



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2023

No. 201

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 6, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT FRANKLIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### THANKING INDIANOLA ROTARY CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Indianola Rotary Club for giving Indianola third graders over 5,280 dictionaries since its first year in 2003.

The Indianola Rotary supports youth leadership and literacy for children and adults. With their literacy focus, they have been able to support and inspire

children in our community. I thank Indianola Rotary Club members for the time and effort they have donated to their community.

### CONGRATULATING AARON BARTHOLMEY ON HIS GUINNESS WORLD RECORD

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Aaron Bartholmey on the newly announced Guinness World Record for his pencil collection.

In July of 2023, the Colfax Historical Society helped to certify the tally of his record-breaking collection of 69,255 pencils with assistance from the American Pencil Collectors Society. These wooden advertising pencils are mostly from local businesses, and one is recorded as over 100 years old.

His hobby began as a child, after going to a flea market with his grandfather, and it now has grown into a world record and a passion for history and local memorabilia.

Congratulations to Aaron Bartholmey on his Guinness World Record, and best of luck in finding his next pencil.

### RECOGNIZING KELBY TELANDER

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kelby Telander for his bravery and resilience.

As a toddler, Kelby Telander struggled with hearing loss and underwent many surgeries, including a life-changing cochlear implant surgery at the University of Iowa Stead Family Children's Hospital. While a patient, he was selected to be kid captain at the University of Iowa football game.

As many University of Iowa fans know, before games at Kinnick Stadium, a patient from the Stead Family Children's Hospital is chosen as kid captain to lead the University of Iowa football team onto the field. For Kelby, this was an impressive experience.

I am proud to recognize that over a decade later, Kelby Telander, a former kid captain and patient at Stead Family Children's Hospital has joined the

University of Iowa football team as a linebacker. Kelby is number 25 and recently saw his first career action in the Hawkeyes' 41-10 win against West Michigan.

I am proud of Kelby Telander for not only joining the powerhouse Hawkeye football team but for his bravery and resilience. Congratulations, and Go Hawks.

### HONORING BRITT ORTIZ' CAREER

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor my friend Britt A. Ortiz and congratulate Britt on his retirement from a long, impressive career in higher education.

The son of Carmen and Arturo Ortiz, Britt grew up in Old Town Goleta, California. His mother, Carmen, was an assembly line worker for a manufacturing plant and later became a floor manager. His father, Arturo, is an electrician.

Britt attended public schools and graduated from Dos Pueblos High School in 1979. He went on to attend the University of California at Santa Barbara as a first-generation college student.

I know his journey well. Though I grew up many miles south of him in the San Fernando Valley, I, too, attended public schools, defying low expectations from my teachers, counselors, and others. Just like other Latino students like myself and Britt, we went on to be first-generation students at UC, Santa Barbara.

With dedication, grit, and hard work, Britt earned his bachelor's degree in 1985 with a double major in sociology and psychology. Britt went on to receive his master's degree in educational leadership and policy studies at the University of California, Northridge.

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.

H6147

His first full-time job after college was as an outreach counselor for a UCSB partnership program that provided tutoring at junior high and high schools in Goleta and Santa Barbara. This kicked off a long career dedicated to helping students achieve their educational goals.

Seeing a need for dedicated and qualified educators and counselors in the San Fernando Valley, Britt used his acquired skills to motivate generations of Latino and Latina engineers and computer science students. His leadership set the gold standard for opening doors to traditionally underserved students.

He planned hundreds of bilingual financial aid workshops and organized college resource fairs. He partnered with groups such as the United Way to make these things happen.

During 2 years of work with CSUN's minority education program, Mr. Ortiz and the MEP team brought in the largest freshman class of minority engineering and computer science majors in the history of the College of Engineering and Computer Science at California State University, Northridge.

After mastering his skills in the San Fernando Valley, he returned to UC, Santa Barbara and led the UC system's largest and oldest precollege academic preparation program. His work helped prepare first-generation, low-income, and underserved students and their families for higher education.

Over the course of his career, he also worked to get \$4.5 million in grants and funding for various agencies, institutions, and early academic outreach programs that helped students across the State of California succeed and achieve their dreams.

He has done all of this work and more so that students who were often discouraged and overlooked had the support, encouragement, and opportunity they needed to chase after and achieve their dreams regardless of the circumstances they were faced with or what was thrown at them.

I thank Britt Ortiz for all that he has done during his 35-year career. He showed kids what is possible. He gave them the tools they needed to learn. He helped them achieve their full potential, and he helped make their dreams come true.

What makes Britt's career so special is that as a young boy, he was discouraged from going on to college, but he defied those negative thoughts and actions against him by proving to himself—not to anybody else, but to himself—that if he put his best foot forward, if he always tried his best, if he always gave it his best, he could achieve anything.

That is what is amazing about this great country, that no matter who you are, no matter what language you start with, no matter what it is that you are faced with, if you are focused and you take advantage of all the opportunities that are here for you in this great country, you can and will make it.

What is sad is all along the way some people may not believe in you. They may try to discourage you and actually get in your way. Some people may even try to get you thrown out of your school or out of your classroom or what have you for things you have never done.

I say this because I have witnessed these things with my own eyes, but it takes people like Britt Ortiz to prove to young people that those are just lies, and they can be overcome. That is why today I honor Britt Ortiz for his 35-year career of helping young people overcome these challenges and to live their dreams.

---

NOVEMBER 22 RECOGNIZED AS  
KIMCHI DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Kimchi Day. Kimchi is a staple Korean banchan, or side dish, consisting of fermented cabbage and other vegetables.

What was once limited to Korean families' tables is now a culinary icon that reflects the growing Korean cultural influence in the United States since the first Korean immigrants arrived more than a century ago.

I am proud to be joined by many Korean Americans from all across the country in the gallery today to celebrate kimchi and the larger contributions that the Korean-American community have made here in the United States.

Later this afternoon, Members and those listening are invited to come to the Cannon Caucus Room at 2 p.m. as we celebrate Kimchi Day with our Korean-American community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Korean-American colleagues—there are four of us serving in Congress: ANDY KIM, YOUNG KIM, MICHELLE STEEL, and MARILYN STRICKLAND—who have been instrumental in working with me in a bipartisan way to introduce this Korean Kimchi Day resolution to make November 22 as Kimchi Day. I thank my colleagues and those who signed on to that resolution.

Lastly, I thank everybody for loving kimchi. "Kimchi mah-nee saranghae jooaeyo," "Please love kimchi a lot."

---

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

---

CELEBRATING HOMEGOING OF  
LIEUTENANT FRED BREWER, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 80,000 American military personnel who remain unaccounted for from previous conflicts around the world. Their families, nonprofit organizations, and the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency continue to fight tirelessly every day to bring these patriots home and to give them the dignified memorials they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the homecoming of one of these fallen heroes, Second Lieutenant Fred Lorenzo Brewer, Jr., who after nearly 80 years has returned home to Charlotte, North Carolina.

Born on August 4, 1921, Lieutenant Brewer was raised in Charlotte's historic Brooklyn neighborhood where his family attended the historic Ebenezer Baptist Church.

After graduating from Shaw University in Raleigh, the segregated South's first Black college, Lieutenant Brewer was commissioned by the United States Air Force and entered the uniformed service in November of 1942.

He was soon stationed at Tuskegee Army Airfield in Alabama, and he joined the 100th Fighter Squadron, 332nd Fighter Group. Completely segregated from their White peers, he was one of the nearly 1,000 Black pilots trained at Tuskegee who would eventually become known around the world as the Tuskegee Airmen.

Known for their extreme bravery and distinctive red-tail planes, the Tuskegee Airmen fought tirelessly to defend democracy abroad and to combat racism at home.

On October 29, 1944, Lieutenant Brewer's plane, named *Trav'lin' Light*, after the Billie Holiday song, went missing while on a mission out of Ramitelli Airbase in Italy.

That day, like so many other young Black men in his elite group, Lieutenant Brewer gave the ultimate sacrifice for a country that did not yet see him as an equal citizen. In serving and in giving his life, Lieutenant Brewer showed extraordinary faith in his country and in democracy that while imperfect in its protection and promotion of his life and livelihood, it could still be worthy of his ultimate sacrifice.

While Lieutenant Brewer did not live to see it, generations of survivors vindicated his sacrifice during the civil rights era, bringing our Nation closer to the dream of every man and every woman being created equal. That is the promise of democracy, Mr. Speaker. That is the promise for which he gave his life.

□ 1015

He was only 23 years old, and he left behind his parents, Fred, Sr., and Janie Brewer, and a younger sister, Gladys.

Thanks to the unyielding advocacy of his surviving cousins, Robena Brewer Harrison and Brenda L. Brewer, and the determined work of the POW/MIA Accounting Agency, Lieutenant Brewer's remains were identified in August.

Last Thursday, exactly 79 years and 1 month since his death, Lieutenant Brewer returned to Charlotte, receiving a dignified transfer. The U.S. flag was flown in his honor last Thursday at the U.S. Capitol at the request of my office.

Today, he will finally be laid to rest at Salisbury National Cemetery with full military honors.

While we celebrate today, we must never forget the countless Americans, including 25 Tuskegee Airmen, who remain unaccounted for and the families that long to bring their beloved heroes home, and we must never stop perfecting the cause for which they sacrificed.

We welcome Lieutenant Brewer home. We are forever indebted to his service.

#### CELEBRATING THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as Christmastime approaches, I rise to share the history of another of our most beloved Christmas carols: "Hark! The Herald Angels Sing."

Felix Mendelssohn once commented that the music he wrote to commemorate Johannes Gutenberg and the invention of the printing press would not be suitable for hymn or church music. How wrong he turned out to be.

Formerly, the words of this hymn were: "Hark, how are all the welkin [heaven] rings! Glory to the King of Kings."

The hymn's composer, Charles Wesley, didn't originally intend this as a Christmas hymn but perhaps as a hymn for Easter.

Wesley, the cofounder of the Methodist Church, wrote more than 4,000 hymns over the course of his life. George Whitefield, Wesley's friend, later added the first two lines we now sing.

An organist named W.H. Cummings decided to adapt Mendelssohn's music to Wesley's hymn. He arranged the 10-line stanza that we sing today, which was published as a carol in 1856.

The words of the carol are as follows:

Hark! The herald angels sing,  
 "Glory to the newborn King;  
 Peace on Earth, and mercy mild,  
 God and sinners reconciled!"  
 Joyful, all ye Nations rise,  
 Join the triumph of the skies;  
 With th'angelic hosts proclaim,  
 "Christ is born in Bethlehem!"  
 Hark! The herald angels sing,  
 "Glory to the newborn King!"  
 Christ, by highest Heaven adored;  
 Christ the everlasting Lord;  
 Late in time, behold Him come,  
 Offspring of a virgin's womb.  
 Veiled in flesh the Godhead see;  
 Hail, th'incarnate Deity,  
 Pleased with us in flesh to dwell,  
 Jesus our Emmanuel.  
 Hark! The herald angels sing,  
 "Glory to the newborn King!"  
 Hail the Heaven-born Prince of Peace!

Hail the Sun of righteousness!  
 Light and life to all He brings,  
 Ris'n with healing in His wings.  
 Mild He lays His glory by,  
 Born that man no more may die.  
 Born to raise the sons of Earth,  
 Born to give them second birth.  
 Hark! The herald angels sing,  
 "Glory to the newborn King!"

Mr. Speaker, I hope the history of this beautiful song will remind you of the Christmas season, of what it is all about and what the history is of this hymn.

On behalf of all the people of central Texas and all of Texas, I wish you a merry Christmas and a happy Hanukkah.

#### HONORING NOAH MACMILLAN

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to honor my neighbor and my young friend, Noah MacMillan, who we lost last July when he died of complications from colon cancer at the age of 33 years old.

What an honor it is to speak to America this morning about Noah MacMillan. Noah's brilliance, his gentle soul, and his boundless creativity live on in the hearts of everybody he touched, in the truly extraordinary and imperishable art that he left behind, and in the beautiful devotion of his remarkable parents, Jeff MacMillan and Lucinda Leach; and his brothers, Seth and Julian.

Noah was an accomplished artist. He was a talented athlete and a soccer player. He was a gifted chef, and he was a generous teacher.

His stunning and thought-provoking illustrations were accomplished in a variety of news outlets, including The New York Times, Smithsonian Magazine, Bloomberg Business, Sports Illustrated, and Riverfront Times, to name just a few of the places that recognized his exceptional art.

One of the crowning achievements of Noah's life and one of his final projects was an illustration that fused his passions for exuberant, colorful art and for the game of soccer.

The vibrant stamp that you see next to me here bursting with energy and power honors the electrifying achievements of women's soccer in America.

It was released by the United States Postal Service at the beginning of this year, 2023. Now, countless little replicas of Noah's art are flying all across the country on envelopes and packages, inspiring artists and athletes, especially young girl soccer players everywhere, all over America and all over the world.

Noah first came to battle cancer at the age of 23. He had the same oncological surgeon that I had at Johns Hopkins; Dr. Efron.

Noah's quiet courage and insistence on living joyfully carried him through treatment and through a lot of times of adversity over the next 10 years of his life.

In that intervening decade before colon cancer stole this splendid young man from us, he lived with great purpose and great passion and an unwavering dedication to his art and to the people in his life who he loved and was devoted to.

To honor Noah's generosity and his creativity, his loving family has launched a scholarship in his honor at his alma mater, Washington University in St. Louis.

This fund will make it possible for a high school student artist to attend the same summer program at Wash U. in St. Louis that gave Noah the confidence and the skills to pursue his dreams of becoming an artist and an illustrator, a dream that led just one of his pieces of art to become a stamp in our country.

Noah was not only a remarkable artist, he was an astonishingly quick-witted and gentle and loving human being.

He left an indelible mark on everyone who knew him, including his fantastic care team led by Dr. Jonathan Efron and nurse practitioner Tam Warczynski.

Noah is survived by his fiancée, Hitomi Inoue; his devoted parents, Jeffrey and Lucinda; his two loving brothers, Julian and Seth; his extended family; countless friends and neighbors; grateful, loving students; and, of course, his timeless amazing art, which now the entire country will get to enjoy.

#### HONORING JOHN "ANDREW" FISTER

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Amherst County teacher John "Andrew" Fister.

Mr. Fister was an exemplary educator who dedicated nearly 25 years of his life to teaching, training, and developing his students.

After teaching Bible, math, and German for 18 years in Ohio, he moved to Virginia to serve 3 years as an academic instructor, helping young adults enter the workforce.

In January of 2022, Mr. Fister joined Amherst County public schools as a math and German teacher. Despite his relatively short time there, he left an indelible impact on the student body.

Mr. Fister was loved by many students, even those not in his classes, and served as a mentor for many who walked those halls.

With a special gift working with students needing a second chance or just a little extra help, he taught them to believe in themselves and to work hard to achieve their dreams.

Mr. Fister's enthusiasm for life was contagious, and he meant so much to so many in the Amherst community.

Only 50 years old, his time on Earth was too short for those who loved him, but his personal testimony and the influence he had on others will live beyond his life here.

His family and those who knew him best are comforted by the knowledge that he is in Heaven with his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

#### FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the urgent need to stand up for democracy at home and abroad.

Yesterday, Members of Congress heard from our Secretary of State, our Secretary of Defense, and other senior leaders from the administration on the dire situation in Ukraine and Israel.

While they said the right things, the sense of urgency, the sense of passion is missing from all of this right now. It is missing from this debate, Mr. Speaker.

If we leave next week for the holidays with inaction, Russia will win, and we will begin to hand over Ukraine to Russia and Vladimir Putin.

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching the actions of this Chamber right now in the next 10 days, and the silence is deafening.

Let's be clear: Both Russia and Hamas seek to destroy democracy, and we must stand with our allies and pass a supplemental aid package now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Ukraine. Right now, we risk Ukraine literally running out of bullets if we go 10 days with inaction here in Congress.

If we do nothing by the end of the month, Russia will begin to win in Ukraine. If we abandon Ukraine, Russia will win.

We need to be clear: The silence and inaction we are seeing play out here on the floor of the House means strong support for Russia and their invasion of Ukraine. That is the choice we are making by doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan is rolling over in his grave right now as he watches far-right extremist Republicans standing with Russia and Vladimir Putin. How has the Republican Party become the party of Vladimir Putin?

Mr. Speaker, this place is broken. I want to be clear in what I am saying. We are witnessing a minority of the Republican Conference calling the shots in this Chamber.

A majority of the Republican Conference supports standing with Ukraine, but they have been cowed by the minority in their party, and we continue to see the tail wagging the dog.

To my Republican colleagues who remain silent, the time for action is now. Allow a clean vote on the supplemental funding package for Ukraine and for Israel. We must stand strong with Ukraine today.

Let's talk about the cost because that has been brought up over and over. If we gift wrap Ukraine for Vladimir Putin over this holiday season, we

will spend 100 times more money around the globe containing an aggressive Russia. Moldova and Georgia are next.

This is a national security issue for the American people, and support for Ukraine is in our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Israel as well. We must stand with Israel and support its right to defend itself.

We must immediately pass humanitarian aid and security aid for Israel so that we can disarm and dismantle Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, 400 Members of this Chamber would easily support a clean security and humanitarian assistance package for Israel. It is shameful that our new Speaker chose to play partisan political games with support for Israel.

For the American people watching, the bill that passed out of this Chamber says we will stand with Israel, absolutely, only if we defund the police for billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. That is the choice that this body had, and it is shameful.

When someone's house is on fire, we don't say, hey, we will put out the fire as long as you let us not pay for a bunch of IRS agents to go after billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. You help them when their house is burning down.

Right now, that is what we are watching in Israel with Israel security assistance and humanitarian aid that we need to provide to the Palestinian people in Gaza.

An overwhelming majority of Members support standing with Ukraine and standing with Israel. If we could get a clean vote on this bill on the floor, it would pass, but it is time for action.

□ 1030

Let me say that House Democrats, Senate Democrats, and Senate Republicans all agree on the need to support Israel and Ukraine, and I would even say a majority of the Republican Conference agrees. However, we can't get a vote on this as long as the far-right extremists of the Republican Conference continue to wag the tail of the dog in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is about the future of democracy for the world. The defining question for our great experiment in self-governance is whether we can defend democracy at home and abroad. We will face that question about defending democracy at home in November, but right now, we need to stand and be counted.

Authoritarianism is on the rise around the globe. We can either stand with democracies like Israel and Ukraine or we can bend the knee to Putin, terrorists, and other authoritarian regimes around the world.

As I voted for Speaker 19 times now, I have learned how incredibly fragile our democracy is. We must act now to pass a supplemental aid package and stand with Ukraine and Israel.

The world is watching, Mr. Speaker. Bring a clean bill to the floor now. The time for action is now.

#### SECURING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY IN U.S. COLLEGES

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Sixth District is blessed to be among those congressional districts with the highest number of colleges and universities among all the 435 House districts, but Joe Biden's weakness on the global stage has allowed America's foreign adversaries to target our Nation's college students.

From pushing propaganda to stealing critical research to censoring free speech, America's colleges and universities are now on the battleground of foreign interference.

Regimes like the Chinese Communist Party have expanded their influence by bribing American academic institutions with funding opportunities.

According to a Senate report from 2019, 70 percent of all institutions failed to comply with the enforcement tool that is used to protect against threats by foreign adversaries.

All of this is unacceptable and dangerous, as it poses a threat to our national security, research and intellectual property, and our students and academic freedom.

That is why this Congress must pass the DETERRENT Act, which provides transparency, accountability, and clarity to foreign gift reporting requirements for colleges and universities across the country.

House Republicans remain committed to delivering a future that is built on freedom for the American people, and that starts with preventing our adversaries from indoctrinating our students with their propaganda and stealing the research of our colleges and universities across this country.

CONGRATULATING THE JAMES WOOD VOLLEYBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE CLASS 4 STATE TITLE

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the James Wood women's volleyball team for winning the class 4 State title, the program's second straight State championship.

After working hard all season, the Colonels left it all on the floor and dominated the Hanover Hawks for their sixth 3-0 win in six postseason matches.

These talented student athletes include Kennedy Spaid, Ashlynn Spence, Alexys Taylor, Adeline Pitcock, Kyla Wilhelm, Tenley Mattison, Hannah McCullough, Paige Ahakuelo, Brenna Corbin, and Claire Keefer.

Throughout each set, the Colonels focused on working together as a team and doing what was necessary to get the job done, demonstrating resilience, adaptability, and impeccable skills.

Under the leadership and encouragement of Head Coach Adrienne Patrick,

the Colonels were on a mission all season to repeat history, and it ended with them once again as State champions.

Again, I congratulate the James Wood women's volleyball team, Head Coach Adrienne Patrick, parents, faculty, and staff on this incredible achievement.

#### COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I want peace. I want a decisive victory over Hamas and an end to its hateful and destructive reign. I want Israel and Palestine to coexist safely, securely, and with prosperity for generations to come.

It is difficult to talk about peace during wartime, but that is exactly what we must do. We cannot be distracted by disingenuous messaging bills that do nothing but grab headlines with no plan forward.

As a person of faith, I have been taught not to hate, but I must admit that I have hated what I have seen in this Chamber recently. For as I hate anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and racism, as I despise homophobia and transphobia, as I reject and revile hatred and bigotry of any kind, I am also disgusted by the way those prejudices have been weaponized in our Chamber.

We voted yesterday on yet another nonbinding messaging resolution denouncing anti-Semitism, H. Res. 894.

To be clear, I have supported efforts to push back against anti-Semitism. That is why I am supporting Mr. NADLER's plan to combat anti-Semitism. It is why I am supporting Mr. GREEN's two-state solution resolution. It is why I signed on to Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ' letter regarding the safety of students on college campuses.

Let's face facts. That was not what this resolution was about. This resolution offers no solutions. It does not seek to bring people together. This resolution was a cynical attempt to weaponize the very real fears of some of our Jewish friends and our neighbors to push a specific political agenda, one that is strikingly disrespectful to the Palestinian state, the State of Israel, and others who support the cause of free and sovereign Palestinian and Israeli states.

On Monday, my colleague, Mr. NADLER, laid out how reckless and uninformed clause 4 of this resolution is. By making it the official position of this Congress that "anti-Zionism is anti-Semitism," we are labeling the thousands of Jews in this country who don't believe their deeply held faith is intrinsically tied to the modern State of Israel as anti-Semitic.

There are very real steps that we as the United States Congress can and should take to combat anti-Semitism in a productive and bipartisan manner.

Condemning anti-Semitism wherever it rears its ugly head is critical, but continuing to vote on nonbinding resolutions week after week after week to score political, partisan points does not get us closer to a solution. It is disrespectful to the seriousness of this situation.

Until Republicans are willing to address rising hate and fascism, we will be sitting here waiting without being able to accomplish anything. It is no better than moments of silence or thoughts and prayers with no substantive action to back it up, which were offered during the mass shootings in our schools, malls, and places of worship.

We have work to do for the American people. The rise of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, homophobia, and xenophobia are a threat to the American experiment in multicultural democracy, and there are Members of this body who are putting in the work to defend the more perfect Union that we built over the last 250 years.

When Republicans who have been obsessed with these messaging bills are ready to join us, we will welcome them with open arms.

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IS POWERFUL AGENT FOR FREEDOM, PEACE, AND DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, American leadership has always been the most influential, powerful agent for freedom, peace, and democracy.

One month ago, the House stood up to protect our values and national interests by passing a bipartisan package to help Israel defend itself from Hamas.

I recently attended a screening of the footage from Hamas that Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member MEEKS invited us all to, and I am so grateful for their leadership to have us do that. I knew it was footage that would be tough to see, but I knew it was footage I needed to see. I won't ever be the same after having seen that.

As we support our ally, we must take a comprehensive look at the Biden administration's Middle East policy.

Encapsulating all of my thoughts today in my remarks is a simple concept: With foreign policy, although it would be desired by all, you can't have it all. You have to make tough choices when it comes to foreign policy. You don't get to have everything that you would ever want. You cannot have it all with respect to foreign policy.

I will share a little bit about how important it is to take a stand.

While I am grateful for President Biden's clear support for Israel, his administration's attempts to placate Iran, the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world, have been a critical misstep.

For the past 3 years, the Biden administration has embarked on a deeply

misguided and contradictory quest to resurrect the Iran nuclear deal while begrudgingly continuing one of the Trump and Pence administration's most successful efforts at peace in the Middle East, the Abraham Accords, and the recognition of Israel by its Arab neighbors in embracing diplomatic and economic ties through these accords.

Rather than maintaining the maximum pressure campaign that sanctioned and starved Iran of foreign revenue, the Biden administration has balked at enforcing sanctions. They have allowed Iranian oil exports to surge back to levels higher than they were in 2018 and attempted to unfreeze billions of dollars in Iranian assets from foreign banks.

The Iranian regime is flush with cash thanks to the global energy crisis and the administration's policy of appeasement. Iran uses this cash to fund, equip, and train a terrorist network across the region. This includes groups like Hamas and Hezbollah.

According to reports from The Wall Street Journal, 500 or so Hamas terrorists trained in Iran in the months leading up to the October 7 attack on innocent Israelis. The Iranian regime has developed this terror network not just in Gaza and Lebanon but also in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen for one purpose: to cause just enough chaos to make the Arab world think twice about sustainable peace with Israel and the reliability of U.S. diplomacy.

The Biden administration says its Iran appeasement is geared toward preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, a goal I think we could all get behind, but it has obviously emboldened Iran and undermined regional security.

We need our four main regional security partners—Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkiye—to work together in unity, and we need America to lead on this front.

President Biden's approach creates tremendous doubt that the United States is more committed to the security of our partners than to a delusional accommodation of Iran. What must Riyadh, Cairo, and Istanbul have thought these past 3 years while watching the U.S. respond meekly to Iranian proxy groups disrupting political order, trafficking illegal weapons, and lobbing rockets at American diplomats with impunity?

Iran would love nothing more than for Saudi Arabia to think twice about normalizing relations with Israel, given the current crisis. Iran would love nothing more than for Egypt to decide that the opportunity costs for working with Israel on humanitarian corridors in Gaza, something that I have been calling for in a bipartisan fashion, is too high. Iran would love nothing more than for Turkiye to decide that it is more beneficial to work directly with Iran rather than through the United States.

The Trump-Pence administration correctly understood that the Abraham

Accords were the best chance we have for sustainable peace in the Middle East. We are stronger together than we are apart.

President Biden is undermining regional security and unity by appeasing the region's chief destabilizer: Iran. We must enforce sanctions, communicate clearly that we stand on the side of Israel and our partners, and line up our diplomatic and military commitments with our national interests that are also the national interests of Israel and the Arab world.

#### IN MEMORY OF PASTOR CHARLES GILCHRIST ADAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRONG). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, Michigan's 12th Congressional District mourns the loss of Pastor Charles Gilchrist Adams, a beloved spiritual and community leader. He was an activist in our district whose influence impacted so many of our lives across the State and the world. He was loved and respected by so many.

Pastor Adams served as a lead pastor for the historic Hartford Memorial Baptist Church in Detroit, a role that he held for more than 50 years.

As a pastor, he dedicated his life and mission to service, fighting for justice for our communities and improving the lives of our residents in northwest Detroit. He was a tireless advocate for safe and affordable housing for all and childcare for our working families.

He served as president of the Detroit Branch of the NAACP in 1984, and he also served on the executive board until 1992.

Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in remembering Pastor Charles Gilchrist Adams for his incredible advocacy, leadership, and impact on our district.

May he rest in love, and may his legacy live on in our community.

□ 1045

#### RECOGNIZING DEARBORN FIREFIGHTERS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, the 12th Congressional District recognizes two outstanding members of Dearborn's fire department: Battalion Chief Kenneth Murray, for his 26 years of service, and EMS Coordinator Glenn Owens, for his 25 years of service to our communities.

Battalion Chief Murray started with the Dearborn Fire Department in 1997 as a firefighter. He steadily rose through the ranks, serving as an engineer, lieutenant, and captain before he was promoted to battalion chief in 2020.

Over the course of his career, Battalion Chief Murray has garnered numerous awards and was recognized as Dearborn Exchange Club's Fire Officer of the Year in 2016. Battalion Chief Murray has been an outstanding public servant to the communities served by the Dearborn Fire Department.

EMS Coordinator Owens began his career as a firefighter in the Dearborn

Fire Department in 1998. Over the past 25 years, Owens has served in numerous roles, and he remains steadfast in his commitment to service and keeping our community safe.

EMS Coordinator Owens has been recognized many times over the course of his career in Dearborn for his incredible record, including saving lives and safe driving.

Please join me in recognizing Battalion Chief Kenneth Murray and EMS Coordinator Glenn Owens for their many years of outstanding service to the people of Dearborn in Michigan's 12th District Strong as we wish them well in their retirement.

#### ACKNOWLEDGING MY INCREDIBLE TEAM

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I want to take time to acknowledge my incredible team and our accomplishments these past few years for our community. I lovingly call our congressional district 12th District Strong.

At the beginning of this year, we opened three new Neighborhood Service Organizations in Detroit, Inkster, and Southfield.

Throughout the district, our Neighborhood Service Organizations have returned over \$5.5 million in constituent services dollars directly to over 8,000 residents, returning alone just this year over \$306,000 for our communities.

We served and responded to over 164,069 letters from our neighbors who advocate for clean water, clean air, utilities for all, and so much more. We have hosted and participated in over 120 events, including coffee hours, townhalls, resource fairs, and more to ensure that I remain accessible to my residents.

In Congress, in our legislative advocacy work from affordable housing to medical debt cancellation and auto insurance discrimination, we have introduced 160 bills, and 39 bills and amendments have actually passed since 2019.

This year, we celebrated the 1-year anniversary of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, where we are committed to advocating for working moms and their families on issues of affordable childcare, paid leave, and ending poverty policies that are incredibly important, as well as something dear to me, combating Black maternal health, and so much more.

We also started the Get the Lead Out Caucus, where we know that no amount of lead is safe for our children or our families.

These accomplishments would not have been possible without our residents' faith in me and sending me here to the United States Congress to do the people's work. It has been an honor to serve as the Congresswoman for the 12th Congressional District, 12th District Strong.

I thank all of my team for all of their hard work and tenacity. This is just the beginning of what we will be able to accomplish.

#### CONGRATULATING THE STEWARTVILLE HIGH SCHOOL TIGERS

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

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Stewartville High School Tigers on winning this year's Minnesota Class 3A high school football championship.

Stewartville capped off an undefeated season with their 43-13 victory over Annandale in the State championship game on November 25 at the U.S. Bank Stadium in Minneapolis.

While this marks the third time the Tigers have made it to the State finals, this year's win earned them the first-ever championship title in Stewartville's history.

The Tigers finished their 2023 season with a perfect 14-0 record, and all of us across the First Congressional District are incredibly proud to call them our own.

Congratulations to Coach Mueller, his team, and the entire Stewartville community on this well-deserved title.

Way to go, Tigers.

#### OHIO'S NUCLEAR ENERGY PROBLEMS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the production of nuclear power in our country is an awesome responsibility. Put in the hands of the wrong people, it can be deadly.

Those who operate nuclear facilities must be highly trained and honorable. Recall Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima? They all teach us nuclear power in the hands of careless and, indeed, corrupt people can be deadly to thousands of innocent people.

This morning, let us turn to Ohio's two financially strapped nuclear plants, both located in northern Ohio, adjacent to our people's freshwater kingdom, Lake Erie.

In Ohio, the largest corruption crimes in America's commercial plant nuclear history are being litigated. These crimes are also the largest public corruption trials in Ohio's history.

Last week, a Federal grand jury in Cincinnati indicted former chair of Ohio's Public Utilities Commission, Sam Randazzo, on bribery and embezzlement for his role in receiving \$4.3 million in kickbacks for what has been labeled the biggest political bribery scandal in Ohio's history.

The nuclear power company, FirstEnergy, ultimately paid more than \$60 million in 2018 and 2019 to bribe public officials like the Speaker of the Ohio House, who has now been sentenced to 20 years in prison.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article entitled "Sam Randazzo, Ohio's former top utilities regulator, charged with bribery, embezzlement crimes."

[From the Plain Dealer Cleveland, Dec. 5, 2023]

**SAM RANDAZZO, OHIO'S FORMER TOP UTILITIES REGULATORY, CHARGED WITH BRIBERY, EMBEZZLEMENT CRIMES**  
(By Jeremy Pelzer, Andrew J. Tobias, and Jake Zuckerman, Zuckerman)

**COLUMBUS, OH.**—A federal grand jury has indicted Sam Randazzo, the former chair of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, on 11 counts related to bribery and embezzlement. U.S. Attorney Kenneth Parker's office announced Monday.

The indictment states that Randazzo accepted a \$4.3 million bribe in exchange for helping FirstEnergy, an Akron-based electric utility, secure its policy priorities, including helping with House Bill 6, the 2019 energy law at the center of a federal bribery probe. FirstEnergy admitted to bribing Randazzo in 2021, but he wasn't charged until now.

If convicted, Randazzo could face up to 20 years in prison.

The 74-year-old Columbus resident self-surrendered on Monday morning at U.S. District Court in Cincinnati, according to a release. He appeared in federal court that afternoon, cuffed at the wrists and ankles, before Chief Magistrate Judge Karen Litkovitz at Cincinnati's federal courthouse. He pleaded not guilty and was released on a bond of his own recognizance.

The 11 counts against Randazzo include: one count of conspiring to commit travel act bribery and honest services wire fraud, two counts of travel act bribery, two counts of honest services wire fraud, one count of wire fraud and five counts of making illegal monetary transactions, according to the release.

As chairman of the PUCO from April 2019 until he resigned in November 2020, Randazzo reviewed requests from gas and electric companies seeking to levy new costs on customers. He accepted \$4.3 million soon after meeting with then-FirstEnergy executives Chuck Jones and Mike Dowling in December 2018, as Randazzo was applying to become PUCO chair.

In November 2019, Randazzo pushed to cancel a 2024 rate review case that the company believed would hurt its bottom line by forcing it to reduce the rates it charged customers, as well as open its books to regulators, which they saw as problematic.

Randazzo also played a key role in getting lawmakers, including Ohio Senate Finance Committee Chair Matt Dolan, to include language in the 2019 state budget that loosened state limits on FirstEnergy, and other utilities' ability to make "significantly excessive" profits, according to the indictment.

Dolan, a Chagrin Falls Republican now running for the U.S. Senate, previously acknowledged speaking to Dowling, who convinced him of the need to place the amendment in the state budget. The Plain Dealer/cleveland.com reached out to Dolan on Monday for comment.

The indictment states that Randazzo routed the bribe money through his consulting business, Sustainability Funding Alliance of Ohio. He also used that business to funnel to himself at least \$1 million meant for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio, a consortium of large-scale energy buyers who he represented in PUCO cases as an attorney.

"Public officials—whether elected or appointed—are tasked with upholding the highest level of integrity in their duties and responsibilities. Such service to the public must be selfless, not selfish," the U.S. Attorney said in a statement. "Through the indictment unsealed today, we seek to hold Randazzo accountable for his alleged illegal activities."

