro  
Garcia (IL) Moore (UT)  
Garcia (TX) Moore (WI)  
Garcia, Robert Moran  
Gimenez Morelle  
Golden (ME) Moskowitz  
Goldman (NY) Moulton  
Gomez Mrvan  
Gonzales, Tony Mullin  
Gonzalez, Tony Murphy  
Vicente Nadler  
Gottheimer Napolitano  
Granger Neal  
Graves (LA) Neguse  
Green (TN) Newhouse  
Grijalva Nickel  
Grothman Norcross  
Guest Nunn (IA)  
Guthrie Obernolte  
Harder (CA) Omar  
Hayes Owens  
Pallone

Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Pence  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pfluger  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Ross  
Rouzer  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rutherford  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Simpson  
Slotkin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Staubert  
Steel  
Steil  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swailwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Druen  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santos

NOT VOTING—10

Crawford McCarthy Rodgers (WA)  
Jackson Lee Ocasio-Cortez Trone  
Johnson (OH) Pelosi  
Kelly (PA) Phillips

□ 1047

Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. OMAR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPULSION OF REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE SANTOS FROM THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 878) providing for the expulsion of Representative GEORGE SANTOS from the United States House of Representatives, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 311, nays 114, answered "present" 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 691]

YEAS—311

Adams Adams  
Aguilar Aderholt  
Allred Barragan  
Amo Beatty  
Auchincloss Bowman  
Balint Boyle (PA)  
Barragan Brown  
Beatty Brownley  
Bera Budzinski  
Beyer Bush  
Bishop Caraveo  
Blunt Rochester Carbajal  
Bonamici Cárdenas  
Bowman Carson  
Boyle (PA) Carter (LA)  
Brown Cartwright  
Brownley Casar  
Budzinski Casten  
Bush Castor (FL)  
Caraveo Castro (TX)  
Carbajal Cherfilus-McCormick  
Cárdenas Chu  
Carson Clark (MA)  
Carter (LA) Clarke (NY)  
Cartwright Cleaver  
Casar Clyburn  
Casten Cohen  
Castor (FL) Connolly  
Castro (TX) Correa  
Cherfilus-McCormick Costa  
Chu Courtney

Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budzinski  
Burgess  
Bush

D'Esposito  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
De La Cruz  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Duarte  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españat  
Estes  
Evans  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Flood  
Foster  
Foushee  
Foxy  
Frankel, Lois  
Franklin, Scott  
Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garbarino  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert  
Gimenez  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez, Tony  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Green (TN)  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes

NAYS—114

Alford  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Banks  
Bean (FL)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)

Boebert	Hageman	Nehls
Best	Harris	Norman
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Ogles
Buchanan	Hern	Palmer
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Burlison	Hill	Posey
Cammack	Huizenga	Reschenthaler
Carl	Hunt	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Issa	Rosendale
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Clyde	Jordan	Santos
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Crane	Kustoff	Scott (VA)
Davidson	LaMalfa	Self
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Sessions
Donalds	Lee (FL)	Smith (MO)
Duncan	Lesko	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Spartz
Ezell	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Fallon	Luna	Steube
Finstad	Luttrell	Strong
Fischbach	Mace	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Massie	Tiffany
Fleischmann	Mast	Timmons
Fry	McCauley	Turner
Fulcher	McClintock	Van Doyne
Gaetz	McCormick	Van Orden
Gallagher	McHenry	Walberg
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	Waltz
Gooden (TX)	Miller (WV)	Weber (TX)
Gosar	Mills	Williams (GA)
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Williams (TX)
Greene (GA)	Mooney	Wilson (SC)
Griffith	Moore (AL)	Wittman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Green, Al (TX)      Jackson (IL)

NOT VOTING—8

Crawford            Kelly (PA)            Phillips  
 Jackson Lee        McCarthy            Rodgers (WA)  
 Johnson (OH)      Ocasio-Cortez

□ 1056

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Governor of the State of New York of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes today due to a previously scheduled family commitment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 690 and "yea" on rollcall No. 691.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the expulsion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTOS), the whole number of the House is 434.

HOUR OF MEETING

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUNN of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we lost one of our greatest Americans, and today, I rise along with my colleagues representing all of Arizona, Republicans and Democrats alike, to honor the life and legacy of the most influential Arizonan in history, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, who passed away this morning at the age of 93.

Justice O'Connor spent her life breaking down barriers in pursuit of a more just society. She blazed every trail she set foot on, defying the odds stacked against women in the legal profession to rise to become Arizona's assistant attorney general, our first female majority leader in the State senate, Maricopa County Superior Court judge, and, ultimately, the first female Justice on the United States Supreme Court.

She brought her Arizona brand of pragmatism and independence with her to the Supreme Court and was often the swing vote on deeply consequential decisions.

In the years since her retirement from the Supreme Court, I have admired her steadfast commitment to preserving our democracy through objective, fact-based, and collaborative civil discourse through her creation of the Sandra Day O'Connor Institute and, of course, through the Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law at Arizona State University.

Her work will inspire future generations to follow her example to become engaged and thoughtful civil participants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank our colleagues for standing in respect of a great woman. She was not only a great woman from Arizona but a great woman and trailblazer for all women across America.

As was said, she was the first female majority leader to serve in the Arizona Senate. She went on to be the first woman to serve as a Supreme Court Justice. She stood up for truth. She stood up for justice. She was not only a wonderful woman and representative of Arizona but a wonderful American.

We are saddened by her passing, but she set the trail for all of us women. She was a great Republican, a great American, and we praise her each and every day.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in a moment of silence.

CELEBRATING RUTH SELLERS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. McCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish a happy 100th birthday to Ruth Sellers of Mariposa, although the general consensus is she is really in her midfifties. Skeptical or not, the town is going to celebrate with her tomorrow. From our Nation's Capital, I want to join them to express our love and respect.

An Army brat, she spent her youth in prewar China and the Philippines. In the war, when she wasn't Rosie the Riveter at the Newport shipyard, she was a USO volunteer, where she met her husband, Earl.

After a successful career at IBM, she retired to Mariposa in 1986 and has since been a terrifyingly inexhaustible force of nature in so many community endeavors it would take an hour to catalog.

She will be celebrating many more birthdays in the year ahead, and Mariposa will be better for it.

Happy birthday, Ruth.

PROMOTING PIPELINE SAFETY

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the bipartisan efforts to make our Nation's pipeline network safer.

Recently, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced the Promoting Innovation in Pipeline Efficiency and Safety Act, or PIPES Act, of 2023. This bill would help secure 2.6 million miles of pipelines that carry natural gas and petroleum to communities nationwide.

It would allow the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to hire more workers to monitor pipeline safety and create proper protections to regulate carbon dioxide pipelines more efficiently. Also, it would promote more methods to contain greenhouse gases.

In addition, the bill would make it easier for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions to educate and develop the next generation of pipeline safety professionals.

As the ranking member of the Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, I applaud my colleagues from both parties for creating a bill that works for the American people.

ADDRESSING RED TAPE FOR MEDICARE ENROLLMENT

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, under current law, American seniors who defer enrollment in Medicare may find themselves hit with higher fees

due to late enrollment charges. Permanently raising seniors' healthcare premiums for delaying Medicare enrollment only hurts seniors who are already struggling on fixed incomes.

That is why I helped introduce the Medicare Economic Security Solutions Act. This is a bipartisan bill to cap these fees and address red tape for seniors enrolling in Medicare.

As someone who is approaching the eligibility age myself—believe it or not—protecting the benefits our seniors have earned is personal to me.

I am proud to help lead this bipartisan and commonsense bill that would lower costs for my constituents. I urge my colleagues to join me on this bill.

□ 1115

#### HONORING DR. ALZO J. REDDICK

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor one of Orlando's legends, the first Black man hired to teach at Winter Park High School, the first Black administrator at Rollins College, the first Black man from Orlando who was elected to the State legislature since Reconstruction, the first Black chairman of the Orange County Democratic Executive Committee, and the first Black legislator to pass two constitutional amendments—Dr. Alzo J. Reddick.

A son of central Florida, Dr. Reddick has been a tried and true tireless leader for our Orlando community and, importantly, for the advancement of our Black and Brown people, and folks across the entire country.

He was on the forefront of the fight to uplift the working class and poor folks of our community, to extend educational opportunities to students from all walks of life, and to create a world where our community knows peace, equity, and equality. Dr. Reddick paved the way for legislators like me to be where we are today.

Today, I thank him and honor him for all the work he has done for every single Floridian.

#### CONGRATULATING WILLIAM "LOU" REED

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate William "Lou" Reed on being named Rincon's new fire chief.

Reed started with the Rincon Fire Department in November of 2011 and has served as a firefighter, an engineer, and a captain.

Lou was appointed to be the Rincon fire chief on September 11 after having led the department on an interim basis for 20 months.

He recently received a bachelor's degree in fire administration and is working toward a master's degree in public health administration.

As the new chief, he has already created goals to reduce the number of fires and fire-related deaths by analyzing response data, providing safety education programs to residents, and enforcing State and local fire prevention codes.

Lou has already shown he has the skills of a true leader. I am excited to see what he accomplishes further as the new Rincon fire chief.

#### A RISE IN ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of Senator SCHUMER's address on anti-Semitism in the Senate.

I echo Senator SCHUMER's concerns. Anti-Semitism is on the rise in our country, and it is simply unacceptable.

As Americans, we have the responsibility to condemn bigotry and hate in all of its forms, including anti-Semitism.

To quote my friend and colleague in the Senate, "We are stewards of the flames of liberty, tolerance, and equality that warm our American melting pot, and make it possible for Jewish Americans to prosper alongside Palestinian Americans, and every other immigrant group from all over the world."

I thank Senator SCHUMER for his powerful words. As we watch the events abroad and here at home unfold, I urge Americans to remember that our shared humanity, commitment to equality, and tolerance are our greatest strengths.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Senator SCHUMER's remarks. <https://www.democrats.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/majority-leader-schumer-delivers-major-address-on-anti-semitism-on-the-senate-floor>

#### CONGRATULATING KIT SEKELSKY

(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 to recognize Warren County native Kit Sekelsky for her success on "Jeopardy!." In 2021, Kit won three games, taking home nearly \$40,000.

Earlier this month, she had the opportunity to compete again as part of the Second Chance Tournament. The Second Chance Tournament gives champions from past seasons an opportunity to qualify for this season's Tournament of Champions. Kit was able to make it out of the quarterfinal before finishing second in the semifinal match.

While she was unable to move forward in the competition, Kit earned the elusive "Jeopardy!" champion title.

Congratulations, Kit, on this special achievement.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO ROSA PARKS

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

Mr. THANEDAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rosa Parks, a beacon of hope during the civil rights movement.

As we mark the 68th anniversary of her historic defiance against racial segregation, we remember her decision to not give up her seat on a Montgomery bus in 1955 and how it ignited a movement that reshaped our Nation's history.

Detroit, her adopted home and final resting place, has been indelibly marked by her courage. Her spirit and resolve continue to inspire generations in Detroit to stand up against racial disparity and champion inequality.

In her honor, and in recognition of the city she loved, we must persist in our efforts to dismantle systemic racism and build a society where every individual, regardless of race, can achieve their full potential.

#### WYFF 70TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not just as a South Carolinian but also as co-chair of the Broadcasters Caucus to celebrate the 70th anniversary of WYFF News 4.

Known originally as WFBC, the station started broadcasting on December 31, 1953. The first anchor for the station was Norvin Duncan who worked for WFBC radio before joining the newly created WFBC-TV.

Channel 4 was the first broadcaster in South Carolina to televise a live game, which was a basketball game between Furman and Newberry Colleges.

By the 1970s, technology had advanced, and WYFF's staff had to increase as well to ensure accurate, timely news for upstate South Carolina, Georgia, and western North Carolina.

WYFF was also the first station in South Carolina to have an African-American anchor when Deborah Lee began anchoring "The Scene at 6."

For 70 years, WYFF news has kept the upstate informed on innumerable local events, heartwarming stories, storms, and national emergencies.

WYFF has even lost staff members in the field who were just working to keep citizens informed as storms raged. I remember specifically Mike McCormick and Aaron Smeltzer who passed away in 2018.

I thank Carol, Nigel, Jane, and the rest of the WYFF team for continuing

the station's legacy. I look forward to the next 70 years of WYFF keeping the upstate informed and safe with local, live, and breaking news.

#### ADDRESSING BORDER CRISES

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

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker:

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud product of the Borderlands. I grew up on both sides of the border, my parents worked for the maquiladoras, and I still cross the border when I am back in my district because Las Cruces benefits from an interconnected community with El Paso and Juarez.

For years, I have seen the challenges that we face at the border with the humanitarian crisis and the influx of drugs. We are at a point where we need more resources to address these crises.

We need bipartisan solutions to address these issues, so I introduced a package of legislation that addresses security at our border and immigration reform. I am proud to share that my bills have been informed by the people of New Mexico, for the people of New Mexico.