Roger Sugarman, an attorney representing Randazzo in criminal and civil lawsuits, de-

clined to comment Monday. Randazzo did not respond to questions posed by reporters.

Randazzo's arraignment on Monday advanced a stunning fall from grace from a once respected utility lawyer and lobbyist with notorious influence at the Statehouse. He is often credited with pushing for what would become state laws constricting the growth of wind, solar, and energy efficiency programs in Ohio. State lobbying records reflect years of lobbying work on behalf of the Ohio Gas Company, Vectren Energy and IEU. Now-state Sen. Shane Wilkin once told Randazzo in an email that "we already know you run the energy world." He was a mainstay at IEU's regular "Ohio Energy Management Conference."

Gov. Mike DeWine, who appointed Randazzo, had dinner with Jones and Dowling the same night as the latter pair's meeting with Randazzo. DeWine spokesman Dan Tierney said Monday that while the governor's office wasn't privy to the indictment and was still reviewing it, "the indictment alleges very serious acts. Our office has full faith in the criminal justice system to adjudicate these serious allegations in an appropriate manner."

Many of the emails and text messages referenced in the indictment to and from the former FirstEnergy executives and Randazzo have previously been made public. However, the indictment's details about his embezzlement charge are new, according to Dave DeVillers, Parker's predecessor as U.S. attorney.

Randazzo resigned as PUCO chair in November 2020, days after the FBI raided his Columbus townhouse. In the years that followed, prosecutors were silent about Randazzo, leading to questions about why they were taking so long to decide whether to file charges.

Ashley Brown, a former PUCO commissioner, said the delay has cost the state's electricity customers, given that the PUCO has paused its own investigations into the HB6 scandal at Parker's request to wait for the federal corruption investigation to wrap up.

In the meantime, electricity customers have continued to pay a fee contained in HB6 that subsidizes a pair of coal plants owned by FirstEnergy and several other utilities.

"It's hard to imagine why he wasn't indicted earlier," said Brown, who also questioned why no current or former FirstEnergy officials have been charged so far.

Asked about the length of time it took for charges to be brought, DeVillers said, "They could have been negotiating with the defense attorney, they could have been talking to him and it fell apart. And then it could be they dug into this count [the embezzlement charge], which seems to be completely different, and needed to ferret that out to find out what that was all about."

Randazzo is already a defendant in a civil lawsuit filed in 2021 by Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost. As part of that case, a Franklin County judge ordered the seizure of up to \$3 million worth of Randazzo's assets, though that decision is still being appealed.

Randazzo's indictment comes several months after ex-Ohio House Speaker Larry Householder was sentenced to 20 years in prison for leading a \$60 million bribery scheme using FirstEnergy money to help pass House Bill 6, which included a \$1 billion-plus ratepayer bailout for two nuclear power plants then owned by a FirstEnergy subsidiary. Former Ohio Republican Party Chair Matt Borges received 5 years in prison for his role in the scandal; two others connected to the bribery scheme have pleaded guilty and are awaiting sentencing.

FirstEnergy officials previously admitted that Randazzo helped them to develop strategy and legal language for HB6.

After HB6 passed, emails made public last year showed Randazzo, as PUCO chair, worked behind the scenes to hinder attempts to fully repeal the law, and he only grudgingly called for state regulators to take limited action—asking FirstEnergy to investigate itself over whether it misspent any customer money—in response to negative press.

To date, no current or former FirstEnergy officials, have been charged in connection with the HB6 scandal or any of Randazzo's alleged crimes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, FirstEnergy's plot was to foist its billion-dollar-plus corporate losses on the consumers of Ohio due to its pitiful management of its two nuclear power plants in northern Ohio. These are crimes.

While Randazzo was being indicted, the Federal Government moved to claim an additional \$6.5 million from FirstEnergy for this crime. We should all be deeply disturbed that inherently dangerous nuclear assets have been in the hands of criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial titled: "Finally, 11 counts against ex-PUCO chief Sam Randazzo but why still none against then-FirstEnergy officials whose fingerprints are all over the case?"

[From The Plain Dealer Cleveland, Dec. 6, 2023]

**FINALLY, 11 COUNTS AGAINST EX-PUCO CHIEF SAM RANDAZZO BUT WHY STILL NONE AGAINST THEN-FIRSTENERGY OFFICIALS WHOSE FINGERPRINTS ARE ALL OVER THE CASE?**

(By Editorial Board)

Monday's unsealing of an 11-count federal conspiracy, bribery, wire fraud and embezzlement indictment against former Public Utilities Commission of Ohio chief Samuel Randazzo was a welcome sign of prosecutorial progress in the FirstEnergy/House Bill 6 corruption case—but it's like the first footfall in a long-delayed reckoning with some of the key officials at the heart of the asserted conspiracy.

Our editorial board had repeatedly urged the U.S. Attorney for Southern Ohio, Ken Parker, to explain publicly why such a long delay in a case whose first arrests—of five Statehouse figures, including now-convicted former House Speaker Larry Householder and former Ohio Republican Party chair Matt Borges—came more than three years ago.

And where is the second footfall—charges against any of the FirstEnergy Corp. executives whose roles in paying out the bribes and soliciting the corrupt actions by Randazzo and others have been detailed in this and prior indictments?

The Randazzo indictment refers to now-departed Executives 1 and 2 at Akron-based FirstEnergy—former CEO Chuck Jones and former Senior Vice President for External Affairs Michael Dowling—as those with the primary contacts with Randazzo over the \$4,333,333 bribe FirstEnergy Corp. previously admitted paying Randazzo in a 2021 deferred prosecution agreement.

But they're clearly not the only FirstEnergy officials privy to the laundry list of regulatory and legislative favors Randazzo was helping the company secure, including a lucrative decoupling accounting provision that PUCO staff opposed, modifications to the state's "significantly excessive earnings test" (SEET) that were added to the two-year state budget, and "burning" of

a critical PUCO audit about FirstEnergy's distribution modernization rider (DMR).

According to the Randazzo indictment, "On or about March 4, 2020, Executive 1 messaged another Company A executive: "He [Randazzo] will get it done for us but cannot just jettison all process. Says the combination of over ruling Staff and other Commissioners on decoupling, getting rid of SEET and burning the DMR final report has a lot of talk going on in the halls of PUCO about does he work there or for us? He'll move it as fast as he can. Better come up with a short term work around."

An indictment to shed light on the full scope of corruption entailed in FirstEnergy's actions is needed.

It's possible Parker's delay in indicting Randazzo over bribes long since acknowledged by FirstEnergy and favors that have come into clearer light in civil cases was because he hoped to turn others into cooperating witnesses—or Randazzo into one himself.

Then there's the unexpected embezzlement charge against Randazzo in the indictment, accusing him of defrauding another client, the Industrial Energy Users-Ohio, a group of big energy customers, of \$1,104,598.

David DeVillers, the former U.S. Attorney for Southern Ohio under whose leadership the corruption case was first investigated and prosecuted, told cleveland.com's Jeremy Pelzer, Andrew J. Tobias and Jake Zuckerman that the embezzlement charge might have been the whammy in the mix, taking time to sort out. "It could be they dug into this count, which seems to be completely different, and needed to ferret that out to find out what that was all about," DeVillers told the reporters.

Either way, it is to be hoped that the indictment of Randazzo will finally cause Parker to lift his effective hold on important PUCO and other state-level investigations into how both the PUCO and its processes, and the legislative process separately, were so distorted and corrupted, so reforms can be made. That's especially urgent given that unrepealed parts of fatally tainted House Bill 6 right now require electricity customers in Ohio to subsidize—to the tune of more than \$200 million so far, according to the Ohio Office of Consumers' Counsel—two money-losing coal plants, one in Indiana. Shining the full disinfectant of transparent investigations on how all this came to be is a critical first step to reform.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, since the Davis-Besse plant came online in 1977, its corporate leadership has never understood nuclear power or its dangers. It is only the unionized workers that have saved our lives. The plant shares an old Babcock-and-Wilcox design with the Three Mile Island reactor that partially melted down in 1979. Another plant with the design, the Rancho Seco plant in Sacramento, California, permanently closed in 1989.

Davis-Besse itself is now nearly 50 years old and has a dismal reputation within the industry and a history of too many close calls. In 1985, the plant suffered a loss of the main and backup supplies of cooling water because of a series of system failures, and this should have been a wake-up call, but it went unheeded.

In 2002, we faced the worst nuclear safety incident since Three Mile Island when a major hole was discovered in Davis-Besse's reactor head, endangering the lives of millions of Ohioans

and the purity of Lake Erie. The plant's unionized workers again saved us all.

The Davis-Besse nuclear power plant, with its history of safety violations and close calls, is a clear example of how corporate culture can influence safety culture for the worst, and the industry around our country never held them accountable.

The fines and penalties imposed on FirstEnergy have done little to deter misconduct. It is time for us to take bold action and provide our region with safe, advanced, modern power in a platform akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

So much more needs to be done to make our communities safe and whole from FirstEnergy's fraud, starting with making sure that the Benton-Carroll-Salem school system where Davis-Besse is located can be made whole. The value of property in the region has gone down 90 percent, which means the school system is going to be nearly \$6 million short on what it needs to teach the next generation.

I urge judges in the case to take the grid under FirstEnergy's ownership under safe public conservatorship until a reliable operator can be stood up.

May we find the wisdom and courage to confront these nuclear challenges head-on to usher in a new era of clean and responsible energy for the consumers and people of northern Ohio who have been balked so royally over the last nearly half century.

#### CELEBRATING THE 30-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF A PLACE CALLED HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30-year anniversary of A Place Called Home, a nonprofit that has served thousands of at-risk youth and families in the South Los Angeles community.

A Place Called Home provides free programs that focus on job readiness and mental health services as well as art and technology. It allows children to explore creativity through their arts programming.

Earlier this year, they hosted the Latinx Theater Festival in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, where the children helped with ticketing, light, and sound design for the productions.

A Place Called Home aims to increase children's likelihood of staying in school and graduating, and in the past 30 years, it has supported more than 500 first-generation students in their journey to college.

They serve 2,000 meals to students every week on top of the thousands more they provide to families at home in California's 37th District. None of this would be possible without their founder, Debrah Constance, and CEO Norayma Cabot, who work tirelessly

with the board and staff every day to support my district's children and families.

I hope you will join me in celebrating this milestone for A Place Called Home, and I look forward to seeing all that they do in the next 30 years and beyond.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MIKE WATANABE

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mike Watanabe. He passed away last month after 77 years full of life.

Mike began his service to the Los Angeles community when he joined the Asian American Drug Abuse Program as a counselor in 1975. He saw the impact that drug use had on his friends and community in the wake of the Vietnam war and wanted to find a way to advocate for recovery after earning his master's degree in social work. He became the executive director in 1982 before ascending to the role of president and CEO in 2004.

Through his decades of service with AADAP, he worked with community leaders to support substance abuse recovery. AADAP's efforts have served residents in California's 37th District for over 50 years.

Mike is remembered for his compassion, leadership, and unwavering belief in building a supportive community.

My friend Mike always kept it 100. He built a family at AADAP and throughout the Los Angeles area. Mike was a part of the Los Angeles County Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission for 16 years, chairing the Asian and Pacific Islander Constituent Committee and supporting several other AAPI-focused organizations all aimed at substance abuse recovery.

His support of early Asian-American community organizations left a lasting impact on the success of today's nonprofits and Asian-American services. We are all the better for having been impacted by Mike's jovial spirit and passion for community service. He will be greatly missed.

Please take a moment to honor the life of Mike Watanabe. My heart is with his wife, Suzanne, and their family during this time.

#### GOP THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a moment of truth. House Republicans pose a deep threat to our national security. It is dependent on what we do domestically and upon how we support our allies abroad, like Ukraine.

Ukraine will not be able to fend off Russia on its own, and Republicans will be responsible if they refuse to act to counter war criminal Putin's anti-West, anti-democracy assault.

I guess that makes sense, since the Republican Party has pledged fealty to Donald Trump, a master anarchist who is focused on government destruction, exploding democracy, and distracting and impoverishing the American people. He is someone who just 2 weeks



ago called people vermin. He is using white supremacist code words.

The global stage is watching us because they are all in for Ukraine and democracy, but Republican isolationism has hurt and will continue to destabilize our democracy, weaken our allies, and remove the United States from the global stage. When we leave, someone far more dangerous will take our place and hurt us more.

No more distractions, conflation, or profligations. Mr. Speaker, the time to get serious about this country is right now.

---

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

---

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

---

#### PRAYER

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

Open our eyes dear Lord. Give us sight in the overwhelming darkness that has blinded us to the light of Your will. The shadow of hatred for our brothers and sisters has blinded us to Your command to live and act in love.

Open our eyes and our hearts and purge the animosity from our world where weapons of war and arms of outright prejudice are set in motion by human hands and triggered by the hardness of our hearts.

Cleanse our hearts from every inkling of hostility wherever it dares to take root within us and however it is displayed by us: in our disdain for a relative or neighbor who has slighted us, in our contempt for Jews or Muslims or another person or group that has fallen out of our favor, and even in the insults we too often toss across the political aisle.

Bring us out from the darkness we have created and call us back to our love for You by following Your command to love one another, that once again we would live in Your light.

Shed Your divine light in our lives such that it would cause us to set down our weapons, abandon our hatred, and walk without stumbling, in the way You have revealed to us. In the power of Your name, we pray that You would grant us Your mercy and illumine Your will for us this day.

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 gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURPHY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

---

#### HONORING MAJOR JEFFREY HOERNEMANN

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor U.S. Air Force Major Jeff Hoernemann of Andover, Minnesota. Jeff lost his life last week along with seven other airmen during a routine training mission off the coast of Japan. He was just 32 years old.

Throughout his life, Jeff had a competitive spirit and was uniquely disciplined. A graduate of Andover High School, Jeff broke school and conference records in the indoor 800 meters and the 4 x 800-meter relay.

As a teenager, he won a \$15,000 scholarship with an essay describing his careful budgeting to purchase a bike for triathlons.

After competing in cross country and earning a degree in mechanical engineering from North Dakota State University, Jeff entered the Air Force. In 2016, he became a pilot after completing Columbus Air Force Base's Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training class.

Jeff dedicated his life to service and made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, across the city of Andover, the State of Minnesota, and this country, we honor his life and preserve his memory. Our prayers are with Jeff's wife, Jess; his parents, Thomas and Catherine; and his brother, Jared.

---

#### AID FOR ISRAEL AND UKRAINE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting while freedom burns. We have 5 legislative days left to aid our allies, Israel and Ukraine.

Each hour we wait makes it harder for our allies to defend freedom and de-

mocracy against tyrants and terrorists.

OMB Director Shalanda Young made it clear this week that the past resources we secured for Ukraine have run out.

As Speaker JOHNSON said in Florida, Putin won't stop in Ukraine. He will continue to devour territory and undermine democracy until he is stopped.

My Republican colleagues ask what the plan is in Ukraine and Israel. The plan is to win. The plan is to defeat Putin. The plan is to vanquish terrorism generally and Hamas in particular.

Most Members agree on that plan—300 on Ukraine and 400 on Israel. I urge the Speaker to give us the opportunity to act on that consensus now. Freedom demands it.

---

#### HONORING GARY PETERSON

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Gary Peterson, a dedicated leader hailing from the Tri-Cities, who tragically lost his battle with cancer this past month.

It saddens me that rather than announcing his next greatest achievement, I am instead here to mourn his passing.

Gary was known throughout central Washington, the United States Capitol, and the Department of Energy as a fierce advocate for the interests of the Tri-Cities.

His leadership in our communities proved fruitful for decades, sparking both economic development and innovation for the citizens of central Washington.

His advocacy for the Hanford cleanup mission has been the cornerstone of the success of our region, and I am in awe of the impact he has made over the years.

His immense knowledge, wisdom, and understanding of our community's priorities was matched by so few, and I have no doubt his name will go down in history with the names of people like Sam Volpentest and Bob Ferguson.

Gary's legacy includes leading advocacy for the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's campus, supporting the advancements of the Hanford cleanup mission, and advocating for the growing local economy at TRIDEC.

He will be known as a loving husband, father, grandfather, and personal friend. He will be missed, but his legacy will continue to live on.

---

#### MISS EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA TEEN ALYSON SHARP

(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, there she is: Miss Eastern

North Carolina Teen, Ms. Alyson Sharp.

Alyson's platform promotes agriculture and, more specifically, the advancement of women in agriculture—girls farm, too.

Her love for agriculture has been inspired by one of eastern North Carolina's legendary farmers, Pender Sharp of Sharp Farms in Wilson, North Carolina. Pender is Alyson's grandfather. She refers to him as her "Big."

As Miss Eastern North Carolina Teen, Alyson remains dedicated to community service. She collected and donated food for a food drive to ensure homeless individuals had a good Thanksgiving Day meal.

Currently, she is working with the Wilson Police Department to make Christmas special and to fulfill the wishes of kids across the city. During her pastime, she enjoys hunting and fishing.

Miss Eastern North Carolina Teen is a crown most special to me as Alyson brings hope for a brighter future.

#### BEST COMMUNITIES FOR MUSIC EDUCATION

(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 10 school districts across the 15th District who are recognized as "Best Communities for Music Education" and received the SupportMusic Merit Award from the National Association of Music Manufacturers Foundation.

This recognition is given to schools who continue to provide all children with the opportunity to learn and to grow with music.

The award program acknowledges and celebrates innovative schools and districts that have developed a stronger presence for music education on campus and in the lives of the students.

Congratulations to St. Francis School in Clearfield County, Tidioute Community Charter School in Warren County, Bald Eagle Area School District in Centre County, Armstrong School District in Armstrong County, DuBois Area School District in Clearfield and Jefferson Counties, State College Area School District in Centre County, Bellefonte Area School District in Centre County, Clearfield Area School District in Clearfield County, Lewisburg Area School District in Union County, and Port Allegany School District in McKean and Potter Counties.

We congratulate these school districts on this recognition.

#### CELEBRATING GARTH FAGAN

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today I stand to honor Garth Fagan, a Rochester visionary who profoundly influenced the cultural fabric of not only our local community but the entire world.

As we pay tribute to this extraordinary artist, I acknowledge and celebrate the deep connection between Garth Fagan and the people and places enriched by his vision.

Committed to Rochester's artistic growth, he established the Bottom of the Bucket, But . . . Dance Theater in 1970, now known simply as Garth Fagan Dance.

Since then, Garth has inspired and nurtured a new generation of talented artists from around the globe. His innovative choreography has earned him accolades, including a Tony award for Broadway's "The Lion King," a production masterfully blending culture and creativity, which will remain forever a testament to his artistic brilliance.

Garth Fagan is truly a national treasure. As he transitions away from his leadership role in the dance company, his profound impact will undoubtedly continue to resonate—captivating audiences for generations to come.

#### IMPACTS OF INFLATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous decisions by Biden hurts the pocketbooks of Americans and destroys jobs, made even more obvious as we enter the holiday season of Christmas and Hanukkah.

Bidenomics inflation has overcome hourly raises, reducing the spending power of Americans by \$11,434 annually in the two Biden years.

Under Biden, prices for the same Thanksgiving dinner were 25 percent higher in 2023 than in 2019. As Christmas approaches, Americans are challenged. In a WalletHub survey, more than one in three Americans are foregoing gifts this year due to Bidenflation.

Republicans, led by Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will continue to fight to reduce inflation and create jobs. Speaker JOHNSON is correct that we must support the borders of Ukraine and America.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it continues moving from the safe haven of Afghanistan to America with Biden open borders for terrorists.

It is sadly clear there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent, as finally admitted by the FBI.

#### RECOGNIZING LAURA PENROD

(Ms. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an incredible educator in southern Nevada, Ms. Laura Penrod, who has been recognized as Nevada's Teacher of the Year for 2024.

Ms. Penrod currently teaches at Southwest Career and Technical Academy where she opened the special education department and began working and teaching English soon thereafter.

She brings 17 years of teaching experience to help her students not only in the classroom but also after school, advising several extracurricular activities and in her community as a fearless champion of public education.

Ms. Penrod exemplifies what makes our teachers so special—the drive to do good and always be there for our students.

I wish Ms. Penrod the best of luck as she moves on to the National Teacher of the Year competition, and I am deeply grateful for the impact she has on her students and our community.

#### RECOGNIZING DR. J. WILLIAM MCROBERTS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in special recognition of my dear friend, mentor, and former surgical chairman, Dr. J. William McRoberts, known affectionately as "Mac."

A native of Rochester, Minnesota, he graduated from Princeton University and attended Cornell University School of Medicine where he was elected class president.

After completing his surgical training at the Mayo Clinic, he was stationed as director of urology at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Bremerton, Washington. He continued to serve in the U.S. Navy as a captain in the Reserves for 20 years.

He began his academic career as an assistant professor at the University of Washington, excelling throughout the ranks and becoming chairman of urology in the division of surgery at the University of Kentucky.

As my chairman, Dr. McRoberts taught me a great deal about patient care, endurance, and professionalism. Despite long and oftentimes grueling hours, he kept a great wit and humor about him, challenging us all not only to be better physicians but better humans. He demonstrated that compassion and surgical skill are not mutually exclusive.

Once he retired from academic life in 2001, instead of just enjoying the fruits of his labor, he has served in underserved areas in Kentucky and for the last 3 years in rural eastern North Carolina.

Now, at the age of 90, I am releasing him of his medical obligation to enjoy his life with his wife, Marley; son, Porter; daughter, Jane; and their grandchildren.

My life has been a better one lived because of his professionalism, humor, and friendship.

□ 1215

## IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES IN LAHAINA

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has a proud immigrant tradition, with many of us able to trace our roots across the globe.

Few places in Hawaii exemplify our diversity more than Lahaina, where nearly a third of the residents are foreign-born. They came from the Philippines, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and more. They are the backbone of Maui's economy, working in hotels, restaurants, retail shops, and golf courses. They clean homes and are caregivers for "keiki," "children," and "kupuna," "elders," alike.

On a day when fire did not discriminate what it took, Lahaina's immigrant community bore more than its fair share of loss. A quarter of the deceased had ties to the Philippines. Too many lost documents and lifesavings.

Now, immigrants in Lahaina face impossible decisions. They are too scared to seek out the help that they need, and they are afraid to travel or relocate due to their legal status.

They need our help, and we have to meet them where they are through trusted partners so they can focus on healing and rebuilding.

Four generations ago, my family immigrated to Hawaii with the same hopes and dreams many in our Lahaina "ohana," "family," have. We can't forget our roots, and we must meet this moment with the aloha that they would have wanted.

## HONORING MICHAEL MORAN

(Ms. BOEBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life, sacrifice, and service of Cortez Police Sergeant Michael Moran, a true American hero who laid down his life in service to our great country and his community.

Sergeant Moran was fatally shot during a traffic stop on November 29, providing a tragic end to a life of dedication and service.

Sergeant Moran answered the call to serve our Nation as a marine for 9 years before joining the Cortez Police Department in 2012. His life was marked with selfless courage and love, always putting others before himself.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Moran was a shining example for all Americans. His passing is an immeasurable loss for us all, and he was the best that Colorado's Third District had to offer.

My prayers go out to his family, his loved ones, and the community of Cortez. I pray for God's wraparound presence to surround them, comfort them, and heal them in this time of mourning.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Moran for his selfless service.

## HIGHLIGHTING LACK OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN RURAL AMERICA

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the lack of mental health services in rural America.

As facilities close their doors and providers leave town, many people in our rural communities are forced to travel for miles to get care or forgo care altogether. That is harmful and unfair, which is why I introduced a bipartisan bill to expand access to telemental health services in rural areas.

This legislation will specifically help folks working in farming, fishing, and forestry. These industries are critical to our economy and way of life in my district. In fact, Oregon has the second-largest number of Triple-F workers per capita in the entire country. These jobs can also be very stressful, and few seek help due to stigma.

Improving telehealth access will take away that stigma, save folks time and resources, and get more Oregonians the help they need when they need it.

Congress has left rural America behind for far too long. It is time we change that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this very important bill.

## CELEBRATING DONALD LEWIS

(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 celebrate the achievements of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC, chief financial officer, Donald Lewis, who is retiring after 40 years of Federal service.

Mr. Lewis started his Federal career when he was just a student back in 1983 as an audit assistant for the Federal Junior Fellowship Program at Kings Bay Naval Base in Georgia. From there, he was able to move up into the procurement career field by taking on different positions with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Strategic Weapons Facility.

In 2004, Donald joined FLETC and worked in different positions before becoming the current assistant director and chief financial officer. As assistant director and chief financial officer, he provides strategic direction and executive oversight of FLETC business activities, which include executing and overseeing an annual budget of over \$600 million.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Lewis on his remarkable achievements and on his upcoming retirement. His years of distinguished service are extremely admirable.

## CONGRATULATING VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY TROJAN EXPLOSION MARCHING BAND

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Virginia State University, an esteemed historically Black college and university founded in Petersburg, Virginia, in 1882.

I rise today to congratulate the Virginia State Trojan Explosion Marching Band, which was recently recognized as the Nation's top Division II HBCU band in 2023. The band was judged on important components, including auxiliaries, drum majors, musicality, percussion, and marching maneuvers. They will now compete in ESPN's inaugural HBCU Band of the Year competition.

Throughout the year, the VSU Trojan Explosion was also invited to perform at the White House, NBC's "TODAY," and the National Battle of the Bands competition in Houston.

I commend Dr. Taylor Whitehead, VSU's director of marching and pep bands, and every member of the Trojan Explosion for their hard work and dedication. They are proof that greatness happens at Virginia State University. They have made their school, their community, and their Congresswoman proud. I will be cheering for them in their upcoming competition.

## CHOICE IN AUTOMOBILE RETAIL SALES ACT OF 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 906, I call up the bill (H.R. 4468) to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with respect to emissions from vehicles, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4468

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

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act of 2023".

## SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING, IMPLEMENTING, OR ENFORCING A PROPOSED RULE WITH RESPECT TO EMISSIONS FROM VEHICLES.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on May 5, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 29184).

**SEC. 3. ENSURING TAILPIPE REGULATIONS DO NOT LIMIT THE AVAILABILITY OF NEW MOTOR VEHICLES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2) Any regulation” and inserting “(2)(A) Any regulation”; and  
(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, any regulation prescribed under paragraph (1) (and any revision thereof), including any such regulation or revision prescribed before the date of enactment of this subparagraph, shall not—

“(i) mandate the use of any specific technology; or

“(ii) result in limited availability of new motor vehicles based on the type of new motor vehicle engine in such new motor vehicles.”.

(b) NECESSARY REVISIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate such revisions to regulations as may be necessary to conform such regulations to section 202(a)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act, as added by subsection (a).

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

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part A of House Report 118–298, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 4468.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, and I urge all Members to support its passage.

America's economy is at its best when innovation, free enterprise, and consumer choice rule the day. This formula once made America a world leader in the automotive sector. Unfortunately, some key decisionmakers have forgotten that. Elected officials, government regulators, and auto manufacturers eager to appease their liberal overlords, especially those in the Biden administration, need a reminder of that fact.

It is troubling that this administration, in a faltering economy, would try to replace reliable, available, functional, and affordable transportation for hardworking Americans with something far less reliable, far less available, far less functional, and far less affordable.

Under EPA's recent tailpipe proposal, two-thirds of all new cars being sold in America must be electric-powered vehicles by 2032. That is only 8 years from now.

The American people did not ask for this.

While the average price of an EV reportedly fell 22.4 percent in the last year in response to lack of demand and government subsidies, they are still far more expensive than a liquid fuel vehicle.

There are also hidden costs: \$500 extra annually for insurance; at least \$4,000 for battery replacement, and that is the bottom; \$1,200 to \$2,500 for home charging equipment. That is after you pay to rewire your home.

Range anxiety is still a real concern. EVs need more frequent and much longer stops for charges. The average EV gets about 234 miles per charge compared to 403 miles with a gas fill-up. Plus, cold weather, battery size, and towing weight can shrink battery range significantly.

Any way you look at it, working-class Americans who need reliable and affordable transportation would take a hit from a mandate eliminating their options.

This bill protects our constituents, allowing them to buy the automobile that makes the most sense for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 4468, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. Instead of working with us on legislation to lower costs for consumers, protect public health, drive innovation, and grow the economy, the Republican majority is once again bringing an anti-clean vehicle bill to the floor as part of their polluters over people agenda.

H.R. 4468 would block the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing its proposed light- and medium-duty vehicle rule. It would also block the Agency from finalizing any future standard to cut greenhouse gas pollution from vehicles. This bill would simply prevent the EPA from doing its job.

House Republicans are trying to legislate away years of innovation in cleaner transportation to put polluters over people.

The Clean Air Act is clear, Mr. Speaker. EPA has the authority and obligation to protect American communities from air pollution that would cause harm to public health and welfare. That includes pollution from the transportation sector, the single-largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollution in the United States.

This pollution affects more than 100 million Americans who live in counties with unhealthy air, and air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths each year.

The EPA's proposed emissions standards for manufacturers of cars and light-duty trucks is intended to tackle this pollution head-on. The result: The new rule is projected to deliver \$1 trillion in net public health benefits.

Cleaner cars are also a win for consumers who can expect to save an average of \$12,000 in fuel and maintenance costs over the lifetime of a light-duty vehicle once EPA standards are in effect.

I will stress that EPA's proposal is achievable. It will save consumers money and bolster jobs and our economy by promoting American manufacturing. It will reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

With this bill, House Republicans are denying the American people all of these benefits.

The bill is also a direct assault on our domestic auto industry. Decades of innovation spurred by ambitious EPA standards have led to a growing fleet of cleaner, more affordable cars for all Americans.

I have to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the bill's reference to choice is a misnomer. EPA's proposed standards are key to expanding vehicle choice for American drivers. More than 100 electric vehicle models are now available in U.S. markets alongside many hybrid and gas-powered options, giving Americans unprecedented flexibility in where and how they choose to fuel. This incredible innovation is the main reason why the United States is a global leader in the transportation sector.

□ 1230

H.R. 4468 would stifle this innovation and cause detrimental uncertainty for American automakers. The bill includes vague language that will prevent the EPA from ever finalizing vehicle standards for any type of motor vehicle. The bill would lock auto manufacturers in today's technology in perpetuity, chilling potential advancements in new hybrids, flex fuel, fuel cell, and even internal combustion engines.

None of this makes any sense, Mr. Speaker. This extreme bill would hurt our ability to harness new technologies, which would only weaken our ability to compete with China.

With this legislation, Republicans are telling the American industry to stand down to China in a global challenge. That is just wrong. Rather than ceding that role to China, House Democrats delivered real solutions with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws are investing in America's ability to beat our economic competitors, including China, ensuring the United States is the global leader on clean transportation.

H.R. 4468 would seriously hamper the EPA's ability to address the worsening

climate crisis and air pollution for vehicles. It would also limit consumer choice, stifle innovation, create uncertainty for American automakers, hurt American global leadership, weaken our ability to compete with China, and deny Americans the immense public health and environmental benefits of EPA's proposed standards.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, this bill does not prevent the EPA from finalizing a rule. It only tells the EPA that it cannot mandate a specific technology and prevents the EPA from issuing rules that limit a vehicle's availability based on engine type.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the full committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden's rush-to-green agenda is failing. Just last week, nearly 4,000 auto dealers all across this country sent a letter to President Biden urging him to stop his EV mandates. They said demand isn't there and the EVs are just sitting on their lots.

The administration has allocated billions for EV charging, yet not a single charger has come online as a result. All of this failed central planning is shipping our auto future and jobs to China. This is not the future Americans want or deserve.

For more than a century, affordable transportation has helped drive America's economic success. Our cars have allowed people all across this Nation and around the world to increase our mobility and raise our standard of living.

H.R. 4468 ensures that we can keep building on this legacy of American leadership and prosperity. Let's stop President Biden. He wants us all driving EVs, 100 percent battery electric, not plug-in, not hybrid, not plug-in hybrid. We don't agree. Vote for the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, when Americans get behind the wheel, when they want to drive their cars, they put it in "R" to go reverse and then they put it in "D" to go forward. Just as in the House here, the Rs want to take us backward, and the Ds want to drive us forward.

That is why I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. This bill would block the EPA from finalizing its proposed medium- and light-duty vehicle rule to strengthen tailpipe standards for future model years.

As we know, the transportation sector is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, and it is also a major emitter of other harmful air pollution.

It should not surprise anyone that the EPA is working to fulfill its obligation to protect Americans from harmful air pollution.

This bill prejudices the outcome of that process and will stifle technological innovation, despite the fact that the proposal will save lives, save consumers money, and bolster American manufacturing.

More and more Americans are choosing to go electric. They realize that EVs are not only good for the environment but also provide major consumer savings over the life of the vehicle.

Thanks in large part to the incentives included in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, even more of these vehicles and their components will be made here in America.

The legislation before us will undermine the tens of billions of dollars of planned investments to develop and produce American-made clean vehicle technologies by injecting uncertainty into these standards.

For over 100 years, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. If we want to continue to retain that title, we need to embrace the changes that are occurring in the sector. That means supporting the regulatory policies and incentives that would drive us forward to a cleaner and healthier future.

Unfortunately, this bill will stifle America's next great industrial revolution before we even seriously get into the race with China and dozens of other foreign competitors.

For the sake of promoting American innovation and to address our pollution challenges and supporting our long-term national economic competitiveness, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Put it in "D" to go forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the author of the bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or the CARS Act.

In April, the Biden administration's EPA opposed a rule setting light- and medium-duty tailpipe emissions standards so stringently that the EPA expects the proposal would force two-thirds of new light- and medium-duty vehicles sold in 2032 to be electric.

There is no hiding that the proposed rule is an electric vehicle mandate. Not only does this EV mandate display breathtaking government overreach into the auto industry, but it is also unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic for American consumers.

EVs are \$13,000 more expensive than the average, gas-fueled vehicle. Repairs to an EV cost \$2,300 more on average, leading to higher insurance costs, over \$500 annually.

The proposed standards are also unattainable. Our grid cannot handle the power load that is required, plus most

of the country lacks the charging infrastructure needed for the mandate.

We also don't have access to all the critical minerals to produce the vehicles or the capacity to refine those minerals for use in batteries. China controls most critical mineral mines, processing, and manufacturing for EVs. China has 78 percent of the world's cell manufacturing capacity for EV batteries.

Have we already forgotten the disastrous realities of overreliance on China for our supply chain? I have yet to hear a constituent say we need our supply chains to be more reliant on China.

Opponents of the CARS Act argue that EVs are growing in popularity and prices are dropping. If that is the case, why is the mandate necessary? Just last week, nearly 4,000 car dealers sent a letter to the administration pleading with them to pump the brakes on the proposed rule, citing lack of demand.

The range of EVs is another concern. Currently, one charge couldn't even get me across my district. EVs have almost 80 percent more issues and are less reliable than other vehicles.

Let me be clear: I am not against EVs. I am against EV mandates. A single EV battery requires the mining of hundreds of thousands of pounds of minerals. Those minerals are then refined using energy from China's coal plants. Ironically, an EV mandate is not a silver bullet to reduce global emissions.

Sadly, the biggest loser for this mandate may be the American autoworker, since significantly less labor is required to assemble EVs. The future of those working at engine plants, like the one in my district, are now in peril, too. The administration should side with consumers and innovators, not pick winners and losers.

EVs will play a significant role in the future of the industry, but so should hybrids and other solutions as they become more functional, reliable, affordable, and chosen by the consumer.

Madam Speaker, let's allow consumers to have access to affordable and reliable cars, encourage American innovation, and set us up to prevail over China.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, a bill that would undermine the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to prohibit the EPA from implementing emissions regulations and their ability to protect our air quality and our climate.

I thank our ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, and, of course, my great colleague, Congresswoman DINGELL, from the State of Michigan.

The auto industry relies on the EPA and their emissions standards to successfully compete. When the GOP shut down the Federal Government in 2018, our automakers could not roll new automobiles off the line because they

needed the EPA to do the emissions testing.

This is dangerous legislation, particularly because the EPA serves as a critical partner to our automakers during this very transformative time.

No fear-mongering. People will have a choice. They will continue to have a choice, and they will work with their dealers. People do not have the choice of the air they breathe.

The United States is poised, through our manufacturing base, to lead the world in innovation, safety, and clean technology. Not only does H.R. 4468 jeopardize public health and the environment, it hurts our economy and global competitiveness.

Let us not cede technology to China. Let us create, develop and manufacture it here in the United States of America.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted it, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would strike the language that blocks EPA regulations based on the limited availability of new motor vehicles. This amendment would restore the EPA's authority and responsibility to set science-based standards that protect our health and climate while supporting American innovation and leadership in the automotive and manufacturing sector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BICE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, my amendment would ensure the EPA can continue to drive progress in reducing vehicle emissions and advancing clean transportation technology.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), the co-lead for this bill.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act, that I proudly co-lead with Representative WALBERG.

This important legislation would prohibit the Biden administration's EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its radical proposed rule that seeks to eliminate gas-powered vehicles. Additionally, the CARS Act would restrict the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to pro-

mulgate similar rules moving forward. Hallelujah.

In April, President Biden's EPA proposed this radical rule that would set emission standards so high for light- and medium-duty vehicles that auto manufacturers would be forced to produce a higher percentage of electric vehicles just to comply. This is a de facto electric vehicle mandate on the American people. With this rule's implementation, the EPA projects that EVs could account for as much as 67 percent of new light-duty vehicle sales by 2032, as compared to electric vehicle sales of only 6 percent last year.

From assaulting the American people's Second Amendment liberties to the online censoring of free speech, the Biden administration is routinely abusing its power in order to further control Americans' everyday lives. With this new EPA rule, it is very clear that President Biden is now coming for our combustion engine car keys in his war against our personal freedoms.

Restricting consumer choice in the name of the left's Green New Deal garbage agenda represents an illegitimate power grab that hardworking Americans simply cannot afford.

One thing is clear. The American people already burdened by soaring energy prices and record-high inflation cannot be further burdened by this disastrous EV mandate.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to support the CARS Act, our commonsense legislation that would help save the American energy sector. It would protect both American consumers and auto manufacturers, and it would stop Biden's authoritarian government overreach in its tracks.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the ranking member of our Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, it is known that the transportation sector is responsible for the single largest greenhouse gas emissions. I choose not to contribute to that. I am the proud owner of a Chevy Volt, which is a very affordable, all electric vehicle—not one of the expensive ones that the Republicans like to talk about. It has zero emissions from the pipe. It is a beautiful little car that most families could afford.

I would say that the legislation that has been proposed actually takes choice away from Americans because it says that the EPA will no longer have the authority to regulate the emissions that are allowed. This will save lives.

This legislation that has been proposed is absolutely dangerous. What we know is that if the EPA can conduct its mission, then we would see 7 billion tons of greenhouse gases that would not be in the air. Lives would be saved.

This legislation is so important. The legislation that Republicans have proposed would take away the right of

Americans to have a safe environment and health. We say that this legislation is going in absolutely the wrong direction. We want to be sure that no one will vote for it. We will protect the lives of Americans, the right of the mission of the Environmental Protection Agency, and that we will have a better world to live in. That should be the right that is given to Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have tremendous respect for my colleague that just spoke, but I have to say that this idea that electric vehicles are emission-free is totally unfounded.

In fact, it is totally false. All you have to do is look at where the raw materials come from. Look at how China produces those materials. There are lots of emissions. If the argument is legitimate that we are going to save lives here, we are going to cost lives over there because they are not concerned about the climate. They are not concerned with the environment, they are not concerned about the people that they use—slave labor in many cases—to try to harvest the materials that make these electric vehicles in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I support EVs, but this administration continues to push a rush-to-green agenda that prioritizes government mandates over the American people.

The American people have spoken through their shopping habits. EVs sit unsold on lots nearly twice as long as internal combustion engine vehicles due to a lack of charging infrastructure and high costs. On average, EVs cost \$16,000 more than internal combustion engine vehicles.

We all want to reduce emissions, but EVs are not the solution that the administration says they are. The amount of raw materials in one long-range battery EV could instead be used to make 90 hybrid electric vehicles. The overall carbon reduction of those 90 hybrids over their lifetimes is 37 times as much as a single battery EV.

Where are the raw materials developed?

Mostly in China.

Should we be dependent on them?

Preserving consumer choice is critical to maintaining competition in the automotive markets and ensuring access to reliable and affordable cars for all Americans.

You cannot force Americans to buy cars they do not want any more than you can force energy transitions that can't be accomplished.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDENAS).

Mr. CARDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468.

I am frustrated and disappointed but not surprised to see my Republican colleagues bring yet another bill to the floor that puts polluters over people.

Scientists continue to warn us that the world is on its way to getting warmer and warmer and increasing global warming temperatures. If we want to avoid the worst climate changes and the worst disasters, we must reduce our air pollution.

Why, when we know that the transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, would we limit the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to carry out its authority to improve transportation emissions?

Yet, today's bill would kill our chance of getting on the right track and put us on the wrong track. Poor air quality and ever-worsening climate disasters are increasing. Our constituents are already facing these major problems all over our country.

More than 45 million Americans, including many of my constituents, live within 300 feet of major roadways or corridors that contribute directly to negative health effects like asthma, cardiovascular disease, and premature death.

That is right, air pollution is a matter of life and death. Our work here in Congress will determine how liveable our planet is, whether our neighborhoods will be liveable or not for generations to come.

Today, my Republican colleagues have chosen to abandon a healthy and prosperous future for Americans. Republicans choose Big Oil companies and their profits over people. This is reckless, and I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 4468.

Madam Speaker, I wasn't here when my Republican colleagues were against Social Security, against Medicare, and now they are against making sure that we have a liveable planet. Please vote "no" on H.R. 4468.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we actually agree on some things with our Democrat colleagues. We agree that we ought to keep the environment clean: the air, water, and land. But throwing money at it, like my Democrat colleagues are trying to do, is not the answer to the problem.

This rule would result in lost middle-class jobs in the United States because we can't get new facilities and infrastructure even permitted to do these things under the current administration. Until that happens, America will be heavily reliant on China.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, do we live in Communist China?

Really, do we live in Communist China?

I can't believe that the Biden administration first wants to ban gas stoves—we had to do legislation to prevent that. Now, they want to ban 67 percent of the manufacturing of regular gas-powered cars by 2032. That is insane.

President Biden and my Democratic colleagues claim they are for the mid-

dle class. They always say: We are for the middle class. Well, no, they are not because who can afford these electric cars?

It is the people with a bunch of money. That is who can afford it. Not the middle class. Not the lower class.

I am in strong support of this bill to prohibit and prevent this radical regulation against common Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I had to come down to the floor to speak out strongly against the Republican's pro-China bill.

The Republican Party wants to take us backwards. They want to raise costs on American families, and, in doing so, a lot of people ask why? Why would you attack American auto companies and American workers? Why would you work against the best interests of the American people, putting money back into their pockets?

It has become clear to me, serving here, especially this Congress this year, that my good friends on the GOP side are shills for polluters. It is to the detriment of the people that we represent back home.

American workers and automakers have made huge innovations in the cars and trucks that we drive. Now, electric vehicles being built in America, rather than China and other parts of the world, are more energy efficient, they are fun to drive, and that is why American demand for EVs has jumped 350 percent over the past 2 years alone.

U.S. electric vehicles have now zipped past a major milestone. There have been 1 million battery electric vehicles sold in a single year. This year's sales suggest that a rising number of consumers are making that jump. Why?

Because you don't have the maintenance costs and you don't have to stop at the gas station. We have a lot of work to do on electric vehicle charging.

It has been the Clean Air Act that has helped American innovators and automakers and workers make our cars more fuel efficient over time. Now, with the historic Inflation Reduction Act passed by a Democratic-led Congress, signed by President Biden, we are bringing those manufacturers and the batteries and the assembly here in America.

It has been announced there is \$150 billion in investments across nearly 400 new facilities in U.S. electric vehicle and battery manufacturing in Ohio, in South Carolina, mostly in these red districts. This is a Made in America moment, and we have to reject these kind of take-us-backward attempts offered by the grand oil party, the GOP. Why did they do this?

Because they are so tied to fossil fuels and gas and oil that they cannot see what lies ahead of us. That means

investing in America for a change. That means having these vehicles manufactured here in America and not being worried about China eating our lunch.

They are the ones that are trying to flood the EU market. Do you think our European allies want to buy Chinese-made vehicles?

No, they want to buy American-made vehicles because they are our allies. Please vote against this pro-China GOP bill. Vote for America and vote "no."

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, again, I agree, vote America. I urge my Democrat colleagues to remember that fossil fuels have raised more people around this planet across the globe out of poverty than any other fuel source on the planet, and America knows how to do that best.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague's legislation, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

I thank my colleague, Congressman WALBERG, for leading on this important legislation. After 3 years, it has become abundantly clear that the administration's approach is bad for my Hoosiers and bad for the Nation.

You can't create demand by forcing supply. EVs continue to pile up on dealer lots across the country and in my district.

Almost daily, we hear of auto manufacturers that are tempering investor expectations because of underwhelming sales. The money is leaving.

Simply put, people are not buying EVs.

EPA's aggressive rule is a de facto mandate on Hoosiers to switch to EVs.

This legislation would curb EPA's electrification-or-nothing approach and allow consumers to choose the best type of vehicle that fits the needs of their family.

As I have repeatedly stated, this administration is fundamentally ignoring the reality of energy distribution.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. EVs may make sense for densely populated areas, but the lack of range and insufficient towing capabilities do not meet the needs of rural Indiana's Sixth District.

The CARS Act will begin to bring sensible policy back to the forefront and allow American innovation to lead the way to the next generation of transportation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1300

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, last week, the Department of Energy's Geothermal Technologies Office released the most comprehensive analysis to date, quantifying the domestic lithium resources in the Salton Sea region of Imperial Valley, also known as Lithium Valley in my district.

The analysis found that Lithium Valley's total resources could produce enough lithium to manufacture over 375 million total electric vehicle batteries. This is more than the total number of cars currently on the road in the United States today. That is a lot of lithium and a lot of electric vehicles, and that will lower the cost of electric vehicles for everyone in our Nation.

Lithium Valley is a great example of how domestic solutions exist for our domestic and global supply chains, and my Republican colleagues should be as excited about this analysis as I am. Given their critical mineral supply chain concerns, I would think this is welcome news. However, instead of focusing our efforts on how to best leverage this report to further our domestic lithium production, we are here debating a bill that will do the exact opposite and harm our domestic supply chain efforts.

H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, would prohibit the EPA from finalizing their proposed rule on multipollutant emissions standards, drastically cutting into the development and production of domestic technological innovations, such as electric vehicles and battery manufacturing, that our Nation needs.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill in its entirety. In addition to slowing down our country's ability to compete with China on electric vehicles in the global market, it is a direct attack on our Nation's ability to curb vehicle emissions and help rural and marginalized communities in their own districts suffering from the highest pollution.

My home State of California and, in particular, my district, California's 25th, have significant air pollution challenges.

As a physician, I have seen the public health impacts of air pollution firsthand. These consequences are serious and have very real bad effects on the lives of my constituents. From having to skip work to deal with air pollution-associated health challenges to spending money on unexpected healthcare costs, my constituents are experiencing the negative impacts of air pollution every day.

Recently, the American Thoracic Society released its latest "Health of the Air" report, which estimated that we can prevent over 21,000 deaths by cleaning up our air, and a major step in doing so is by reducing vehicle emissions, which this bill will not do.

What we should be doing is following California's lead by taking concrete steps to reduce dangerous air pollution from transportation modalities. In-

stead, this bill specifically punishes California for its efforts, and that is unacceptable.

California has chosen to make the health of Californians a priority. This bill should do the same for all Americans, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this environmentally unfriendly and disastrous polluter-over-people bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we are seeing President Biden put Green New Deal priorities ahead of Pennsylvania families. By proposing to eliminate gas-powered cars from our roads, the Biden administration is attempting to fundamentally change how Americans drive.

The proposed rule from the EPA assumes that battery electric vehicles will make up 60 percent of new cars in 2030 and almost two-thirds by 2032. The basic facts show us that this assumption is simply wrong and that attempting to ban the sale of internal combustion engine cars, internal combustion engine trucks, and internal combustion engine SUVs that families in Pennsylvania rely on is dangerous.

This legislation is a vital part of stopping the Biden administration's far-left, Green New Deal agenda from being implemented.

In tandem with my legislation, the Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act, the CARS Act would help to ensure that the Clean Air Act, which is a 51-year-old piece of legislation, is not manipulated to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have heard testimony from experts across the political spectrum, including members of the Biden administration, who say that transitioning to EVs would be costly and ineffective. Just this month, we heard from more than 4,000 car dealers, including 70 from Pennsylvania, who say that transitioning to battery vehicles would be a disaster for drivers across our country.

More than 95 percent of Americans use gas-powered vehicles. Demanding that they transition to battery electric vehicles in the next decade would be disastrous for our economy, unsustainable for our electric grid, and devastating to American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and put a stop to President Biden's reckless use of agency rulemaking.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), who is a member of our committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I love my colleagues on the other side, but it is just disappointing that,

yet again, another Republican messaging bill is coming to the floor intentionally to mislead and harm the American people.

Even the United Auto Workers, who my colleagues say they are helping, say that this bill seeks to inject American union-made vehicles as a wedge issue in the culture war.

I remind my colleagues, some of whom are young while some of us are seasoned, that it was years ago when gas prices went up and consumers wanted smaller cars. Japanese carmakers were prepared, and our domestic auto industry was flatfooted. We weren't ready to build small cars, and we took a beating.

We cannot make that mistake again. We need to be ready to innovate, build these electric vehicles now, and do so in a competitive way.

This bill is a blatant attack on the EPA and on our ability to, and how we will and must, compete in a global marketplace. It prevents the EPA from finalizing recently proposed new standards for light- and medium-duty vehicles, which will save consumers up to \$12,000 over the lifetime of their vehicles. It will also reduce fine particle pollution that not only harms our environment but leads to increased asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, and premature death.

To be really clear, EPA is not imposing an electric vehicle mandate. EPA's standards actually would expand vehicle choice by accelerating innovation in hybrid and fully electric vehicles and promote American manufacturing to keep us from relying on our adversaries. In total, EPA estimates that the net benefits of these standards would exceed \$1 trillion.

The bill we are debating will have widespread harmful effects on the future of our auto industry. What scares me the most is this is going to enable China even more to potentially lead the global EV transition.

I ask my colleagues, are we going to help China do anything? I am not. I will not cede American leadership to anyone. We cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we are the ones who put the world on wheels.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to invest in our EV transition so we don't lose to China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have talked to those dealers. The dealers aren't opposed to EV vehicles. There is a rulemaking, and the rulemaking needs to take their input into consideration.

I am a car girl. I was born one, raised one, worked in it, and my district depends on it.

Let's get serious. We need to get to work, and blocking our domestic auto



industry from innovating is no way to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this crazy push to make EVs the only choice for U.S. car buyers without first building out our domestic supply chains for critical minerals is a recipe for dependence on China and, by extension, defaulting to China's filthy environmental practices.

Aren't we already too beholden to China? It really stinks, but, yes, we are.

Moreover, China's EV companies have announced significant investments to manufacture EVs in Mexico, presumably to gain access to the North American car market.

Why is the Biden White House hell-bent on shoving their EV mandates down Americans' throats?

China is not our friend, Mr. Speaker, and unlike China's treatment of their very own citizens, we should not be dictating to Americans what they can or cannot drive. In America, we let consumers choose the cars they drive. It is that simple. Even one of our speakers over there said that she chose to drive an EV.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. This legislation is misguided and will take us backward in combating climate change and air pollution.

If I may offer some brief history from my home State, for much of the mid-20th century, California was plagued by smog. Thankfully, the Clean Air Act allowed California to establish stronger vehicle emission standards than those at the Federal level. Standards like those in my home State empowered the auto industry to produce better, cleaner cars, which expanded American manufacturing and reduced our reliance on foreign oil.

These standards were a win for consumers, for our domestic auto industry, and for meeting our air quality and climate goals. However, H.R. 4468 would erase the decades of progress we have made by blocking EPA from reducing air and climate pollution.

In fact, the only party that would benefit from rolling back EPA's efforts to slash air pollution is the fossil fuel industry.

This bill isn't based in science, and it fails to recognize the climate impacts our constituents are already feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mr. Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act.

The American people shouldn't be told by unelected bureaucrats which car best suits their needs and the needs of their families, but the Biden administration is seeking to do so through some backdoor policymaking aimed at taking gas-powered engines off the market.

Let me be clear: This is not about being anti-electric vehicle. This is about being pro-consumer choice. Demand should be driven by consumer preferences and budgets.

Let's look at the facts. According to a report from the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, gasoline-powered cars and trucks represented 93 percent of all new vehicle sales in 2022. According to Congressional Budget Office projections, electric vehicles will account for only 30 to 56 percent of new car sales by 2032.

Even with the outrageous incentives for electric vehicles that are being subsidized by taxpayers, which are included in Biden's so-called Inflation Reduction Act, this policy will fall well short of EPA's goal of two-thirds of new car sales being electric vehicles.

No matter how much the government floods the market with requirements that squeeze out internal combustion engines and require electric vehicles, if consumers don't want to buy the cars, then they should not be forced to do so.

The CARS Act will stop the EPA's current light- and medium-duty vehicle regulations and, instead, allow consumers and the market to determine the cars and engine technology needed and save billions in taxpayer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and consumer choice.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, House Republican's latest attempt to undermine climate change action taken by the Biden administration and dismiss the high risks presented by air pollution for communities like mine.

My district falls within the South Coast Air Basin, which has the worst air pollution in the entire country. Inland Empire residents have higher levels of cardiovascular disease, childhood asthma, and other respiratory diseases compared to the national average as a result.

□ 1315

The EPA's proposed rule, which this bill would inhibit, reduces car emissions, drives innovation of clean technologies, and improves public health in my district and across the country.

My constituents deserve to breathe clean air and live healthy lives. We should all support EPA's efforts to address health disparities and combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my friend, colleague, and neighbor.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden has made it clear since day one that he will use the full weight and power of his office to push a radical climate agenda at the expense of consumer choice and American energy security.

His rush-to-green agenda, drawn up and enforced by Washington bureaucrats, pushes for a one-size-fits-all approach to vehicle purchases.

The Biden administration's standards would mandate that two-thirds of all new vehicles sold by 2032 be electric. The standards strong-arm manufacturers into building cars that simply do not reflect market demand.

In fact, last month nearly 4,000 car dealers from all 50 States joined a letter to President Biden urging him to slow down the EPA's proposed rule.

Just last week, Consumer Reports released a survey showing that electric vehicles proved far less reliable than internal combustion engine counterparts.

The survey found that EV model years 2021 through 2023 encountered nearly 80 percent more problems compared to the conventional vehicles. It is no wonder Ford and GM recently announced they are cutting back investments in EV production and reassessing their EV production goals for the first half of 2024. The American people just aren't buying them.

Furthermore, the EPA's rule, if implemented, will increase the strain on our electric grid at a time when misguided State and Federal energy policies are already driving power plants to retirement.

With the passage of this legislation today, we can reaffirm our support of the free market and consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of the CARES Act today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the California Air Resources Board having been a Republican appointee by Governor Pete Wilson and having served under two Republicans and one Democratic Governor, I have seen the modeling firsthand to know the importance of reducing our transportation omissions. It is through this lens that I strongly oppose H.R. 4468.

This bill would not only prevent the EPA from implementing its newest and strongest emission standards, but it would also block EPA from finalizing vehicle emission standards that indirectly result in the phasing out of any specific engine technology, which could deal a fatal blow to innovation and the deployment of alternative fuel energies, including electric vehicles.

EPA's proposed standards that this bill would eliminate, reduces 7.3 billion metric tons of carbon pollution and 15,000 tons of particulate matter pollution, which would provide between \$63 and \$280 billion in health benefits to Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill and partisan efforts to thwart EV development and hinder emissions reductions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill because American consumers are directly impacted by the cost of vehicles.

Unfortunately, the EPA is trying to force Americans into only being able to pick from some of the most expensive vehicles on the market—electric vehicles.

The Energy and Commerce Committee received testimony in April that the average price of an EV is \$13,000 more than the average price of an internal combustion engine vehicle.

Detroit News Editorial Board reported last week that the new average EV list price was 28 percent higher than a gasoline vehicle last month, according to CarGurus.

In addition, insurance for an EV is also \$44 more expensive per month versus \$528 more expensive per year than insurance for gas-powered cars. EVs are 50 percent more expensive to fix in the case of an accident, according to Forbes.

The price of a vehicle is incredibly important to my constituents and those of my colleagues because access to a car is tied to improved economic outcomes for low-income households.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill to preserve affordable vehicle choices for Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468. I have listened as the party that is actively trying to strip away America's personal freedoms and rights is disguising its antisocial, anticlimatic legislation as protecting choice and personal freedom. That is rich.

House Republicans are putting polluters over people, yet again prioritizing special interests over the health and well-being of Americans.

This deeply harmful bill would undermine the EPA's authority to finalize proposed emission standards and prevent the agency from taking future action to protect the public from dangerous air pollution.

Their opposition to the rule has very real impacts for historically marginalized environmental justice communities, most often low-income communities of color, many of which I represent, who live near the roadways.

We know greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants can cause a host of adverse public health impacts, including higher rates of cancer, respiratory illness, and preterm births, which is why we cannot stand by while House Republicans work to curtail EPA's authority.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is forcing electric vehicles upon Americans by using a tailpipe emissions rule designed to phase out vehicles with internal combustion engines. In so doing, the EPA imposes an unwise restrictive policy and eliminates consumer choice.

The Clean Air Act directs the EPA to reduce pollutant emissions from vehicles themselves; however, electric vehicles are entirely separate products. They are not emission-controlled devices like catalytic converters in combustion engine cars.

By setting emission standards at a stringent rate, the EPA is essentially mandating substitution of a different product to comply with tailpipe standards.

This goes beyond existing authority and tries to circumvent congressional powers, and that is illegal.

Instead of ripping away consumer choice, the EPA should do its job and stop enforcing irrelevant rules to meet political objectives. Those in favor of the EPA's rules here use the term "sound science." Well, cutting off vehicles that have shown tremendous improvements in efficiency with less emissions is denying scientific gains.

What would actually help Americans is driving lower fuel prices through domestic production with reliable base-load energy sources like nuclear, hydro, geothermal, natural gas, and clean burning coal.

We need to stop attempting to control what vehicle drivers can purchase and instead focus on what the people elected them to do.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect people's rights and choices, and pass H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my friend and outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, if this was a "Jeopardy!" game, it would be called: Here we go again for a thousand.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at what the EPA has done to overreach, we are

talking hundreds of proposed rules that they have overreached on telling the American public what they can and can't do.

Mr. Speaker, if it were allowed under House rules, I would address the gallery and I would ask the gallery, raise your hand if you like the fact that the President of the United States is going to tell you what kind of vehicle you can and cannot drive.

It is not necessarily allowed under House rules, but I am guessing, because my district doesn't like it, that most Americans don't like it either.

Today, we are going to stop the EPA from outlawing gas-powered vehicles. The CARS Act places a critical stop sign on this failed path toward forcing all Americans to own electric vehicles. Not only does this legislation prohibit the EPA from enforcing a ban, but it also acknowledges the abuse that the EPA has done.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor, and I thank Mr. WALBERG for leading this legislation. The Energy and Commerce Committee is leading the way to energy dominance and allowing Americans to make their own choices that they very much need to be able to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from referencing the occupants in the gallery.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automotive Retail Sales Act.

A few months ago, the EPA proposed a new rule that would effectively require the vast majority of automobiles sold in the United States to be electric within just a few years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against electric vehicles, but I feel very strongly that American families should be empowered to choose the vehicle that best meets their needs rather than having their government make that decision for them.

Mr. Speaker, I represent over 100,000 people who commute from my rural California district back and forth into Los Angeles every single day. For those people, an electric vehicle is not only unaffordable, it is also impractical.

Preserving their ability to make their own choice on this issue also preserves the market forces that incentivize manufacturers to continue to lower the cost of electric vehicles and increase their quality.

Mr. Speaker, that is good not only for families, but also for the environment. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

The out-of-touch government dictated EV mandates pushed by this administration are an attack on our way of life in northern Minnesota and across this country.

Many of my constituents not only can't afford an EV, they don't want to purchase an EV because they are not compatible with our daily lives. How are we supposed to reliably drive an EV when its battery has the potential to lose 50 percent of its range in Minnesota's subzero temperatures?

Let's not forget that the critical minerals used to make these EVs are sourced from Chinese Communist Party-controlled mines in places like the Congo and Indonesia—mines that have zero environmental standards, mines that have zero labor standards, and mines that use child slave labor.

Thanks to this administration's refusal to support responsible, domestic mining, their EV mandate will only increase our reliance on the Chinese Communist Party for critical minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind you and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the biggest copper nickel find is in northern Minnesota, the Duluth Complex—95 percent of our nickel reserve, over 88 percent of our cobalt, and a third of our copper and other platinum group metals that help make electric vehicles—and this administration just pulled the leases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 4468.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), an auto dealer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, and in full disclosure, I am a car dealer. I am, frankly, the expert in the room.

This legislation would stop the EPA from implementing a rule that is an attack on hardworking Americans and, if implemented, would decimate small businesses and wreak havoc on the pocketbooks of families.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and owner and operator and expert in car dealerships in Texas for over 52 years, I have seen firsthand the impact that overregulation can have on small businesses. Competition drives my industry, not government innovations. By the way, no one wants to buy an EV vehicle.

We are a country of competition, of risk and reward, and the Federal Government should not be in the car business. We must allow individuals to choose the vehicle that best suits their

needs, not the government or Joe Biden.

The EPA's proposed rule would have heightened impact on hardworking American families with an estimated increase in costs from maintenance to interest costs to lack of equity. It is clear President Biden's EPA are out of touch with the American people by ignoring out-of-control inflation while pushing a green energy bailout.

The customer is getting hammered again and your local car dealer is getting hammered again. The proposed rule would also increase our dependency on China, something the administration seems determined to ensure happens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and Main Street America and vote for H.R. 4468.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The amazing thing to me is that today during the debate, I heard very few statements on the part of the Republicans about clean air.

This is all about the Clean Air Act and the fact that the EPA is trying to set standards that will eliminate pollution and make it easier for people to breathe and not be negatively impacted by pollution that is in the air. What the Republicans want to do is gut the Clean Air Act so those standards cannot be put in place.

Now, they also mentioned China constantly, over and over again. The fact of the matter is that with this bill, they would be putting China in charge. China is the country—Beijing—that imposes the mandates. What the EPA does is basically say in order to achieve cleaner air, we are saying to the car manufacturers, they have to do certain things, but they still have the choice of what kind of vehicles to produce, whether it be a hybrid, an electric, or a gasoline-combustion vehicle.

All those vehicles are still going to be available, are still going to be manufactured. It is just that they are going to have fewer or no emissions, and the air will be cleaner for Americans to breathe.

Now, the ultimate thing is when the Republicans talk about the workers and the jobs. The fact of the matter is, the United Auto Workers—which represents most of the car makers, or all of them as far as I know—are opposed to this bill. The reason for their opposition is because they want to continue to manufacture cars.

They don't want China to continue to innovate and essentially start to corner the world market on electric vehicles or even other vehicles. If that happens, the number of jobs here in the United States will be diminished. They are saying we oppose this bill because we want to create more cars and create more jobs, and we want the United States to continue to be the leader.

For all these reasons—for cleaner air, to keep American leadership above any

competition with China, to make sure there continue to be choices with the cars that you buy through your manufacturers—I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this bill, which I think is going to take away the American leadership in car manufacturing and innovation and so many other things.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my friend and colleague, to close.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, what it really boils down to is choice for Americans, affordable choices. Just because we want to be part of this green agenda here, constantly crying about climate change doesn't mean it is going to be good for Americans.

These mandates, for example, on trucks will add 16,000 pounds of weight that is no longer part of the cargo capacity for trucks. On automobiles, it is adding about \$13,000 to the price of a car.

Little credit has been given for how efficient and clean internal combustion engines run these days. This is all a big CO<sub>2</sub> scam. I remind you; CO<sub>2</sub> is only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere.

Let's go back in the direction of allowing people to have choices of the best manufactured cars that come from right here in America instead of giving it over to China, which is what will happen on the mined products, the labor, so many other things.

Americans can figure out what they like. They certainly don't need California mandates that have already failed in the past and the Federal Government dictating to them what their choices are in driving.

H.R. 4468 is a good, righteous bill. Let's support that and help people continue to have the choices they want in this country and not be mandated by Congress or certainly California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that was my closing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118-298.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Washington, and I have an amendment at the desk.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

“(B) Any regulation proposed or prescribed, including any revision to a regulation, under paragraph (1) on or after January 1, 2021, shall not—

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the CARS Act is to permit Americans, not the executive branch of the Federal Government, to continue deciding what type of car makes the most sense for them.

The purpose is not to reopen decades-old requirements that Americans have become accustomed to with their cars, and which manufacturers consider to be standard—whether it is the catalytic converter or the onboard diagnostic system, especially because those regulations were not trying to do away with an engine type—but, rather, to just address the most harmful pollution coming from that car.

Rather than creating any confusion for EPA, automakers, or the public, or leading to unintended consequences or unnecessary litigation, this amendment sets a limit on how far back in time the provisions of H.R. 4468 apply.

Instead of applying to any regulation ever issued in the history of the authority provided under Clean Air Act section 202(a), the manager's amendment caps the retroactivity of the bill's provisions to section 202(a) regulations, including revisions, proposed or prescribed on or after January 1, 2021.

By adding this date, the legislation focuses on pushing back on regulations that would have the Federal Government, and not Americans, decide what kinds of cars they should be able to drive.

For over 100 years, Americans have been free to buy their own mode of transportation based upon what is available, reliable, affordable, and functional for their lives. Quite frankly, it was because of these criteria that electric vehicles never took off with American consumers, but the Model T did.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that adopting this amendment would have an insignificant net effect on the deficit.

I urge all Members to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would revise the look-back portion of the bill that requires EPA to revise all previous regulations to conform with the bill's vague metrics on limiting availability of vehicles.

This amendment would shorten this period to only apply to rules finalized under the Biden administration, so please understand what they are doing here is saying that the only thing we are going to revoke, essentially, are the rules that were finalized under President Biden. I mean, nothing could be clearer that this amendment is

based on politics and not policy by limiting the revocation to the Biden administration.

This amendment does not improve the legislation in any way. It fails to address the fundamental problems with the underlying bill. The amendment is essentially trying to go back in time to the failed policies of the Trump EPA. We would literally be moving backwards in our efforts to address the climate crisis and decarbonize the transportation sector and trying to eliminate pollution that affects Americans.

The amendment doesn't address any of the concerns that my Republican colleagues claim to have about electric vehicles. This amendment simply doubles down on Republicans' attacks on EPA's authority, public health, and regulatory certainty.

It does absolutely nothing to support our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry, like boost American competitiveness, counter China, or strengthen our economy.

This is just blatantly political, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment as well as the underlying bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at what we have heard today. If we want to help America's autoworkers, then let's keep them on the job. It takes a lot less labor to make electric vehicles than it does to make combustion engine vehicles.

If we want to protect the environment, then let's keep China from doing all the mining and refining of the rare earth minerals and critical materials, and supply chain that we actually need to make electric vehicles here in America.

If we want to stop supporting China, rather than buy Chinese cars, which is where this is ultimately going to go if we continue down this road, let's permit mining and refining of critical materials right here in America so when we do make electric vehicles, and we give the American people a choice about purchasing those vehicles, they are made with American materials mined and refined in America by American workers rather than putting money in the pockets of the Chinese Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to think about what the future looks like. We need to rein in the EPA's egregious rule mandating electric vehicles.

Let me remind you, Republicans are not opposed to electric vehicles. I have a lot of friends who own electric vehicles. Not very many of them live in Appalachia, rural communities, where they are impractical and unaffordable, but if we want to empower the American people with choice, then we need to roll back this EV mandate because the day will come when the only choice that people will have is to buy a car

that is manufactured in China by China. That will be the only thing that is going to be available because we can't get permits here in America to do our mining and refining of those critical materials.

China has already sent signals that they are going to start and have already started withholding those critical materials that we need to make electric vehicles.

The Chinese are setting a trap. God forbid if we let the Biden administration force us to fall into that trap.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4468 is postponed.

□ 1345

DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5933.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1346

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, with Mr. MOYLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the DETERRENT Act, H.R. 5933. The Republican transparency and accountability agenda is on the march, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce has set its sights on postsecondary education.

We delivered the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, a bill to ensure Title IX funding doesn't go to athletic programs which disadvantage young women.

Just yesterday, we conducted oversight of anti-Semitism on campus during a contentious hearing with Ivy League presidents.

Now, we are considering the DETERRENT Act, a bill that restores transparency and accountability in foreign donations to American universities.

The DETERRENT Act strengthens section 117 of the Higher Education Act, which was intended to protect American universities from nefarious foreign donations.

Unfortunately, many schools failed to report these foreign gifts and funding, leaving foreign actors with a stranglehold on U.S. academic institutions.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of universities fail to comply with the law, and outside experts uncovered nearly \$13 billion in previously undisclosed foreign funds.

Of course, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Without transparency, we have no idea the true amount of foreign funds at our universities.

This legislation safeguards our national security in five key ways. First, this bill lowers the minimum foreign gift reporting threshold to \$50,000 from its current \$250,000. For countries of concern, every penny must be reported.