We have waited for too long to address this issue, and we need to put partisan politics aside to deliver for all of our constituents.

Estoy aquí con todos ustedes hoy como un producto orgulloso de la frontera. Crecí en ambos lados de los Estados Unidos y México, mis padres trabajaron para las maquiladoras y todavía cruzo la frontera cuándo regreso a mi distrito porque Las Cruces es una comunidad interconectada con El Paso y Cd. Juárez.

Durante los años he visto los retos que enfrentamos en la frontera con una crisis humanitaria y el flujo de drogas a nuestro país. Estamos en un punto importante en que necesitamos más recursos para abordar estas crisis.

Necesitamos soluciones bipartidistas para solucionar estos problemas, por eso yo presenté un paquete de legislación que aborda la seguridad en nuestra frontera y la reforma migratoria. Estos proyectos de ley han sido informados por nuevos mexicanos, para nuevo Mexicanos, y he pasado los últimos meses proponiéndole al Caucus Hispano del Congreso, y al Caucus de Los Nuevos Demócratas y hemos trabajado entre ambos partidos para encontrar soluciones a la crisis migratoria.

Hemos esperado demasiado para abordar este tema y debemos dejar de lado la política partidista para cumplir con todos nuestros votantes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks.

#### CONGRATULATING BREVARD HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' CROSS COUNTRY TEAM

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Brevard High School boys' cross country team for winning the 2A State championship. This is the second 2A State championship title that this team has won in the last 3 years.

The Brevard Blue Devils dominated the championship race with a score of 45 points, scoring well ahead of the runner-up team. The Blue Devils also had three runners finish in the top 10.

I congratulate the Blue Devils. Their recent success is a testament to the countless hours of training, hard work, and a genuine passion for athletics and a quest for knowledge.

They have each made western North Carolina proud. May the future bring many more years of success as we continue to celebrate the legacy of their exceptional cross country program.

#### NATIONAL HOUSING CRISIS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, on this first day of December, I rise today to point out that the people's House went the entire month of November without passing a bill to tackle our Nation's housing crisis.

Communities on the California central coast are ranked as some of the most expensive places in our country to live in.

I was sent to this Chamber by my constituents to enact policies that will help lower these skyrocketing prices.

Congress needs to help increase the availability of affordable housing options. We need to reform and expand programs that provide housing assistance for working families and veterans like I have been pushing for. We need to invest in our communities for solutions that are helping those experiencing homelessness.

Mr. Speaker, there are bills we could pass today to lend a hand, including bipartisan ones that I have helped write.

By all means, let's keep pursuing baseless impeachment inquires or defunding the salaries of Cabinet members that we don't agree with.

Mr. Speaker, please, let's start governing.

#### RECOGNIZING THE TIOGA CENTRAL AND WAVERLY HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAMS

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Tioga Central and

Waverly High School football teams. They are making history.

This is the first time two football teams from upstate Tioga County, New York, are competing simultaneously in State title games.

Tioga football's resounding 63-16 victory in the semifinals marks their third consecutive State title game appearance.

With 39 consecutive wins, they are not only chasing a third straight State championship but also their fourth title since 2015.

Just as remarkably, Waverly football's dominant win of 42-0 in the semifinals earned them a spot in the Class C State final for the first time in school history.

This historic moment is a testament to the dedication of our student athletes, the guidance of their coaches, and the unwavering support of our community.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating these young athletes, their coaches, their families, and the entire Tioga County community.

#### RECOGNIZING TOM LAMBERT

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

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the lifetime of service and the exceptional work of Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County CEO Tom Lambert.

Tom is a true public servant who has made a difference for all of us in Houston. For more than four decades, Tom has worked at METRO.

Focusing these four decades on the safety of METRO riders, his improvements to the system will benefit them for years to come.

His ability to listen to riders led to streamlined services with improved schedules. His leadership led to the completion of an additional 15 miles of light rail in 2015, and his commitment to moving Houstonians in new ways helped pave the way, literally and figuratively, for bus rapid transit.

Tom has demonstrated his dedication to keeping our community informed, engaged, and moving forward. Tom exemplifies the very best of Houston: innovation, collaboration, vision, and leadership.

I send sincere thanks to Tom for his work and for his commitment to our community and congratulate him on his retirement.

□ 1130

#### COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM IN AMERICA

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitism has reared its ugly head on our

very shores. It should be extinguished entirely.

Over the past few weeks, we have seen anti-Semitic demonstrations take place across the country. Turn on the television, open a newspaper, or go online and you will find a litany of examples. As Rabbi Moshe Hauer mentioned in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development recently, the plague of anti-Semitism has afflicted the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Rabbi Hauer's assessment, and it is incumbent upon us all to stand with the Jewish community, push back on anti-Semitism wherever and whenever it crops up, and rid our country of this scourge.

Anti-Semitism has no place in any civil society, especially the United States—not now, not ever. I include in the RECORD a letter of November 14, 2023, from Rabbi Moshe Hauer.

ORTHODOX UNION,

New York, NY, November 14, 2023

RABBI MOSHE HAUER TESTIMONY—HOUSE EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT “CONFRONTING THE SCOURGE OF ANTISEMITISM ON CAMPUS”

MR. CHAIRMAN, RANKING MEMBER, AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE: My name is Rabbi Moshe Hauer. You have heard and will hear individual stories of what life has been like for Jewish students on America's university campuses. I would like to share with you the bigger picture. While I come to you today as the Executive Vice President of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, also known as the Orthodox Union, the largest organization serving Orthodox Jews in the world, in this testimony I hope to represent the entire Jewish community, every Jew and every Jewish student on a university campus. Across the entire Jewish communal and religious spectrum, my colleagues and I work together daily to address the plague of antisemitism that has struck us all, a plague that is afflicting our beloved United States and that is firmly centered in its institutions of higher learning.

I want to share with this committee three points.

1. The Orthodox Union, along with Hillel, Chabad, and others, directs significant resources and attention to our future, to our youth and students. Each of us places full-time educators on university campuses who seek to provide a Jewish home for those students on campus, creating a place where they can come to connect warmly to their faith community, to celebrate the Sabbath and holidays, to socialize, study, eat, and pray together with their religious peers, and to be supported and guided by nurturing mentors.

Today, this entire community is in crisis. Jewish students on campus no longer need a home; they need a fortress. Religious educators who have dedicated their lives to providing students with warmth, nurturing, and a stronger Jewish identity find themselves thrust into the role of trauma counselors and security advocates, even as they experience their own trauma and fear. On too many campuses, everywhere they go the students and their mentors encounter protests, chants, and signs that express the goals of eliminating the world's one Jewish state and killing Jews and that baselessly accuse Jews of unspeakable crimes. These messages of hate and intimidation come from students

and from professors, and they are tolerated if not encouraged by many university administrators.

Decades ago, Jews were not admitted to these universities. Now they let us in and expose us to hostility and intimidation. Which situation is better?

Every person in this country should have access to the resources that the federal government provides. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination based on shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics, applies to all programs and activities supported by federal financial assistance, including—of course—both public and private universities. Those universities are tolerating and often supporting faculty and student groups whose vocal and virulent antisemitism create discriminatory environments inhospitable to Jews.

The Jewish experience on campus is a case study in Title VI non-compliance. This hearing you are holding today gives us hope that the fundamental right to religious liberty enshrined in the Bill of Rights will be honored and enforced on these campuses.

2. This intimidation and hostility are experienced by every Jewish student, Orthodox, Reform, or unaffiliated, whether identifiably Jewish or not. The 17,000 non-Orthodox teens that we serve in American public schools through our Jewish Student Union clubs experience it as well, as the plague of brazen and appalling antisemitism has spread from higher education to public middle and high schools. It is, however, important to highlight for a moment the specific experience of Orthodox students on campus.

The Orthodox Jewish students on close to 100 campuses. Orthodox Jews are usually very visibly Jewish, identifiable by religious symbols and recognizable modes of dress, and have not surprisingly been the victims of a significant share of the antisemitic hate crimes. This makes life very difficult in the university environment where the term “Jew” is an epithet, where anger and hate are a constant, and where protection and support from the administration are absent. Our kids cannot circulate anonymously on campus and cannot go undercover by tucking the star of David necklace into the shirt or by removing the kippah. Their strictly kosher diet and their desire to practice their faith mean that if they want to eat or pray—which they do daily—they need to go to the center for Jewish life on campus. The Orthodox Jewish student on campus is a walking billboard: it is me, the Jew, the one you harass, demonize, and intimidate. I can neither run nor hide.

3. Finally, it is critical that you understand how what is happening in our universities is being experienced by the broader Jewish community. The Jewish people are the people of the book, and that book teaches us both our values and our story. We know our history, and it goes like this: For more than three thousand years we have lived in a great many places, where we thrived and contributed to the host country, and then we had to leave. Sometimes we were expelled by laws and sometimes by fear, by the sheer danger of the hate that grew towards us. That is our story. We always end up having to leave.

We all believed that the United States was different.

The current tsunami of antisemitism that has surged in the United States and that is centered in its universities has shaken us. And now, as of October 7th, I do not know if there is a Jew that has not said to themselves, “here we go again.”

We never imagined it. Five years ago, one year ago, if someone would tell you or me that we would be sitting in this room discussing this kind of open, blatant, and vile

antisemitism in the United States of America, we would have thought they were crazy. America is different. America was supposed to be different. We were sure that this land of liberty and civil rights would be the exception to the rule. Jews would never be chased from here, neither by law nor by fear. That is what we thought.

We are less convinced of that now. We are shaken, we are doubting, and we are wondering, “here we go again.” We are worried for the present, for the safety of our kids on campus. And we are worried for our future in this country and—quite frankly—for the future of a country whose institutions of “higher learning” appear utterly incapable of teaching basic values, right from wrong.

You are our elected leaders.

It is in your hands to restore our faith that America will be the exception to the rule of our history.

It is in your hands to clarify that the true blessing of free speech does not include speakers who “direct a threat to a person or group of persons with the intent of placing the victim in fear of bodily harm or death.”

It is in your hands to ensure that Title VI is respected and enforced, as those same hateful words that may be chanted in our streets may not be part of the government funded environments of our educational institutions that have tragically become discriminatory environments inhospitable to Jews.

It is in your hands to take a step back and to consider the big and frightening picture of what this country is starting to look like. For us in the Jewish community, America is feeling a lot less free and a lot less safe. We need you to restore our sense of freedom and safety in this blessed land.

Thank you for your attention today and for your actions tomorrow and in the future.

RABBI MOSHE HAUER,

Executive Vice President, Orthodox Union.

#### EXPANDING PASSENGER RAIL IN NORTHERN OHIO

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the U.S. Department of Transportation to develop intercity passenger rail corridors across our Great Lakes region from Chicago to Cleveland.

We in the Great Lakes noticed the attention that the Department of Transportation pays to the East Coast and the West Coast, but please don't forget our Great Lakes northern region.

Take a look at the I-80/90 corridor and think about that already being carved into the landscape. Use it.

In 2021, I joined other Great Lakes Members of Congress to urge Amtrak to retool its connect on U.S. 2035 Plan, which then excluded improvements to the Cleveland to Chicago corridor. To this day, we continue to lack daytime passenger rail service across this highly congested rail corridor and, of course, constricted Chicago. Boy, does it need help.

Our constituents deserve better. Leaders from the U.S. Department of Transportation; State, local, and regional Departments of Transportation; planning agencies; advocacy organizations; labor unions; and the private

sector have joined together to address this longstanding constriction to economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask DOT: Please see us, hear us, help us.

#### HONORING STUDENTS FROM THE NATIONAL YOUTH ORCHESTRA

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride to honor five students from my district who were selected to perform at the 2023 National Youth Orchestra.

Each summer, Carnegie Hall's Weill Music Institute invites some of the brightest young musicians from across the country to travel the world in a free, multi-week training residency with world-class professional musicians.

The National Youth Orchestra participates in a platform to shine on a global stage. Today, I recognize five of the 2023 National Youth Orchestra participants from my district.

They are Beckett Miles from Jacksonville; Leila Warren from Ponte Vedra Beach; Nelson Keakopa from St. Johns County; and Luke Valian Mahobay from Jacksonville; and Theodore "TJ" Shistle from Jacksonville.

Thanks to countless hours of practice, determination, and dedication, these students have participated in performances which have touched the hearts of audiences around the world and demonstrated an outstanding proficiency, grace, and commitment to excellence.

On behalf of Florida's Fifth Congressional District, congratulations to each of these young musicians for their contribution to the field of music performance, their passion for their craft, and their willingness to share their talent.

Mr. Speaker, our community is behind them as they go on to accomplish their future accolades.

#### DENOUNCING THE RISE OF ANTI-ARAB HATE AND ISLAMOPHOBIA

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

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, three young college students went for a walk in Burlington, Vermont, during their Thanksgiving break: Hishem, Kinnaan, and Taahseen spoke Arabic to one another and wore keffiyehs.

They were shot.