Second, the bill closes loopholes that allow foreign entities to hide the true origin or purpose of their gifts.

Every disclosure must include the intended purposes, dates, and person at the institution responsible for accepting the gift.

Third, the DETERRENT Act requires that research faculty at our largest research universities disclose foreign gifts and contracts publicly so the American people can see if academic work is compromised.

Fourth, it reveals foreign investments by the endowments of our largest private universities.

Finally, it sets real, meaningful penalties for universities that fail to comply. Foreign influence is not something our schools should take lightly.

I am proud of my Republican colleague, Representative MICHELLE STEEL, for introducing this fantastic piece of legislation, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce is proud to deliver yet another win for transparency, for accountability, and for the American people.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5933, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions, or DETERRENT Act, is before us today.

Historically, collaborations with global partners—and careful Federal investments in research—have enabled our colleges and universities to make bold, forward-thinking strides in health, science, and technology for people around the world.

Additionally, institutions have collaborated with the U.S. Government to enhance our research by attracting and retaining researchers and scholars from across the world.

These partnerships help drive intellectual and campus diversity, strengthen inner workings of our economy, and give us an undeniable competitive edge.

Institutions, however, must be transparent about the resources they receive from foreign entities, particularly as the Federal Government invests nearly \$30 billion annually in our higher education research and development efforts.

Some colleges and universities, unfortunately, have not complied with all of their responsibilities in those disclosures. Regrettably, H.R. 5933 does nothing to meaningfully protect research security at colleges and universities.

For example, colleges must report any gift from a representative of a "country of concern" no matter the value—even a cup of coffee.

The faculty's information is then shared in a publicly searchable database, regardless of whether the action was nefarious or not.

This is excessive and burdensome—to say nothing about the potential discriminatory effect—and would disincentivize universities from conducting critical research using collaborative partners from around the world.

It would force them to deviate from established compliance and reporting guidelines under section 117 of the Higher Education Act.

Schools are already grappling with recruiting and retaining students and scholars. If passed, H.R. 5933 will stall decades of innovative progress and jeopardize global research initiatives.

Students and faculties are already calling on Congress to improve our

higher education system and address discrimination on campus.

However, certain provisions of this bill would only exacerbate the ongoing culture wars that have consumed our colleagues in Congress.

For example, the legislation singles out partnerships with certain countries, targeting researchers based solely on their nationality.

As I have said before, we can achieve accountability and compliance without contributing to anti-Asian, anti-Semitic, or Islamophobic animosity.

I have offered a thoughtful alternative to improve section 117 compliance and support institutions as they evaluate and implement their research integrity and foreign influence policies, and that alternative will be offered during the amendment process.

This amendment builds on the Chips and Science Act and the Presidential Memorandum on government-supported research and development national security policy guidelines.

Specifically, it aligns reporting requirements with those of Federal agencies and requires the Secretary of Education to go through negotiated rule-making to address key implementation aspects of section 117.

We must take targeted and thoughtful steps to protect our research and development initiatives without jeopardizing our global partnerships that will benefit us all.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL).

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman, Dr. Foxx, for yielding time.

Actually, this has nothing to do with an anti-Asian bill. This is my bill, and we want to protect our children from this propaganda.

Yesterday, before the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the entire world, leaders of three of our Nation's most prestigious universities failed to demonstrate the most basic levels of humanity when discussing anti-Semitism on campus.

Make no mistake: Their lack of moral clarity shows exactly what happens when we permit hostile foreign actors like Qatar, Iran, and Communist China to buy influence on our college campuses.

When they give money without return, actually, there is no such thing as a free lunch. That is why today I am offering a legislative solution to crack down on this crisis in our higher education system. That is why I rise today to urge support and passage of the DETERRENT Act.

Justice Brandeis once said: Sunlight is the best disinfectant. As we saw yesterday, our college campuses are infected.

The DETERRENT Act brings desperately needed sunlight by strengthening transparency and disclosure requirements under section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

While the previous administration reinvigorated the use of this tool, the current administration has repeatedly downplayed the threat of foreign actors and failed to take meaningful steps to protect our students, research, and national security. If the President will not act, Congress must.

The DETERRENT Act has three pillars to strengthen section 117. The first pillar brings much-needed transparency.

Foreign adversaries look for any loophole to hide their intentions. This is especially true for states that pose the greatest threats to our Nation, like Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea.

The DETERRENT Act eliminates these loopholes by lowering the foreign gifts reporting threshold from \$250,000 to \$50,000 for all foreign donors and eliminating the threshold entirely for those from countries of concern.

The bill also requires the disclosures include detailed information about the foreign source, the intent of the gift, and the complete text of any contracts with the concerned entities.

The second pillar of my bill establishes accountability. For too long, schools have adopted a take the money first, ask questions later approach to billions of dollars of foreign funds.

As reporting and congressional oversight revealed in the case of UC Berkeley in my home State of California, these problematic relationships are often discovered years after the fact when the damage has already been done.

Requiring timely transparency for institutions receiving foreign funds means ensuring the penalties for non-reporting are more than a slap on the wrist.

□ 1400

The DETERRENT Act institutes a progressive fine schedule, culminating in the loss of title IV funding for non-compliant universities. The bill also sets up an institutional point of contact so institutions cannot use the faceless bureaucracy to claim ignorance of unreported foreign funds on their campuses.

The third and final pillar of the DETERRENT Act is clarity. The DETERRENT Act streamlines the bureaucratic reporting process and aligns section 117 with other laws. It shifts the reporting schedule from a biannual to an annual basis, using reporting thresholds from existing law to avoid confusion.

It improves communication between the Department of Education and institutions by mandating a point of contact on section 117 for institutions to utilize at the Department. It also requires periodic meetings between the Department and institutions to discuss improvements to online reporting.

Section 117 has not been updated in more than 30 years. These reforms are long overdue.

The DETERRENT Act is a common-sense bill that adds transparency, ac-

countability, and clarity to section 117. That is why it passed the Education and the Workforce Committee in a bipartisan vote.

Let's protect our students from this propaganda. Mr. Chair, I urge every Member of this body to vote "yes" on the DETERRENT Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will quote from a letter we received from the Asian American Scholar Forum in terms of the effect this bill would have on Asian-American researchers. It is a long letter, but I will read one paragraph.

"The DETERRENT Act would further chill participation in research by signaling to researchers and institutions that scientific collaboration is discouraged and effectively deter economic institutions and scholars from engaging with Chinese-American and immigrant colleagues and peers out of fear of punishment or heightened scrutiny. The DETERRENT Act's definition of a 'foreign source' includes not just individuals overseas but those with lawful immigration status in the United States who are not U.S. citizens or nationals. As a practical matter, the DETERRENT Act would force scholars and researchers to scrutinize the immigration status of potential collaborators and would deter them from collaboration with individuals who may be perceived to be immigrants. Moreover, many scholars would not have access to private information, such as the immigration status of their peers, making this practically a difficult or impossible requirement for faculty, scholars, and researchers to meet. Additionally, the reporting requirement for contracts of no monetary value as it pertains to foreign entities and countries of concern as defined by the DETERRENT Act would significantly chill even normal, everyday communications, as it may be perceived as an agreement."

This would obviously have a chilling effect, and that is one of the reasons we are opposing the DETERRENT Act.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I support the DETERRENT Act, and I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

Education is a battleground for influence, and it seems that foreign countries understand this better than some Members of this Congress.

On our watch, the Federal Government doles out billions in taxpayer dollars to fund expensive degrees that empower an anti-American agenda while these woke universities secretly collect checks from hostile nations and watch their endowments grow and grow.

The DETERRENT Act would strengthen existing law, requiring colleges to publicly report gifts and con-

tracts with foreign countries. Under the DETERRENT Act, this information would be publicly available on a searchable database because taxpayers, parents, and students deserve to see who is buying the opportunity to influence the next generation of Americans.

The DETERRENT Act would further expose disturbing data that has recently come to light. At least 200 American colleges declined to report a total of \$13 billion in contributions from authoritarian countries like Qatar, China, and Saudi Arabia.

For some reason, the Biden administration has halted many of the existing investigations of reporting violations and has declined to enforce current law. Why would that be? Could it have something to do with the \$14 million donated to the Penn Biden Center from unnamed contributors in China?

The Biden administration minimizes it, and universities try to hide it, but the American people are suffering the effects of foreign influence.

Just yesterday, in the Education and the Workforce Committee, the presidents of Harvard, Penn, and MIT defended the influence Hamas has on our campuses and students across this country. The number one donor of these undisclosed funds, Qatar, is a country that says Israel alone is responsible for the attacks by Hamas and even houses an office for the Hamas leader in its capital city.

International partnerships can be beneficial for universities but should not come at the cost of our national security, intellectual property, academic freedom, or perpetuation of our American values.

Mr. Chair, I support passage of the DETERRENT Act to ensure greater transparency regarding who is funding our colleges and universities, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Asian American Scholars Forum from which I quoted be entered into the RECORD.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's request will be covered under general leave.

ASIAN AMERICAN SCHOLAR FORUM,  
November 7, 2023.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,  
*Chairwoman, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: Asian American Scholar Forum (AASF) respectfully submits this letter to provide feedback on H.R. 5933, the Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERRENT) Act. We write to express our concerns in opposition of the DETERRENT Act, which will have a chilling effect on Asian American and Asian immigrant researchers and all scholars from participating in U.S. scientific innovation, and will chill open science and innovation more broadly.

AASF is a national non-profit, non-partisan organization that works to promote

academic belonging, openness, freedom, and equality for all. AASF accomplishes this through education and research, advocacy, and building up leaders within the Asian American scientific and academic community. AASF is one of the leading Asian American national civil rights organizations on science and research security policy as it relates to the Asian American community including profiling concerns. Our membership includes the National Academy of Engineering, the National Academy of Medicine, the National Academy of Science, and the American Academy of Arts & Sciences members as well as past and current university presidents, provost, vice provosts, deans, associate deans, and past and current department chairs. AASF is a member of the National Council for Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA). Founded in 1996, NCAPA is a coalition of 47 national Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) organizations serving to represent the interests of the greater AANHPI communities and to provide a national voice for Asian American and National Hawaiian Pacific Islander issues.

In January 2021, the Trump Administration issued NSPM-33, which directed federal agencies and academic institutions to protect U.S. government-supported research and development “[w]hile maintaining an open environment to foster research discoveries and innovation.” In January 2022, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) issued guidance to implement NSPM-33. In addition to protecting “security and openness,” the guidance seeks “to be clear so that well-intentioned researchers can easily and properly comply” and “to clarify and simplify how researchers disclose information to the federal government.” The guidance cautioned that “if our policies to address [research security challenges] significantly diminish our superpower of attracting global scientific talent—or if they fuel xenophobia against Asian Americans—we will have done more damage to ourselves than any competitor or adversary could. So we need a thoughtful and effective approach.” Further, OSTP noted that “it is important to avoid undue, vague, and implicit pressures on researchers, as this could create a chilling atmosphere that would only constrain and damage the U.S. scientific enterprise.” in light of the White House’s NSPM-33 and the current process within federal agencies and academic institutions to harmonize and create new requirements and policies, we are concerned with the addition of the DETERRENT Act in its entirety. Moreover, we have several key concerns with problematic sections that would result in significant negative impact to the Asian American and scholar community.

**NEW REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE DETERRENT ACT WILL HINDER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NSPM-33, CREATING CONFUSING AND ADDITIONAL UNDUE BURDENS ON ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS AND RESEARCHERS.**

As indicated by the NSPM-33 guidance, transparency and clarity of any federal requirements with disclosure of information is critical not only for compliance, but also for safeguarding our national security. Currently, academic institutions and federal agencies are working to implement the reporting and disclosure requirements under NSPM-33. With this implementation process underway, any new reporting requirements will create confusion and additional burdens on academic institutions and researchers. Transparency and clarity of process will help everyone—from researchers, academic institutions, and the governments—and promote effective collection of information. Any new disclosure requirements at this time will be counterproductive to that process.

Additionally, it is critical to ensure that federal agencies and academic institutions follow the NSPM-33 mandatory anti-discriminatory provision, engage with the directly impacted Asian American and scholar community, and that due processes are in place both within federal agencies and academic institutions to protect the rights of Asian Americans, particularly those of Chinese descent who have been subjected to heightened scrutiny as U.S.-China tensions worsen.

**THE DETERRENT ACT WILL CHILL ASIAN AMERICANS AND IMMIGRANTS FROM PARTICIPATING IN AMERICAN SOCIETY AND RESEARCH, THEREBY RESULTING IN CIVIL RIGHTS CONCERNS AND HARM U.S. LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.**

The DETERRENT Act will worsen the existing chilling effect on Asian American and immigrant communities, hurting their ability to participate in American society and contribute to our country through their leadership and research. The Asian American community has a long history of being targeted and scapegoated as national security threats based on our race, ethnicity, religion, or ancestry, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. More recently, federal agency programs such as the Justice Department’s now-defunct “China Initiative,” raised concerns about racial bias and profiling of Asian Americans, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic and anti-China rhetoric from U.S. government officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a new wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The Asian American and immigrant community are currently living in a climate of fear. A survey conducted between December 2021 and March 2022 of 1300+ faculty members nationwide found that although an overwhelming majority of the survey respondents (89 percent) would like to contribute to the U.S. leadership in science and technology, many feel unsafe (72 percent) and fearful of conducting research (42 percent) in the U.S., especially engineering and computing science faculty, life science faculty, federal grant awardees, and senior faculty. Around 61 percent of the survey respondents feel pressure to leave the U.S., especially junior faculty and federal grant awardees. Moreover, nearly half of respondents (45 percent) intend to avoid federal grant applications, especially engineering and computing science faculty and senior faculty due to fear.

This chilling effect is especially felt among Chinese-origin American faculty in the U.S., who fear potential federal investigation and prosecution stemming from the China Initiative. This has been exemplified by the recent significant rise over the last few years of Chinese-origin scientists returning to China, despite an overwhelming majority of them wanting to contribute to U.S. leadership in science and technology. This is extremely concerning considering that U.S. leadership in science and technology and national defense have benefited significantly from immigrants by attracting the best and brightest scientists and engineers from around the world, yet U.S. policies and rhetoric push these researchers out of the country despite their desire to contribute. Around 46 percent of PhD students in science and technology fields in 2020 were from abroad. Chinese stu-

dents account for the largest of this group (37 percent), with 87 percent of them having stayed in the U.S., constituting a significant part of the American science and technology labor force.

These findings reveal the widespread fear of conducting routine research and academic activities, along with the significant risks of losing talent culminated in hesitancy to remain in the U.S. The DETERRENT Act and its potential for misguided heightened scrutiny towards Chinese Americans and immigrants will exacerbate these fears, ultimately harming research and hampering innovation in the U.S.

**THE DETERRENT ACT RAISES ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION CONCERNS AS IT IS NOT WORKABLE, RAISES PRIVACY AND SECURITY CONCERNS, AND IS UNREASONABLY PUNITIVE**

The DETERRENT Act would further chill participation in research by signaling to researchers and institutions that scientific collaboration is discouraged, and effectively deter academic institutions and scholars from engaging with Chinese American and immigrant colleagues and peers out of fear of punishment or heightened scrutiny. The DETERRENT Act’s definition of a “foreign source” includes not just individuals overseas but those with lawful immigration status in the United States who are not U.S. citizens or nationals. As a practical matter, the DETERRENT Act would force scholars and researchers to scrutinize the immigration status of potential collaborators and would deter them from collaboration with individuals who may be perceived to be immigrants. Moreover, many scholars would not have access to private information such as the immigration status of their peers, making this practically a difficult or impossible requirement for faculty, scholars, and researchers to meet. Additionally, the reporting requirement for contracts of no monetary value as it pertains to foreign entities and countries of concern as defined by the DETERRENT Act would significantly chill even normal, everyday communications, as it may be perceived as an agreement.

Second, the public disclosure requirements in the DETERRENT Act raises serious concerns of privacy, especially as it pertains to Section 117b, which would require academic institutions to publicly post on its website the information researchers and faculty report under this provision, including their name. This will not only further chill scientific participation, but may also expose researchers to be targeted by foreign adversaries.

Moreover, the requirement under Section 117a for the Department of Education to share information reported with national security and intelligence agencies both pursuant to the DETERRENT Act and retroactively, raises serious concerns about how the shared information will be used and protected by the receiving agencies. The Chinese American and immigration communities have already experienced years of heightened scrutiny and concerns of racially biased surveillance and prosecution. We need further privacy and surveillance protections, rather than further encroachment into their rights and privacy.

Third, we are very concerned with how low the new threshold is for the reporting for gifts and contracts dropping from \$250,000 to \$50,000, as this would significantly increase academic institution’s reporting burden.

Furthermore, the harsh penalty provisions are punitive and would not only harm scientific research and innovation, but education and scholarship more broadly. Section 117d of the DETERRENT Act ties violations under the act to student aid funding, impacting students at the academic institution who

are not connected with any reporting requirement at issue. Section 117 as it stands today allows the Secretary of Education to investigate and bring a civil action to compel compliance with the reporting requirements, as well as to recover costs for enforcement. The DETERRENT Act's punitive and arbitrary penalties are unnecessary and call into question the purpose of this legislation.

We encourage the committee to consider our concerns raised above. Additionally, we encourage you to engage in further discussion with AASF to include the perspective of the Asian American scholar community and help foster a climate of trust with the Asian American and immigrant communities.

Sincerely,

GISELA PEREZ KUSAKAWA,

*Executive Director,*

*Asian American Scholar Forum.*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN).

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chair FOXX for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have a problem. Today, America's education system is being purchased and manipulated by foreign nations. Since 2013, we know about \$12 billion has flooded in from foreign sources to U.S. colleges, and outside experts say billions more in foreign funds could have been underreported.

Foreign nations are pumping money into our higher education systems, and these nations are not our friends. This means our enemies are funding our colleges and universities.

Make no mistake, every dollar that flows into our classrooms comes with strings attached. By accepting these foreign funds, our colleges and universities are importing toxic hatred straight from the dogma of our Nation's enemies into our classrooms.

The results speak for themselves, as we saw in Chair FOXX's committee hearing yesterday: rampant anti-Semitism, censorship, and disdain for our U.S. Constitution, our Founding Fathers, and our American way of life.

This is what happens when our institutions of higher learning accept the Trojan horse of foreign funding. This blatant attempt to inject foreign ideologies into our schools undermines the fundamental purpose of American education.

It goes without saying that we should be teaching American values in American schools.

As a proud cosponsor of Representative STEEL's bill, H.R. 5933, the DETERRENT Act, I look forward today to supporting this timely legislation, which will provide much-needed transparency in foreign funding to schools and reporting requirements.

As we say in Florida, let the sunshine in. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear: America's institutions of higher learning are not for sale.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I proudly rise today in support of Congresswoman STEEL's DETERRENT Act.

The world is on fire, and evil is spreading globally. We cannot permit American colleges and universities to be compromised. Our adversaries are determined to subvert our national interests, and today's modern battleground now includes American college campuses.

When American higher ed administrators accept financial incentives and gifts from adversarial regimes, it sends a clear message that influence on campus is for sale and that American universities are open for business.

Simply put, this is profit over patriotism. I will go a step further and call it anti-American.

It is important to understand that when our universities receive millions from countries that are antithetical to American values, there are strings attached.

Under section 117 of the Higher Education Act, colleges and universities must disclose any foreign funding to an institution exceeding \$250,000. Yet, in 2019, a Senate report found that 70 percent of colleges chose to evade, hide, and cheat to avoid compliance with this law. Only 30 percent of administrators overseeing our educational institutions deemed it important to follow the law put in place by Congress with oversight authority.

This is incredibly concerning, and it must come to an end.

I am proud that my bill, the Reporting on Investments in Foreign Adversaries Act, the RIFA Act, was included in Congresswoman STEEL's landmark legislation. This is the latest step to hold private industry accountable for their financial partnerships with foreign countries and entities hostile to the United States.

There is a disturbing lack of accountability for private institutions with endowments funded by foreign countries. Many of these countries seek nefarious influence within American universities, which undermines our national security.

By bribing American academic institutions with billions of dollars, our adversaries corrode the minds of American students with anti-American and pro-Marxist propaganda. This poses a threat to our national security, research and development efforts, intellectual property, and academic freedom as a whole.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, the manipulation of our children on American soil paid for by the American taxpayer is unacceptable.

For the sake of our Republic and the millions of taxpaying Americans, we demand a higher standard, full transparency, and more accountability for college administrators who are

complicit. We cannot be satisfied with anything less.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the DETERRENT Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, despite my colleagues' claims, the DETERRENT Act would only burden colleges and universities and jeopardize global partnerships while doing nothing to help them comply with existing compliance and reporting guidelines.

House Democrats tried several times to ensure that the legislation included attainable, commonsense provisions for these institutions. For example, in committee, I offered an amendment to build on the Chips and Science Act and the "Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Guidelines," aligning reporting requirements precisely to those Federal agencies that are already reporting with the Department of Education and requiring the Department of Education to go through negotiated rulemaking to conform those reporting requirements. Unfortunately, the Republican majority did not agree to it.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats are committed to helping institutions comply with the law, but we must always strike a balance between enforcing the law and fostering safe campuses for students, scholars, and faculty.

Regrettably, the legislation before us does nothing to achieve that goal. It would only drive deeper wedges into higher education systems at the expense of students, faculty, and our country's global innovative efforts.

Mr. Chair, as I indicated, in that letter from the Asian American Scholar Forum, they said: "As a practical matter, the DETERRENT Act would force scholars and researchers to scrutinize the immigration status of potential collaborators and would deter them from collaboration with individuals who may be perceived to be immigrants," and the zero limit on monetary value for gifts "would significantly chill even normal, everyday communications."

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5933, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As we all know, public confidence in American universities is in a free fall. According to Gallup, it has dropped almost 3 percentage points a year, on average, over the last 8 years.

The crisis of confidence is multifaceted: part tuition cost, sinking return on investment, and soaring debt. To each of the issues plaguing modern universities, the answer is restoring the principles of transparency and accountability.

Yes, passing this legislation would send a strong message to our foreign



adversaries, but more importantly, it will send a strong message to our constituents: We are good stewards of your votes.

While I know we cannot restore public trust in the university system overnight, requiring a basic level of transparency in foreign donations and accountability from universities is a great first step.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the DETERRENT Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

H.R. 5933

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions Act” or the “DETERRENT Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) is amended to read as follows:

##### “SEC. 117. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS.

###### “(a) DISCLOSURE REPORTS.—

“(1) AGGREGATE GIFTS AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES.—An institution shall file a disclosure report in accordance with subsection (b)(1) with the Secretary on July 31 of the calendar year immediately following any calendar year in which—

“(A) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source (other than a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern)—

“(i) the value of which is \$50,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source within the calendar year; or

“(ii) the value of which is undetermined; or

“(B) the institution receives a gift from a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern, or, upon receiving a waiver under section 117A to enter into a contract with such a country or entity, enters into such contract, without regard to the value of such gift or contract.

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL DISCLOSURES.—In the case of an institution that is substantially controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations) (or successor regulations) by a foreign source, the institution shall file a disclosure report in accordance with subsection (b)(2) with the Secretary on July 31 of each year.

“(3) TREATMENT OF AFFILIATED ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, any gift to, or contract with, an affiliated entity of an institution shall be considered a gift to or contract with, respectively, such institution.

###### “(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—

“(1) GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a)(1) shall contain the following:

“(A) With respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with, any foreign source—

“(i) the terms of such gift or contract, includ-

“(I) the name of the individual, department, or benefactor at the institution receiving the gift or carrying out the contract;

“(II) the intended purpose of such gift or contract, as provided to the institution by such foreign source, or if no such purpose is provided by such foreign source, the intended use of such gift or contract, as provided by the institution; and

“(III) in the case of a restricted or conditional gift or contract, a description of the restrictions or conditions of such gift or contract;

“(ii) with respect to a gift—

“(I) the total fair market dollar amount or dollar value of the gift, as of the date of submission of such report; and

“(II) the date on which the institution received such gift;

“(iii) with respect to a contract—

“(I) the date on which such contract commences;

“(II) as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates; and

“(III) an assurance that the institution will—

“(aa) maintain an unredacted copy of the contract until the latest of—

“(AA) the date that is 4 years after the date on which the contract commences;

“(BB) the date on which the contract terminates; or

“(CC) the last day of any period that applicable State law requires a copy of such contract to be maintained; and

“(bb) upon request of the Secretary during an investigation under subsection (f)(1), produce such an unredacted copy of the contract; and

“(iv) an assurance that in a case in which information is required to be disclosed under this section with respect to a gift or contract that is not in English, such information is translated into English in compliance with the requirements of subsection (c)(1).

“(B) With respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with, a foreign source that is a foreign government (other than the government of a foreign country of concern)—

“(i) the name of such foreign government;

“(ii) the department, agency, office, or division of such foreign government that approved such gift or contract, as applicable; and

“(iii) the physical mailing address of such department, agency, office, or division.

“(C) With respect to a gift received from, or contract entered into with, a foreign source (other than a foreign government subject to the requirements of subparagraph (B))—

“(i) the legal name of the foreign source, or, if such name is not available, a statement certified by the compliance officer in accordance with subsection (f)(2) that the institution has reasonably attempted to obtain such name;

“(ii) in the case of a foreign source that is a natural person, the country of citizenship of such person, or, if such country is not known, the principal country of residence of such person;

“(iii) in the case of a foreign source that is a legal entity, the country in which such entity is incorporated, or if such information is not available, the principal place of business of such entity; and

“(iv) the physical mailing address of such foreign source, or if such address is not available, a statement certified by the compliance officer in accordance with subsection (f)(2) that the institution has reasonably attempted to obtain such address.

“(D) With respect to a contract entered into with a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern—

“(i) a complete and unredacted text of the original contract, and if such original contract is not in English, a translated copy of the text into English;

“(ii) a copy of the waiver received under section 117A for such contract; and

“(iii) the statement submitted by the institution for purposes of receiving such a waiver under section 117A(b)(1).

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a)(2) shall contain—

“(A) the legal name and address of the foreign source that owns or controls the institution;

“(B) the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control; and

“(C) any changes in program or structure resulting from the change in ownership or control.

“(c) TRANSLATION REQUIREMENTS.—Any information required to be disclosed under this section with respect to a gift or contract that is not in English shall be translated, for purposes of such disclosure, by a person that is not an affiliated entity or agent of the foreign source involved with such gift or contract.

###### “(d) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—

“(1) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 60 days before the July 31 immediately following the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act, the Secretary shall—

“(A) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section (including any report submitted under this section before the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act)—

“(i) are made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format), including any information provided in such reports (other than the information prohibited from being publicly disclosed pursuant to paragraph (2));

“(ii) can be individually identified and compared; and

“(iii) are searchable and sortable by—

“(I) the date the institution filed such report;

“(II) the date on which the institution received the gift, or entered into the contract, which is the subject of the report;

“(III) the attributable country of such gift or contract; and

“(IV) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign source that is a natural person);

“(B) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database;

“(C) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report is with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

“(i) a foreign source that is a foreign government; or

“(ii) a foreign source that is not a foreign government; and

“(D) with respect to a disclosure report that does not include the name or address of a foreign source, indicate, as part of the public record of such report included in such database, that such report did not include such information.

“(2) NAME AND ADDRESS OF FOREIGN SOURCE.—The Secretary shall not disclose the name or address of a foreign source that is a natural person (other than the attributable country of such foreign source) included in a disclosure report—

“(A) as part of the public record of such disclosure report described in paragraph (1); or

“(B) in response to a request under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of such section.

“(e) INTERAGENCY INFORMATION SHARING.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a disclosure report from an institution in compliance with this section, the Secretary shall transmit an unredacted copy of such report (that includes the name and address of a foreign source disclosed in such report) to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

“(f) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any institution that is required to file a disclosure report under subsection (a) shall designate, before the filing deadline for such report, and maintain a compliance officer, who shall—

“(1) be a current employee or legally authorized agent of such institution; and

“(2) be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for personally certifying accurate compliance with the foreign gift reporting requirement under this section.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AFFILIATED ENTITY.—The term ‘affiliated entity’, when used with respect to an institution, means an entity or organization that operates primarily for the benefit of, or under the auspices of, such institution, including a foundation of the institution or a related entity (such as any educational, cultural, or language entity).

“(2) ATTRIBUTABLE COUNTRY.—The term ‘attributable country’ means—

“(A) the country of citizenship of a foreign source who is a natural person, or, if such country is unknown, the principal residence (as applicable) of such foreign source; or

“(B) the country of incorporation of a foreign source that is a legal entity, or, if such country is unknown, the principal place of business (as applicable) of such foreign source.

“(3) CONTRACT.—The term ‘contract’—

“(A) means—

“(i) any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property or services by the foreign source;

“(ii) any affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source that involves the use or exchange of an institution’s name, likeness, time, services, or resources; and

“(iii) any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter, of property or services from a foreign source (other than an arms-length agreement for such acquisition from a foreign source that is not a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern); and

“(B) does not include an agreement made between an institution and a foreign source regarding any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as such term is defined in section 472), unless such an agreement is made for more than 15 students or is made under a restricted or conditional contract.

“(4) FOREIGN SOURCE.—The term ‘foreign source’ means—

“(A) a foreign government, including an agency of a foreign government;

“(B) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, created under the laws of a foreign state or states;

“(C) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, substantially controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations) (or successor regulations) by a foreign source;

“(D) a natural person who is not a citizen or a national of the United States or a trust territory or protectorate thereof; and

“(E) an agent of a foreign source, including—

“(i) a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign legal entity, acting on behalf of a foreign source;

“(ii) a person that operates primarily for the benefit of, or under the auspices of, a foreign source, including a foundation or a related entity (such as any educational, cultural, or language entity); and

“(iii) a person who is an agent of a foreign principal (as such term is defined in section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611).

“(5) GIFT.—The term ‘gift’—

“(A) means any gift of money, property, resources, staff, or services; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as such term is defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity

and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made for not more than 15 students, and that is not made under a restricted or conditional contract with such foreign source; or

“(ii) assignment or license of registered industrial and intellectual property rights, such as patents, utility models, trademarks, or copyrights, or technical assistance, that are not identified as being associated with a national security risk or concern by the Federal Research Security Council as described under section 7902 of title 31, United States Code; or

“(iii) decorations (as such term is defined in section 7342(a) of title 5, United States Code).

“(6) RESTRICTED OR CONDITIONAL GIFT OR CONTRACT.—The term ‘restricted or conditional gift or contract’ means any endowment, gift, grant, contract, award, present, or property of any kind which includes provisions regarding—

“(A) the employment, assignment, or termination of faculty;

“(B) the establishment of departments, centers, institutes, instructional programs, research or lecture programs, or new faculty positions;

“(C) the selection, admission, or education of students;

“(D) the award of grants, loans, scholarships, fellowships, or other forms of financial aid restricted to students of a specified country, religion, sex, ethnic origin, or political opinion; or

“(E) any other restriction on the use of a gift or contract.”

(b) PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN FOREIGN ENTITIES AND COUNTRIES.—Part B of title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 117 the following:

“SEC. 117A. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN FOREIGN ENTITIES AND COUNTRIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An institution shall not enter into a contract with a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern.

“(b) WAIVERS.—

“(1) SUBMISSION.—

“(A) FIRST WAIVER REQUESTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An institution that desires to enter into a contract with a foreign entity of concern or a foreign country of concern may submit to the Secretary, not later than 120 days before the institution enters into such a contract, a request to waive the prohibition under subsection (a) with respect to such contract.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF WAIVER REQUEST.—A waiver request submitted by an institution under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) the complete and unredacted text of the proposed contract for which the waiver is being requested, and if such original contract is not in English, a translated copy of the text into English (in a manner that complies with section 117(c)); and

“(II) a statement that—

“(aa) is signed by the point of contact of the institution described in section 117(h); and

“(bb) includes information that demonstrates that such contract is for the benefit of the institution’s mission and students and will promote the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States.

“(B) RENEWAL WAIVER REQUESTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An institution that has entered into a contract pursuant to a waiver issued under this section, the term of which is longer than the 1-year waiver period and the terms and conditions of which remain the same as the proposed contract submitted as part of the request for such waiver may submit, not later than 120 days before the expiration of such waiver period, a request for a renewal of such waiver for an additional 1-year period (which shall include any information requested by the Secretary).

“(ii) TERMINATION.—If the institution fails to submit a request under clause (i) or is not granted a renewal under such clause, such institution

shall terminate such contract on the last day of the original 1-year waiver period.

“(2) WAIVER ISSUANCE.—The Secretary—

“(A) not later than 60 days before an institution enters into a contract pursuant to a waiver request under paragraph (1)(A), or before a contract described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) is renewed pursuant to a renewal request under such paragraph, shall notify the institution—

“(i) if the waiver or renewal will be issued by the Secretary; and

“(ii) in a case in which the waiver or renewal will be issued, the date on which the 1-year waiver period starts; and

“(B) may only issue a waiver under this section to an institution if the Secretary determines, in consultation with the heads of each agency and department listed in section 117(e), that the contract for which the waiver is being requested is for the benefit of the institution’s mission and students and will promote the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States.

“(3) DISCLOSURE.—Not less than 2 weeks prior to issuing a waiver under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall notify the—

“(A) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, of the intent to issue the waiver, including a justification for the waiver.

“(4) APPLICATION OF WAIVERS.—A waiver issued under this section to an institution with respect to a contract shall only—

“(A) waive the prohibition under subsection (a) for a 1-year period; and

“(B) apply to the terms and conditions of the proposed contract submitted as part of the request for such waiver.

“(c) DESIGNATION DURING CONTRACT TERM.—

In the case of an institution that enters into a contract with a foreign source that is not a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern but which, during the term of such contract, is designated as a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern, such institution shall terminate such contract not later than 60 days after the Secretary notifies the institution of such designation.

“(d) CONTRACTS PRIOR TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an institution that has entered into a contract with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern prior to the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act—

“(A) the institution shall immediately submit to the Secretary a waiver request in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii); and

“(B) the Secretary shall, upon receipt of the request submitted under paragraph (1), immediately issue a waiver to the institution for a period beginning on the date on which the waiver is issued and ending on the sooner of—

“(i) the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act; or

“(ii) the date on which the contract terminates.

“(2) RENEWAL.—An institution that has entered into a contract described in paragraph (1), the term of which is longer than the waiver period described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph and the terms and conditions of which remain the same as the contract submitted as part of the request required under subparagraph (A) of such paragraph, may submit a request for renewal of the waiver issued under such paragraph in accordance with subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(e) CONTRACT DEFINED.—The term ‘contract’ has the meaning given such term in section 117(g).”

(c) INTERAGENCY INFORMATION SHARING.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall transmit to the heads of each agency and department listed in section 117(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by this Act—

(1) any report received by the Department of Education under section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) any report, document, or other record generated by the Department of Education in the course of an investigation—

(A) of an institution with respect to the compliance of such institution with such section; and

(B) initiated prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 3. POLICY REGARDING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST FROM FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.**

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117A the following:

**“SEC. 117B. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY REGARDING FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS TO FACULTY AND STAFF.**

“(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN POLICY AND DATABASE.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act, each institution described in subsection (b) shall maintain—

“(1) a policy requiring covered individuals employed at the institution to disclose in a report to such institution on July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the year in which such enactment date occurs—

“(A) any gift received from a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is greater than the minimal value (as such term is defined in section 7342(a) of title 5, United States Code) or is of undetermined value, and including the date on which the gift was received;

“(B) any contract entered into with a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is \$5,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commences and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates;

“(C) any contract with a foreign source in force during the previous calendar year that has an undetermined monetary value, and including the date on which such contract commences and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates; and

“(D) any contract entered into with a foreign country of concern or foreign entity of concern in the previous calendar year, the value of which is \$0 or more, and including the beginning and ending dates of such contract and the full text of such contract and any addenda;

“(2) a publicly available and searchable database (in electronic and downloadable format), on a website of the institution, of the information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1) that—

“(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and until the latest of—

“(i) the date that is 4 years after the date on which—

“(I) a gift referred to in paragraph (1)(A) is received; or

“(II) a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) begins; or

“(ii) the date on which a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) terminates; and

“(B) is searchable and sortable by—

“(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract);

“(ii) the attributable country with respect to which information is being disclosed;

“(iii) name of the individual making the disclosure; and

“(iv) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign source who is a natural person);

“(3) a plan effectively to identify and manage potential information gathering by foreign

sources through espionage targeting covered individuals that may arise from gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source, including through the use of—

“(A) accurate communications;

“(B) periodic reporting under paragraph (2) of the information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1); and

“(C) enforcement of the policy described in paragraph (1).

“(b) INSTITUTIONS.—An institution shall be subject to the requirements of this section if such institution—

“(1) is an eligible institution for the purposes of any program authorized under title IV; and

“(2)(A) received more than \$50,000,000 in Federal funds in any of the previous five calendar years to support (in whole or in part) research and development (as determined by the institution and measured by the Higher Education Research and Development Survey of the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics); or

“(B) receives funds under title VI.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘foreign source’ and ‘gift’ have the meanings given such terms in section 117(g);

“(2) the term ‘contract’—

“(A) means any—

“(i) agreement for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or barter, of property or services by a foreign source;

“(ii) affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source involving the use or exchange of the name, likeness, time, services, or resources of covered individuals employed at an institution described in subsection (b); or

“(iii) purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern; and

“(B) does not include any fair-market, arms-length agreement made by covered individuals for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from a foreign source other than such a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern;

“(3) the term ‘covered individual’—

“(A) has the meaning given such term in section 223(d) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (42 U.S.C. 6605); and

“(B) shall be interpreted in accordance with the Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-supported Research and Development published by the Subcommittee on Research Security and the Joint Committee on the Research Environment in January 2022; and

“(4) the term ‘professional staff’ means professional employees, as defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).”

**SEC. 4. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.**

The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117B the following:

**“SEC. 117C. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.**

“(a) INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.—A specified institution shall file a disclosure report in accordance with subsection (b) with the Secretary on July 31 immediately following any calendar year in which the specified institution purchases, sells, or holds (directly or indirectly through any chain of ownership) one or more investments of concern.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each report to the Secretary required by subsection (a) with respect to any calendar year shall contain the following:

“(1) A list of the investments of concern purchased, sold, or held during such calendar year.

“(2) The aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held as of the close of such calendar year.

“(3) The combined value of all investments of concern sold over the course of such calendar year, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(4) The combined value of all capital gains from such sales of investments of concern.

“(c) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN POOLED FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An investment of concern acquired through a regulated investment company, exchange traded fund, or any other pooled investment shall be treated as acquired through a chain of ownership referred to in subsection (a), unless such pooled investment is certified by the Secretary as not holding any listed investments in accordance with subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2).

“(2) CERTIFICATIONS OF POOLED FUNDS.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish procedures under which certain regulated investment companies, exchange traded funds, and other pooled investments—

“(A) shall be reported in accordance with the requirements under subsection (b); and

“(B) may be certified by the Secretary as not holding any listed investments.

“(d) TREATMENT OF RELATED ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of this section, assets held by any related organization (as defined in section 4968(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) with respect to a specified institution shall be treated as held by such specified institution, except that—

“(1) such assets shall not be taken into account with respect to more than 1 specified institution; and

“(2) unless such organization is controlled by such institution or is described in section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to such institution, assets which are not intended or available for the use or benefit of such specified institution shall not be taken into account.

“(e) VALUATION OF DEBT.—For purposes of this section, the fair market value of any debt shall be the principal amount of such debt.

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, may issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations or other guidance providing for the proper application of this section with respect to certain regulated investment companies, exchange traded funds, and pooled investments.

“(g) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any specified institution that is required to submit a report under subsection (a) shall designate, before the submission of such report, and maintain a compliance officer, who shall—

“(1) be a current employee or legally authorized agent of such institution;

“(2) be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for personally certifying accurate compliance with the reporting requirements under this section; and

“(3) certify the institution has, for purposes of filing such report under subsection (a), followed an established institutional policy and conducted good faith efforts and reasonable due diligence to determine the accuracy and valuations of the assets reported.

“(h) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 60 days before the July 31 immediately following the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section—

“(A) are made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format), including any information provided in such reports;

“(B) can be individually identified and compared; and

“(C) are searchable and sortable; and

“(2) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INVESTMENT OF CONCERN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘investment of concern’ means any specified interest with respect to any of the following:

“(i) A foreign country of concern.

“(ii) A foreign entity of concern.

“(B) SPECIFIED INTEREST.—The term ‘specified interest’ means, with respect to any entity—

“(i) stock or any other equity or profits interest of such entity;

“(ii) debt issued by such entity; and

“(iii) any contract or derivative with respect to any property described in clause (i) or (ii).

“(2) SPECIFIED INSTITUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘specified institution’, as determined with respect to any calendar year, means an institution if—

“(i) such institution is not a public institution; and

“(ii) the aggregate fair market value of—

“(I) the assets held by such institution at the end of such calendar year (other than those assets which are used directly in carrying out the institution’s exempt purpose) is in excess of \$6,000,000,000; or

“(II) the investments of concern held by such institution at the end of such calendar year is in excess of \$250,000,000

“(B) REFERENCES TO CERTAIN TERMS.—For the purpose of applying the definition under subparagraph (A), the terms ‘aggregate fair market value’ and ‘assets which are used directly in carrying out the institution’s exempt purpose’ shall be applied in the same manner as such terms are applied for the purposes of section 4968(b)(1)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”

#### SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS.—The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), as amended by section 4 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117C the following:

##### “SEC. 117D. ENFORCEMENT; SINGLE POINT-OF-CONTACT.

“(a) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Secretary (acting through the General Counsel of the Department) shall conduct investigations of possible violations of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C by institutions.

“(2) CIVIL ACTION.—Whenever it appears that an institution has knowingly or willfully failed to comply with a requirement of any of the sections listed in paragraph (1) (including any rule or regulation promulgated under any such section) based on such an investigation, a civil action shall be brought by the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary, in an appropriate district court of the United States, or the appropriate United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to request such court to compel compliance with the requirement of the section that has been violated.

“(3) COSTS AND OTHER FINES.—An institution that is compelled to comply with a requirement of a section listed in paragraph (1) pursuant to paragraph (2) shall—

“(A) pay to the Treasury of the United States the full costs to the United States of obtaining compliance with the requirement of such section, including all associated costs of investigation and enforcement; and

“(B) be subject to the applicable fines described in paragraph (4).

“(4) FINES FOR VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall impose a fine on an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of a section listed in paragraph (1) as follows:

“(A) SECTION 117.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with

respect to a calendar year, and that has not previously knowingly or willfully failed to comply with such a requirement, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution for such violation as follows:

“(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

“(aa) not less than \$50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

“(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, and not more than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(II) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with the reporting requirement under subsection (a)(2) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is not less than 10 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

“(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to an additional calendar year, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

“(aa) not less than \$100,000 but not more than twice the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

“(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(II) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(2) of section 117 with respect to an additional calendar year, such fine shall be in an amount that is not less than 20 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(B) SECTION 117A.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117A for the first time, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 5 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i), the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution for each subsequent time the institution knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117A in an amount that is not less than 20 percent of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

“(C) SECTION 117B.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117B with respect to a calendar year, and that has not previously knowingly or willfully failed to comply with such a requirement, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution of not less than \$250,000, but not more than the total amount of gifts or contracts reported by such institution in the database required under section 117B(a)(2).

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117B with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year in an amount that is not less than \$500,000, but not more than twice the total amount of gifts or contracts reported by such institution in the database required under section 117B(a)(2).

“(D) SECTION 117C.—

“(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of a specified institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117C with respect to a calendar year, and that has not previously knowingly or willfully failed to comply with such a requirement, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution in an amount that is not less than 50 percent and not more than 100 percent of the sum of—

“(I) the aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held by such institution as of the close of such calendar year; and

“(II) the combined value of all investments of concern sold over the course of such calendar year, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of a specified institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117C with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year in an amount that is not less than 100 percent and not more than 200 percent of the sum of—

“(I) the aggregate fair market value of all investments of concern held by such institution as of the close of such additional calendar year; and

“(II) the combined value of all investments of concern sold over the course of such additional calendar year, as measured by the fair market value of such investments at the time of the sale.

“(b) SINGLE POINT-OF-CONTACT AT THE DEPARTMENT.—The Secretary shall maintain a single point-of-contact at the Department to—

“(I) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions regarding compliance with the requirements of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C;

“(2) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in section 117(d)(1), including—

“(A) improving upload functionality by allowing for batch reporting, including by allowing institutions to upload one file with all required information into the database;

“(B) publishing and maintaining a database users guide annually, including information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

“(C) creating a standing user group (to which chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply) to discuss possible database improvements, which group shall—

“(i) include at least—

“(I) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

“(II) 2 members representing private, non-profit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

“(III) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

“(IV) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3)); and

“(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements;

“(D) publishing, on a publicly available website, recommended database improvements following each meeting described in subparagraph (C)(ii); and

“(E) responding, on a publicly available website, to each recommendation published under subparagraph (D) as to whether or not the Department will implement the recommendation, including the rationale for either approving or rejecting the recommendation;

“(3) provide, every 90 days after the date of enactment of the DETERRENT Act, status updates on any pending or completed investigations and civil actions under subsection (a)(1) to—

“(A) the authorizing committees; and

“(B) any institution that is the subject of such investigation or action;

“(4) maintain, on a publicly accessible website—

“(A) a full comprehensive list of all foreign countries of concern and foreign entities of concern; and

“(B) the date on which the last update was made to such list; and

“(5) not later than 7 days after making an update to the list maintained in paragraph (4)(A), notify each institution required to comply with the sections listed in paragraph (1) of such update.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of sections 117, 117A, 117B, 117C, and this section:

“(1) FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘foreign country of concern’ includes the following:

“(A) A country that is a covered nation (as defined in section 4872(d) of title 10, United States Code).

“(B) Any country that the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence, determines to be engaged in conduct that is detrimental to the national security or foreign policy of the United States.

“(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘foreign entity of concern’ has the meaning given such term in section 10612(a) of the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act (42 U.S.C. 19221(a)) and includes a foreign entity that is identified on the list published under section 1286(c)(8)(A) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (10 U.S.C. 22 4001 note; Public Law 115–232).

“(3) INSTITUTION.—The term ‘institution’ means an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 102, other than an institution described in subsection (a)(1)(c) of such section).”.

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

“(30)(A) An institution will comply with the requirements of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C.

“(B) An institution that, for 3 consecutive institutional fiscal years, violates any requirement of any of the sections listed in subparagraph (A), shall—

“(i) be ineligible to participate in the programs authorized by this title for a period of not less than 2 institutional fiscal years; and

“(ii) in order to regain eligibility to participate in such programs, demonstrate compliance with all requirements of each such section for not less than 2 institutional fiscal years after the institutional fiscal year in which such institution became ineligible.”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States—

(1) shall conduct a study to identify ways to improve intergovernmental agency coordination regarding implementation and enforcement of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f), as amended or added by this Act, including in-

creasing information sharing, increasing compliance rates, and establishing processes for enforcement; and

(2) shall submit to the Congress, and make public, a report containing the results of such study.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 118–298. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 4, strike “subsection (f)(1)” and insert “section 117D(a)(1)”.

Page 17, beginning on line 3, strike “identified as” and all that follows through “Code” on line 7, and insert “associated with a category listed in the Commerce Control List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations”.

Page 19, beginning on line 12, strike “point of contact of the institution described in section 117(h)” and insert “compliance officer of the institution designated in accordance with section 117(f)”.

Page 27, line 10, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 27, line 11, strike “a plan effectively to identify” and insert “an effective plan to identify”.

Page 29, line 11, insert “and” after the semicolon.

Page 29, strike “; and” and insert a period.

Page 30, beginning on line 1, strike paragraph (4).

Page 36, line 8, before the period insert the following: “and, whenever it appears that an institution has knowingly or willfully failed to comply with a requirement of any of such sections (including any rule or regulation promulgated under any such section), shall request that the Attorney General bring a civil action in accordance with paragraph (2).”

Page 49, beginning on line 1, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study to identify ways to improve intergovernmental agency coordination regarding implementation and enforcement of sections 117, 117A, 117B, and 117C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f), as amended or added by this Act, including increasing information sharing, increasing compliance rates, and establishing processes for enforcement.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress, and make public, a report containing the results of the study described in paragraph (1).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, my amendment makes technical edits to the underlying bill while also clarifying certain language on gifts, enforcement, and the timeline for the subsequent Government Accountability Office study.

The DETERRENT Act includes commonsense disclosure exemptions for industrial and intellectual property rights, except when they involve national security. My amendment clarifies the definition for intellectual property of national security concern by citing the existing Commerce Control List, which includes categories such as chemicals, avionics, and aerospace. If a transaction with foreign nations involves these sensitive industries, it should be disclosed.

Chronic noncompliance of section 117 is the central motivation for this bill, so my amendment also includes language to ensure the Secretary follows the law and brings civil action against noncompliant entities. This means even a recalcitrant administration, like the Biden administration, would have to treat noncompliance with the seriousness it deserves.

Lastly, my amendment adds language requested by the GAO to help it effectively measure the implementation and interagency coordination of provisions in the DETERRENT Act. Communication is key to combating malign foreign influence, and the GAO study will identify ways to improve that communication and coordination.

Mr. Chair, with this amendment’s simplistic nature, I hope for its easy passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this appears to be technical and clarifying. That is always a good thing, and I hope that we will adopt the amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and supporting this very technical amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CAREY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 26, line 10, insert "(other than the name or any other personally identifiable information of a covered individual)" after "paragraph (1)".

Page 26, line 10, insert "(other than the name or any other personally identifiable information of a covered individual)" after "paragraph (1)".

Page 27, beginning line 6, strike "name of the individual making the disclosure" and insert "the narrowest of the department, school, or college of the institution, as applicable, for which the individual making the disclosure works".

Page 27, line 22, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 27, after line 22, insert the following: "(4) for purposes of investigations under section 117D(a)(1) or responses to requests under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), the names of the individuals making disclosures under paragraph (1)."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CAREY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

I rise in support of my amendment and the underlying bill, the DETERRENT Act.

Foreign influence on our universities and colleges is a serious threat, and I am concerned foreign adversaries are targeting our Nation's students.

The DETERRENT Act ensures that we have transparency, accountability, and clarity in how foreign actors are involved with our universities and colleges.

My amendment will improve this important bill by revising a provision in the underlying legislation that creates a public, searchable database of staff or faculty who have disclosed gifts or contracts from foreign entities.

While I support transparency and accountability for our university faculty and staff to ensure foreign entities do not have undue influence over university research, policies, or instruction practices, it is important we balance that with the need to protect the privacy of an individual faculty or staff member at our institutions of higher education.

This commonsense amendment simply changes the underlying bill's public database by removing the personally identifiable information of faculty and staff who are listed in the database as a result of reporting gifts or contracts with foreign entities.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. I still have deep concerns about section 117 of the bill, because it places a target on the backs of researchers who work with foreign collaborators and would create a chilling effect for both international research and retention of international faculty and scholars, but this amendment would take the identifying information out and remove that target. I think that is a good direction.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CAREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 118-298.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, after line 4, insert the following:

"(E) INELIGIBILITY FOR WAIVER.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), (B)(i) (C)(i), or (D)(i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117, 117A, 117B, or 117C with respect to any 2 additional calendar years, the Secretary shall prohibit the institution from obtaining a waiver, or a renewal of a waiver, under section 117A."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the DETERRENT Act, a bill that will work toward preventing foreign influence within America's institutions, colleges, and universities by strengthening section 117 of the Higher Education Act.

Section 117 requires colleges and universities to report contracts with and gifts from a foreign source that, alone or combined, are valued at \$250,000 or more for per calendar year.

My amendment will prohibit repeat-offending institutions from obtaining waivers that will allow them to accept donations or gifts from countries or entities of concern.

Some countries and entities, like China, pose a particular concern to the United States, and as such, institutions are required under this act to obtain special waivers if they wish to accept donations, gifts, or contracts from them.

My amendment simply adds that if an institution fails to comply with this act for 3 years, they are no longer eligible to receive these waivers. It is kind of a "three strikes and you are out" deal.

Foreign funds can come with strings attached, as we all know, strings that undermine our own national security. Foreign countries can use investment in America's colleges and institutions to disseminate propaganda, steal secrets and research, and, unfortunately, so much more.

This is why countries that raise more concern have more supervision over any of their donations or gifts, including waiver requirements.

This is really a commonsense amendment. We are not stripping away waivers after the first mistake. We are not even stripping away waivers after the second mistake. If it is the third time, if you neglect this act, this is obviously purposeful and that is when we say, as I mentioned before, three strikes and you are out. You have proven, if you do that, that you lack the transparency and the trust that are required to have these waivers permitted.

This amendment is not only about transparency and accountability, but it is also fundamentally about our national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of our national security by supporting this amendment. I hope this is bipartisan.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, while I certainly want to ensure that institutions remain compliant with section 117, many compliance problems can be minimal or unintentional. Colleges and universities will obviously be held accountable for those problems and subsequent violations can be punished more severely, but a permanent ban seems very excessive as a mandatory penalty in all cases.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I think I made my point clear. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118-298.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 17, strike "4" and insert "5".

Page 26, line 14, strike "4" and insert "5".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer yet another amendment on the DETERRENT Act. It again deals with section 117, which requires colleges and universities to report contracts or gifts that total over \$250,000 in a given year. It is, I think, very important because of the nefarious influence that some foreign governments might exert on our youngest and most talented minds.

When Secretary DeVos, in 2019, initiated investigations into just 12 universities to ensure compliance with section 117, the Department found that \$6.5 billion of previously unreported foreign gifts and contracts were revealed. Despite this demonstrating a clear need for increased investigation and enforcement, the Biden administration's Department of Education refuses to open investigations under section 117 to ensure institutions aren't hiding foreign investments.

Think about that for a second: 12 institutions. \$6.5 billion of gifts revealed, when they were essentially audited. That is scary. It is unbelievably frightening.

The underlying bill does not require institutions to maintain certain information about foreign gifts and contracts, including unredacted versions, which would allow for future investigations, if needed.

□ 1430

However, my amendment would change the minimum length of time that they must maintain this information from 4 years to 5 years. It is a step in the right direction. It is really rather minor, 4 to 5 years. The yearlong extension, why this is relevant, is because if we had a potential change in the administrations—regardless that administrations last 4 years at a time—this would be protected with 5 years.

If we have a Department of Education that is uninterested or unwilling to investigate potential foreign influences in our institutions, this added extension of that 1 year could become very impactful.

This should be, I think, in my humble opinion, a completely bipartisan and noncontroversial amendment. It can go both ways. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have concerns about a future Republican administration, this just adds that extra year of protection.

This will also work toward restoring legislative branch relevance, as we see the executive branch continually year over year, regardless of what party is in power at the White House, eat away at our constitutional oversight, and, frankly, authority in powers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment and in favor of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is not an unreasonable requirement. To have the information that is stored for 4 years, an additional year is not unreasonable. Therefore, I do not oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, as chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise in strong opposition to the DETERRENT Act.

The DETERRENT Act would burden higher education institutions and Federal agencies by needlessly complicating existing research security measures. Further, the bill would impose unreasonably expansive reporting requirements on individual researchers. What is worse is that it would broadcast their personal information on public databases; therefore, casting a chilling effect disproportionately on the Asian-American academic community.

From the incarceration of Japanese Americans in World War II to racial profiling of Chinese-American scientists under the failed China Initiative, countless Asian Americans have had their lives destroyed because our government falsely accused them of being spies. Already, 72 percent of Asian-American academic researchers report feeling unsafe.

Safeguarding national security can be done through commonsense reforms that Democrats have offered that don't come at the expense of U.S. scientific innovation, global collaboration, and the Asian-American community. In fact, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT has submitted such an amendment that is a commonsense reform.

Meanwhile, this bill, the DETERRENT Act, is a bill that I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, one of the other reasons why we should hopefully get overwhelming support for this amendment is this—let me give you a quick example.

In the final year of President Trump's administration, universities reported \$1.6 billion in foreign donations. In the entire first year of the Biden Presidency, that number magically plunged to \$4.3 million.

I doubt that the actual donations and gifts and such were reduced by 37,200 percent. I think it is merely a case of if section 117 isn't going to be essentially audited, then these universities and other institutions don't feel compelled to follow Federal law. That is another reason why I think extending this from 4 to 5 years is critical.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 118-298.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 22, strike "and".

Page 9, line 3, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 9, after line 3, insert the following new clause:

"(v) any affiliation of the foreign source to an organization that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189)."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, the DETERRENT Act is an important bill. It seeks to hold colleges, universities, and foreign actors accountable while providing the transparency necessary into any influence foreign countries are attempting to exert onto our Nation's students and academic institutions through new disclosure requirements. This bill could not be more timely.

My amendment will clarify that ties to a designated terrorist organizations, such as Hamas, must be disclosed when receiving funds from a foreign group or individual.

In light of the disgustingly callous and vile pro-Hamas demonstration seen on college campuses across the country, including, sadly, even in my own district, this amendment is more important than ever.

Mr. Chair, I will remark that after comments made by college and university presidents in my colleague, Dr. Foxx from North Carolina's, committee hearing, those comments were so horribly dishonest, disturbing, and, quite frankly, dangerous.

This amendment and the necessary exclamation point it sends is necessary.

The public deserves to know the source of foreign money being poured into our universities, especially if these sources have any ties to terrorist groups and organizations like Hamas.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this is an amendment that we should be able to accept. The problem is that it is hard to imagine how the college could actually comply with it.

Any association with a terrorist organization obviously should be avoided. You are not dealing with the terrorist organization; you are dealing with an organization who then has an affiliation or some support from the organization. There is no way for the college to know.

I would hope that we would not force the college into complying with something they would have no way to comply with.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, there is adequate capacity for colleges and universities across this country to identify the source of funds such as this.

In fact, we know all too often that there are individuals even working within the Federal Government who have ties and have associated themselves with actions of Hamas. We have the technology to do so. And simply expecting that universities do their due diligence and then disclose to the American people, students, and supporters of those universities is certainly not a bar too great for them to meet.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and have the right to close.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will read the short amendment. It says: "Any affiliation of the foreign source to an organization that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

It is hard to imagine how a college could always know exactly who has an affiliation with what.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 118-298.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike "\$50,000" and insert "\$1".

Page 38, beginning on line 3, strike "not less than \$50,000 but".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is really rather simple. It is about transparency. It is about simply moving the reporting requirements. My amendment reduces the threshold for the value of gifts that must be reported from \$50,000 to \$1. It simply lowers the threshold. Mr. Chairman, this is about transparency.

The underlying bill, which represents a solid and sorely needed first step, advertises much-needed transparency. If we are going to stop America's foreign adversaries from targeting our Nation's educational institutions and students, we need transparency at every level.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this lowers the threshold to \$1. Any gift from any source, every gift or contract from any country—if you have some Canadian collaborators or somebody from Great Britain offering you coffee and donuts, you have to report it on a searchable database. I think that is an absurd amount of reporting that would have to be done.

This would create backlogs at the Department of Education and take time away from the scrutiny of the reports that really need to be looked at.

Mr. Chair, I hope we do not pass this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the Trump administration discovered \$6.5 billion in previously unreported foreign money to universities from adversarial countries.

In response to the terrorist attack against Israel, I think it is important that we make it tougher. That we make it more clear who is trying to unduly influence our universities and our students—the future of America.

Qatar, an anti-Semitic country, earlier this week accused Israel of committing genocide, has contributed \$5 billion to U.S. universities. There are billions of dollars going unreported. Saudi Arabia has contributed \$3 billion. This can't be allowed.

We have foreign adversaries, adversaries of Israel, adversaries of the West, adversaries of America donating to universities, and we need to know. That is all we are asking.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, our universities across America have opened the doors to working-class Americans and impoverished Americans to be able to access a better life and education.

I speak to this amendment that indicates that any donation, as much as \$1, has to be under this particular act.

First of all, this is a blanket representation that our universities are taking moneys from terrorists. I am outraged to say that the University of Houston, University of Texas, Texas Southern University, and Prairie View A&M would be in the position of taking money from terrorists.

If you pass this amendment, you implode the innocent persons who are giving donations and the work of our universities attempting to provide dollars to educate more Americans—more impoverished Americans who simply have families that cannot afford for them to go to school. This is an outrage.

I want everybody to know that under this particular act, \$1 has to be reported. That \$1 may come from a grandmother or that \$1 may come from a hardworking parent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1445

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Generous and kindhearted people from the faith institutions that many of our universities come under, Mr. Chair, you are going to ask them to vet or to determine whether terrorists are involved.

It is not the question of whether terrorists are involved. I want this Nation to be protected. We now realize that we are subject to a lot of terrorist potential because of the times we are in. I take it seriously. I am on the Homeland Security Committee.

Nevertheless, this \$1 is to make a mockery of the hard work of many folks at "working-class" universities and colleges, our community colleges, and 2-year colleges that themselves receive donations from people who are grateful that they allowed them to be a vocational nurse or welder and, because of that opportunity, they were able to make a living for themselves and their families.

We must have rational and reasonable thinking here. I am grateful for America's hierarchy of education because so many people come here to be educated.

Mr. Chair, let us vote this amendment down. Let us not do this and undermine the educational system of this Nation and the Constitution.



Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I think it is important to understand that we are in a new day. October 7 changed the world.

Qatar, for example, has praised Hamas. They have literally praised the systematic rape of women and the torture and rape of little girls. Surely, my colleagues understand why reporting donations is so paramount.

I can't stand by and pretend that this isn't going on. Qatar is trying to buy forgiveness—\$500 million to Hamas. How many rapes did that pay for, Mr. Chairman? How much is enough to absolve their sins?

I am appalled that anyone would be opposed to this. We need reporting. We need transparency. We are in a new day. The West is under attack.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I could go on about Al Jazeera, which is funded by Qatar, praising the torture. They were cutting off the genitals of men. They were cutting off the breasts of women. They were gang-raping women.

Foreign contributions need to be found out, discovered, and disclosed. The only way to make sure that nothing is slipping through the cracks is to lower the threshold.

There is no reason to oppose this amendment. If the universities are doing nothing wrong, then they have nothing to hide.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment. It is common sense, and it takes a stand against the atrocities that took place in Israel, the pay-fors, and the forgiveness that Qatar is trying to buy through our American universities.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned billions of dollars from countries, and he mentioned some countries of concern. Countries of concern already have to report zero-dollar and up gifts. This just adds all other countries.

There is no need for the bill to go from the present law of \$250,000 and up reports down to \$50,000 for countries that are not countries of concern down to \$1 to scrutinize billion-dollar gifts from countries of concern.

These reports are not free to comply with. The estimated costs of compliance are in the hundreds of thousands of dollars under the bill already.

Mr. Chairman, if you were to explode the number of reports that would have to be made if this amendment is adopted, there is no telling what the costs will be to the colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we defeat the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 118-298.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 18, strike "and".

Page 16, line 7, strike the period and insert "and".

Page 16, after line 7, insert the following subparagraph:

"(F) an international organization (as such term is defined in the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288))."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Chair Foxx for her hard work in an effort to try to right our country and the committee that she so artfully presides over.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply adds international organizations to the bill's definition of foreign source, including them in the bill's reporting requirements. It uses the definition found in 22 U.S.C. 288, which reads, in part: "a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation."

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, Americans are all too aware of the influence of international organizations such as the United Nations or the World Health Organization. As just one example, the World Health Organization was one of the so-called authorities trying to dismiss the lab leak theory, with the assistance of prominent academics and the Chinese Communist Party.

Many of our adversaries, such as China and Iran, are active participants in these organizations, much to my dismay and to the dismay of many Americans.

The fact that Iran was appointed to chair the United Nations's 2023 Social Forum, a conference focusing on human rights, would be laughable if not for Iran's own very grave human rights abuses, which are serious, to say the least.

I am concerned that should the excellent policies in this bill become law, our adversaries will instead attempt to funnel money to college campuses through international organizations. This amendment would address that possibility and shed even more light on these foreign gifts received by American colleges and universities.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add all international organizations as foreign sources that universities must report funding from under section 117. It would include the United Nations, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, and the World Trade Organization. These multinational organizations, many of which have significant participation by the United States, should not be deemed as necessarily national security threats.

This amendment would expand the burdensome section 117 compliance without giving any clear reason of how it would protect national security.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague talks about protecting national security and implies that somehow this amendment would imperil that. I don't understand how letting Americans know more about who is providing funds internationally to our universities in our country imperils our national security.

We should know who is trying to attempt to influence not only what is happening on campuses but the very minds on those campuses, whether it is Confucius Institutes or an organization antithetical, maybe anti-Semitic, from the Middle East that is sending endowments and funds to American universities to influence the minds of those who are participating in education at those universities. It is important not only for citizens to know but, quite honestly, for our Federal Government and the security agencies to know.

Mr. Chair, I remind my good friend on the other side of the aisle that I had a bill some time ago to require this reporting, which is already required in many aspects and many respects, but universities, even with the requirement, don't keep the information and don't report any of it at this time.

Isn't that a peril to national security?

If we actually want to strengthen security in our country for our citizens, then I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, but, again, transparency is key. Universities have become, unfortunately, as we have seen in our public media on this very day and on these very days, hotspots for international insurgent activity in our country, things that are antithetical to our country and our way of life, things that we have never seen before, anti-Semitic chants on American university grounds.

If those things are being stoked, inflamed, encouraged, and paid for by international organizations at all, then Americans ought to know that.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the American Council on Education signed by 18 national higher education organizations.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's request will be covered under general leave.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON  
EDUCATION®,

Washington, DC, December 4, 2023.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*House of Representatives.*

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*House Minority Leader,*  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the American Council on Education and the undersigned higher education associations, I write in strong opposition to H.R. 5933, the "Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERREMENT)" Act, which the House is scheduled to consider on the floor this week. While we understand the concern regarding foreign funding to U.S. institutions of higher education is bipartisan, we believe the DETERREMENT Act is duplicative of existing interagency efforts, unnecessary, and puts in place a problematic expansion of the data collection by the U.S. Department of Education that will broadly curtail important needed international research collaboration and academic and cultural exchanges.

Institutions of higher education share a strong interest with the government in safeguarding the integrity of government-funded research and protecting academic freedom and free speech from foreign influence and/or interference. Our community takes the reporting requirements regarding foreign gifts and contracts under Section 117 of the Higher Education Act very seriously. Indeed, our community has worked tirelessly over the past several years to educate our members regarding these reporting obligations, as well as working with the national security agencies, research agencies, and the Department of Education to clarify and improve foreign gift and contract reporting. For example, our associations and our institutions continue to work with federal agencies to implement new reporting requirements under NSPM-33, which is targeted at improving research security and addressing concerns around federal funding. We are also engaged in implementing new requirements under the recently passed CHIPS and Science Act and ensuring compliance with statutory requirements enacted in previous National Defense Authorization Acts.

Since 2018, when issues with foreign gift reporting were raised by Congress and policy-

makers, there has been a substantial increase in Section 117 reporting. In response to questions before the House Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this year, Secretary Cardona stated that the Department has received over 34,000 filings in the past two years and is on track to receive the most Section 117 reports of any administration. Just this month, ED announced that the most recent reporting dataset shows nearly 5,000 additional foreign gifts and contracts with transactions valued at nearly \$4 billion since ED's last data release, as of October 2023. This increase in Section 117 reporting demonstrates that our institutions are committed to transparency and the efforts to bring more attention to the issue of foreign funding to our institutions.

However, the new Sections 117A, 117B, 117C, and 117D greatly expand Section 117 in a way that will be very problematic for colleges and universities seeking to engage in important and advantageous partnerships with foreign countries and entities. We would also note that the recently released 2023 annual report to Congress by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission made several recommendations regarding Section 117 but did not recommend these overly expansive and problematic new reporting requirements. Our concerns regarding each new provision are listed below:

Section 117A "Prohibition on Contracts with Certain Foreign Entities and Countries" would require institutions to receive a waiver from the Department of Education before beginning or continuing any contract with a country of concern (currently the People's Republic of China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran) or a foreign entity of concern. This provision is particularly concerning because the definition of a "contract" in the bill is incredibly broad and therefore will likely capture not only all research agreements, but also student exchange programs and other joint cultural and education programs with Chinese institutions.

Our institutions currently abide by the regulations and requirements maintained by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Department of the Treasury regarding U.S. partnerships, exports, and purchases from foreign entities and foreign countries. In addition, federal research agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, and National Institutes of Health all have recently strengthened research security and foreign partnership reporting requirements. There are no indications that expanded Department of Education reviews are necessary, and it is unlikely the Department of Education has the expertise to carry out the review of contracts, many of which will likely focus on scientific research. The Department lacks the technical expertise to assess risks associated with scientific research and critical and emerging technologies. Additionally, in light of the extremely broad definition of a contract in the legislation, this review will likely overwhelm the Department, and we are concerned that very few waiver requests would ultimately be granted. No other industry or government entities, including states, localities and other nonprofit organizations, must undertake this type of review of agreement before they can enter into a contract with a country or foreign entity.

Section 117B "Institutional Policy Regarding Foreign Gifts and Contracts to Faculty and Staff" would require institutions of higher education (those with more than \$50 million in federal research and development funding or any institution receiving Title VI international education funding) to develop a policy to compel research faculty and staff to report foreign gifts and contracts over

\$480, as well as creating and maintaining a searchable, public database with that information. This requirement is unnecessary given other existing federal statutory mandates that require researchers to disclose all sources of foreign, domestic, current, and pending support for their research to federal research agencies as they apply for research awards and contracts. To effectively implement this requirement, the Office of Management and Budget recently approved common disclosure forms to be used by all federal agencies.