Whether or not this meets the legal standard for hate crime, we know this was a hateful act. The recent rise in Islamophobia in this country has led to deadly violence. It is deeply disturbing and frightening.

I want to be clear: Leaders in this very Chamber need to unequivocally denounce the rise of anti-Arab hate and Islamophobia. Words matter.

We need to lead with our values—community and acceptance—rather than hatred and fear.

No one should be targeted because of their ethnicity or their religion. It has no place in Vermont. It has no place anywhere. We all have a part to play. We need to speak up and stand with our Muslim neighbors and friends now.

The eyes of the Nation are on Vermont, and we want to make it absolutely clear to Americans that we will stand against this kind of violence and hate.

#### CELEBRATING GARDEN CLUB OF ORANGE PARK ON THEIR 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, do you know what always works when you are in trouble with your spouse?

Flowers.

Science has shown that not only do flowers make us happier, but they have a strong positive effect on our emotional well-being.

No stranger to the power of flowers are the dedicated members of the Garden Club of Orange Park.

Since 1948, this club has bloomed into a staple for the beautification of northeast Florida, and today I rise to commemorate them on their 75th birthday. Let's all agree, they don't look a day over 29.

Through countless projects, they have nurtured a spirit of environmental awareness and sustainable living. The fruits of their labor include actual fruit trees at homes built by Habitat for Humanity and gardens at local elementary schools.

The Garden Club has not only enriched our physical surroundings, but it has also transformed public spaces, creating havens of tranquility and beauty for all to enjoy.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, I thank each member, past and present, for their commitment to environmental preservation and exceptional community service. I trust that their legacy will continue to bloom for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is a joy to wish the Garden Club of Orange Park a happy 75th anniversary.

#### NEGOTIATING SUCCESSFUL RELEASE OF HOSTAGES

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues for their unanimous support of H. Res. 793, which passed the House this week.

I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution, calling on Hamas to immediately release the 240 hostages

taken during the horrific and inexcusable attack on Israel on October 7.

In the 55 days since the attack, I have met with family members of many of the hostages. They have experienced unimaginable pain and loss but still have hope, and so do I.

I am deeply grateful to President Biden and his administration for their leadership in negotiating the vitally important deal to release many of the hostages. I am relieved that 110 of them have been reunited with their loved ones, but we won't rest until every single one is home safely.

#### PA-17 WPIAL CHAMPS HEAD TO PIAA CHAMPIONSHIPS

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

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, plenty of my colleagues claim to have the best high school football. Of course, they will be wrong because western Pennsylvania is second to none.

When Jack Lambert took his place in the Hall of Fame, he called folks in western Pennsylvania a proud, hard-working people who love their football and their players.

It was true then, and it is true today.

It doesn't matter if we are cheering for the Steelers or for WPIAL contenders under the Friday night lights. On any field, football is serious business in western Pennsylvania.

I congratulate the WPIAL champions from my district for bringing home the hardware: Beaver Falls, North Allegheny, and Aliquippa High Schools.

A special congratulations to the Quips on their record 20th WPIAL title victory.

Good luck this weekend to all the teams battling it out for the State playoffs and for the State title.

#### RECOGNIZING OUR BRAVE SERVICEMEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our brave servicemembers and their families.

America's veterans have sacrificed so much for our freedom, and for that, I am deeply grateful, but words alone are not enough.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to honor the pledge we made to military families and ensure that they get the benefits that they deserve.

When my constituent, Shirley Thomas, suddenly stopped receiving her VA benefits, she reached out to my office for help. In just 3 short weeks, my team was able to restart Shirley's benefits and secure back payments for the months that she missed.

I recently visited Shirley and reiterated my commitment to helping military families like hers, because supporting our servicemembers means supporting them long after they come home. It means providing them with safe, affordable housing; expanding educational opportunities to help veterans pursue their career goals; improving home care services for elderly veterans; and so much more.

Today, and always, I will keep fighting to do just that.

#### WORLD AIDS DAY

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on World AIDS Day, as we remember tens of millions of beautiful souls we have lost around the world to HIV and AIDS and pray for their families.

Over the last two decades, our fight against HIV/AIDS in the world has been transformed by PEPFAR, made possible by the leadership of President Bush and bipartisan support in Congress.

It was my privilege to be a leader in this fight on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee where we secured more than \$100 billion for PEPFAR to support its life-giving work.

I salute President Bush and Mrs. Bush for their ongoing attention and commitment to this issue. I have traveled to visit the clinics in Africa and have been told by people there that PEPFAR gave them hope. They would never have been tested if they didn't think there was an opportunity for something to improve their lives. They lost the stigma of being tested positively by having hope given to them.

I thank President Bush and Mrs. Bush for helping address the issue with their Pink Ribbon Campaign.

As we go forward, let us hope that this body will soon reauthorize PEPFAR for what it means.

During the COVID crisis, I spoke to the head of the World Health Organization and asked him if PEPFAR helped. He said, yes, the science, the distribution of drugs, the network that was created was all very helpful to us in the fight against COVID, especially in Africa.

Again, thanks to President Bush for his leadership at the time. I told him at that time that I am with you as long as it is big. He made it big, and he has made it constant; and we salute him and are grateful to him for that.

This year's World AIDS Day is fraught with meaning because our nation faces the imperative of reauthorizing PEPFAR HIV is very resourceful: it keeps adapting to survive, and so must we. I join so many of my colleagues and voices across the world in calling on Congressional leaders to make reauthorizing PEPFAR a top priority as we negotiate government funding legislation. Today, and every day, America must demonstrate to the world that

we remain fully committed to building an AIDS-free generation, with health equity and justice for all.

#### SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE

(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, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base is getting it done for the American people.

As a proud U.S. Air Force veteran and member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I toured the base recently to better understand its challenges, including the possibility of losing F-15E Strike Eagles without any replacement. That is why I led a bipartisan letter encouraging House Members not to strike the Strike Eagle provision from the NDAA.

During my visit, I saw a deteriorating child development center, and this is unacceptable. While at the facility, a 4-year-old came up to the window and waved, smiling, which touched my heart.

Mr. Speaker, we must advance military construction projects like this and join in the work of the bipartisan Quality of Life panel, because this 4-year-old, her friends, and her family deserve nothing less. This is the best way that we can wave back to the children of our military families.

#### ST. JUDE MARATHON

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, will be the beginning of the weekend of the St. Jude Marathon in Memphis, Tennessee.

Memphis is a city that has much to be proud of, but one of our most prideful things is we are home to St. Jude Children's Research Hospital. It cures cancers, tries to cure the ones that they haven't yet, and gives children with cancer opportunities to be treated free of charge.

This week, there will be a St. Jude marathon through Memphis; a big race with thousands and thousands of runners who are there to raise money for St. Jude and to bring attention to what St. Jude does for the children of the world.

I praise St. Jude, and I am appreciative that they are in Memphis. I encourage everybody to support them and to contribute.

I am not supposed to say that but I did.

□ 1145

#### THE RIGHT OF THE STATE OF PALESTINE TO EXIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 9, 2023, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, proud to be an American. Why shouldn't I? My foreparents suffered 240-plus years of slavery to make it great. I am proud to stand in the House of Representatives today as a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, and unafraid.

Today, as a liberated Democrat, I will address two issues. Both relate to votes that I have taken. The first issue that I will address deals with affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. The second issue that I will address will deal with my having voted "present" in the case of the expulsion of Mr. SANTOS.

With reference to the state of Palestine's right to exist, I am proud to tell you that on Tuesday of this week, we took a vote. Mr. Speaker, that vote on Tuesday of this week related to the State of Israel's right to exist. I believe that Israel has a right to exist. I believe in and support Israel's right to exist. I support Israel. I have done so since I have been in this Congress. Since I have been here, we have voted on more than \$50 billion in support to Israel. You will find that I have voted for all the help to Israel.

I have spoken on the floor in support of Israel, and I think that my record is very clear on where I stand when it comes to the State of Israel and its right to exist. I voted for the resolution. It was reaffirming Israel's right to exist. I voted for it. I, in voting for it, realized that it did not have something that I thought we ought to have, and that is a statement indicating that Palestine has a right to exist.

Palestine has been there, the inhabitants. In 1948, when the U.N. decided that it would, by way of resolution, recognize two states in the area, the area referred to was Palestine. I believe that Palestine, with Palestinians, has a right to exist, as well.

Today, I will file the resolution that I shall read. This resolution is one that affirms the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Now, I understand that Palestine is not a state currently, and I address that in the resolution. This is not calling for an immediate styling or having Palestine become a state. That is not what the resolution is about. It is recognizing the right to become a state.

In this Congress, we have said that there should be a solution to the concerns related to Israel and Palestine, and it is a two-state solution that we have talked about.

The President of the United States has said that there should be a two-state solution. I believe that there should be a two-state solution. If there is going to be a two-state solution, and if we are going to fund Palestine and Israel as we have—we have sent many dollars in humanitarian aid to Palestine—and if we are going to continue



to do this, and if I am going to continue to vote for these funds, I want Congress to be on record saying that there ought to be a State of Israel and that we can have a state for Palestinians, as well.

I shall file the resolution, and I shall file it immediately after I finish this statement about Palestine as well as about my vote of "present" on Mr. SANTOS for his expulsion.

First, let's talk about Palestine. Here is a resolution. It reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. In the House of Representatives, Mr. GREEN of Texas submitted the following resolution, which was referred to a proper committee.

The resolution itself reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Whereas, this resolution may be cited as the original resolution affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist;

Whereas, the people, the Palestinian people, are inhabitants of the land of Palestine;

Whereas, in 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 181, which called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states.

I may have said 1948 earlier. This corrects my earlier statement.

Whereas, on May 14, 1948, President Harry Truman issued a statement recognizing Israel as an independent state; and

Whereas, on November 28, 2023, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 888 reaffirming the State of Israel's right to exist by a vote of 412 "yeas," 1 "nay," and 1 "present."

I voted for the resolution. I believe Israel has a right to exist. I believe that the House of Representatives should be on record indicating that Israel has a right to exist.

Continuing: Now, therefore, be it resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time—important words, "and at a future time"—to become a nation-state.

Some things bear repeating: Resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a nation-state.

If we believe in a two-state solution, then we want to have this resolution approved by the House of Representatives. We believe that Israel has a right to exist as a nation-state. We say we want a two-state solution. This but only codifies what we say.

The President of the United States has said there should be a two-state solution. You can't have a two-state solution without at some point recognizing the fact that Palestine has to be one of the two states.

Again: Resolved that the House of Representatives affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a nation-state.

That was number one.

Number two: Recognizes the two-state solution as the only solution that will secure a lasting peace in the region.

Number three: Rejects calls for Palestine's destruction.

Just as we reject calls to have Israel destroyed, we should reject calls to have Palestine destroyed or the notion of a Palestinian state to become a non-existent notion.

I believe this resolution is going to make a difference. I am going to file this resolution. I believe that the resolution ought to go to the proper committee. I will ask the chairperson of the proper committee to bring the resolution to a vote within the committee or to process it out of the committee. I will leave it to the chair and the ranking member to make the decisions as to how this will work.

I want it to come to the floor for a vote. I would like to see it have the opportunity to come to the floor for a vote with the same level of expediency that the resolution supporting Israel's right to exist had in coming to the floor to a vote. There was expediency exerted. There was expediency that allowed that resolution to get to the floor not within months, not within weeks, but within days. I ask that this resolution receive the same level of respect.

We have to respect Israel's right to exist, and we have to respect Palestine's right to exist. Both have the right to exist. The resolution makes it possible for the Congress to go on record.

I also believe this. Aside from filing the resolution, I believe that there are three things that have to happen for Palestine to become a state. The first thing that has to happen is there has to be a recognition that Palestine is a state, obviously, but by the House of Representatives, that it should become a state by the House of Representatives. Number one, Palestine has to become a state, and the House of Representatives has to recognize this right for Palestine to become a state.

Number two, I think that the Israelis should recognize Palestine's right to become a state, but I don't think that we have to allow them to determine whether Palestine should become a state. I think that Palestinians have the right to have statehood without having the Israelis determine that they should become a state.

Number three, just as in 1948 when President Truman recognized Israel as a state without the consent of the Palestinians, I believe that a President of the United States can recognize Palestine as a state without the consent of Israel. I don't think Israel has to give its consent for Palestine to become a state. Just as we recognized Israel without Palestinians giving their consent, we can do the same thing for Palestine without Israel giving its consent. I believe that Palestine has a right to become a state, and I don't believe that Israel has the right to veto the Palestinian's right to become a state.

I will file this resolution, which will put the House on record. If the House

goes on record, I will continue my efforts to push for a two-state solution as a resolution to the concerns between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

ON THE MATTER OF THE EXPULSION OF GEORGE SANTOS

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, now, to my second point, the issue related to Mr. SANTOS.

I voted "present" today. Let's look at what the vote count was. The vote count was 311 "yeas," 114 "nays," 2 "present," and 8 persons not voting.

I am proud of my vote. I am proud to say that I voted "present."

It is not unusual for me to stand alone. I know that it takes a certain type of courage to stand alone. I pray that I will continue to have that type of courage because I believe that the House has made a mistake today in going on record and expelling Mr. SANTOS from Congress.

I believe it was a mistake because I believe that the process itself will now lend itself to whatever 290 persons believe to be a reason to expel a person, that becomes a reason for a person to be expelled. Whatever 290 persons can agree on, you can now expel a person. I don't think that that process is a fair and just process.

Let me continue by saying this. Yes, the House had every right to do what it did. Yes, constitutionally, the House had the right to do what it did. Constitutionally, it did, yes.

□ 1200

Yes. So it is not about whether I differ with the Constitution or differ with whether the House had a right to do this. I believe that we have the right to do things, but I believe also that there are better ways to do things, and there are some ways that we should not do things.

Prior to today, it has been said many times, that five persons have been expelled—two for having committed crimes and three for having been associated with the Confederacy and its rebellion against the Union, the United States.

I think that what we have done today opens ourselves up to having persons expelled for things that a good many people are not going to agree with. Let me explain.

To expel a person without a bifurcated system, in my opinion, is a mistake. Impeachment has a bifurcated system. The House indicts by way of impeaching, and then after impeaching, the Senate has the trial to convict or not. Impeachment itself is not bifurcated, the process to remove the President from office is bifurcated. Impeachment is one part of that process. That is the function of the House.

The process then provides that if you want to continue and remove, you have to get the consent of the Senate. That is the bifurcated process to remove a President from office.

I think we ought to have a bifurcated process—notwithstanding our right not to. I think we ought to have a bifurcated process to remove a person from Congress.

There is only one way for a person to get to the Congress of the United States of America, unlike the Senate, where you can get appointed. With the Congress, you have to be voted in by the people. That is why this is the people's House. This House belongs to the people of the United States of America, and membership herein belongs to the people of the United States of America.

In the infinite wisdom of those who were the codifiers and the writers of the Constitution, they have given us the authority to remove people. We can do it. I just happen to disagree with the way we are doing it. By doing it this way, without having the actual House of Representatives give some deference to the judicial system, we no longer have another party in the process.

We, in fact, now have become the investigators, the judges, the jury, and the prosecutors. We have every right to do that. I don't quarrel with anyone who would say to me, as a retort, well, we have the right to do it. We have every right to do it.

The question is: should we do this?

I don't think so. I think it was a mistake. I think that at some point in the future we are going to see the error of our ways. This decision is going to haunt us. You cannot appeal a decision of the House of Representatives, which is why we ought to have the judicial system involved.

If a person commits a crime, it is brought to our attention, there is a conviction, it comes from the judiciary, and we then act on that conviction. We have now a second party involved in the process such that that party can deliberate and make a decision without the House of Representatives having influenced that decision. I think that is a fair way to remove people from the House of Representatives.

I don't think that we should do it with the House being the investigators, the judge, the jury, and the prosecutor. I believe that justice itself would be better served if we used the system that we have been using. Utilizing the system that we have put into place today I think is going to create some serious concerns for us in the future.

What can we do?

We can impose sanctions. We can remove persons from their committee assignments. We can publish our findings. We can allow the citizens—which every 2 years they have the opportunity to determine who will serve them—allow them to have the vote and let them determine whether or not they want a person—that I might deem unfit to serve—give them the opportunity to do so.

I think that a bifurcated system works better than the system that we have now installed in the House of Representatives.

I believe, given the history of my country that I love—again, I love it because my foreparents suffered for 240 years as enslaved persons. We built it. We made it great with the economic foundation of mothers and fathers. Yes, I love my country.

I also understand that my country is not always fair to people of color. It hasn't been. To this day there are times when it still is not. I think people of color are going to regret having cast that vote because we are the most vulnerable—we are the most vulnerable in this country.

Let me say this: we are among the most vulnerable because I recognize that there are other persons who are vulnerable, as well. We are among the most vulnerable in this country. Among the most vulnerable. There are others who are vulnerable, as well. I don't want to disrespect the truth.

I know that we suffer because I understand how we got here and why we were brought here. We were brought here to be permanent—240 years of slavery is evidence of the desire to have permanency. We were brought here to be permanent subservient—with no power. Subservient. Having the mindset of a person who wants to serve and wants to please.

A permanent subservient. Powerless. There was a desire that we never have the power that we have today. I am grateful for the way the country has metamorphosed to this point. I am sorry it took so long. I regret that there was ever an institution of slavery. A permanent, subservient, powerless cast of people.

I would also add this: identifiable. Identifiable, permanent, subservient, powerless cast of people. Identifiable. There is your evidence. Identifiable. Subservient—240 years, plus, of slavery. A powerless, subservient cast.

Born into slavery. Died as a slave. That 240 years has not been erased. No, we don't have slavery in the country today, but we still have some minds that have not metamorphosed into the future. We have some people who still disrespect people of African ancestry.

They disrespect people of African ancestry as evidenced by certain things they do or choose not to do. Disrespect. Disrespect because they will respect people who rebelled against the country, who fought to maintain slavery, who were in the Confederacy, they respect them.

In 1956, this Congress gave them a Congressional Gold Medal, the enslavers, the Confederate soldiers. To this day, the Congress doesn't have the respect that it should have for the enslaved. No Congressional Gold Medal for the enslaved. The Congressional Gold Medal is for the enslavers.

THE RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING IS  
DISRESPECTFUL TO PEOPLE OF COLOR

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, persons of color suffer greatly in this country. Disrespect. Disrespect because right across the street there is a building, the Russell Senate Office Building, that disrespects people of color.

Richard Russell was a self-proclaimed white supremacist. He was a Senator who fought the Voting Rights Act and voting rights in general. He was a Senator who was a coauthor of the Southern Manifesto. He was a racist and a bigot.

His name is on the building. We have been asking now for a long time that his name be removed from the building. We find that the Senate, in its wisdom, has not done so. That is disrespecting people of color. Yes, we are among the most disrespected in this country.

There is evidence and the Senate could remove Russell's name from that building tomorrow if they wanted to. It is not a question of whether there is a way, it is a question of whether they have the will. I marvel at how Senators' offices are in a building named after a racist and a bigot. I don't go into the Russell Senate Office Building. I respect myself enough to stay out of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Those Senators, they decide the timeline. Until they decide that it should be removed, it won't be removed. It will be removed. When it is removed, I am going to acknowledge it and be grateful for it. I will tell them that it took too long. It is just taking too long. Why?

They claim they can't remove a racist's name from a building paid for by taxpayer dollars because they can't agree on a new name. We have solved that problem. Simply call it what it was before it became the Russell Senate Office Building, and that was the Old Senate Office Building.

Let it become the Old Senate Office Building. Then take as much time as you like to conclude that it should have some worthy person's name. I have no name to offer. I only want that you do justice by Black people the same way you do justice by other people.

The same way you make an issue of an injustice against others. Make the same about television time available to criticize the Richard Russell Office Building and the name being on it. It is a symbol of national shame.

Why is it that CNN, MSNBC, FOX, all of them, why have they not made a big to-do of it?

One of the reasons may be because they report the news from the Russell Senate Office Building. Yes, they are all located right there near the rotunda where Richard Russell has a statue in his honor.

The Richard Russell Office Building is a symbol of national shame, and the news outlets ought to be ashamed of themselves to tolerate it and then participate in it—to participate in the perpetuation of the maintenance of the name on the building. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Yes, people of color are among the most disrespected. Yes, we are.

□ 1215

That is why I am concerned about this vote that we have taken today. It is because we are among the most disrespected that I am not sure our transgressions are going to be judged the same as the transgression of a person of a different hue. I believe that a

person of a different hue can get a better decision than a person of color in this country.

We see it all the time in the courts of the country. I was a judge of a small claims court for one-quarter of a century. I was a litigator. I saw the injustices as they took place that I could do nothing about. This is an injustice that is in its infancy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I warn you that you are going to see the injustice take place. You will see it. Maybe what I am saying today will help to prevent it. I doubt it. I doubt it.

There are some Members that I am very much concerned about now that this vote has been taken. I am very much concerned about them because there are people here who would want to remove them from office if they could without having committed a crime because of positions that they have taken, policy positions. That would be an injustice.

So, I am proud of my vote. I voted the way I voted for reasons that I have called to your attention, Mr. Speaker, but a review does not hurt.

One, Mr. Speaker, the only way you get here is if the people elect you. You can't be appointed to the House of Representatives. It is the people's House. The people send us, and the people ought to remove us unless we have committed a crime and been adjudicated as such by a proper court.

Two, the decisions are not appealable. There is no appeal from our decision.

Three, the process itself is not bifurcated any longer when it comes to removal from the House of Representatives. Prior to today, it was bifurcated, and the judicial system would have the opportunity to judge a person and determine whether the person was guilty of a crime. Finding such, that could then be used by the House of Representatives to expel the person.

We have taken the judicial system completely out of the process. We have become judge, jury, prosecutors, and investigators.

The truth is, whatever 290 of us can agree on, then that is a reason to expel a person. If 290 of us can agree on a reason, then that is it. Given the way we have entrenched ourselves now into teams, I don't favor the consequences that I can foresee.

We have allowed ourselves now to become, unfortunately, a House of Representatives where this discord is no longer just a difference of opinion about policy. It has become a means by which we can come to the floor to remove a person from office, a person who was sent here by people who voted. I am much afraid for what we are going to have to regret because of what we will do as time progresses.

So, I shall now move to the well of the House and file my resolution affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist. I have read it to you, Mr. Speaker. Some Members may be tuning in late, so I will read it again. This is the resolution.

I voted for Israel's right to exist on Tuesday of this week. I think we ought to vote similarly for Palestine to have a right to exist, as well.

It reads:

Affirming the state of Palestine's right to exist.

Whereas, this resolution may be cited as the Original Resolution Affirming the State of Palestine's Right to Exist;

Whereas, Palestinian people are inhabitants of the land of Palestine;

Whereas, in 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 181, which called for the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states;

Whereas, on May 14, 1948, President Harry Truman issued a statement recognizing Israel as an independent state.

Mr. Speaker, I support Israel as an independent state. That is not here. I support Israel as an independent state. This is a sidebar comment. I have supported it. I will continue to support it.

I supported Israel by voting for more than \$50 billion in funds, but I did it because I thought we were moving toward a two-state solution. I did it because I thought a two-state solution was the will and the desire of the House of Representatives.

I have reached a point now where I have to know. That is what I thought. Passage of the resolution will give me the certainty I need. The absence of the passage of the resolution will cause me to have a great deal of consternation about how I am going to approach votes in the future.

To continue:

Whereas, on November 28, 2023, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 888, reaffirming the State of Israel's right to exist—I voted for it, and I would vote for it again and again and again if given the opportunity—by a vote of 412 “yeas,” 1 “nay,” and 1 “present.”

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives, one, affirms Palestine's right to exist and at a future time to become a state.

Mr. Speaker, I accentuated at a future time because I am making it clear to those who would make the argument that this is about saying that Palestine should become a state today. That is not what I am saying. “At a future time”—I don't know when in the future, but I do believe that we ought to have that as our goal since we have stated that we want a two-state solution.

Number two, recognizes the two-state solution as the only solution that will secure a lasting peace in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this. There are some people who want a one-state solution. They mouth “two state,” but in their hearts, they want one state. I am not one of them. What I say is what I mean.

Those Members who say they want a two-state solution and really want a one-state solution, well, this is not for them. This is for people who want a two-state solution.

Number three, rejects calls for Palestine's destruction.

Mr. Speaker, there will be people who will say that nobody is calling for Palestine's destruction. They are wrong. I was on C-SPAN just this week, and there was a caller who called in and who literally, by virtue of the way he presented his argument, wanted to see the destruction of Palestine, the destruction of Palestine. I am not for that. I am not for that. I am not for what is happening with the destruction of Palestine currently. For us to conclude that it is okay to destroy Palestine is an absurdity.

How could we possibly approve of the destruction that we see and the lives that are being taken? How could we approve of that? I don't approve of it. If others can approve of it, the killing of babies, I don't approve of it.

Yes, you have a right to defend yourself, but you have to do it in a just fashion. To perform, if you will, an unjust act in the name of justice is still an injustice. You cannot clean it up by saying it is a just act. Your actions themselves speak for you.

Killing babies is not a just act, especially when you have declared war on Hamas and you end up killing Palestinian babies. It was wrong to kill Israeli babies. What Hamas did was dastardly. The way they did it, it is impossible to even imagine a human being doing it, but you can't complain about killing innocent Israeli babies and then decide: Well, it is okay. The Palestinian babies are just collateral damage. They just happened to be in the wrong place.

What is wrong with us? I will not support the killing of these Palestinian babies. I will not support the destruction of Gaza. I pray that this country will come to its senses.

How long can this go on?

Mr. Speaker, I am always honored to have this opportunity. I don't know how much longer I will have it. There are a lot of people who don't like what I say who have the power to change rules.