This provision also raises serious privacy concerns for research faculty and staff, whose private financial transactions of relatively small amounts will have to be made public. Not only will this information be available to the U.S. public, but it will also provide our foreign adversaries with a roadmap for targeting our top-notch U.S. researchers.

Section 117B will result in the collection of an ocean of data, much of it trivial and inconsequential, and do little to address the fundamental concerns regarding research security and foreign influence. In addition, this could inadvertently undermine the U.S. economic competitiveness and national security objectives these bills are intended to enhance (i.e., faculty will be discouraged from working with foreign partners because their personal financial information will be made public).

Section 117C would create new "Investment Disclosure Reports" for certain institutions of higher education (private institutions with endowments over \$6 billion or with "investments of concern" above \$250 million). Those institutions would need to report those investments with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern, on an annual basis, to the U.S. Department of Education. Those investments would then be made public on a searchable database. As written, this would likely capture a small number of private institutions of higher education and does not serve to achieve any significant national interests, especially given that all U.S. institutions of higher education already comply with Treasury rules regulating their investments, including the recent Executive Order 14105 regarding outbound investments in certain sensitive technologies in countries of concern. It is also unclear how this will address issues of national security beyond existing federal requirements.

Section 117D would establish new fines regarding compliance with Section 117 and the new subsections of Section 117. The legislation would put into statute the tie between Section 117 and an institution's Program Participation Agreement (PPA), which governs an institution's ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional fines for each new reporting requirement, and in some cases tying those fines to an institution's Title IV funding. As you know, those funds are awarded to the students who then choose to use that funding at institutions of higher education. By tying the new proposed fines to a school's Title IV funding, this would punish students for compliance issues at institutions, specifically compliance with foreign gift reporting, which is not likely impacting individual students. We do not believe these additional fines are necessary, given that Section 117 is already tied to an institution's PPA.

We appreciate that the DETERREMENT Act would make Section 117 an annual report, rather than the current biannual requirements, in order to better align it with the new National Science Foundation foreign

gift reporting requirement. We also appreciate that the legislation would exempt tuition and certain outgoing contracts from our institutions used to purchase goods from foreign companies. Exempting tuition is especially important since the DETERRENT Act would lower the reporting threshold from \$250,000 to \$50,000 for some gifts and contracts but \$0 for certain countries of concern and foreign entities of concern.

Congress should examine the research security provisions in the CHIPS and Science Act, recent National Defense Authorization Acts, and NSPM-33 that are currently being implemented and not simply add duplicative and confusing regulations. A recent survey from the Council on Governmental Relations found that over the past four years, universities have spent considerable funds to comply with expanding federal requirements to address inappropriate foreign influence on research. The survey found: “The projected year one average total cost per institution for compliance with the Disclosure Requirements, regardless of institutional size, is significant and concerning. The figure ranges from an average of over \$100,000 for smaller institutions to over \$400,000 for mid-size and large institutions. Although some of these expenses are onetime costs, a sizeable portion will be annual recurring compliance costs. Overall, the cost impact to research institutions in year one is expected to exceed \$50 million. Further, all research institutions will experience significant cost burden and administrative stress, and smaller research institutions with less developed compliance infrastructure may be disproportionately affected.” The DETERRENT Act would greatly increase these costs to our institutions, while also duplicating reporting requirements and provisions already being implemented.

We also urge Congress to examine the language included in the 2021 Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) (S. 1260) and 2022 House-passed America COMPETES Act (H.R. 4521), which proposed bipartisan fixes and improvements to Section 117. We urge Congress to reexamine that language, incorporated as an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Education and the Workforce Ranking Member Bobby Scott to the House Rules Committee, and work together in a bipartisan manner to improve Section 117 in a way that addresses national security concerns while also protecting the important work at our U.S. institutions of higher education.

We understand that Congress and policymakers are concerned with research security, as well as foreign malign influence, at our institutions. However, the DETERRENT Act is the wrong action to take to address these issues and we urge you to vote against the legislation.

Sincerely,

TED MITCHELL,  
*President.*

On behalf of: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, American Association of Community Colleges, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, APPA, “Leadership in Educational Facilities”, Association of American Universities, Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, Association of Research Libraries, Council for Advancement and Support of Education, Council of Graduate Schools, EDUCAUSE, NAFSA: Association of International Educators, National Association of College and University Business Officers, National Association of Diversity Offi-

cers in Higher Education, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, part of the letter reads: “While we understand the concern regarding foreign funding to U.S. institutions in higher education is bipartisan, we believe the DETERRENT Act is duplicative of existing interagency efforts, unnecessary, and puts in place a problematic expansion of the data collection by the U.S. Department of Education that will broadly curtail important needed international research collaboration and academic and cultural exchanges.”

Mr. Chairman, I think that applies to this amendment, too.

Mr. Chairman, I hope Members vote “no” on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “DETERRENT Act of 2023”.

**SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.**

Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 117. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.**

“(a) DISCLOSURE REPORTS.—

“(1) AGGREGATE GIFT AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES.—An institution shall file a disclosure report described in subsection (b) with the Secretary not later than July 31 of the calendar year immediately following any calendar year in which—

“(A) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, the value of which is \$100,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source within the calendar year; or

“(B) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, the value of which totals \$250,000 or more, considered alone or in combination with all other gifts from, or contracts with, that foreign source over the previous 3 calendar years.

“(2) FOREIGN SOURCE OWNERSHIP OR CONTROL DISCLOSURES.—In the case of an institution that is substantially owned or controlled (as described in section 668.174(c)(3) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)) by a foreign source, the institution shall file a disclosure report described in subsection (b) with the Secretary not later than July 31 of every year.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a) shall contain the following:

“(1)(A) In the case of gifts or contracts described in subsection (a)(1)—

“(i) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the

aggregate amount of such gifts and contracts received from or entered into with such foreign government;

“(ii) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the aggregate dollar amount of such gifts and contracts attributable to a particular country and the legal or formal name of the foreign source; and

“(iii) the intended purpose of such gift or contract, as provided to the institution by such foreign source, or if no such purpose is provided by such purpose is provided by such source, the intended use of such gift or contract, as provided by the institution.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the country to which a gift is attributable is—

“(i) the country of citizenship or, if unknown, the principal residence, for a foreign source who is a natural person; or

“(ii) the country of incorporation or, if unknown, the principal place of business, for a foreign source that is a legal entity.

“(2) In the case of an institution required to file a report under subsection (a)(2)—

“(A) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source, without regard to the value of such gift or contract, the information described in paragraph (1)(A);

“(B) the identity of the foreign source that owns or controls the institution;

“(C) the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control; and

“(D) any changes in program or structure resulting from such ownership or control.

“(3) An assurance that the institution will maintain a true copy of each gift or contract agreement subject to the disclosure requirements under this section, until the latest of—

“(A) the date that is 4 years after the date of the agreement;

“(B) the date on which the agreement terminates; or

“(C) the last day of any period of which applicable State public record law requires a true copy of such agreement to be maintained.

“(4) An assurance that the institution will—

“(A) produce true copies of gift and contract agreements subject to the disclosure requirements under this section upon request of the Secretary during a compliance audit or other institutional investigation; and

“(B) ensure that all contracts from the foreign source are translated into English, as applicable.

“(c) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES FOR RESTRICTED AND CONDITIONAL GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), whenever any institution receives a restricted or conditional gift or contract from a foreign source, the institution shall disclose the following to the Secretary, translated into English:

“(1) For such gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the amount, the date, and a description of such conditions or restrictions. The report shall also disclose the country of citizenship, or if unknown, the principal residence for a foreign source which is a natural person, and the country of incorporation, or if unknown, the principal place of business for a foreign source which is a legal entity.

“(2) For gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the amount, the date, a description of such conditions or restrictions, and the name of the foreign government.

“(d) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 30 days before the July 31 immediately following the date of enactment of

the DETERRENT Act of 2023, the Secretary shall—

“(1) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which each report submitted under this section—

“(A) is, not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of such report, made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format);

“(B) can be identified and compared to other such reports; and

“(C) is searchable and sortable by—

“(i) the date the institution filed such report;

“(ii) the date on which the institution received the gift, or entered into the contract, which is the subject of the report; and

“(iii) the attributable country of such gift or contract as described in subsection (b)(1)(B); and

“(2) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report was submitted by the institution with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

“(A) a foreign source that is a foreign government; or

“(B) a foreign source that is not a foreign government.

“(e) RELATION TO OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—If an institution that is required to file a disclosure report under subsection (a) is in a State that has enacted requirements for public disclosure of gifts from, or contracts with, a foreign source that includes all information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, the institution may file with the Secretary a copy of the disclosure report filed with the State in lieu of the report required under such subsection. The State in which the institution is located shall provide the Secretary such assurances as the Secretary may require to establish that the institution has met the requirements for public disclosure under State law if the State report is filed.

“(2) USE OF OTHER FEDERAL REPORTS.—If an institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, where any other department, agency, or bureau of the executive branch requires a report containing all the information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, a copy of the report may be filed with the Secretary in lieu of a report required under subsection (a).

“(f) MODIFICATION OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall incorporate a process permitting institutions to revise and update previously filed disclosure reports under this section to ensure accuracy, compliance, and ability to cure.

“(g) SANCTIONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As a sanction for non-compliance with the requirements under this section, the Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that in any year knowingly or willfully violates this section, that is—

“(A) in the case of a failure to disclose a gift or contract with a foreign source as required under this section, or to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(4) pursuant to the assurances made under such subsection, in an amount that is not less than \$250 but not more than 50 percent of the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source; or

“(B) in the case of any violation of the requirements of subsection (a)(2), in an amount that is not more than 25 percent of the total amount of funding received by the institution under this Act (other than funds received under title IV of this Act).

“(2) REPEATED FAILURES.—

“(A) KNOWING AND WILLFUL FAILURES.—In addition to a fine for a violation in any year under paragraph (1), the Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that knowingly or willfully violates this section for 3 consecutive years, that is—

“(i) in the case of a failure to disclose a gift or contract with a foreign source as required under this section or to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(4) pursuant to the assurances made under such subsection, in an amount that is not less than \$100,000 but not more than the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source; or

“(ii) in the case of any violation of the requirements of subsection (a)(2), in an amount that is not more than 25 percent of the total amount of funding received by the institution under this Act (other than funds received under title IV of this Act).

“(B) ADMINISTRATIVE FAILURES.—The Secretary may impose a fine on an institution that fails to comply with the requirements of this section due to administrative errors for 3 consecutive years, in an amount that is not less than \$250 but not more than 50 percent of the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source.

“(C) COMPLIANCE PLAN REQUIREMENT.—If an institution fails to file a disclosure report for a receipt of a gift from or contract with a foreign source for 2 consecutive years, the Secretary may require the institution to submit a compliance plan.

“(h) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any institution that is required to report a gift or contract under this section shall designate and maintain a compliance officer who—

“(1) shall be a current employee (including such an employee with another job title or duties other than the duties described in paragraph (2)) or legally authorized agent of such institution; and

“(2) shall be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for compliance with the foreign gift reporting requirement under this section.

“(i) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT.—The Secretary shall appoint and maintain a single point of contact to—

“(1) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions of higher education regarding compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(2) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in subsection (d), including—

“(A) improving upload functionality by allowing for batch reporting, including by allowing institutions to upload to the database one file with all required information;

“(B) publishing and maintaining, on an annual basis, a database user guide that includes information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

“(C) creating a user group (to which chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply) to discuss possible database improvements, which shall—

“(i) include at least—

“(I) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

“(II) 2 members representing private, non-profit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

“(III) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

“(IV) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 3(3) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(3)); and

“(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements; and

“(D) publishing, on a publicly available website—

“(i) following each meeting described in subparagraph (C)(ii), recommended database improvements; and

“(ii) with respect to each recommended improvement described in clause (i)—

“(I) the decision of the Department as to whether such recommended improvement will be implemented; and

“(II) the rationale for such decision.

“(j) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AND GIFTS.—

“(1) EXCLUSIONS.—The following shall not be considered a gift from, or contract with, a foreign source under this section:

“(A) Any payment of one or more elements of a student's cost of attendance (as defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made on behalf of students that is not made under contract with such foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such student covering one or more elements of such student's cost of attendance.

“(B) Assignment or license of registered industrial and intellectual property rights, such as patents, utility models, trademarks, or copy-rights, or technical assistance, that are not identified as being associated with a national security risk or concern.

“(C) Any payment from a foreign source that is solely for the purpose of conducting one or more clinical trials.

“(2) INCLUSIONS.—Any gift to, or contract with, an entity or organization, such as a research foundation, that operates substantially for the benefit or under the auspices of an institution shall be considered a gift to, or contract with, such institution.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘clinical trial’ means a research study in which one or more human subjects are prospectively assigned to one or more interventions to evaluate the effects of those interventions on health-related biomedical or behavioral outcomes;

“(2) the term ‘contract’—

“(A) means any—

“(i) agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property or services by the foreign source, for the direct benefit or use of either of the parties, except as provided in subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source that is based on the use or exchange of an institution's name, likeness, time, services, or resources, except as provided in subparagraph (B); and

“(B) does not include any agreement made by an institution located in the United States for the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or barter, of property or services from a foreign source;

“(3) the term ‘foreign source’ means—

“(A) a foreign government, including an agency of a foreign government;

“(B) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, created under the laws of a foreign state or states;

“(C) an individual who is not a citizen or a national of the United States or a trust territory or protectorate thereof; and

“(D) an agent, including a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign legal entity, acting on behalf of a foreign source;

“(4) the term ‘gift’—

“(A) means any gift of money, property, resources, staff, or services; and

“(B) does not include anything described in section 487(e)(2)(B)(ii);

“(5) the term ‘institution’ means an institution of higher education, as defined in section 102, or, if a multicampus institution, any single campus of such institution, in any State; and

“(6) the term ‘restricted or conditional gift or contract’ means any endowment, gift, grant, contract, award, present, or property of any kind that includes provisions regarding—

“(A) the employment, assignment, or termination of faculty;

“(B) the establishment of departments, centers, institutes, instructional programs, research or lecture programs, or faculty positions;

“(C) the selection or admission of students;

or

“(D) the award of grants, loans, scholarships, fellowships, or other forms of financial aid restricted to students of a specified country, religion, sex, ethnic origin, or political opinion.”.

### SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall begin the negotiated rulemaking process under section 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098a) to carry out the amendment made by section 2.

(b) ISSUES.—Regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) to carry out the amendment made by section 2 shall, at a minimum, address the following issues:

(1) Instructions on reporting structured gifts and contracts.

(2) The inclusion in institutional reports of gifts received from, and contracts entered into with, foreign sources by entities and organizations, such as research foundations, that operate substantially for the benefit or under the auspices of the institution.

(3) Procedures to protect confidential or proprietary information included in gifts and contracts.

(4) The alignment of such regulations with the reporting and disclosure of foreign gifts or contracts required by Federal agencies other than the Department of Education, including with respect to—

(A) the CHIPS Act of 2022 (Division A of Public Law 117-167; 15 U.S.C. 4651 note);

(B) the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act (Division B of Public Law 117-167; 42 U.S.C. 18901 note); and

(C) any guidance released by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, including the Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government-supported Research and Development published by the Subcommittee on Research Security and the Joint Committee on the Research Environment in January 2022.

(5) The treatment of foreign gifts or contracts involving research or technologies identified as being associated with a national security risk or concern.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by section 2 shall take effect on the date on which the regulations issued under subsection (a) take effect.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer this Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5933.

My Democratic colleagues and I remain committed to ensuring institutions have sufficient resources to safeguard their work from undue foreign influence. Nevertheless, while I appreciate the majority’s interest in addressing this important issue, I fear that their proposal is far too extreme and does not actually promote institutional compliance.

Specifically, with such harsh fines and limited opportunities for institutions to seek guidance, I am concerned that these changes to section 117 of the Higher Education Act will discourage institutions from collaborating with international entities that are essential in solving important global issues.

It is also very concerning to see language that targets individual faculty members for their collaboration with foreign entities. We have seen, in cases such as the wrongfully accused MIT faculty member, that this sort of targeting can easily lead to harmful consequences rooted in xenophobia for innocent scholars. We must always strive to strike a balance between enforcing the law and fostering safe campuses for students, scholars, and faculty.

Through its overlapping and overly burdensome requirements, harsh penalties, and duplicities to current foreign influence requirements across Federal agencies, the DETERRENT Act takes a sledgehammer to a problem that needs to be addressed with a scalpel.

The Democratic substitute makes a thoughtful approach to section 117 compliance to support institutions as they evaluate and implement their research integrity and foreign influence policies.

In addition to requiring the filing of annual reports for gifts and contracts from foreign entities, our bill would create a robust database at the Department of Education to hold these reports. It establishes commonsense sanctions for noncompliance that allow for room to help institutions that need support scaling up their compliance work. Moreover, it establishes a single point of contact at the Department to coordinate section 117 compliance.

It also builds on the work being done through the implementation of the Chips and Science Act and the “Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Guidelines” by aligning important requirements to those of other Federal agencies and requiring the Secretary of Education to go through negotiated rulemaking to address key implementation aspects of section 117.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute, rather than the underlying bill, to enhance institutions’ real ability to protect against foreign influence.

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

□ 1500

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute from Mr. SCOTT.

Instead of taking the threat of foreign influence seriously, this amendment is a mere slap on the wrist for campuses and includes gaping disclosure loopholes. This is insufficient to protect our students and institutions from our worst adversaries.

The amendment first makes it easier for foreign sources to be undetected, doubling the threshold for contracts to \$100,000 and allowing gifts under \$250,000 over a 3-year span to go unreported.

Bad actors will seek any possible way to avoid transparency about their attempts to harm America through their influence over American postsecondary education, and a strict threshold is essential to stop that from happening.

The annual thresholds in the DETERRENT Act are simple and align with other requirements in existing Federal law.

Shockingly, this amendment includes no differences for America’s biggest enemies: countries of concern and entities of concern. In my colleagues’ minds, gifts from Russia and Iran are the same as gifts from England.

I find it alarming that my colleagues are trying to make it easier for countries of concern to find ways to influence our universities.

The DETERRENT Act uses a tailored list of countries and individuals, pulled from existing law, that have a proven track record of being security threats and actively working against the United States.

The Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute also has terrible carve-outs that provide gaping loopholes for cunning adversaries. The amendment prevents disclosure of the names of foreign sources and who at the institution is responsible for receiving the gift.

These loopholes will make it easier for foreign sources to conceal their relationships and schools to feign ignorance, rendering disclosures all but useless.

Finally, the Democrats provide no real incentive for schools to comply. Their fines for violations go as low as \$250. After three consecutive years of violations, the Democrats’ fine only goes up to the full amount of the gift.

This is a laughable drop in the bucket compared to the billions in foreign contributions. Money talks, and institutions need to know section 117 cannot be ignored. We have already seen institutions fail to disclose billions in the past, and this paltry fine has no real consequences.

Mr. Chair, it is time to take foreign influence seriously. I stand against this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, it should be made very clear that there is not one American, not one Member of Congress, not one Democratic Member of Congress, as well, joined with colleagues who reasonably understand our mutual commitment to the national security of this Nation, who wants any interference in the important research that is being done by universities across America.

They are the hope of the world. There are brilliant students who come with complete innocence here to the United States to create global research that will help not only this country but the world.

I want that to continue. I want the bad actors to be wiped out. Clearly, as my friends have now moved from China to the Mideast, I abhor Hamas. They are terrorists, but I am yet to find a dollar from them to any legitimate institution here in the United States.

What I will say is that we have a system in place. It builds on the Chips and Science Act and the Presidential memorandum on government-supported research.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, we already have a process to weed out and stop it. I can't imagine stopping research at the Yales and Harvards and Princetons, but I also can't imagine stopping it from the ordinary universities across America.

Let us support the present legislation and the U.S. Department of Education and stop blaming our educational institutions and calling them terrorists.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in the committee chair's remarks, she mentioned that there is a difference between countries of concern and other countries. I remind her that we just passed an amendment that essentially eliminated that difference. A recorded vote was requested, and perhaps she could join me in trying to defeat that amendment to the bill.

This amendment in the nature of a substitute significantly increases the gifts and contracts that need to be reported compared to present law. It takes a more moderate approach to national security than the underlying bill, which I think is an extreme approach.

It will be very difficult for colleges to comply with. For that reason, I hope that we adopt the Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute and, if not, defeat the underlying bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, my friend from Virginia and I have been doing really

very well in working in a bipartisan manner recently, and I hate for things to come between us, but his amendment in the nature of a substitute really does do a lot of damage to the underlying bill.

There is no enforcement mechanism. There is no difference for malign actors. We have evidence to show that these foreign gifts are having an impact on the number of anti-Semitic demonstrations on the campuses. We know that foreigners are doing a lot to undermine our beliefs and values in this country.

We need to be aware of where money is coming from, from other countries and particularly from those countries that we know want to destroy us.

Mr. Chair, I have to very strongly oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on it.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5933.

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

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSPARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5933.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1631

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, with Mr. STEUBE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 118-298 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118-298 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. MOLINARO of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MOLINARO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5, printed in part B of House Report 118-298 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 372, noes 39, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]

AYES—372

Adams	DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Kamlager-Dove
Aguiar	Dingell	Kaptur
Alford	Donalds	Kean (NJ)
Allen	Duarte	Keating
Allred	Duncan	Kelly (IL)
Amo	Dunn (FL)	Kelly (MS)
Amodei	Edwards	Kelly (PA)
Armstrong	Ellzey	Khanna
Arrington	Emmer	Kiggans (VA)
Babin	Eshoo	Kildee
Bacon	Espaillat	Kiley
Baird	Estes	Kilmer
Balderson	Ezell	Kim (CA)
Banks	Fallon	Kim (NJ)
Barr	Feenstra	Krishnamoorthi
Bean (FL)	Ferguson	Kuster
Beatty	Finstad	Kustoff
Bentz	Fischbach	LaHood
Bera	Fitzgerald	Lamborn
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Landsman
Bice	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)
Biggs	Flood	Larson (CT)
Bilirakis	Foster	Latta
Bishop (GA)	Fox	LaTurner
Bishop (NC)	Frankel, Lois	Lawler
Blunt	Rochester	Franklin, Scott
Boebert	Fry	Lee (FL)
Bonamici	Fulcher	Lee (NV)
Bost	Gaetz	Leger Fernandez
Boyle (PA)	Gallagher	Lesko
Brecheen	Gallego	Letlow
Brown	Garamendi	Levin
Brownley	Garbarino	Lieu
Buchanan	Garcia, Mike	Loudermilk
Buck	Garcia, Robert	Lucas
Bucshon	Gimenez	Luetkemeyer
Budzinski	Golden (ME)	Luna
Burchett	Goldman (NY)	Luttrell
Burgess	Gonzales, Tony	Lynch
Burlison	Gonzalez,	Mace
Calvert	Gonzalez,	Magaziner
Caraveo	Vicente	Malliotakis
Carbajal	González-Colón	Maloy
Cárdenas	Good (VA)	Mann
Carey	Gooden (TX)	Manning
Carl	Gosar	Massie
Carter (GA)	Gottheimer	Mast
Carter (LA)	Granger	McBath
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	McClain
Cartwright	Graves (MO)	McClellan
Case	Green (TN)	McClintock
Casten	Green, Al (TX)	McCormick
Castor (FL)	Greene (GA)	McGarvey
Chavez-DeRemer	Griffith	McGovern
Cherfilus-	Grothman	Meeks
McCormick	Guest	Menendez
Ciscomani	Guthrie	Meng
Clark (MA)	Hageman	Meuser
Cline	Harder (CA)	Mfume
Cloud	Harris	Miller (IL)
Clyburn	Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks
Clyde	Hayes	Mills
Cohen	Hern	Molinaro
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar
Collins	Higgins (NY)	Mooney
Comer	Hill	Moore (AL)
Cannolly	Hinson	Moore (UT)
Correa	Houchin	Moore (WI)
Costa	Houlahan	Moran
Courtney	Hoyer	Morelle
Crane	Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz
Crawford	Hudson	Moulton
Crow	Huffman	Moylan
Cuellar	Huizenga	Mrvan
Curtis	Hunt	Mullin
D'Esposito	Issa	Murphy
David (KS)	Ivey	Nadler
Davidson	Jackson (NC)	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Jackson (TX)	Neal
Davis (NC)	Jackson Lee	Neguse
De La Cruz	Jacobs	Nehls
Dean (PA)	James	Newhouse
DeGette	Jeffries	Nickel
DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Norcross
DelBene	Johnson (SD)	Norton
Deluzio	Jordan	Nunn (IA)
	Joyce (OH)	Oberholte

Ogles	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)
Owens	Schiff	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Schneider	Thompson (PA)
Palmer	Scholten	Tiffany
Panetta	Schrier	Timmons
Pappas	Schweikert	Tonko
Pascarell	Scott, Austin	Torres (CA)
Payne	Scott, David	Torres (NY)
Pelosi	Self	Trahan
Peltola	Sessions	Trone
Pence	Sewell	Turner
Perez	Sherman	Underwood
Perry	Sherrill	Valadao
Peters	Simpson	Van Drew
Pettersen	Slotkin	Van Duyne
Pfluger	Smith (MO)	Van Orden
Plaskett	Smith (NE)	Vargas
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Vasquez
Quigley	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Raskin	Smucker	Wagner
Reschenthaler	Sorensen	Walberg
Rodgers (WA)	Soto	Waltz
Rogers (AL)	Spanberger	Wasserman
Rogers (KY)	Spartz	Schultz
Rose	Stansbury	Weber (TX)
Rosendale	Stanton	Webster (FL)
Ross	Stauber	Wenstrup
Rouzer	Steel	Westerman
Roy	Stefanik	Wexton
Ruiz	Steil	Wild
Rutherford	Steupe	Williams (NY)
Ryan	Stevens	Williams (TX)
Sablan	Strickland	Wilson (FL)
Salazar	Strong	Wilson (SC)
Salinas	Swalwell	Wittman
Sánchez	Sykes	Womack
Sarbanes	Tenney	Yakym
Scanlon	Thanedar	Zinke

NOES—39

Auchincloss	Evans	Omar
Barragán	Foushee	Pingree
Beyer	Frost	Pocan
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	Presley
Bowman	Gomez	Ramirez
Bush	Grijalva	Scott (VA)
Carson	Himes	Takano
Casar	Jackson (IL)	Tlaib
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Tokuda
Chu	Lee (CA)	Velazquez
Clarke (NY)	Lee (PA)	Waters
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Watson Coleman
Doggett	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—28

Balint	Johnson (GA)	Miller (WV)
Cammack	LaLota	Norman
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Phillips
Craig	Langworthy	Porter
Crenshaw	Lofgren	Radewagen
Crockett	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Escobar	McCarthy	Scalise
Fletcher	McCauley	Titus
Garcia (TX)	McHenry	
Horsford	Miller (OH)	

□ 1701

Mr. CARSON and Ms. TOKUDA changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. NEAL, VARGAS, Mses. SEWELL, ESHOO, SCANLON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. WEXTON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 698.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, due to the tragic shooting at UNLV, I have been working with law enforcement and the public to address the situation, and I was absent from the floor and the vote on the Molinaro Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 5933.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 698, Agreeing to the Molinaro Amendment to H.R. 5933.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6, printed in

part B of House Report 118–298 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 94, noes 320, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

AYES—94

Aderholt	Finstad	Miller (IL)
Allen	Fischbach	Mills
Arrington	Fitzgerald	Mooney
Babin	Franklin, Scott	Moore (AL)
Banks	Fry	Nehls
Bice	Good (VA)	Newhouse
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	Ogles
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	Palmer
Boebert	Granger	Perry
Bost	Green (TN)	Pfluger
Brecheen	Greene (GA)	Posey
Burchett	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Hageman	Rogers (WA)
Burlison	Harris	Rose
Cammack	Harshbarger	Rosendale
Carl	Hern	Roy
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Hunt	Schweikert
Cline	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Stauber
Clyde	Kaptur	Steupe
Collins	Kustoff	Strong
Comer	LaMalfa	Tenney
Crane	Lamborn	Tiffany
Davidson	Loudermilk	Timmons
DesJarlais	Luna	Van Drew
Donalds	Luttrell	Van Duyne
Duncan	Mace	Van Orden
Emmer	Massie	Weber (TX)
Ezell	Mast	Williams (TX)
Fallon	McCormick	
Ferguson	McHenry	

NOES—320

Adams	Carson	Diaz-Balart
Aguiar	Carter (LA)	Dingell
Alford	Cartwright	Doggett
Allred	Casar	Duarte
Amo	Case	Dunn (FL)
Amodei	Casten	Edwards
Armstrong	Castor (FL)	Ellzey
Auchincloss	Castro (TX)	Eshoo
Bacon	Chavez-DeRemer	Espaillat
Baird	Cherfilus-	Estes
Balderson	McCormick	Evans
Barr	Chu	Feenstra
Barragán	Ciscomani	Fitzpatrick
Bean (FL)	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Flood
Bentz	Clyburn	Foster
Bera	Cohen	Foushee
Bergman	Cole	Fox
Beyer	Cannolly	Frankel, Lois
Bilirakis	Correa	Frost
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fulcher
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gaetz
Blunt Rochester	Crawford	Gallagher
Bonamici	Crockett	Gallego
Bowman	Crow	Garamendi
Boyle (PA)	Cuellar	García (IL)
Brown	Curtis	García, Mike
Brownley	D'Esposito	García, Robert
Buchanan	David (KS)	Gimenez
Buck	Davis (IL)	Golden (ME)
Bucshon	Davis (NC)	Goldman (NY)
Budzinski	De La Cruz	Gomez
Bush	Dean (PA)	Gonzales, Tony
Calvert	DeGette	Gonzalez,
Caraveo	DeLauro	Vicente
Carbajal	DelBene	González-Colón
Cárdenas	Deluzio	Gottheimer
Carey	DeSaulnier	Graves (MO)

Green, Al (TX) Manning  
 Griffith McBeth  
 Grijalva McCaul  
 Grothman McClain  
 Guest McClellan  
 Harder (CA) McClintock  
 Hayes McCollum  
 Higgins (NY) McGarvey  
 Hill McGovern  
 Himes Meeks  
 Hinson Menendez  
 Houchin Meng  
 Houlahan Meuser  
 Hoyer Mfume  
 Hoyle (OR) Miller-Meeks  
 Hudson Molinaro  
 Huffman Moolenaar  
 Huizenga Moore (UT)  
 Issa Moore (WI)  
 Ivey Moran  
 Jackson (IL) Morelle  
 Jackson (NC) Moskowitz  
 Jackson Lee Moulton  
 Jacobs Moylan  
 James Mrvan  
 Jayapal Mullin  
 Jeffries Murphy  
 Johnson (GA) Nadler  
 Johnson (OH) Napolitano  
 Johnson (SD) Neal  
 Kamlager-Dove Neguse  
 Kean (NJ) Nickel  
 Keating Norcross  
 Kelly (IL) Norton  
 Kelly (MS) Nunn (IA)  
 Kelly (PA) Obernolte  
 Khanna Ocasio-Cortez  
 Kiggans (VA) Omar  
 Kildee Owens  
 Kiley Pallone  
 Kilmer Panetta  
 Kim (CA) Pappas  
 Kim (NJ) Pascarell  
 Krishnamoorthi Payne  
 Kuster Pelosi  
 LaHood Peltola  
 LaLota Pence  
 Landsman Perez  
 Langworthy Peters  
 Larsen (WA) Petterson  
 Larson (CT) Pingree  
 Latta Plaskett  
 LaTurner Pocan  
 Lawler Pressley  
 Lee (CA) Quigley  
 Lee (FL) Ramirez  
 Lee (NV) Raskin  
 Lee (PA) Rogers (AL)  
 Leger Fernandez Rogers (KY)  
 Lesko Ross  
 Letlow Rouzer  
 Levin Ruiz  
 Lieu Rutherford  
 Lucas Ryan  
 Luetkemeyer Sablan  
 Lynch Salinas  
 Magaziner Sanchez  
 Malliotakis Sarbanes  
 Maloy Scanlon  
 Mann Schakowsky

NOT VOTING—25

Balint  
 Cleaver  
 Craig  
 Crenshaw  
 Escobar  
 Fletcher  
 Garbarino  
 Garcia (TX)  
 Graves (LA)

Horsford  
 Jackson (TX)  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Lofgren  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 Miller (OH)  
 Miller (WV)  
 Norman

Phillips  
 Porter  
 Radewagen  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Scalise  
 Waltz  
 Westerman

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8, printed in part B of House Report 118–298 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 213, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 700]

AYES—202

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Allred  
 Amo  
 Auchincloss  
 Barragan  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Bowman  
 Boyle (PA)  
 Brown  
 Brownley  
 Budzinski  
 Bush  
 Caraveo  
 Carabajal  
 Cardenas  
 Carson  
 Carter (LA)  
 Cartwright  
 Casar  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Khanna  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kim (NJ)  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Chu  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Correa  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crockett  
 Crow  
 Cuellar  
 Davids (KS)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (NC)  
 Dean (PA)  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Deluzio  
 DeSaulnier  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Eshoo  
 Espallat  
 Evans  
 Foster  
 Foushee  
 Frankel, Lois  
 Frost  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Garcia (IL)  
 Garcia, Robert

Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Aderholt  
 Alford  
 Amodei  
 Armstrong  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Baird  
 Balderson  
 Banks  
 Barr  
 Bean (FL)  
 Bentz  
 Bergman  
 Bice  
 Biggs  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (NC)  
 Boebert  
 Bost  
 Brecheen  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burchett  
 Burgess  
 Burlison  
 Calvert  
 Carey  
 Carl  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chavez-DeRemer  
 Ciscomani  
 Cline  
 Cloud  
 Clyde  
 Cole  
 Collins  
 Comer  
 Crane  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Curtis  
 Ivey  
 D'Esposito  
 Davidson  
 De La Cruz  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Donalds  
 Duarte  
 Duncan  
 Dunn (FL)  
 Edwards  
 Ellzey  
 Emmer  
 Estes  
 Ezell  
 Fallon  
 Feenstra  
 Ferguson  
 Finstad  
 Fischbach  
 Fitzgerald  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flood  
 Foad  
 Foy  
 Franklin, Scott  
 Fry  
 Fulcher

NOES—213

Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Garcia, Mike  
 Gimenez  
 Golden (ME)  
 Gonzales, Tony  
 Gonzalez-Colon  
 Good (VA)  
 Gooden (TX)  
 Gosar  
 Granger  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green (TN)  
 Greene (GA)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guest  
 Guthrie  
 Hageman  
 Harris  
 Harshbarger  
 Hern  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Hinson  
 Houchin  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Hunt  
 Issa  
 Jackson (TX)  
 James  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (PA)  
 Kean (NJ)  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kiggans (VA)  
 Kiley  
 Kim (CA)  
 Kustoff  
 LaHood  
 LaLota  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Langworthy  
 Latta  
 LaTurner  
 Lawler  
 Lee (FL)  
 Lesko  
 Letlow  
 Loudermilk  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luna  
 Luttrell  
 Mace  
 Malliotakis  
 Maloy  
 Mann  
 Massie  
 McCaul  
 McClain  
 McClintock  
 McCormick  
 McHenry  
 Meuser

NOT VOTING—24

Allen  
 Balint  
 Cammack  
 Cleaver  
 Craig  
 Escobar  
 Fletcher  
 Garbarino

Garcia (TX)  
 Horsford  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Landsman  
 Lofgren  
 Mast  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy

Miller (IL)  
 Miller-Meeks  
 Mills  
 Molinaro  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney  
 Moore (AL)  
 Moore (UT)  
 Moran  
 Moylan  
 Murphy  
 Nehls  
 Newhouse  
 Nunn (IA)  
 Obernolte  
 Ogles  
 Owens  
 Palmer  
 Pence  
 Perry  
 Pfluger  
 Posey  
 Reschenthaler  
 Rodgers (WA)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rose  
 Rosendale  
 Rouzer  
 Roy  
 Rutherford  
 Salazar  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Self  
 Sessions  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smucker  
 Spartz  
 Stauber  
 Steel  
 Stefanik  
 Steil  
 Steube  
 Strong  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Tiffany  
 Timmons  
 Turner  
 Valadao  
 Van Drew  
 Van Duyne  
 Van Orden  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Waltz  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams (NY)  
 Williams (TX)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Yakym  
 Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1705

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:  
 Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I was detained on my way to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 699, Ogles Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 5933—DETERRENT Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1709

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
 So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 Stated for:



Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700.

Stated against:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). There being no further amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, and, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on H.R. 4468, if offered; and passage of H.R. 4468, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 170, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

YEAS—246

Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bean (FL)  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Boyle (PA)  
Brecheen  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budzinski  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison

Calvert  
Cammack  
Caraveo  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Costa  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Curtis  
D’Esposito  
Davidson  
Davis (NC)  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duarte  
Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Elizy  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Foxy  
Franklin, Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Golden (ME)  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harder (CA)  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Hill  
Higgins (LA)  
Carl  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (NC)  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Kean (NJ)  
Keating  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Landsman  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Lee (NV)  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Maloy  
Mann  
Manning  
Massie  
Mast  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Moskowitz  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Nickel  
Nunn (IA)

NAYS—170

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Amo  
Auchincloss  
Barragan  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Brown  
Brownley  
Bush  
Carbajal  
Cardenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clyburn  
Connolly  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crockett  
Crow  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio

Obernolte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pappas  
Pence  
Perez  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Ryan  
Salazar  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Slotkin  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Sorensen  
Spartz  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Dуйne  
Van Orden  
Vasquez  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

Himes  
Houlihan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Salinas  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

NOT VOTING—17

Balint  
Cleaver  
Craig  
Escobar  
Fletcher  
Garcia (TX)  
Horsford  
Lofgren  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Norman  
Phillips  
Porter  
Ruppersberger  
Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1717

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CHOICE IN AUTOMOBILE RETAIL SALES ACT OF 2023**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill H.R. 4468 to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing a proposed rule with respect to emissions from vehicles, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Stevens of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4468 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Ms. Stevens moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4468 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 4, beginning on line 9, strike clause (ii) (relating to limited availability of new motor vehicles based on engine type), and make such conforming changes as may be necessary.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 214, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 702]

YEAS—201

Adams Foushee Menendez
Aguilar Frankel, Lois Meng
Allred Frost Mfume
Amo Gallego Moore (WI)
Auchincloss Garamendi Morelle
Barragan Garcia (IL) Moskowitz
Beatty Garcia, Robert Moulton
Bera Golden (ME) Mrvan
Beyer Goldman (NY) Mullin
Bishop (GA) Gomez Nadler
Blumenauer Gonzalez, Napolitano
Blunt Rochester Vicente Neal
Bonamici Gottheimer Neguse
Bowman Green, Al (TX) Nickel
Boyle (PA) Grijalva Norcross
Brown Harder (CA) Ocasio-Cortez
Brownley Hayes Omar
Budzinski Higgins (NY) Pallone
Bush Himes Panetta
Caraveo Houlihan Pappas
Carbajal Hoyer Pascarell
Cárdenas Hoyle (OR) Payne
Carson Huffman Pelotola
Carter (LA) Ivey Perez
Cartwright Jackson (IL) Peters
Casar Jackson (NC) Pettersen
Case Jackson Lee Pingree
Casten Jacobs Pocan
Castor (FL) Jayapal Pressley
Castro (TX) Jeffries Quigley
Cherfilus-Johnson (GA) Ramirez
McCormick Kamlager-Dove Raskin
Chu Kaptur
Clark (MA) Keating Ross
Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL) Ruiz
Clyburn Khanna Ryan
Cohen Kildee Salinas
Connolly Kilmer Sánchez
Correa Kim (NJ) Sarbanes
Costa Krishnamoorthi Scanlon
Courtney Kuster Schakowsky
Crockett Landsman Schiff
Crow Larsen (WA) Schneider
Cuellar Larson (CT) Scholten
Davids (KS) Lee (CA) Schrier
Davis (IL) Lee (NV) Scott (VA)
Davis (NC) Lee (PA) Scott, David
Dean (PA) Leger Fernandez Sewell
DeGette Levin Sherman
DeLauro Lieu Sherrill
DelBene Lynch Slotkin
Deluzio Magaziner Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier Manning Sorensen
Dingell McBath Soto
Doggett McClellan Spanberger
Eshoo McCollum Stansbury
Espallat McGarvey Stanton
Evans McGovern Stevens
Foster Meeks Strickland

Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda

NAYS—214

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry

NOT VOTING—18

Balint
Cleaver
Craig
Escobar
Fletcher
Garcia (TX)
Higgins (LA)
Horsford
Lofgren
Matsui
McCarthy
Miller (OH)

Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Miller (WV)
Norman
Phillips
Porter
Ruppersberger
Waltz

□ 1724

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 197, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 703]

YEAS—221

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Williams (TX) Wittman  
Wilson (SC) Womack

Yakym  
Zinke

NAYS—197

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

NOT VOTING—15

Balint Horsford  
Cleaver Lofgren  
Craig Matsui  
Escobar McCarthy  
Fletcher Miller (OH)

Miller (WV)  
Norman  
Phillips  
Porter  
Ruppersberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1730

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the

house and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 914

Whereas on September 30, 2023, as the House of Representatives was considering legislation to avoid a lapse of appropriations for Federal agencies and departments which would result in a shutdown of those agencies and departments, Jamaal Bowman, the Representative from the 16th Congressional District of New York, pulled a fire alarm;

Whereas section 22-1319 of the District of Columbia Criminal Code makes knowingly causing a false alarm of fire a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment up to six months, or both;

Whereas section 22-1319 of the District of Columbia Criminal Code states “It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to willfully or knowingly give a false alarm of fire within the District of Columbia, and any person or persons violating the provisions of this subsection shall, upon conviction, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine not more than the amount set forth in section 22-3571.01 [of this Code] or by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment”;

Whereas on October 26, 2023, Representative Bowman pled guilty to violating section 22-1319 of the District of Columbia Criminal Code and was required to pay a \$1,000 fine and write an apology letter to the United States Capitol Police and was placed on probation; and

Whereas the actions of Representative Bowman forced the evacuation of the Cannon House Office Building and disrupted the work of the Congress as a vote was underway on the floor of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives censures Jamaal Bowman, Representative from the 16th Congressional District of New York;

(2) Representative Jamaal Bowman will forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

(3) Representative Jamaal Bowman will be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Ms. Clark of Massachusetts moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 216, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]  
YEAS—201

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

Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—216

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

Burgess  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
D’Esposito  
Davidson  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds

Duarte  
Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Elizy  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Foxy  
Franklin, Scott  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez

Gonzales, Tony	Lawler	Rose
Good (VA)	Lee (FL)	Rosendale
Gooden (TX)	Lesko	Rouzer
Gosar	Letlow	Roy
Granger	Loudermilk	Rutherford
Graves (LA)	Lucas	Salazar
Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Green (TN)	Luna	Schweikert
Greene (GA)	Luttrell	Scott, Austin
Griffith	Mace	Self
Grothman	Malliotakis	Sessions
Guest	Maloy	Simpson
Guthrie	Mann	Smith (MO)
Hageman	Massie	Smith (NE)
Harris	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Harshbarger	McCaul	Smucker
Hern	McClain	Spartz
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Stauber
Hill	McCormick	Steel
Hinson	McHenry	Stefanik
Houchin	Meuser	Steil
Hudson	Miller (IL)	Steube
Huizenga	Miller-Meecks	Strong
Hunt	Mills	Tenney
Issa	Molinaro	Thompson (PA)
Jackson (TX)	Moolenaar	Tiffany
James	Mooney	Timmons
Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Turner
Johnson (OH)	Moore (UT)	Valadao
Johnson (SD)	Moran	Van Drew
Jordan	Murphy	Van Dwyne
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Van Orden
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Wagner
Kean (NJ)	Nunn (IA)	Walberg
Kelly (MS)	Obernalte	Waltz
Kelly (PA)	Ogles	Weber (TX)
Kiggans (VA)	Owens	Webster (FL)
Kiley	Palmer	Wenstrup
Kustoff	Pence	Westerman
LaHood	Perry	Williams (NY)
LaLota	Pfluger	Williams (TX)
LaMalfa	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Lamborn	Reschenthaler	Wittman
Langworthy	Rodgers (WA)	Womack
Latta	Rogers (AL)	Yakym
LaTurner	Rogers (KY)	Zinke

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wild

NOT VOTING—16

Balint	Kim (CA)	Norman
Cleaver	Lofgren	Phillips
Craig	Matsui	Porter
Escobar	McCarthy	Ruppersberger
Fletcher	Miller (OH)	
Horsford	Miller (WV)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1739

So the motion to table was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be physically present for votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 698, "nay" on rollcall No. 699, "yea" on rollcall No. 700, "nay" on rollcall No. 701, "yea" on rollcall No. 702, "nay" on rollcall No. 703, and "yea" on rollcall No. 704.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). Pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. McCLAIN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

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

On September 30, as the House of Representatives met to consider legislation to avoid a government shut-

down, Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN of New York knowingly pulled a fire alarm to cause chaos and stop the House from doing its business. This is a felony, plain and simple. It is not difficult to understand.

Capitol Police were forced to waste resources investigating rather than doing their job to keep the Capitol safe. USCP determined BOWMAN broke the law, and he was indicted by the Attorney General of the District of Columbia. Realizing no number of excuses could get him out of this, Mr. BOWMAN pled guilty.

As a former principal of the Cornerstone Academy for Social Action in New York City, Mr. BOWMAN should know the consequences of pulling a fire alarm to cause panic. In New York schools, the policy is clear. When a student commits a crime on campus, police are called, and that student is either suspended or expelled.

One would think Representative BOWMAN would be able to hold himself to the same standards as he held his students to. I don't think that is a lot to ask.

The Republican majority held our own former Member accountable after the House Ethics Committee found he engaged in criminal behavior. It would be hypocritical for the House Democrats to not join us in holding one of their own Members accountable who actually pled guilty to breaking the law.

I do not submit this resolution lightly, Mr. Speaker. Article I, Section 5 of our Constitution gives the House the solemn responsibility to discipline Members for disorderly behavior. As conviction demonstrates, Representative BOWMAN sought to cause panic to delay official proceedings of this House.

I urge my fellow Members to vote "yes" on my resolution and to hold our colleagues accountable when they break the law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a profoundly stupid resolution. Under Republican control, this Chamber has become a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all. Republicans have focused more on censoring people in this Congress than passing bills that help people we represent or improving this country in any way. What a waste of time and money. They have turned this place into a joke.

They came into the majority talking a big game, but have delivered nothing, not a single, damn thing. They talk about passing this and passing that. All their hyperpartisan bills are going nowhere.

What we are now doing is distracting from the fact that the Republican agenda has been a total and complete failure, the least productive Congress in history, the most rules failed in a

single year. They dragged America to the brink of default twice, almost shut down the government, wasted weeks fighting about who should be Speaker, and hitting each other in the hallways.

We should be talking about important issues in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. We should be addressing healthcare costs, helping Americans build economic security, competing with our adversaries abroad, and investing in our people at home.

We just had a shooting in Las Vegas. We should be talking about preventing gun violence in this country, and you have us here talking about how someone tried to go out the wrong door of the Cannon House Office Building.

Honestly, what the hell is wrong with you?

Congressman BOWMAN apologized. I want to read his statement so we can be clear about what we are talking about here today. "Today, as I was rushing to make a vote, I came to a door that is usually open for votes but today would not open. I am embarrassed to admit that I activated the fire alarm, mistakenly thinking it would open the door. I regret this and sincerely apologize for any confusion this caused."

He messed up. Like many of us do every day, he was rushing to get to votes. Guess what? No one was hurt. No one's life was put in danger. Votes went on like nothing happened. Anyone who works here knows that a fire alarm going off across the street wouldn't impact votes here in the Capitol.

I find it terribly ironic that we are talking about censoring Mr. BOWMAN, yet we never censured any of our colleagues who tried to overturn the election on January 6 or who failed to respond to a subpoena or who put our national security in danger by storming the SCIF with their phones.

In fact, to the contrary, MIKE JOHNSON, the new Speaker of the House, held a press conference yesterday about the January 6 video footage. Something he said stuck with me:

We have to blur some of the people's faces who participated in the events of that day because we don't want them to be retaliated against and charged by the DOJ.

Just to be clear, Republicans want to protect the insurrectionists, shield them from accountability, the people who beat officers, kicked in doors, smashed windows, desecrated this building, and tried to take down our democracy. Not our doors; America's doors, America's officers, America's windows. This is America's building that Trump's mob defiled.

Speaker JOHNSON wants to protect the mob but has us here debating this absurd censure. What a pathetic exercise in retaliation and revenge. What a petty thing it is to bring this garbage to the floor. Sadly, it is just a typical week for this disgraceful Republican majority.

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

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

To use that logic, then all those people should have just said “sorry,” and we would move on, right?

No, we don’t do that.

Let me tell you, I take a little bit of offense to “What the hell is wrong with you?” I will tell you, there is nothing wrong with me. I took an oath to defend the Constitution, and that is exactly what I am going to do. I am not going to apologize for it. I am going to hold the Constitution. It is very simple. We really shouldn’t even have this debate. If you break the law and you follow due process, there are consequences to your actions, even if you say “sorry.”

We can try all of the diversion tactics that we would like. It doesn’t change the fact that someone broke the law and that someone should be held accountable. It is disappointing, Mr. Speaker, that their own party can’t hold them accountable, that they have such hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, we all remember that day, September 30, 2023, at 11:59 a.m. That was when the Democrats actually called for a motion to adjourn. It was a tactic to stop the vote from taking place when we were just 12 hours away from a government shutdown. It was also the day that the leader on the other side tried to give a speech to delay the vote even further.

Perhaps the most egregious thing we saw was when one of the Members—remember, we are Members of Congress—and a Member on the other side of the aisle pulled a fire alarm to disrupt proceedings. It was certainly an attempt to interfere with an official proceeding.

Now, the speaker who spoke on his behalf said, no, no, no, he was rushing for a vote. In fact, that is what the statement from Mr. BOWMAN was, that he was rushing for a vote. Then why, after pulling that alarm, did he show up to vote an hour later? If he was in such a rush to come to the Capitol to vote, why did it take him an hour to actually cast his vote?

That is the question that he should be answering, because nothing else truly makes sense. The bottom line here is that he was charged with a crime after an investigation by the police. He did break the law, he did plead guilty, and we need to hold that Member accountable. That is why we have brought this resolution today.

It is not pathetic. What is pathetic is somebody who is a grown adult pulling a fire alarm like they are in high school. As a high school principal, Mr. BOWMAN knows very well the old fire alarm trick, and there would be accountability for his students if they pulled the fire alarm.

That is why we are here today making sure there is accountability. That is all that this is about. It is not just accountability if Republicans do some-

thing. There is accountability if anyone in this Chamber does something, commits a crime, pleads guilty. That is what we are doing today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we speak here today, conflicts are raging around the globe, and the American people have told us exactly what they want us to do. Democracy is under siege. Putin is salivating at the prospect that Republicans might abandon Ukraine. Seventy thousand childcare centers are on the verge of shutting down because the GOP let vital funding expire. We don’t even have a budget, despite the fact that we voted for those top-line numbers back in June.

This ridiculous censure is how the Republicans are spending the time of this Chamber and the time of the American people. The MAGA majority should be embarrassed if they are still capable of shame. Republicans filed this censure the same day they decided to shield the identities of January 6 rioters.

I do have to hand it to the majority. They have managed to both push an extreme agenda and be a do-nothing majority. They have done nothing to make families freer, safer, or more confident in their future. Instead, they have voted against lowering the cost of insulin, affordable housing, and gun safety. They have done nothing to promote freedom, but they do not miss an opportunity to vote for abortion bans, book bans, and tax cheats.

Just last week, the majority’s leadership said no to holding George Santos accountable after a motion to expel was made by the Republican chairman of the Ethics Committee, but today they bring this to the floor? A censure isn’t a substitute for a policy agenda. It isn’t filler when you have nothing to offer the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this sham resolution.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, it was said by our friends on the other side of the aisle that this censure motion is profoundly stupid. What is profoundly stupid is an adult man, who has been elected as a Member of Congress, held to a high esteem, pulling a fire alarm like a child, like throwing a tantrum. What is worse is that he violated the law. He broke the law when he did it.

□ 1800

It wasn’t just something to say, oh, I am sorry. He broke the law because he wanted to obstruct the meeting of this body, the vote of this body. The January 6 individuals have been talked about. If someone had done that on January 6, they would have been put in jail. The American people know it.

They see that there is a double standard. They see that this side of the aisle cleans up its House. The other side is going to let people who have committed crimes continue to sit in office.

The other side of the building is going to let someone who has taken bribes in the form of gold bars—apparently cash isn’t good enough under Biden inflation. For a Democratic Member of the Senate to take cash is not enough. You have to take gold.

We clean up, and we have a standard on this side of the aisle, and the American people know it. The standard on this side of the aisle is high. What is clear today is the standard on that side of the aisle is not.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will say it again, this resolution is profoundly stupid.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is painfully obvious to myself, my colleagues, and the American people that the Republican Party is deeply unserious and unable to legislate. Their censure resolution against me today continues to demonstrate their inability to govern and serve the American people.

Over the last 3 years, I have tirelessly fought for my district and my constituents by bringing over \$125 million to the district. I helped save members of my community over \$7 million and resolved over 6,500 constituent casework issues.

I have introduced over 50 bills, resolutions, and amendments, and I had two bills on STEM education passed in the historic Chips and Science Act.

Even today, as Republicans force a censure on me, I introduced a new bill, the College Athlete Right to Organize Act, to ensure college athletes get paid for their time and hard work. No matter the result of the censure vote tomorrow, my constituents know I will always continue to fight for them.

Fighting for my district includes working to prevent a government shutdown. Just over 2 months ago, I was rushing to the Capitol to vote and prevent a Republican shutdown. When I tried to exit a door that I usually go through, it didn’t open, and due to confusion and rush to go vote, I pulled the fire alarm.

I immediately took responsibility and accountability for my actions and pled guilty. Immediately. The legal process on this matter has played out. In no way did I obstruct official proceedings. The vote took place and Democrats were able to ensure we avoided a government shutdown.

Unfortunately, Republicans are here trying to rehash an already litigated matter. This is a matter in which the Republican-controlled House Committee on Ethics decided not to proceed with any further investigation.

This is an insult to the people I was elected to represent. Instead of passing meaningful legislation for the American people, some Republicans are

using this censure to waste our time and money. They are trying to make you forget about all of the rights they want to destroy.

They are trying to make you forget they want to take away your reproductive rights, your voting rights, your healthcare, your Social Security, and your Medicare.

House Democrats have been trying to focus on and address the issues the American people care about.

Can we please, please, please, please address the affordability crisis?

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are struggling to put food on their tables, pay their rent, and keep the electricity on.

Can we address the issue of gun violence.

Just this week, we broke the record for the most mass shootings in a year and we have lost over 35,000 people due to gun violence.

Can we address our crumbling public school infrastructure?

Kids are learning in schools with asbestos, no air conditioning, and mold. It is hurting their ability to learn, grow, and thrive.

Can we put an end to our massive spending on weapons and war, and instead invest in our communities and our kids?

The number one thing I tried to do as a middle school principal and as an educator for 20 years was to teach my students when they made a mistake, they owned up to it, they took responsibility, and they held themselves accountable. That is exactly what I did. Yet, we are still here.

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

Mr. Speaker, although your district may appreciate all of those accomplishments, are we supposed to just forget about the crime that you committed?

Perhaps, in education, maybe we should have studied a little harder. If you commit a crime, there is a penalty to that crime. You don't get to say: I committed a crime, but I did all these good things. All these good things erase this crime over here. It doesn't work that way.

Again, I will say that it is not profoundly stupid to hold up the Constitution. The left may believe holding up the rights of the Constitution is profoundly stupid. I don't believe we do. I will again say that this hearing and this censure is not profoundly stupid. It is actually a hearing of where we followed the law.

Mr. Speaker, the other fact that I may want to correct—I will correct the truth with maybe the other half of the truth—is “immediately” means right away. So when you say, “I immediately” took action, “I immediately”—well, the incident occurred

on September 30. October 26 was when you pled guilty. I think that is a little bit longer than immediately. Again, maybe math wasn't my best subject either.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ).

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

On September 30, while the House considered crucial legislation to avoid a government shutdown, Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN pulled a fire alarm to disrupt proceedings, a crime for which he pled guilty. Let me repeat that again. A crime for which he pled guilty.

As a career firefighter, who served for 25 years in the city of Miami, 9 years of which I served as its chief, I know just how serious this is. Every time a firefighter responds to an alarm, they are placing themselves and the public at risk.

While that is a risk that we are willing to take to protect life and property, we should never put our first responders and the public at risk by pulling a false alarm. In fact, in 2021, over 40 police and firefighters died and were killed while responding to an alarm.

While Representative BOWMAN initially claimed that he pulled the alarm thinking it would open a locked door, we know that that was a blatant lie.

After pulling the alarm, Representative BOWMAN can be clearly seen on camera ripping down the emergency exit signs and fleeing the scene. He had every opportunity to alert Capitol Police to his mistake but chose not to.

Had it been a simple mistake, I wouldn't be here. It wasn't a simple mistake.

It is disgraceful that a Member of Congress would go to such lengths to break the law and put first responders and the public at risk to prevent the House from voting to keep government open so our Federal workers can receive their paychecks.

For obstructing the House, putting first responders and the public at risk, and breaking D.C. laws, Representative BOWMAN should be censured before the House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman talks about following the Constitution. Really? Coming from that side, it is laughable to hear that. There was silence about the crimes of Donald Trump; silence about what happened here on January 6. Silence.

Do you want to talk about opening a door?

The people who stormed this place broke down doors trying to kill people. Silence. I don't want to hear any lectures about upholding the Constitution. There is nothing but silence about the crimes of those who attacked this Capitol on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about my colleague, Mr. JAMAAL BOWMAN, who I have the privilege of serving on two committees within this very Congress: the Education and Labor Committee and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

I have seen Mr. BOWMAN fight for disability rights, childcare, affordable prescription drugs, and affordable housing. He has stood up to racism. He has stood up to the attacks on public education, attacks on teachers, and cuts to school nutrition. There is a unique and vital perspective Mr. BOWMAN brings to education issues in this Congress.

In his freshman term, he served as a subcommittee chair for Energy. He was a Conference committee member on the Chips and Science Act, advocating for diversity, equity, and inclusion, so that the jobs and profits could go to everyday Americans.

This man does not deserve to be reprimanded. We should heed the leadership that he brings to education issues. He looks at AI and he asks: How can we solve the problems of tomorrow? If we could all do such a thing.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I really don't take any joy in being here standing before you today to address this matter of grave concern.

Mr. Speaker, this is not trivial. This is not stupid. This is profoundly important; a solemn duty that I do not take lightly. This is not personal. This is not partisan. It is to protect this very body.

Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN was criminally charged and pleaded guilty to falsely pulling a fire alarm. While I applaud his confession, that doesn't mean this is without consequences. This act was not a mere lapse in judgment. It was not a mistake. It was not an accident.

It was an intentional, calculated attempt to disrupt the very democratic process by halting a critical vote on this very floor, voting for government funding. If you don't believe it, watch the video.

What should our response be as a House to this willful act of obstruction?

Mr. Speaker, to this point, nothing has been done.

This inaction sends a very dangerous message: that a Member of Congress can break the law and the norms of this institution to obstruct a vote without any consequences. We must rise above partisan politics and hold our own accountable.

The integrity of our democratic process, the safety of our community, the trust of the American people, and the function of this body demands nothing less.

We cannot allow the reckless, calculated actions of one individual to overshadow the critical work that this

body does. I am sure that Mr. BOWMAN is a fine Representative for the people of his district. This is not a joyous day for anyone here on this side of the aisle. This is a sad day for this body.

It is an even sadder day if we do nothing about this egregious act. I recommend that the entire body vote "yes" for the censure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman by saying if this isn't political or partisan, I don't know what the hell is. This is a pathetic display that we are seeing here on the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution because House Democrats want a functioning House of Representatives. We are in the midst of the least productive Congress since the Great Depression. This historic dysfunction is what happens when extreme MAGA Republicans dictate the agenda.

□ 1815

The majority is fixated on censures, expulsions, and impeachments. Meanwhile, the American public is worried about making ends meet.

Where is the Republican urgency around lowering costs? Where are their solutions for their constituents who are worried about rent, groceries, and utilities?

The truth is that they have no plan and no solutions. They are taking orders from the former President and being led by the most extreme members of their Conference.

However, when House Democrats held the majority, we passed the bipartisan infrastructure law, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the bipartisan Chips and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws are creating good-paying jobs, lowering energy costs, and making schools safer in communities across this country.

A vote for this resolution will further divide this body at a time when we should be coming together to make the needs of the American public front and center.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleague from New York, Mr. BOWMAN, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined my colleague, ANTHONY D'ESPOSITO, in introducing a resolution to expel disgraced former Congressman George Santos. It was warranted. It

was warranted because he defrauded the voters and defrauded donors, and he is facing a 23-count indictment.

He did not belong in Congress. I was willing to take on a member of my own party and reduce our majority by one because he was unfit to serve.

Now, as a Congressman from the 17th District of New York, I share Westchester County with Mr. BOWMAN. I have gotten to know Mr. BOWMAN throughout the course of my tenure here in Congress. We have even flown home together to Westchester County Airport.

What happened on September 30 was wrong. I am sure he is embarrassed. He should be. As a former middle school principal, he understands the difference between a locked door and a fire alarm. To suggest that somehow he was confused is laughable.

As the video evidence shows, he did push the door, and being locked, it didn't open. Nonetheless, he then took down the signs. He threw one on the ground, carried one, walked over to the fire alarm on the wall, and pulled the fire alarm. It didn't say: Pull to exit. It didn't say: In case of a locked door, pull the fire alarm and the door will open.

No. It said: In case of emergency, pull fire alarm.

He then proceeded to throw the other sign on the ground, and he ran past seven—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven—Capitol Police officers and did not utter one word about accidentally and embarrassingly pulling a fire alarm.

In fact, when the BOLO went out and the Capitol Police came to question him about it, he lawyered up. He then went and met with LEADER JEFFRIES.

That is not taking accountability right away. That is not taking responsibility. In fact, a few days after it happened, he called me directly to ask me: Please don't get on a censure or an expulsion resolution.

I said to him: I will not do anything until I hear from the Capitol Police as to what happened.

He told me: Oh, I won't be charged. They are dismissing it. I didn't do anything.

They ended up referring it to prosecutors. He was charged, and he pled guilty.

I don't think he should be expelled. I think what he did was wrong. I don't think it was an accident. It was absolutely done to disrupt a proceeding as the Democrats were pulling all sorts of stunts that day, including walking single file in to vote by paper even though they all had their electronic voting cards. HAKEEM JEFFRIES was doing his magic minute. We all know what it was.

Let's be honest. Let's take accountability here.

If you are taking accountability, then you should actually tell your colleagues: Do you know what? I did wrong. I accept the censure.

Instead, you are sitting there smirking and laughing. I don't think your

constituents think it is funny. In fact, I know they don't think it is funny because of the number of times I get calls from your constituents.

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

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. The number of times I get calls from your constituents and the amount of time my office gets inundated with requests from your constituents, like when you shut your office down for 2 weeks in August—all the offices shut down. Do you know how many cases we had to take on? Calls came from Jewish constituents who don't feel that they can go to you for help.

They don't think it is funny. The people of Westchester County don't think it is funny.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this censure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, again, reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my Republican colleagues: Are you listening to yourselves talk?

We are in the House Chamber. Heads of state address this body. We have debates about war and peace, and you are talking about a fire alarm? I mean, give me a break.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think the Republican side of the aisle made the case quite clearly today as to why we should not vote for censure. Right now, you can tell how weak their arguments are because they are grasping for straws, trying to do their best "My Cousin Vinny" impersonation as to breaking down what happened here with a fire alarm.

JAMAAL BOWMAN has more courage in his pinkie finger than the entire Republican Party put together and more integrity than the entire Republican Party put together. That is exactly why they are moving to censure him today.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what is actually going on. New York Republicans are so embarrassed that they propped up George Santos, got him elected to office, and then had to turn around and vote to expel him that they want to distract the entire world from their massive embarrassment.

New York Republicans are so embarrassed that they have not accomplished a damn thing for New Yorkers this entire year that they have to find a distraction, so they have decided to target one of the first Black men to ever represent Westchester County in the United States Congress for censure. That is what today is about.

Moreover, New York Republicans are so unfocused and so unable to make

people's lives better that they have decided to bully their colleague. That is what today is about.

They are wasting our time, and they are wasting the country's time over some petty—what rises to censure? I mean, truly, these arguments that are being made here, what is next? Jay-walking? Do you want to get us for jay-walking and for not crossing the street correctly? Is that what you are going to raise for censure next?

This is truly ridiculous. It is beneath the character of the House, and it is beneath the stature and the status of what rises to consideration before this body.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree. I wish we didn't have to be here. We should, as most sports teams do, clean up our own locker room. That would be the best-case scenario, as we actually did with a member of our Conference. We cleaned up our own locker room. It would be nice if the other side would clean up theirs.

So, I agree with you, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. I loved your "My Cousin Vinny" analogy. That was funny, but this isn't a funny thing. It was good, but this isn't funny.

You committed a crime to try to disrupt a proceeding. This is serious. I think it is a little more serious than jaywalking when you try to disrupt the business of the House.

Again, I wish we weren't here because I wish you all would clean up your own locker room so we could really get on to the people's business. We can do both.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 30, 2023, the House of Representatives was considering a continuing resolution to avoid a government shutdown. Minutes after the Democratic whip made a motion to adjourn, JAMAAL BOWMAN decided to pull a fire alarm. He pulled that fire alarm intentionally and willfully, and he knew exactly what he was doing.

This happened in the Cannon House Office Building, where my office is located. I happened to have been in my office when he pulled the fire alarm. This caused the Cannon House Office Building to be evacuated, and my staff and I could not return to our office for several hours.

Once the fire alarm was pulled, the elevators shut down. It made it very difficult for everyone to leave the building, especially if they were handicapped. People had to go down the stairs in order to exit as the fire alarm was blaring. Not only that, all the staff had to leave. They were not allowed to reenter for a very long time.

Capitol Police were scrambling, trying to figure out what had happened, if there was a fire, and if there was a threat to our safety and security. They had to go into an investigation immediately in order to understand why the fire alarm was going.

JAMAAL BOWMAN did not tell the Capitol Police that he pulled the fire alarm even though he admitted himself that, when he makes a mistake, he would tell his own students: If you have made a mistake, own up to it and take accountability.

JAMAAL BOWMAN had plenty of opportunity to admit his mistake and take accountability for his own actions. He should have told Capitol Police immediately that he made a mistake, as he claimed.

It wasn't a mistake, Mr. Speaker. It was on purpose. It was intentional. It was all in part to play the games and the shenanigans that the Democrats were pulling that day as they were trying to block the continuing resolution that was being considered on the House floor.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the fire alarm was pulled minutes after the Democratic whip made a motion to adjourn.

More importantly, he was intentionally playing his part to obstruct an official proceeding.

By the way, this is the same thing that has been used against January 6 defendants and is still being used to this day. They are being locked up, held in pretrial detention, and being prosecuted by the Department of Justice nearly 3 years later for obstructing an official proceeding, which is exactly what JAMAAL BOWMAN, a Member of Congress, did on September 30.

We have a two-tiered justice system in Washington, D.C. Regular people walked into the Capitol. By the way, many nonviolent offenders walked in open doors. Some of them who also were standing out on the lawn and never entered the Capitol are being charged for obstructing an official proceeding.

Yet, JAMAAL BOWMAN says that it was a mistake and that he should get a pass. His colleagues make excuses for him and call us unserious.

Do you know what is unserious, Mr. Speaker? Having a justice system that doesn't hold everyone accountable and doesn't treat people the same way.

This is an outrage, and this is a disgrace to this institution and this body.

For someone who is a former principal and who punished his own students for intentionally pulling fire alarms to make up petty excuses and think that his own constituents and the American people will buy his lie is a slap in the face to his voters, the people whom he represents, this entire country, and every single one of us who serves in this body.

□ 1830

I would also add that if anyone is going to be charged and forced to remain in jail, forced to be serving prison time for obstructing an official proceeding, then JAMAAL BOWMAN should face the exact same fate of every single January 6 defendant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this censure resolu-

tion, and I thank Representative McCLAIN for introducing it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is really rich to get a lecture from someone about civility who stood on this House floor and screamed and interrupted the President of the United States during his state of the Union, or somebody who continues to circle the wagons and cheer on the insurrectionists who attacked this Capitol violently on January 6.

I was the last person off the House floor on that day, and I saw what happened. Then for people to come down here and defend those actions, it is pathetic and disgusting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, they are so desperate. You all are so desperate to distract from the fact that you all have nothing to improve the lives of the American people or end the ongoing genocide.

Now, you are trying to shift the focus by baselessly attacking Representative BOWMAN to score cheap political points, comparing him to the white supremacists on January 6 who were smashing windows in the Capitol and screaming: "Hang Mike Pence." Give me a break.

Your inability to govern is so obvious to the American people. You all can't even find enough Republicans to pass a budget or even keep a Speaker. This is yet another attempt to silence a person of color in this Chamber. We all see it.