As you have seen today, Mr. Speaker, they can change the rules. So, I never know when I will be giving my last speech from this podium, but as long as I have the opportunity to give a speech, I am going to speak truth to power, but more than that, I am going to speak truth about power.

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

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF NANCY PALMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Nancy Palmer, a longtime Grass Valley resident and community leader who passed away peacefully in her home in September.

Nancy was born in Jacksonville, Florida, on September 18, 1938, and later went on to attend Jacksonville University. She and her husband, Captain Gary H. Palmer, moved to western Nevada County in the 1970s where she soon began devoting her time and talents to many local organizations, including Music in the Mountains, Hospice of the Foothills, Grass Valley Rotary, and Sierra College.

Having grown up in a college town, Nancy recognized the value of community-based education. In 1994, she was elected to the Sierra College board of trustees, a position she was to hold for an impressive 29 years. During her tenure, Sierra College opened two other campuses, serving thousands of students in Placer and Nevada Counties.

Trustee Nancy Palmer's passion for community colleges extended beyond the Sierra College district. She coordinated professional trainings for fellow trustees at the State level, coaching student trustees from the 73 California community college districts across the State.

As the keynote speaker for numerous Sierra College commencement ceremonies, she often inspired students with her motto: Action Requires Courage.

Nancy's accomplishments demonstrated a life lived with action and courage. She will be lovingly remembered by the people she influenced and for her invaluable contributions of time and effort to her community.

The Sierra College board of trustees wrote that they are deeply saddened to announce the passing of their valued colleague. President of the board, Paul Bancroft, stated that Nancy cared about the college so much and her dedication as the representative for Nevada County was evident in everything she did.

Willy Duncan, Sierra College's superintendent and president, spoke for his colleagues by stating that Nancy was a wonderful colleague, but more than that, she was a dear friend, and he will miss her greatly.

On behalf of the Third Congressional District and the United States House of Representatives, I offer heartfelt condolences to Nancy's colleagues; her sisters, Judy Butler Good and Roberta Butler; her daughter-in-law, Lisa Palmer; her nephew, Rodney Shawn Scott; and the countless other lives that she touched.

□ 1230

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
DOW HOTEL AND DOW VILLA MOTEL

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to mark and celebrate the centennial anniversary of the Dow Hotel and Dow Villa Motel located in my district in Inyo County, California.

Over a century ago, in 1923, Walter and Maude Dow built the hotel to provide lodging for big movie crews that were filming the stunning eastern Sierras.

Today, the hotel still hosts guests from the film industry as well as tour-

ists visiting the nearby natural attractions.

In 1957, Joe and Verna Bonham and Ivan and Barbara Turner took over ownership and played an integral role in expanding the hotel's facilities.

With their leadership, an adjacent motel named "The Dow Villa Motel" was built and additional sections were constructed, expanding the hotel's overall capabilities by more than double, from 20 rooms to 50.

With a core value of being a family-operated hotel, it was then sold in 1978 to the Bonham's daughters, Lynne Bunn and Jeanne Willey, who still own it today.

The historic Dow Hotel overlooks a magnificent view of the Sierra and Mt. Whitney and is well known for its hospitality and charming atmosphere.

It holds countless memories and historical significance for the area, having hosted producers, directors, and stars, including Clayton Moore, John Wayne, Roy Rogers, and many more.

One hundred years ago, Walter and Maude Dow saw the economic benefit of having movie business in the region and responded by building what has become a treasured and iconic landmark for the Lone Pine community.

Therefore, on behalf of the United States' House of Representatives and the Third Congressional District of California, I am honored to recognize the Dow Hotel and Dow Villa Motel for their 100 years of contributions to our local economies and participation in the business community.

CONGRATULATING THE ROCKLIN HIGH SCHOOL  
FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize and congratulate the Rocklin High School football team on winning the CIF Division 2 Sac-Joaquin Section championship game.

The Rocklin Thunder football team beat St. Mary's Rams last week by a score of 17-6, winning their first section title since 2009.

Rocklin head coach Jason Adams set this goal for his team and the defense led by defensive coordinator Greg Benzel was ready for the challenge.

The stout Rocklin defense stopped the Rams in the red zone time and again, forcing four turnovers in the process.

The offense took advantage of the defensive stops and turnovers when Rocklin quarterback Reeve Slone scrambled for a 44-yard touchdown run to put his team up 14-6 just before half-time.

From that point, Rocklin never looked back. Coach Adams' team was able to achieve this because of their commitment to a common goal and every member of the team playing their role.

However, the job is not quite finished for the Rocklin Thunder. They will be hosting Grant Union High School tonight in the Division 2 NorCal Regional game.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Coach Adams and his team the best of luck in their pursuit of a State championship.

Go Thunder.

DISCOVERY OF A SECRET, ILLEGAL CHINESE  
BIOLAB IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, following the discovery of a secret, illegal Chinese biolab in California, I requested an investigation by the House.

The Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party recently released its highly disturbing report, and I commend the select committee and Chair GALLAGHER for getting to the bottom of many of the disturbing facts in play here.

The lab was run, we have learned from the committee's report, by an international fugitive from China named Jesse Zhu.

After running various state-connected companies in China, Mr. Zhu moved to Canada where he set up dozens of corporations to steal valuable American intellectual property and unlawfully transfer it to China.

The Supreme Court of British Columbia found he committed fraud on an epic scale, resulting in a \$330 million judgment.

He then fled to America, assumed a new alias, David He, and set up several more companies, including the one behind this lab in Reedley, California.

The lab was discovered nearly a year ago when a code inspector came upon a suspicious warehouse in Reedley. There was a hose out of the back of the warehouse. Inside, she found many Chinese nationals wearing white lab coats, glasses, masks, and latex gloves, along with thousands of vials of biological substances, and 1,000 mice. Some of the mice were actually found dead.

It was later learned that these were transgenic mice, genetically engineered to catch and carry the COVID-19 virus.

A further inspection found blood tissue and other bodily fluid samples and serums, along with thousands of vials of selected biological material. Some of the vials were labeled with the names of infectious agents, while others were labeled in a code that was never deciphered.

At first, the CDC refused to investigate. They even hung up on local officials who had called to ask for help when they learned about the lab.

The local Representative got involved and, finally, the CDC did do an inspection. They found at least 20 potentially infectious agents, including HIV, tuberculosis, and the deadliest known form of Malaria. Yet still, the CDC didn't bother to test any of these samples. They simply accepted what was on the label even if the contents were unknown. They didn't test it even if there was a code they couldn't decipher.

The committee said this made it impossible for them to fully assess the potential risks that this specific facility posed to the community.

The select committee report calls this decision by the CDC "baffling." Later, local officials discovered a refrigerator in the lab that had eluded the CDC that was labeled "Ebola."

Now, while the supposed purpose of the lab was to sell various medical test kits, all this company actually did was buy counterfeit kits from China and then resell them here in the United States. Thus, as the committee put it, there was a lack of apparent legitimate or even profit-motivated criminal motive in the operation of the illegal facility.

This raises the question: What was it there for? What was the true purpose of the facility? This is especially pressing to ask given that Jesse Zhu, the illegal operator of the lab, was receiving unexplained payments via wire transfer from Chinese banks.

The report further notes that no one knows whether there are other unknown biolabs because there is no monitoring system in place.

It is very clear that we need further congressional action and investigation here. First of all, we need to examine the role of the CDC, which seemed to completely drop the ball here.

Why did the CDC ignore local officials about the lab for months? Why didn't they test any samples from the thousands of vials with unclear or coded labels? How did they manage to miss a freezer that was actually labeled "Ebola"?

Then we also have to ask: How did this lab escape detection? How many more such operations could there be in California and across the country? Finally, we need to learn more about what was the lab's true purpose. Why was it there? What was it planning on doing? Why is it that its operator was receiving so much money from China?

These are questions that we need answers to. Furthermore, it has also become clear that we need to update the monitoring and regulatory framework, which clearly has gaps because a facility like this was allowed to go undetected. In fact, it relocated several times and potentially posed a serious risk to the surrounding communities.

I commend the work that was done by the select committee, and we need to move forward to make sure that we are doing everything we can to get to the bottom of what happened here and to keep our communities safe.

\$6 BILLION PERMANENTLY OFF-LIMITS TO THE  
IRANIAN REGIME

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the passage of the No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act, which I am a cosponsor of, which overwhelmingly has passed the House of Representatives and would permanently freeze \$6 billion that the administration had released to Iran.

Now, this was released by the administration as part of a deal. They claim the money was only for humanitarian purposes, but we know full well that money is fungible; that Iran is very skilled when it comes to sanctions evasion, and that Iran is funding terrorist organizations and their proxies on a massive scale, including Hamas and Hezbollah and, thereby, posing a serious existential risk to the State of Israel.

In fact, FBI Director Christopher Wray recently confirmed that Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism and has even attempted attacks on American soil. By imposing immediate, mandatory sanctions on foreign financial institutions that facilitate the transfer of these restricted \$6 billion in funds covered under that deal, the No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act will ensure that that money remains permanently off-limits to the Iranian regime.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the House came together on a bipartisan basis to pass this legislation that I have coauthored. I urge the Senate to give it prompt consideration and for the President to sign it.

GOVERNOR NEWSOM IS MAKING CALIFORNIA  
WORSE

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, last night there was a televised debate between the Governor of my State, Gavin Newsom, and the Governor of Florida, Ron DeSantis. It was set up as sort of a comparison of the two States' models of governments and which is the better model for other States and the country to follow.

While it is true that Florida has done quite well in any number of areas, really the comparison could have been made between California and virtually any other State in the country. When it comes to the key metrics of economic performance and quality of life, California is the very worst State in the country.

Despite that, we have a Governor who went on television and, in fact, has for months, for years now been trying to claim that California is, in fact, leading the Nation. He has said time and time again that California is a model for the Nation. He has said the future happens first in California.

Indeed, it is true that the current administration here in Washington has copied any number of California's policies and, in fact, has elevated many of California's officials—Julie Su, the Acting Secretary of Labor held that position for Governor Newsom; Vice President KAMALA HARRIS; the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra was formerly California's attorney general; Alejandro Mayorkas; Douglas Parker, the head of OSHA.

Therefore, a matter of great national concern is to really look at the facts of what is happened in California. What the Governor tried to do last night, Governor Newsom, that is, was to present a complete alternative reality using false, misleading, in some cases simply delusional, assertions about the true nature of life in California.

I wanted to take a moment today to correct some of the misstatements that were made by Gavin Newsom in last night's debate.

First, there was a discussion of the California exodus, and the Governor refused to acknowledge the fact that people are leaving our State in record numbers. In fact, he even asserted that

more people are moving to California than to Florida.

Here is the reality: Between 2019 and 2022, 1,044,000 people left California, while 737,000 people moved to Florida. So many people have been leaving California that the State literally did run out of U-Hauls. In fact, for three straight years, California has led the Nation in U-Haul departures.

What is so notable about this is that prior to the Newsom Governorship, California has gained population every year since our founding in 1850.

We have always been the State that people want to come to, the State where anyone could get ahead, and now we are the State that so many people can't wait to leave behind.

It was just this complete abrupt change in the trajectory. California continued to grow and then Governor Newsom took office and suddenly we are leading the Nation in departures. We have the highest out-migration rate in the country.

In fact, it is even more stark when you look at San Francisco, the city that Newsom was the mayor of, the city represented by Congresswoman PELOSI, the city that Vice President HARRIS is from. This is a city that is on the verge of collapse.

Those aren't my words. That is the editorial page of the San Francisco Chronicle. This is a city where businesses are leaving seemingly every day, citing the intolerable conditions in that city.

□ 1245

In fact, San Francisco right now is losing residents faster than any major city in United States history. That is right, San Francisco is losing residents faster than even Detroit when Detroit went bankrupt.

What is Newsom talking about when he actually said on live television that there are more Floridians going to California than vice versa? The reality is that, actually, if you do a direct comparison, over 50,000 more people went to Florida than came to California.

What Newsom did is very revealing. He said that the rate of Californians per capita moving to Florida is lower than vice versa, but he did an asymmetrical comparison where he used per capita numbers when looking at the State that people are departing from but used raw, absolute numbers looking at the State that they are going to.

If you were to do it in a symmetrical manner, whichever way you did it, whether you did raw numbers on both sides or per capita numbers on both sides, of course, California does much worse. It is, after all, the State that has the highest outmigration rate in the country.

The Governor's willingness to go on television and distort the numbers so egregiously, use this completely nonsensical trick where you make it per capita on one side but not the other, shows how willing he is to mislead both

his own constituents and people throughout our country.

A second area where major correction is needed is when it comes to the handling of COVID-19. Here is the reality: California had the single most draconian and longest-lasting lockdowns in the country when it came to school shutdowns, business shutdowns, church shutdowns and when it came to mask mandates, vaccine mandates, and vaccine passports. Each and every step of the way, California had the highest level of government coercion and control.

Yet, the Governor gets up in last night's debate and says, no, Florida was the lockdown State, which is truly boggling to the mind that he would stand up and, with a straight face, make that assertion. Yes, it is true that basically every State, right when COVID arrived, did take drastic measures when we didn't know what this was in those first couple of weeks in February and March. The difference is some States learned and others did not.

Some States looked at the evidence on how best to handle this public health challenge and acted accordingly in an evidence-based manner that placed trust in their citizens, whereas California never learned and continued a state of emergency until 2023.

In fact, if you look at a direct comparison, Newsom last night claimed that Florida shut down schools, but in fact, if you look at the facts, Florida ranked third out of the 50 States in getting kids back to school. Where did California rank? California ranked 50 out of 50 States in getting kids back to school. We had the longest-lasting school shutdowns in the country. Those harms are going to be with us for a long, long time.

Newsom was saying one thing last night, but just a few weeks ago, he actually admitted—this is a Politico story—we would have done everything differently when it came to COVID. He tried to make excuses. He said we didn't know what we didn't know, but that is not true. It is not a matter of hindsight being 2020 because so many other States—in fact, every other State—managed to do a better job.

Here is the truly perverse thing: Despite everything California did to take away the rights of its citizens, to shut down beaches, to shut down youth sports, to keep kids out of school, many of whom have not come back, by the way, despite the incalculable damage to our young people, to our businesses, to our democratic institutions in the name of public health, California wound up with an excess mortality rate exceeding the national average even though we had the benefit of a relatively young population.

That is why the recent Lancet study actually says California had one of the highest standardized COVID mortality rates in the entire country. Yet, Newsom, of course, ignores that. He simply accuses Florida of having tens of thousands of lives die unnecessarily,

completely ignoring the actual facts of the situation.

The reality is, having lived through Newsom's one-man rule in California, at every turn, the Governor prioritized getting himself in the headlines and rewarding special interests over the health and well-being of Californians, and this continued for years. In fact, things got worse as time went on.

Even after he had set the record for how long he was keeping kids out of school, on October 1, 2021, the Governor announced that California was going to be the first State in the Nation to impose a student vaccine mandate for COVID-19. It applied to all grade levels, public and private schools alike, with no exceptions for religion and personal belief.

He was the first Governor to announce such a mandate. He boasted about being the first Governor to announce such a mandate, and he wound up being the only Governor to announce such a mandate. At the beginning of this year, he formally withdrew the mandate without it ever going into effect. Even the World Health Organization now says COVID vaccines are not needed for healthy kids and teens.

A third issue that came up in last night's debate was homelessness. Newsom claimed that he has spent unprecedented resources on homelessness and has gotten 68,000 people off the streets. The first part is true; the second is preposterous. California has spent \$20 billion on homelessness over the last 5 years, and the problem has gotten worse. We spent all that money, and it has gotten worse.

In recent years, homelessness in California has increased 15 times faster than the country as a whole. Half of all the unsheltered homeless in the whole country now live in California. Newsom himself acknowledged that Californians are "wondering where the heck all their tax dollars are going." If you want to do a direct comparison, the Federal Government has counted over 171,000 homeless in California last year versus 25,000 in Florida.

Newsom himself even said when he was in Los Angeles recently that it looked like a third-world country. San Francisco, frankly, is much worse, with the one exception of a couple of weeks ago when the President of China came to town when there was the AIPAC conference with world leaders in San Francisco. The New York Times wrote a story talking about the makeover and beautification efforts that were hastily undertaken. The Times article said: "San Francisco had the air this week of teenagers frantically cleaning up after a house party with their parents on the way." The Times continues, "Perhaps the most obvious change has been seen at the Speaker Nancy Pelosi Federal Building. For 2 years, . . . people regularly used drugs in an adjacent alley. Most have seemingly disappeared in a poof."

The Times reported that San Francisco added more than 200 beds to its

shelter system just for the arrival of President Xi from China. It notes: "Some residents have wondered why San Francisco has been able to fix its notorious problems for the President [of China] but not for them."

A fourth issue that came up in the debate was education, and Newsom tried to claim that California is outperforming Florida. He cites fourth grade reading and eighth grade math. Here is the reality: Number one, California spends a lot more money than other States. California spends 45 percent more per pupil on K-12 education than Florida does. What do we get in return for that money? California has the lowest literacy rate in the country.

There are 800 California schools where 75 percent of students do not read at grade level. California's most recent eighth grade reading scores are the worst of any State in the country that was measured. Our fourth grade reading scores are the third worst in the country.

That is why it was unbelievable to me when, last night, Newsom asserted that our eighth grade reading scores are somehow indicative of good leadership when we literally have the worst eighth grade reading scores in the country.

Poor students, by the way, fare worst of all in California's education system. California has ranked 49 out of 50 States in achievements for students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch.

The issue of gas prices also came up last night, and Newsom tried to say that Californians are being ripped off. I agree with him on that. Californians are being ripped off. He said we are being ripped off by the oil companies. The reality is that California has by far the highest gas prices of any State in the country.

Right now, gas prices in California are \$1.58 above the national average, so if the oil companies are ripping us off, why are they ripping us off so much more in California than any other State?

There are a few reasons why gas prices are so much higher in California. Primarily, it is that we have the highest gas tax in the country. We have all kinds of regulations and fees that add much more to the price of each gallon. The reality is that we are getting ripped off, but we are getting ripped off by our own government.

By the way, what do we get in return for this, for paying the highest taxes on gas in the country, money that is supposed to be going to transportation? California generally ranks as having about the second or third worst roads of any State in the country, which people will be sure to tell you if you drive through California for any reasonable stretch of time. That is the sad reality of Gavin Newsom's California—highest taxes, deepest potholes. We sacrifice the most and get the least in return.

The issue of taxes also came up last night, and Newsom tried to somehow

slice and dice the data to say that California for certain people has a lower tax burden than Florida does. The reality is this: California has the highest income tax in the country and the highest gas tax in the country. When you look at the overall tax burden in California, total taxes are \$10,167 per person. In Florida, it is about half that, \$5,406.

Newsom wanted to talk about the working class. Well, here is the reality of life in California for the working class.

California has the third highest cost of living in the country.

California has, by far, the highest gas prices in the country, thanks to an extremely regressive set of taxes.

California has the third worst inequality in the country.

California has the highest poverty rate in the country. California leads the Nation in the real poverty rate.

Last year, California had the lowest wage growth in the country. Wages went up less in California for workers than in any State in the country.

That is why the California exodus, when you think of all the people leaving, is not just people who are well off who want to escape the very high income tax rates. It is actually working people who just cannot afford to get by in our State, who are not allowed to pursue their career, who are unable to buy a home because of skyrocketing home prices. That is the reality of life in California under Gavin Newsom.

There was also discussion of the economy, both nationally and in California. Newsom said something very interesting. He said that the Nation's current unemployment rate is a sign of a booming economy. He said the unemployment rate is pretty low nationally. That is the link that he drew—low unemployment rate, good economic stewardship.

The first response to that is that that is a mirage on a national level, given that the workforce participation rate has gone down significantly. Any small business owner will tell you that they are still to this day having a very hard time getting workers.

However, if we take Newsom at his word that the low unemployment rate is a sign of good leadership, well, then we can look at California's unemployment rate to assess his leadership. As it turns out, California has the second highest unemployment rate in the entire country.

If you want to do a direct comparison between California and Florida, just to pick one example, since January 2019, employment has increased by over a million—1,031,000—in Florida. It has declined by 85,000 in California.

If you ask Californians themselves how they think the economy is doing, 71 percent of Californians expect bad times economically over the course of the next 12 months. That is a majority of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents who believe the economy is on the wrong track and expect things are going to get worse in California.

As a final point, the Governor was just a few months ago boasting about how California had a surplus the last couple of years and how that was, again, a great sign of positive governance, of economic stewardship. Well, you didn't hear him mention that last night, and the reason why is that California has a massive deficit right now, a \$31.5 billion deficit, which is out of step with what was happening last year. Right now, Florida has a \$17.7 billion surplus.

Now, when it came to immigration and the border, Governor Newsom made a truly outlandish claim. He said that it is Congress and not President Biden that is responsible for the border crisis. Let's just look at the basic facts.

From 2014 until the beginning of the Biden administration, there were only 4 months out of that whole span of 6-plus years that had more than 100,000 encounters along the southern border, so only 4 months out of all those months for 6 years where there were more than 100,000 encounters at the border. Under the Biden administration, there were 29 straight months with more than 100,000 border encounters.

□ 1300

If you ask what changed between the time before Biden took office and the time that he did take office, it wasn't Congress. The President had a Democrat Senate and a Democrat House for the first 2 years of his administration.

The total numbers now are: 6.4 million illegal crossings at the southern border. There have also been 1.7 million known got-aways.

In fiscal year 2021, this administration set a record for illegal border crossings. In fiscal year 2022, the administration broke that record. In fiscal year 2023, the administration broke that record.

This is another area where Newsom's tendency to grasp for some distorted factoid and paint a completely alternate picture of reality is on display.

When he did his initial interview with Hannity in June of this year, Newsom said, no, no, no. Biden is doing a great job at the border. Look, this month illegal crossings are down 70 percent. There happened to be a blip in June.

You didn't hear him use that talking point last night. Why is that?

In subsequent months, illegal border crossings have been off the charts.

In September of this year, we set an all-time record for a single month where we had 269,735 crossings across the southern border.

There was also mention of sanctuary policies in the debate last night. Newsom has tried to mislead everyone about the extent to which he supports sanctuary policies and exactly what these policies do.

I will read to you something he said in 2018. Newsom said, "Let me be clear: California is a sanctuary State." That

is what he said. "Let me be clear: California is a sanctuary State."

He said, We have defied and resisted the Trump administration's policies at every turn. We will do it again.

Newsom even signed a law closing ICE detention facilities that was overturned by the Ninth Circuit as unconstitutional.

The evidence is extremely clear that we have a crisis at the southern border, that this administration has refused to take the actions that are necessary to address it, and that Governor Newsom has made the situation worse in our own State.

For him to now blame Congress or to blame the House specifically is beyond belief when in the House we passed the Border Security Act earlier this year, the most robust border security bill that has passed the House in a long, long time—maybe ever—which would make a huge difference in the crisis at the border, which is contributing to the fentanyl crisis, to human trafficking, and is introducing potential national security and terror threats into our country.

In the House of Representatives, we passed that bill. What has happened since? It has been gathering dust on CHUCK SCHUMER's desk in the Senate. It is well past time for action on this issue.

The ninth area where the Governor completely misled in last night's debate was when it came to crime. He said crime is down in California.

In fact, FBI data shows violent crime in California increased 13 percent the last few years as it has gone down across the country.

California cities have seen an epidemic of retail theft. In San Francisco this year a string of high-profile businesses, Whole Foods, Nordstrom, Anthropologie, have left the city, and they basically all cited the crime problem as the reason. In Los Angeles, police have advised residents not to go outside wearing jewelry.

In fact, if you want to do a direct comparison between Florida and California when it comes to crime, there were a few figures cited in the debate last night.

One that is very interesting and is very telling is when it comes to motor vehicle theft. Now, why is this telling? Because in California, a lot of the crime doesn't even go reported because it won't be prosecuted.

You have all these laws that have basically legalized retail theft, have legalized open air drug use, like Prop 47. We have other laws like Prop 57 that have downgraded a lot of offenses. We have cities that have defunded the police.

We have these so-called progressive prosecutors like George Gascon who Newsom initially appointed as D.A. of San Francisco who refused to prosecute even those crimes for those laws that are on the books.

You have businesses that will be robbed in broad daylight and they will

just let the people go. They won't bother to file a police report because they know that nothing is going to happen.

You can't actually look at reported crimes as an accurate gauge of how much criminal activity there is.

When it comes to vehicle thefts, that is different because there is usually an insurance claim. We get realistic, accurate numbers when it comes to motor vehicle thefts.

How does that compare? In 2022, reported vehicle thefts per capita were 250 percent higher in California than they were in Florida.

That will be no surprise to anyone who has been to San Francisco. The advice often is you should roll down your windows when you leave your car parked so at least they won't break them when they are trying to break in.

I want to mention one final issue, the 10th and final issue—although there are certainly plenty of others—where the Governor of our State gave a completely false and misleading characterization about what life is like in California, and that is on the issue of personal freedom.

The Governor called California the freedom State, but the Cato Institute rankings of freedom in the 50 States ranked California as the 48th most free State. Florida ranked second out of the 50 states.

Just look at what happened, of course, during the COVID lockdowns where California had the highest measure of government control and the least measure of personal choice and freedom.

It began long before that. California has every year continued to erode the rights and freedoms of its residents.

When it comes to economic freedom, for example, Newsom signed into law AB 5, which has deprived countless people of their right to earn a living, effectively abolishing independent contracting for many professions in California.

Now, his former Secretary of Labor, Julie Su, is trying to do the same thing through the regulatory process here in Washington, D.C.

Look at things like bans on straws, bans on gas-powered leaf blowers, bans on chopsticks and other single-use food items, bans on even gas-powered vehicles by 2035, if Gavin Newsom has his way.

Every day in California, we wake up wondering what is going to be banned next. For Newsom to somehow claim we are the freedom State is a delusion of the highest order.

I will close by making this point, though, Mr. Speaker, which is that California, I believe, is the greatest State in the country.

It is the State where everyone has always wanted to come to. We have everything to offer, and there are still so many great things about our State: the amazing people and diversity of cultures and world-leading companies in California. We have great universities in our State, as well.

We have so many great things going, and we still have parts of our State that people are moving to and want to live in—specifically, my district.

My district is one of the few parts of California that is growing right now. In fact, while the State as a whole has for three straight years led the Nation in U-Haul departures, the largest city in my district, Roseville, was second in the Nation in U-Haul arrivals.

Why is it that people are moving to our area while they are leaving other parts of California?

The reason is that we have fought against the failed governance model that Gavin Newsom has tried to impose on the State as a whole and that is in an especially advanced stage in places like San Francisco.

During the COVID years, we fought in every way we could to allow our communities to follow the evidence and allow citizens to live their lives as they saw fit.

We ended up getting our kids back to school sooner than any other part of California. We ended up having an unemployment rate in Placer County, for example, that was about half the rest of the State.

What was the result of that? We actually ended up having way better COVID-19 outcomes than the State as a whole because we focused on the things that would actually make a difference on disease control rather than population control, rather than gratuitously taking away the personal freedoms of our residents.

Even before COVID and now after—at least as we have moved away from that paradigm—we continue to try to chart a different course than California as a whole has taken.

We support small businesses in our communities rather than attacking them. We support law enforcement in our communities rather than defunding the police and rather than contributing to a false and misleading narrative, a negative narrative about our law enforcement.

We have led the entire Nation in going after fentanyl dealers and charging them with murder, so we don't have more of our kids continuing to get victimized.

When Gavin Newsom says California is a model for the Nation, nothing could be further from the truth. I am very proud to represent communities that do represent a model for how California as a whole can once again become the Golden State.

I encourage everyone who watched the debate last night to take a close look at the facts because there is an increasing tendency for California's failures to become national failures.

As a Representative from California, I will be fighting in every way I can to make sure that that doesn't happen.

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

#### THE GAZA STRIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the current situation in what used to be called the Gaza Strip.

I believe looking at American polls prior to the invasion that took place in October, there were too many segments of the American population who—insofar as there were disagreements between, I guess, what we will call Gaza and the State of Israel or Palestinians in the State of Israel—sided with the Palestinians. They felt somehow Israel was doing something wrong.

I still run into some of these people when I go back to my office across from the Capitol building because sometimes they are out there protesting or making some sort of a case.

I believe that all Americans should realize that—until what they did to themselves about a month and a half ago—that the people in the Gaza strip were fortunate to belong in an area right adjacent to Israel proper.

First of all, in that part of the world, there is probably nowhere where you would want to live more than Israel.

As far as basic freedoms, which we take for granted in the United States, those freedoms are available to people living in Israel, and the freedoms, to a large extent, came from a Western culture which was brought to that part of the world as Jews moved there from other areas around the Middle East and from Europe beginning before World War II.

Indeed, that land was largely a wasteland. It is interesting to read Mark Twain's comments when he toured that part of the world. It was largely a wasteland until the great Jewish migration.

At that time, it not only eventually benefited the Jewish people who came to Israel from Europe, but it benefited the Arabs, as well.

Indeed, between about the year 1900 and right prior to World War II, as the number of Jewish people in that area went up from about 100,000 to 600,000, the number of Arabs in that area moved up from 600,000 to 1.3 million people.

In other words, Arabs from the other areas around Israel, as more people moved there from Europe, they moved there as well to take advantage of the economic opportunity that became available as more Westernized people moved in there, and that continues to this day.

I don't think it is reported enough in the press that many people from Gaza who were working worked in Israel, and the economic opportunities in Israel were far greater than the economic opportunities in Gaza.

Indeed, I believe something like a person who left Gaza to work in Israel may be making four times as much than if they tried to stay in Gaza and work for the employers in Gaza. Again, they are very fortunate that Israel was right next door.



□ 1315

Now, why is Gaza not well off in other ways? Because they are getting huge amounts of aid from around the world, and particularly aid from European countries.

Well, the problem is that the people they have elected, Hamas, grabs that money. There are people who are billionaires, not because they have done anything worthwhile or thought of a new way of doing something or opened a chain of hotels or whatever, the people who are connected with Hamas have become billionaires, taking money off the top that comes from the very poor people who are living in the Gaza Strip.

Indeed, they not only take the money and skim the money off the top, but they then don't recycle the money in the Gaza Strip. They live in Qatar, or maybe they live in Turkiye. This is what Hamas does to the local people.

By the way, I think if you look around the globe, the biggest difference between the prosperous countries and the not prosperous countries, is are the people that are running the not prosperous countries, are they siphoning off the money themselves?

In other words, we have a crooked government.

Nobody could not say that when left to their own devices, the Gazans have elected themselves, Hamas, I guess I would say, a very crooked government, which insofar as they don't have as much money as they would like, it is caused by who they have elected themselves.

Remember, I think there is some feeling out there that Hamas is this fringe group that happens to be running Gaza. Hamas was elected overwhelmingly by the Gazans.

Now, we can feel sorry for people that make such a stupid choice but we also have to say that you are guilty, to a certain extent, by electing such people.

Another indication of how lucky you would think people should be for being in that part of the world, in a region on the beautiful Mediterranean Sea, is that the people from all around the globe are coming not just to be next to Israel, but to be right in Israel.

One of the things that surprised me, as you read about what is going on, is that apparently some of the hostages were from Thailand. I thought, why in the world are hostages from Thailand being grabbed by these horrible Hamas militants?

Well, I looked into it. People, particularly from Thailand or Philippines but sometimes from other places as well, are coming from halfway around the globe to live in Israel.

Now, ask yourself that. I assume that these people from Thailand or Philippines are not Jewish, but, nevertheless, things are so good in Israel that people come from halfway around the globe, from Philippines and Thailand, to work and live in Israel.

If you know anybody who says how horrible it is and how the Israelis are

picking on these people, ask them: If it is so bad there, why do these people come from all over the globe to work there?

Another point to be made, Gaza is not the freest country in the world, but they live next to Israel, which probably has as many freedoms as anywhere else in the world, as far as freedom of speech, freedom of religion; things are about as open as they can be, which is another benefit. They have an example of a modern western state right next door.

The next thing I think the public should consider as far as these poor people on the Gaza Strip, is apparently no one else in that part of the world will take them.

I mean, there are all sorts of people who feign interest in them, who feign sympathy toward them. How many of these people are being invited into, say, Qatar, a Muslim country, in that part of the world that presumably needs people to do work.

I have a feeling there are a lot of people in Qatar from Asia as well doing the work. Why don't the Qataris say, oh, you are wonderful people. Why don't you come to our country?

What do the Egyptians think? The Egyptians are right next door.

If this is such a sympathetic group of people, why don't the Egyptians say: Come here, we can easily take another 1 to 1.5 million people in Egypt. We can even take over that part of the world.

You don't hear that from the Egyptians or from any of the other Muslim countries in the region.

You don't hear Turkiye saying we want these people.

You don't hear Syria saying we want these people.

You don't hear Iran, who is funneling some of the money toward this terrorism, you don't hear them saying we want these people.

So before you have too much sympathy for this group—and I guess we can have sympathy for all human beings—you have to ask yourselves, why do none of these other Arab-Muslim countries in that part of the world, or in the case of Iran, a Muslim country, why aren't they taking them?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the American people who are out there, the demonstrators and such, before saying how horrible things are for the people in Gaza, look at the history. Look and see the benefits that these people are getting from living next to Israel. Look and see the number of Arabs who moved to what is today the Gaza Strip, or Israel as a whole, moved there from other parts of the Middle East after—not before—but after the big Jewish migration that took place in the first half of the last century.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION ACROSS OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the next issue I think is the most important issue facing the United States today, and that is the illegal immigration across our southern border.

We have new numbers that came out for October. Again, we hit records, as far as the number of encounters, of people coming across the southern border.

The most recent number shows 241,000 encounters at that border, up from 1 year ago at 231,000; up from 2 years ago at 164,000; up from 3 years ago at 72,000 when we had a different President.

So again, we hit records on the number of people who are coming here.

We have 71,000, what they call got-aways, which are people who come across the border and do not check in with the Border Patrol.

Most people who come across the border ask for asylum. They don't need asylum but at least they ask for it, and there is a perfunctory check on things.

We hit another near high of almost 62,000 got-aways who won't even check in and ask for asylum crossing the southern border.

This is a disaster waiting to happen. You are permanently changing America. Our forefathers anticipated that America be a country for a moral and religious people. We have no idea what the background of these people is.

Are they going to stand with our Constitution?

Do they understand the natural ideal that our forefathers wanted independent people coming here, not people who would view the government as giving something to them?

So I would hope that the press—it is still not too late—think about running a banner headline rather than focusing on some of the less-important issues around here to educate the American public. We, again, are getting record numbers in our country.

By the way, when you look at migrants who stay here—not just encounters, but who stay here—they are estimating 235,000 in October; 1 year ago, it was 178,000.

So what is that? That is about a 35-percent increase over the last year. Doesn't that merit a banner headline given that Joe Biden isn't hardly kicking anybody out?

After Joe Biden became President 2 years ago, that number was over 100,000; 3 years ago, at the end of President Trump's term, it was about 19,000.

So from 3 years ago in October when we had a different administration, we have gone up by about a factor of 12. Think about that; 12 times as many people crossing the border in October 2023 compared to October 2020.

Mr. Speaker, America had better wake up or we are going to lose this country. People back home tell me that we must let some immigrants in here; we are a country of immigrants.

I attended a ceremony in Milwaukee of over 250 people, in one day, in one city, who were sworn in to be new citizens. We are now swearing in over 1 million people a year that do things right, that are vetted, that we know are not breaking the law, that almost always have jobs; sometimes they have opened a business by themselves.

It is not like America is saying you could never get into America or we are so xenophobic, that we are no longer a country of immigrants. No. We have over 1 million people every year coming here, that are sworn in. That is not including children who are born here to parents who are non-immigrants. Right now our government wrongly is saying that if you are born in this country, you are automatically an American citizen.

It is also not counting the tens of thousands of people who are on visas that have expired. So we are flooding America with new people.

America, again, has to remember, and I want to repeat those figures one more time, in this October compared to three Octobers ago, we have about 12 times as many people coming into this country and being let in across the southern border than were in that short time period ago. I encourage America to wake up.

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, one more issue I would address so that the American public is aware, is that when we put together what I think a normal person would refer to our budget, we try to break it into 12 different parts, which we call appropriations bills.

The Senate has an appropriations bill—we are trying to get them to break things up—and the House has separate appropriations bills, and then negotiations take place between the House and the Senate to see what the new law will be.

Now, there are a variety of the things that the press should be paying attention to in these bills. A lot of things are details with regard to spending.

We have to remember that right now we are borrowing about 22 percent of our budget. I hope all Americans are paying attention as debates are being had over every item in these appropriations bills, as to whether we are spending more or spending less.

Remember, the reason we have these high interest rates, which are making it almost impossible for young people to buy a house, is because of inflation, which comes from excessive spending. That is one thing for people to look up.

The thing I want to address today is that in almost every one of these bills there are efforts being made to increase the number of bureaucrats who are involved in diversity.

In other words, people are going to get into these agencies, and rather than doing something productive, they are going to stick their nose in and say when we hire somebody, when we promote somebody, when we fire somebody, whether we give somebody a grant or not, one of the things to look at is that person's ethnic background.

This is an incredibly divisive thing to do. These people add nothing—by the people, I mean the diversity bureaucrats—add nothing to the wealth of our country, but they do create divisiveness because they begin to cause people to view themselves not as Americans

first, but they begin to say: What are you going to give me because my ancestors are from Africa? What are you going to give me because my ancestors are from Southeast Asia? What are you going to give me because my ancestors are from India? What are you going to give me because my ancestors are from Bolivia?

That is a very dangerous thing to do. Also, this is something that is going to result in kind of lower standards, because rather than just saying we are going to hire the best person for the job, you begin to look at people's ancestry.

There are going to have to be debates on every one of these 12 bills in which we say, are we going to let new committees into these bills? Are we going to let new bureaucrats into these bills who use their power to judge people solely by ancestry?

I hope that, again, our press corps, which is sometimes missing the boat on these issues—and in there, I will even include the conservative press corps—I hope that they pay attention as each one of these bills move forward.

Since now is the time of year when we appropriate money, in other words, now is the time of the year when we spend money, are we going to allow an increase or any of these diversity bureaucrats to be hired?

Nowadays, you are getting college degrees and these sorts of things saying I want to spend my whole life trying to divide people and trying to cause Americans to view themselves as an ethnic group; an ethnic group from a country where not only their parents or grandparents or maybe even great-grandparents have never stepped foot in.

I talked about Bolivia. Are they going to identify as Bolivian, even though they may have never seen Bolivia, their parents never saw Bolivia, their grandparents never saw Bolivia, or even though they have never spoken a word of Spanish? Maybe they think it is important that they be part of this agency so they can bring a Latin-American viewpoint to this agency or represent other Latin Americans. It is just a completely ridiculous idea.

□ 1330

That idea is taking root. I think the only reason I would push it is if I wanted to destroy America, if I wanted Americans to turn to a fight between each other or a contest between each other, which is sure to end in the weakening of America.

Again, we ask the press corps to pay attention as each one of these appropriation bills moves forward and educate the American public, which is what the press corps should be doing, educating the American public on the degree to which we are hiring more people to judge new hires, promotions, and grants or government contracting, who gets the contract based on their ancestry.

Those are three new issues that I hope the press covers.

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

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Acting Clerk of the House, reported that on November 16, 2023, the following bill was presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 6363. Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2024, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 4, 2023, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Celeste Maloy

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2448. A letter from the Special Projects Coordinator, Rural Development Innovation Center, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guaranteed Loanmaking and Servicing Regulations [Docket No.: RBS-20-BUSINESS-0016] (RIN: 0570-AB07) received November 27, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2449. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRL0, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restrictions on Overhaul and Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards (DFARS Case 2021-D021) [Docket: DARS-2023-0006] (RIN: 0750-AL39) received November 29, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2450. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Clearing Agency Governance and Conflicts of Interest [Release No.: 34-98959; File No.: S7-21-22] (RIN: 3235-0695) received November 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-2451. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2023-0076; FRL-10663-02-R9] received November 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2452. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Exemptions to Improve Resiliency, Air Toxics Thresholds, PM 2.5 and Ammonia Emission Statement Reporting, and PM 2.5 in Air Permitting [EPA-R02-OAR-2023-0252; FRL-11034-02-R2] received November 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2453. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0597; FRL-11426-01-OCSP] received November 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tolpyralate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0198; FRL-11435-01-OCSP] received November 21, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: RSAT cast 23-9456, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: RSAT cast 23-9908, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under Section 3(d)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act with accompanying documentation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 803. A bill to direct certain financial regulators to exclude representatives of the Peoples Republic of China from certain banking organizations upon notice of certain threats or danger, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-286 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1568. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to protect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6068. A bill to allow a period in which members of the clergy may revoke their exemption from Social Security coverage, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1161. A bill to accord securi-

ties issued by the International Development Association the same exemption from the securities laws that applies to the securities of other multilateral development banks in which the United States is a member; with an amendment (Rept. 118-289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1109. A bill to amend the Bank Service Company Act to provide improvements with respect to State banking agencies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 839. A bill to require the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to advocate for increased transparency with respect to exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 554. A bill to deter Chinese aggression towards Taiwan by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to publish a report on financial institutions and accounts connected to senior officials of the People's Republic of China, to restrict financial services for certain immediate family of such officials, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 540. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to pursue more equitable treatment of Taiwan at the international financial institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 510. A bill to require the United States Governor of, and the United States Executive Director at, the International Monetary Fund to oppose an increase in the weight of the Chinese renminbi in the Special Drawing Rights basket of the Fund, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1807. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate rules with respect to the electronic delivery of certain required disclosures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1042. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 803 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. MCCORMICK (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 6542. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 6543. A bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of prices for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 6544. A bill to advance the benefits of nuclear energy by enabling efficient, timely, and predictable licensing, regulation, and deployment of nuclear energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Foreign 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 Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BERA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 6545. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the physician fee schedule under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BENTZ:

H.R. 6546. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to allow certain activities to be carried out with regard to certain fish held in captivity or a controlled environment; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. OGLLES, and Mr. NEHLS):

H.R. 6547. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from implementing the Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Colorado River Valley Field Office and Grand Junction Field Office Resource Management Plans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.R. 6548. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide local areas more flexibility in the use of funds for incumbent workforce training programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6549. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to adjust certain requirements with respect to sovereignty and use of airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6550. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide a report to the Congress on the non-compliance of the New York City Housing Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6551. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the payments or allowances that individuals, including veterans service organizations, receive for transportation of veterans to or from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6552. A bill to Require the Government Accountability Office to study and recommend a definition for workforce housing; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MAGAZINER (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. BALINT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 6553. A bill to require the waiver of costs of activities relating to the evacuation of United States citizens endangered by acts of terrorism or war in Israel instigated by Hamas and other Islamist militant groups; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 6554. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against tax for the purchase of communications signal boosters in areas with inadequate broadband internet access service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 6555. A bill to modify the competitive need limitation with respect to the generalized system of preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 6556. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for certain noise mitigation near San Francisco International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6557. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to conduct a study on certain grace periods under the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 6558. A bill to prohibit the issuance of the rule entitled "Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles" or any successor rule; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6559. A bill to provide for the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to ensure that certain aviation roundtables may appoint technical representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6560. A bill to require The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administrator to notify the public of any proposed new PBN flight procedure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6561. A bill to provide for certain requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration in response to requests for information by Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 6562. A bill to provide for a nighttime airport access restriction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OGLES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. BOEBERT, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 6563. A bill to repeal a requirement for the Secretary of Transportation to issue certain regulations with respect to advanced impaired driving technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 6564. A bill to allow the Farm Credit Administration the option to examine low-risk Farm Credit System institutions under a 24-month cycle; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 6565. A bill to establish a system to expedite gate passes and flight access procedures to allow caregivers, parents, and guardians to accompany minors and passengers needing assistance to their flights; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. VAN DREW (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 6566. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to local educational agencies to make physical improvements at the elementary schools and secondary schools served by such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. TLAI, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 6567. A bill to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish a Territorial Disaster Recovery Program to continuously identify, monitor, and address factors and capability gaps that hinder the execution and completion of recovery activities relating to major disasters by eligible entities located in the territories of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 902. A resolution affirming the State of Palestine's right to exist; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ROSS, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 903. A resolution expressing support for the designation of December 3, 2023, as

the "National Day of 3D Printing"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. JACOBS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MENG, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. VICENTE GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. WILD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. CARSON):

H. Res. 904. A resolution supporting the goals of World AIDS Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. ROY, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. SELF, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. LAWLER):

H. Res. 905. A resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Monroe Doctrine; 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. MCCORMICK:

H.R. 6542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of prices for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 6544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To advance nuclear energy.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 6545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To update the physician fee schedule under Medicare.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 6546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the ESA to include a clear distinction between wild sturgeon populations and captive-bred or farm-raised, and hybrid species.

By Ms. BOEBERT:

H.R. 6547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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:

Prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from implementing the Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Colorado River Valley Field Office and Grand Junction Field Office Resource Management Plans.

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.R. 6548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amending the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide local areas more flexibility in the use of funds for incumbent workforce training programs.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 6549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to adjust certain requirements with respect to sovereignty and use of airspace.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: Housing

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is,

To amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the payments or allowances that individuals, including veterans service organizations, receive for transportation of veterans to or from facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 6552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: Housing

By Mr. MAGAZINER:

H.R. 6553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the waiver of costs of activities relating to the evacuation of United States citizens endangered by acts of terrorism or war in Israel instigated by Hamas and other Islamist militant groups.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 6554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, 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:

The BOOST Act would create a refundable consumer tax credit for a signal booster or hotspot of up to \$300 for the principal homeowner or primary lessee (1 per household) in RDOF eligible locations that would sunset after 5-years.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 6555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

To modernize Competitive Needs Limitations (“CNLS”) under the Generalized System of Preferences trade program to encourage more production in countries other than China, helping the United States diversify its global supply chains.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 6556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress, under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to conduct a study on certain grace periods under the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense.

By Mr. OGLE:

H.R. 6558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Preventing the finalization of the OMB rule entitled “Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles”.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Community representation in Next Generation Air Transportation System implementation process

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

FAA responsiveness to requests from Congress

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

FAA public notices

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To allow airports to set curfews for certain flights

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 6563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repeals the section 24220 of the IJJA.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 6564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

A bill to change the audit cycle for low risk farm credit institutions.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 6565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a system to expedite gate passes and flight access procedures to allow caregivers, parents, and guardians to accompany minors and passengers needing assistance to their flights.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 6566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to local educational agencies to make physical improvements at the elementary schools and secondary schools served by such agencies, and for other purposes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 6567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disaster recovery.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 308: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. MENG, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. LIUBU, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 414: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 480: Ms. PETERSEN.

H.R. 621: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 793: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 807: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEMER.

H.R. 974: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 1015: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1118: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. SORENSEN.

H.R. 1191: Mr. LANGWORTHY.

H.R. 1263: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1459: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1610: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1634: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1666: Mr. GUEST, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1721: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 1753: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1770: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1795: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1831: Ms. DE LA CRUZ and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1833: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 2454: Mr. LAWLER.  
 H.R. 2480: Ms. CARAVEO.  
 H.R. 2567: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.  
 H.R. 2630: Mr. LALOTA, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.  
 H.R. 2781: Ms. HAGEMAN.  
 H.R. 2809: Mr. ROSENDALE.  
 H.R. 2870: Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. STANSBURY.  
 H.R. 2882: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2909: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2937: Mrs. CAMMACK.  
 H.R. 2941: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
 H.R. 3014: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.  
 H.R. 3127: Mr. BEYER and Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
 H.R. 3216: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 3238: Ms. CARAVEO and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3381: Mrs. BICE.  
 H.R. 3425: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
 H.R. 3510: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 3519: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PORTER, and Mrs. SYKES.  
 H.R. 3582: Mr. MOOLENAAR.  
 H.R. 3639: Mr. CISCOMANI.  
 H.R. 3726: Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 3876: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. CARAVEO.  
 H.R. 3970: Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 4079: Ms. CARAVEO.  
 H.R. 4278: Mrs. CAMMACK.  
 H.R. 4285: Mr. RUIZ.  
 H.R. 4315: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 4326: Ms. STANSBURY.  
 H.R. 4338: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
 H.R. 4438: Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Ms. CARAVEO.  
 H.R. 4746: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Ms. PORTER.  
 H.R. 4867: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
 H.R. 4940: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. HARDER of California.  
 H.R. 5030: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 5140: Mr. MAGAZINER.  
 H.R. 5169: Mrs. CAMMACK and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5244: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
 H.R. 5266: Mr. KILEY and Mr. MCCAUL.  
 H.R. 5393: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 5399: Mr. CORREA.  
 H.R. 5403: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.  
 H.R. 5476: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5506: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 5754: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, and Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 5776: Ms. PRESSLEY.  
 H.R. 5785: Mr. LAWLER and Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H.R. 5789: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 5917: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
 H.R. 5934: Mr. GALLEGO.  
 H.R. 5937: Mr. VAN ORDEN.  
 H.R. 5948: Mr. MOONEY.  
 H.R. 5987: Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 5995: Mr. AGUILAR.  
 H.R. 6049: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 6055: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
 H.R. 6090: Mr. KILEY.  
 H.R. 6192: Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
 H.R. 6240: Mr. ALLRED.  
 H.R. 6271: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 6297: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
 H.R. 6319: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 6351: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 6423: Mr. BACON.  
 H.R. 6424: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 6451: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 6460: Mrs. LESKO.  
 H.R. 6465: Mr. PETERS.  
 H.R. 6495: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 6504: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 6508: Mrs. FISCHBACH.  
 H.R. 6516: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEUSER, and Ms. SCHRIER.  
 H.R. 6522: Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
 H.R. 6523: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. LANGWORTHY.

H.J. Res. 54: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.J. Res. 97: Mr. BRECHEEN.  
 H.J. Res. 98: Mr. STAUBER.  
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. BROWN, and Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H. Con. Res. 38: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
 H. Res. 837: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.  
 H. Res. 861: Mr. MAGAZINER.  
 H. Res. 874: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 881: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CORREA.  
 H. Res. 894: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.  
 H. Res. 895: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILD, Ms. CROCKETT, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H. Res. 896: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

---

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania on House Resolution 350: Mr. Amo.  
 Petition 2 by Mrs. MCBATH on House Resolution 452: Mr. Amo.  
 Petition 3 by Mr. CLYBURN on House Resolution 453: Mr. Amo.  
 Petition 4 by Mr. THOMPSON of California on House Resolution 454: Mr. Amo.  
 Petition 5 by Ms. DEGETTE on House Resolution 468: Mr. Amo.  
 Petition 6 by Ms. PRESSLEY on House Joint Resolution 25: Mr. Amo, and Mr. Harder of California.  
 Petition 7 by Ms. DELAURO on House Resolution 611: Mr. Amo.

---

#### DISCHARGE PETITIONS—REMOVAL

The following former Member's signature was removed from the following discharge petition when the successor signed the petition:

Petition 1 by Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania on House Resolution 350: Mr. Cicilline.