This is all about the fact that Representative BOWMAN calls out your hypocrisy. The Republicans need to leave him alone and get a grip. The Republicans should do something that will actually improve the lives of the American people that you all represent. Vote "no" on this cheap political stunt.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind you that we talk about baseless claims. If I am not mistaken, Capitol Police did an investigation, referred it to the District of Columbia that did an investigation, and Representative BOWMAN pled guilty to a crime. I don't think that is baseless. In fact, I think that is basis for crime and that is basis for this censure. Because baseless means you have no cause, Mr. Speaker, and I think the mere fact that Mr. BOWMAN pled guilty isn't baseless. It is basis for a crime.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would, once again, remind all Members, on both sides of the aisle, to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other in the second person.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this fake, fraudulent, and fictitious censure resolution.

The proceedings here on the floor of the House of Representatives have been



a complete and total embarrassment. Extreme MAGA Republicans have stooped to a new low, and that is very difficult based on the events that have taken place under this Republican majority throughout this year.

JAMAAL BOWMAN has taken public responsibility for the fire alarm incident. He has apologized, explained the circumstances under which it occurred. He has been held publicly accountable by the D.C. Superior Court, paid a \$1,000 fine, and the Ethics Committee, under a Republican chair, on a bipartisan basis here in this Congress made clear that no further action was required.

It begs the question: Why is the author of this resolution and the extreme MAGA Republicans on the floor of the House wasting time and taxpayer resources trying to undermine the credibility of JAMAAL BOWMAN?

He is someone who is doing his best to serve his constituents, including in some of the poorest sections of the Bronx, and extreme MAGA Republicans have us on the floor with this sad and silly charade.

Now, the extreme MAGA Republicans have said, including the author of this resolution, that this is about law and order. Give us a break. All you have done is demonstrate throughout the years, including on January 6 and thereafter, that you are not the party of law and order. Extreme MAGA Republicans are the party of lawlessness and disorder.

As a matter of fact, the author of this resolution has endorsed Donald Trump, with multiple indictments. Someone who undertook a crime wave over and over and over again, proudly smirking now that she stands behind Donald Trump, and then wants to communicate to us that this is about law and order when you are the party of lawlessness and disorder.

In fact, the author of this resolution voted to overturn the will of the American people on January 6, and then came back, like the majority of her extreme MAGA Republican colleagues after the violent insurrection, after the Capitol was overrun by a violent mob, after more than 100 Capitol Police officers were seriously injured, and then voted still, not for law and order, not for accountability, and not for the Constitution. You voted with the insurrectionists.

Give us a break, lecturing us about the Constitution and law and order. Your own record suggests that is a phony argument. Nobody is buying it.

The American people aren't buying it. We will make sure the people of Michigan won't buy it.

It has been very interesting watching extreme MAGA Republicans in this debate acting like detectives on the House floor. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Perry Mason. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Matlock. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Cagney & Lacey, not even worthy of being held

to the standard of Inspector Gadget and Ace Ventura: Pet Detective. That is how embarrassing your display on the House floor has been.

This is a serious matter. Your behavior on the House floor is a serious matter, and I have the floor. I have the floor.

The behavior of the extreme MAGA Republicans censuring Member after Member after Member has brought disgrace to the institution, to the House of Representatives.

This behavior has brought disgrace; not the underlying censure. There has been accountability in the ways that we have all described. The effort to weaponize the censure—what happened, Mr. Speaker, to civility? What happened to trying to foster an environment where we can solve problems on behalf of the American people?

We don't take these arguments of civility seriously because the overwhelming majority of the extreme MAGA Republican Conference supports the violent insurrectionists and supports the insurrectionist-in-chief, twice impeached, under Federal indictment repeatedly for breaking the law and violating the Constitution.

Here we are on the House floor because extreme MAGA Republicans have no plan. Extreme MAGA Republicans have no policies. Extreme MAGA Republicans have made no progress for hardworking American taxpayers on any issue, and so you are here to try to distract.

We are not going to let it happen. We are not going to let extreme MAGA Republicans distract the people of Michigan, distract the people of New York, distract the people of America. We are on the House floor wasting time talking about fire alarms—not the economy, not inflation, not affordable housing, not lowering costs, not the gun violence epidemic that continues to claim the lives of our young people all across America. Extreme MAGA Republicans have us on the House floor talking about fire alarms. How silly is that under these circumstances?

Social Security is under assault. Medicare is under assault. Reproductive freedom is under assault. The Affordable Care Act is under assault. Democracy itself is under assault, and extreme MAGA Republicans are wasting time on the House floor talking about fire alarms under these circumstances. They are embarrassing themselves. It is petty, it is pathetic, and it is petulant.

Now, House Democrats have said from the very beginning of this Congress that we will find bipartisan common ground with our Republican colleagues on any issue whenever and wherever necessary in order to make life better for the American people on any issue, but we will push back against Republican extremism whenever necessary, and you have crossed a line once again.

We will call out MAGA extremism in the loudest, strongest, most direct way

possible. This extreme MAGA Republicans' do-nothing Republican Congress has done nothing to improve the lives of the American people all over the land. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to solve a single problem on behalf of hardworking American taxpayers. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to do a single thing to improve the quality of life of the American people.

If extreme MAGA Republicans are going to continue to try to weaponize the censure as is being done on this floor right now, going after Democrats repeatedly week after week after week because you have nothing better to do, then I volunteer. Censure me next. That is how worthless your censure effort is. It has no credibility, no integrity, and no legitimacy.

Republicans should censure me next. I will take that censure and I will wear it next week, next month, next year like a badge of honor. I will go home, sleep well, and say to myself, today was a good day.

□ 1845

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, therein lies the problem. I am one of the so-called MAGA Republicans which, again, I don't apologize for.

Under MAGA Republican leadership, I might remind everybody, crime was down—or excuse me, crime was up—crime was down under the last administration. Clearly, crime was down. The economy was up.

All of these problems that we are dealing with in this Congress today, Mr. Speaker, have been created by the Biden administration and created by my friends on the left. That is the truth. Those are the facts.

Under the MAGA Republicans, how many wars were we fighting overseas? Zero. What was the crime rate? Down. Again, we have some serious problems since the Democrats, this administration, took office, and therein lies the problem.

You want to talk about law and order. You want to talk about Cagney & Lacey and Ace Ventura, that is cute. That is cute.

Mr. Speaker, you want to talk about a disgrace to this body? Doing investigative work and actually following due process, that is what we are supposed to do. That is what I thought we did.

I will not apologize for following law and order, but under the Democrats' law and order, you shouldn't go through any investigation. You should just on a whim do some impeachment. That is what the other side of the aisle does.

We clean up our locker room, but when you commit a crime, it is unfortunate that we have to bring this to the table. As much as they want to compare us and call us names, they can continue to do that, but the facts speak for themselves. We waited until an investigation was completed before we brought this censure resolution. We

didn't do it on a whim. That is law and order. If that is Cagney & Lacey, following due process, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle could use a little investigative reporting and some detective work themselves.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, oh, my goodness, I had trouble following the gentlewoman. I mean, was crime up or down in the last administration? The one thing I can say with certainty is that crime was way up in the White House in the last administration without a doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I grew up not understanding why people throughout the country didn't hold Congress in high regard, but I can just imagine the people turning on C-SPAN, turning on the news, hearing the arguments that we are hearing from the other side of the aisle, and then it just makes sense to me.

Let's recap what the American people have witnessed over the last few years: A Member who physically assaulted a colleague, a Republican Member who tried to bring a gun on the House floor, a Republican colleague who brought January 6 insurrectionists into the Capitol.

This is the least productive Congress that we have had since the Great Depression, and this entire party is pushing us toward a shutdown and economic collapse daily, but it is Congressman BOWMAN, who is a thoughtful former educator and staunch defender of democracy, who they want to censure. What a pathetic waste of time. No wonder half of this country doesn't vote when they turn on the TV and see their leaders wasting time like this.

We need more educators in Congress like Congressman BOWMAN, not fewer, and maybe if we had more educators here, they would be able to give my Republican colleagues a class on how to truly govern.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BOWMAN is a brilliant, committed, progressive Member who has dedicated his life to equity and opportunity for kids. He is a leader in economics, education, and racial justice. He is a leader of the Green New Deal for public schools, and legislation to pay artists what they are worth.

He made a mistake. He apologized. He paid the fine. The Ethics Committee declined to further investigate this matter. That should be the end of this.

However, what are we doing here? Republicans would rather waste time

with political stunts and demonizing a Black Member. They want people to forget that they want to strip healthcare from Americans. They want people to forget that they want to cut Social Security and Medicare, the two most important and trusted programs in the country. They want people to forget that they are denying election results on that side, your right to vote.

Right now they will do anything to distract from what they are really doing. There is nothing to show for the majority but chaos, infighting, and cruelty.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I just have to end with this. Just a few weeks ago, Congressman CHIP ROY stood on the floor of this Chamber and called for his fellow Republican colleagues to "come explain to me one material, meaningful significant thing the Republican majority has done. . . ."

The answer is obvious. Nothing. Oppose this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable why the author of this censure doesn't know what is up and what is down because obviously someone who wants to talk about crime supports a former President currently running for President that is facing 91 Federal and State indictments.

It is clear she doesn't know what is up or down because we sit on the Education and the Workforce Committee together talking about how she wants to help our kids, but all she wants to do is criminalize their ability to exist as individuals.

It makes sense that she doesn't know what is up or down because she keeps talking about accountability, and she doesn't understand that criminal charges are accountability. Pleading guilty is taking accountability. That is what the gentleman has done.

The only reason we are here is because she wants more time on camera. It is to make sure there is an ability to send a fundraiser asking for money.

This censure is not necessary because this gentleman has already been held accountable.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we need to be accountable to this body.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the censure of Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN. This is yet another predictable but no less wasteful action.

Congressman BOWMAN has taken accountability for his mistake, and even Republicans on the Ethics Committee agree that this is a waste of time.

We have got 99 problems, but a functional government of the Republican majority is not one of them.

Republicans are disconnected, dysfunctional, discriminating, and a disappointment to the American people. They can't pass a bill to fund our public schools, but they will bring this resolution to attack Congressman BOWMAN, a champion for students, a lifelong educator, a duly elected Member of Congress, and a strong Black man. He honors the legacy of the many brilliant Black men who came before him.

A quick history lesson: We are approaching the anniversary of when Joseph Rainey became the first Black Member of the U.S. House of Representatives in December of 1870. Just like JAMAAL BOWMAN, he fought for public education and civil rights, and he had to deal with double standards and racism in Congress.

This censure is just the latest in this Chamber's racist history of telling Black men that they don't belong in Congress.

To the Black men of this Nation, know that you belong everywhere.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. JAMAAL BOWMAN is fighting for you, and I am fighting for you right alongside him.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise because we are tired of extreme Republican antics that seek to put politics over the needs of people.

Under Republican leadership, the House has successfully passed just 14 bills. Some of these were bills to punt an impending government shutdown, which we all know was only avoided thanks to the Democrats.

Let us not forget that their complete and utter inability to govern resulted in an entire Chamber of Congress being unable to perform its basic duties for 17 days, 17 failed Speaker votes, and multiple failed Speaker candidates. Their House is not in order.

Republicans haven't delivered on any top public priorities like strengthening Social Security, delivering environmental protections, or boosting our economy. Politically motivated censures like this one that target Black and Brown Members of Congress like this one are not only a waste of time, they are a distraction.

The people aren't falling for it. Republicans should actually legislate rather than play useless political games like this attempt to censure Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I apologize to the American people. I apologize that Republicans are wasting

their hard-earned taxpayer money with yet another stupid and meaningless censure resolution instead of doing anything that will help the American people.

JAMAAL BOWMAN is a good man, a decent man, a kind man. He was rushing to exit a House Office Building so he could go vote, and he activated a fire alarm in the process of trying to open a door.

Did he destroy government property? No.

Did he obstruct an official proceeding? No.

Did he wield a deadly weapon? No.

Did he assault or injure anyone? No.

However, did he apologize and take responsibility for his actions? Yes, he did.

That is more than we can say for January 6, when this building was desecrated by an angry mob sent by Trump to overturn an election. Republican Members of this body still act like nothing happened. How disgusting. How offensive it is to the men and women who protect us that my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to act like nothing happened that day.

At the end of the day, this has nothing to do with Congressman BOWMAN, and my friends know that. It is about deflecting from how unhinged this majority is. They had to expel one of their own Members last week, for God's sake. They had the first Speaker in history to be ousted. They have nothing of any consequence to show for an entire year in the majority. Nothing. They have done nothing. They have wasted time on stupid measures like this. Nothing.

This whole exercise is just nuts. For Republicans, it is all about appeasing their orange overlord in Mar-a-Lago who can do no wrong.

They don't care about governing. They aren't fit to govern. They aren't concerned about the serious and complex issues facing this country, the world, or the people we represent. For them, being in power is all about retaliation and revenge, and the destruction of their perceived enemies. It is time for the Republican Party to grow up.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to waste another second on this meaningless resolution. This is pathetic. The Republicans have turned this Chamber into a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all.

My friends have done nothing—not a damn thing—for the people that they say they represent. How can anybody on the other side of the aisle go home with a straight face and say that they are representing their constituents? They have produced nothing for them. They have turned this place into a joke.

It is sad that we are here today. Again, I will end as I began, by apologizing to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this pathetic, stupid resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in case my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need clarification, I want to make it clear, the American people know that they are not better off than they were 4 years ago, and they know it is Democrats in this Congress and the White House that have put them in this anguish as we see today, just to clear things up.

All we have heard from congressional Democrats is excuse after excuse for Representative BOWMAN's criminal behavior. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that if a Republican did what Mr. BOWMAN did, that every single Member on the Democratic side would be down here calling for censure, if not expulsion.

Mr. BOWMAN himself, despite pleading guilty, said it was an accident. How? Someone looks at a sign that says "Fire" and thinks, hmm, I wonder what this will do?

Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 2023.

SPEAKER JOHNSON: I am writing to inform you of my intent to leave my seat on the House Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure following my recent appointment to the Committee on Armed Services.

If anything, further is needed from me or my staff, please don't hesitate to contact my office at 202-225-3484 or email Jordan.Wood@mail.house.gov.

Sincerely,

LANCE GOODEN,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 2023.

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: Following my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability effective today.

Sincerely,

CHUCK EDWARDS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

#### RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on the Budget:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 2023.

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: Following my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the House Committee on the Budget for the 118th Congress, effective today.

Sincerely,

CHUCK EDWARDS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 2023.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully inform the House Republican Conference that I resign my membership on the Committee on Oversight and Accountability for the remainder of the 118th Congress, effective immediately. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve on the Committee under the leadership of Chairman COMER. I am proud of the Committee's accomplishments and look forward to continuing this important work on behalf of the American people.

Sincerely,

KELLY ARMSTRONG,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

**ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN  
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 913

*Resolved*, That the following Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Edwards.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Gooden of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY: Mr. Cloud (to rank immediately after Mr. Grothman) and Mr. Waltz.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Ms. Maloy.  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Ms. Maloy.

Mrs. McCLAIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO  
MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS  
IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5933,  
DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANS-  
PARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE  
REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFAR-  
IOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT**

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5933, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

**HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
DEMOCRATIC LEADER**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable HAKEEM JEFFRIES, Democratic Leader:

DECEMBER 6, 2023.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X of the Rules of the House

of Representatives, I designate the following Members to be available to serve as Members of the Investigative Subcommittee established by the Committee on Ethics during the 118th Congress:

Hon. Nanette Barragán of California, Hon. Troy Carter of Louisiana, Hon. Ed Case of Hawaii, Hon. Madeleine Dean of Pennsylvania, Hon. Bill Foster of Illinois, Hon. Chrissy Houlahan of Pennsylvania, Hon. Ayanna Pressley of Massachusetts, Hon. Greg Stanton of Arizona.

Sincerely,

HAKEEM JEFFRIES,  
*Democratic Leader.*

**NATIONAL MINERS DAY**

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, on this National Miners Day, I rise to recognize all miners across Montana who work tirelessly to keep our lights on and our country safe.

It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent the State of Montana in Congress—a State whose founding history lies in the hardworking hands of miners.

It is no coincidence that Montana is nicknamed the “Treasure State.” As seen on our State’s great seal and State flag: a pick, a shovel, and a plow along with the words “Oro y Plata,” “Gold and Silver,” in Spanish, are depicted front and center, symbolizing our State’s diverse natural resources and our rich history of farming and mining.

Earlier this year, I led an energy tour and brought several Members of Congress to Montana to visit the Stillwater Mine in Columbus and the Rosebud Mine in Colstrip so they could see firsthand the work our miners do and how critical they are to our national security and powering America.

On this day and every day, I thank Montana miners for their indispensable role in the production of domestic energy that keeps America safe, thriving, and powered.

**HONORING GLEN SCHALLER**

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I honor the life and highlight the memory of Glen Schaller—a teacher, organizer, labor leader, political and policy strategist, and a friend of many in California’s 19th Congressional District.

After high school, Glen traveled the country. He found his way to Santa Cruz, fell in love with that special place, and he felt it necessary to make it his home. He studied at Cabrillo College and UCSC and worked in early childhood education for 26 years.

Glen found that he loved helping vulnerable people as a teacher, as an activist, and as an ally for the LGBTQ community for which he was named

Ally of the Year and Grand Marshal of the annual Pride parade.

Glen also played a key role in the local Democratic Central Committee and was a political coordinator for the Central Coast Labor Council.

In that position, I can tell you he made sure that local public servants truly understood what it takes to fight for workers and working families.

Another admirable quality of Glen was that he just didn’t focus on politics, but also on policy. He was a director of a local workforce development board, and he fought to prevent closure of local public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I say to his son, Devon, please know that your father impacted so many people in so many ways. By finding Santa Cruz, Glen found his purpose in fighting for equality so that everybody has the same foundation for opportunity and success on the central coast of California.

**HONORING ANTHONY WHITE**

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sympathies to the family and friends of Anthony White for the tragic loss of their father, husband, friend, and coach.

My remarks will be particularly directed to Anthony Jr. and Olivia Grace.

I met their father 25 years ago this very week when I actually voted for him to be the next Wendy’s High School Heisman recipient, an award given to members of the community that excelled in athletics, academics, and citizenship.

He then later went on to play University of Utah football, and his crowning achievement was taking a school that hadn’t seen success for years and turn it into a championship team in Buena Park in southern California, most recently creating that same type of success for Santa Ana Junior College.

Anthony was an incredible human being that will leave a legacy that is beyond description. I hope they can always remember what he has done for not only them as his dad but every community and every person he has touched. We are all better for knowing Anthony. Losing him has been tragic.

We want San to know that her husband has touched so many of us, and we want to just share with her that we will be here for her after his passing.

We offer our prayers and condolences to his entire family.

**KEY PIECES OF LEGISLATION**

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to be here tonight to talk about some of the key pieces of legislation House Republicans are championing this week, from fighting President Biden's unfair student loan program to protecting consumer choice in purchasing a vehicle to holding universities accountable for their influence from foreign adversaries. We are laser focused on putting Americans' interests first.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the vice chair, for hosting this Special Order with me here tonight.

I appreciate you and others standing here to highlight House Republicans' wins and to advocate for our conservative values.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the problems America is facing and what Congress must do to get this country back on track.

Our grandchildren deserve to live in a country that still stands for freedom, and I serve in Congress to work toward building that future.

Freedom tomorrow means upholding the constitutional rights of all Americans today. That is the lens through which I view my job in Congress and the measuring stick I use for every piece of legislation I consider.

I have highlighted the path forward in my four-part commitment to the big first and House Republicans' commitment to Americans.

Number one, Congress needs to create an economy that is strong. According to the congressional budget report, America is \$33.5 trillion in debt, and the Federal Government is deficit spending more than \$1 trillion every year.

Our energy independence has eroded, small businesses are laboring under burdensome regulations and taxes, and rampant inflation is a tax on everyone.

We need to end Washington's spending addiction by balancing the budget, growing the economy, curbing inflation, and decreasing Federal spending.

We need to cut red tape and burdensome regulations for agriculture producers, businessowners, and for all Americans. We also need to preserve the family-owned farms and small businesses throughout our country.

Earlier this year, the house passed The Limit, Save, Grow Act to reduce government spending, reclaim unspent COVID relief money, and promote pro-growth economic policies.

The House and Senate passed my resolution to prohibit the listing of the

lesser prairie-chicken as endangered or threatened.

The House and Senate also passed a joint resolution to prohibit President Biden's Waters of the U.S. rule from having the force of law.

A strong economy is good for everyone: the whole supply chain, businesses, parents, students, everyone. Ensuring a strong economy remains our commitment.

Number two, this Congress needs to create a Nation that is safe. Violent crime is on the rise, drug addiction is spiking, and many parts of our country are in chaos.

Meanwhile, we are still hearing calls from Washington Democrats to defund the police, and the Biden administration is failing to address our open southern border where fentanyl, criminals, and people caught up in human trafficking rings flood into our country.

We need to defend America's national security and food security. We need to support our troops and invest in an efficient, effective military. We need to secure the border, stop illegal immigration, end the fentanyl crisis, and support the police.

□ 1915

We also need to reauthorize strong agricultural trade legislation, negotiate new international trade agreements, support global food security legislation, promote U.S. goods, and stop wars before they start.

This year, the House passed the National Defense Authorization Act and the Department of Defense appropriations act to support our troops.

House Republicans passed the Secure the Border Act to finish construction of the wall at the southern border and the Schools Not Shelters Act to prohibit the use of public schools for housing illegal immigrants.

We passed the HALT Fentanyl Act and a resolution expressing support for local law enforcement officers and condemning efforts to defund and dismantle local law enforcement agencies.

We all want to live in a country where we can lay our heads on a pillow at night knowing we live in the safest, best country in the world.

Number three, Congress needs to create a future that is built on freedom. As I meet with Kansans, I hear concerns about Big Government, sweeping executive orders, and infringements on the basic rights enshrined in our Constitution.

We must preserve America's constitutional freedoms that protect the lives of unborn children and their mothers. We need to educate students in American history and civic engagement. We also need to improve access to rural healthcare, including access to telehealth services.

We must support those who fought to defend our freedoms by improving accountability and transparency at the Department of Veterans Affairs and working to reinvigorate civilian life after military service.

House Republicans passed the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to penalize healthcare practitioners who fail to provide care for an infant that is born alive from an attempted abortion.

I sponsored three pieces of legislation that would modify the Biden administration's rulemaking to prohibit funds for abortions and abortion referrals.

The House passed the Parents Bill of Rights Act to ensure that rights of parents are honored and protected in America's public schools.

I sponsored the States Handling Access to Reciprocity for Employment Act, or SHARE Act, which would improve the current licensing process for healthcare providers and increase the number of licensed providers able to serve communities across State lines.

We passed the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act and the Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act, which would codify the Boots to Business program, a training course administered by the Small Business Administration through which veterans and their families learn the fundamentals of business management.

America is the strongest, most free nation in the world because our Founders declared that our freedoms do not flow from the government or a king but from God, who created us all with inalienable rights.

Number four, Congress needs to create a government that is accountable. Congress has the responsibility to conduct both rigorous oversight of the executive branch and investigation into possible corruption and criminal activity within the Federal Government.

We need to rein in the White House's abuse of power, hold Washington accountable, end the President's war on fossil fuels, and empower domestic producers to restore American energy independence.

The House passed the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, or the REIN IN Act, which would require the President to provide an inflation impact estimate with respect to executive orders.

I also sponsored the More Accountability is Necessary Now Act, or the MANN Act, six pieces of legislation that I do every Congress which would require the President to report to Congress on executive orders.

The House passed the Lower Energy Costs Act, which would increase the production and export of American energy and reduce the regulatory burdens that make it harder to build American infrastructure and grow our economy.

Through the legislation we all support, I have worked to unleash American energy, cut taxes and red tape, secure the border, and investigate the scandal and corruption surrounding President Biden and Hunter Biden.

I will always stand for freedom in the face of government overreach because whether you are a parent, a child, born or unborn, a student, a farmer, or a

small business owner, you don't need the Federal Government trying to control your life.

Serving as the Representative for the Big First District in Kansas continues to be the honor of a lifetime. There is a lot of work left to do, but with prayer and hard work, I really believe that the greatest days in this Nation are yet to come.

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

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who represents the 36th District of Texas. Congressman BABIN serves on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with me. I am grateful for his presence here tonight and for his friendship.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas, for yielding and for this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to imagine an administration that goes out of its way to increase our dependency on an adversarial nation hell-bent on our demise here in the United States of America. That is precisely what is happening—all because the left hates oil and gas and fossil fuels. I represent a district that is the epicenter of energy in east Texas in the greater Houston region.

Communist China wishes nothing more than to see America burn to the ground, and Joe Biden's reckless demand for electric vehicles continues to give Beijing an ever-increasing advantage in seeing this quest through.

Let's look at some of the facts.

Nearly 80 percent of the world's cell manufacturing capacity for EV batteries is controlled by none other than Beijing, the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of the world's lithium-ion battery megafactories are in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of graphite, the single largest mineral component of EV batteries, electric vehicle batteries, is refined in the People's Republic of China.

Yet, if increased reliance on China isn't alarming enough, let's look at how electric vehicles are faring on the home front.

Just a few weeks ago, in my own office, I had a number of car dealers from my great State of Texas visit to share the latest on EV—electric vehicle—sales. Given how much the Biden administration talks about EVs, you would think that they are selling like hotcakes. Big surprise, or maybe not, they are actually selling like \$50,000 paperweights.

I recently saw a great line in *The Wall Street Journal*: "You can sub-

sidize a buyer into the auto showroom, but you can't make him buy."

The truth is that dealers can't get EVs off their lots.

Texans don't want vehicles that they can't rely on. While I am a huge supporter of innovation, fully electric vehicles aren't ready for prime time, and forcing them on the American people will not change that reality.

By unilaterally mandating unrealistic emission standards for vehicles in an effort to shift markets, this administration has dealt serious damage to the entire automotive sector.

Unfortunately, even with this information, the White House would still force Americans to buy electric vehicles.

Out of concerns for our manufacturers, dealers, national security, and, more importantly, American families, it is time for this administration to return to reality. Fossil fuels are the only reliable energy source that we have. If we stop producing and using them, we will soon be bowing the knee to the demands of Communist China.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very true remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a lot of important discussions this Congress, but there is one important discussion that I truly believe we need to take very seriously. It is section 702 of the reauthorization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

I want to remind us that our main job as Representatives of the people is to protect people's rights to life, liberty, and property. We will never have equal opportunities and will always want to have equal outcomes, but the equality of rights is the job of Congress and the legislature.

We know very well that the constitutional rights of Americans have been violated.

I am going to cite some excerpts from the report that the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board just issued recently. That board was created to oversee due processes, and the issue in line was the reauthorization. It is actually run by Democrats, and the chair is appointed by President Biden.

This is from the report: "The board finds that section 702 poses significant privacy and civil liberties risks, most notably from U.S. person queries and batch queries. Significant privacy and civil liberties risks also include the scope of permissible targeting."

It also talks about new types of procedures that have been recently authorized, in 2022, and we had challenges about collection that some thought Congress would put a stop to. However, it says that the new procedures that we just authorized were used in a widespread fashion. It could be extraordinarily intrusive.

It also says the board finding a risk of overboard government collection of

communications is very real and can cause harm with no individualized judicial review of targeting decisions. We had an almost 300 percent increase in surveillance since 2013, double in the last 5 years.

This search is very concerning since there is no specific review of that.

Also, it says that a lot of things that are collected could be political, religious, and social advocacy. There are significant concerns about this program overall.

The changes that the FBI has done, they say, have not been sufficient to protect privacy and civil liberties. It is also actually confirmed by the internal audit of a recent report—the most recent was in May 2023 when the internal audits of the FBI was talking pretty much about over 90 percent of queries not having any evidence of justification for these queries.

It is like the FBI is very good. They don't record and don't recall, so they want all the liability. It is a serious issue.

We had some discussions, and I think the Judiciary Committee bill is somewhat bad. At least it requires a warrant for queries of a U.S. person. Still, both the bills that the Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee are proposing lack some very serious consideration.

There is no outside review of what data is collected, and this is something the board pretty much recognizes. As an agency, they collect information on Americans, but they cannot assess how much. At the least, there needs to be some sampling by a FISA court when they do certification to start figuring it out because, ultimately, there is a potential that our agencies have access to be able to collect without warrant and surveil many Americans. We don't know how many Americans they are surveilling and what the NSA is doing when they do filtering procedures.

There is no ability for us to even know what is going in the review of that. The board brings these concerns, but also there are concerns with documentation.

I think Congress should have for us—we do it in other areas, and in accounting, we do it, too—where, through evidence and documentation, we can have preventative controls in systems. When queries are run, there is evidence of review and evidence of approval and justification by the FBI as to why they are using this loophole in the law that potentially violates the rights of U.S. citizens and many Americans.

I think the magnitude of this problem is significant, and the magnitude of violations could be very material. I think Congress needs to be much more serious in its consideration before we reauthorize the section.

The other thing the board talks about is national security. It is an important section, but actually, the agency didn't prove that queries that they are doing actually give justification to what they are doing to provide them more expansion on that.

I think we need to put up more guardrails, and I hope we will have more discussions on this issue and this bill if they are going to move forward in the way they are because I want to remind us that if we are not willing to stand up for the rights of Americans here, then I don't know why we are even in Congress.

This Fourth Amendment right is a significant right, and it is a bipartisan issue. I hope we will take a more serious look at how we can improve this FISA reauthorization before it is reauthorized and have better legislation.

□ 1930

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank all the Members for participating tonight.

When government grows, freedom shrinks. As conservatives in Congress, we must not compromise on freedom. Our sworn duty is to uphold the constitutional rights of all Americans, and I encourage all of my colleagues to remember the solemn oath that we all took to do so and support legislation that will aid us in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE), from the First Congressional District and the cohost of this Special Order, for his closing remarks.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Biden is once again circumventing the rule of law and leaving hardworking Americans who never went to college with a \$559 billion bill to cover unpaid student loans.

House Republicans will bring to the floor H.J. Res. 88 expressing our disapproval of President Biden's Saving on a Valuable Education, SAVE, plan which would drastically alter the Income-Driven Repayment program and make America's student loan program even more expensive for taxpayers. Let's be clear: This sets the precedent that Federal education loans do not need to be repaid.

Using American tax dollars to give a blanket subsidy to those who earn disproportionately more money than others is government at its worst. For those who never went to college, for those who are struggling with inflation and don't need more money flooding into a broken system, and for those who already paid off their loans, any effort to wipe the slate clean is completely unfair.

I, along with many other House Republicans, support universities focusing on a strong ROI to keep costs down. We support Federal student loan reforms. We do not support blanket student loan forgiveness for political pandering in an election year.

Even though the system has plenty of room to improve, it is my job to highlight ways the State of Utah is getting it right. Utah has the lowest average student loan debt per borrower in the country and the lowest percentage of graduates leaving campus with student debt. The University of Utah's medical school and nursing program at Weber State University work to hold

down student debt by designing instructional schedules to allow students to work while attending college.

I have had to apologize multiple times to constituents in the First District who built businesses after paying their way through school or other programming and paid their taxes, only to have their hard-earned dollars transferred to folks who have chosen a career and a different approach that required carrying some debt that they planned for.

Now, with the government saying they don't need to plan for it, we are teaching our children the exact wrong thing that made our country so great. I am deeply frustrated that I am going to have to continue to apologize.

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

#### CONCERN FOR OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, concerned about our country, and I am concerned about our willingness as Members of Congress to meet the moment, to stand in the gap, to validate the hope placed in us as the Republican majority, to stand in the gap and to meet the moment to deal with the great crisis, the threats facing our country.

I will begin by mentioning our national debt. The days of spending without consequence are over. We have 40-year-high inflation as a result of unprecedented, excessive, reckless spending. We are on track this year for a \$2.5 trillion deficit. We are running a monthly deficit of about \$200 billion a month.

We are suffering the consequences with 40-year high inflation and grocery prices where Thanksgiving dinner costs 40 percent more than it did when this President was sworn in 3 years ago. Gas prices are up, utility prices are up, housing prices are up, rent prices are up, and then you have got interest rates.

The American people are suffering further under 20-year high interest rates, interest rates that have been increased by the Fed in a futile attempt to try to combat inflation. Historically, you raise interest rates because you have a hot economy and you are trying to ward off inflation. In this case, the inflation has been caused by the unprecedented levels of spending, and then we have further exacerbated

this, this administration, this Federal Reserve under this President, with interest rates that have put home prices out of reach for most Americans.

Now, we have got our credit being downgraded. Two credit rating agencies have downgraded our debt, which will further cause interest rates to go up and payments on our national debt to increase even more.

The snowball effect of \$34 trillion in debt, record interest rates, a \$200 billion monthly deficit, is taking its toll. With each passing day that we fail to deal with the greatest fiscal crisis in the history of the country, we deepen the pain and the suffering that is put upon the American people not only just today but in the future.

Meanwhile, how do we see Congress responding? Do we see a commitment here in this House to cut our spending, to deal with our discretionary spending, as we call it? Every dollar we spend in this House and in the Chamber next door, every dollar we spend for discretionary spending, everything that we vote on in spending, is borrowed. The total this year of discretionary spending is somewhere around \$1.7 trillion. Again, with a \$200 billion monthly deficit and \$2.5 trillion worth of deficit for the 12-month period, all of the discretionary spending is essentially borrowed.

Are we going to meet the moment? Are we going to rise to the occasion as a Republican majority?

If not now, when?

When will we take this seriously? When will we be willing to do what the American people elected us to do?

If not now, when? If not us, who?

I am pleased to have with me my good friend, the courageous fiscal warrior from Arizona, Mr. ANDY BIGGS, and I would like to hear his thoughts on this national debt subject.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOOD for engaging me in this colloquy.

I want to talk briefly about this number that has been put out there. He is asking the question: Will we rise to the occasion?

I am going to give the bad news first. This is like in "The Matrix," the first version, where they give you the red pill or the blue pill. The red pill is reality. The blue pill is you can continue on in your slumber.

I am going to propose a different pill, and it is a black pill. The black pill, I would suggest to you, means that reality is the awful truth. The awful truth here is we know that we are not going to rise to the moment.

Why do we know that? Because in the context of everything you just gave us, I want to talk about that supplemental that has been proposed by the Senate.

We have already passed out of this body a \$14.5 billion supplemental package for Israel. We found a way to pay for it. It goes to the Senate. They don't bother to take it up. They don't want

that. In fact, one of the Republican appropriators over there said: We don't do that; we don't pay for supplementals.

Wow. You know what? That individual was correct. It had never been done before. We did it, but they don't want to do that.

Instead, they want to leverage a controversial spend of \$61 billion for Ukraine funding by leveraging what Israel needs, our good friend in the Levant. That is what they want to leverage.

You know what they throw in there, as well? They throw in some money for Taiwan; they throw in some money for the border. I won't get into the border until you yield more time, but I will tell you this: That money they are talking about for the border is not to stop the 10,000 to 12,000 people per day coming into the country; it is to facilitate their entry and dispersion throughout the country.

If you think we are going to rise to the moment when we are dealing with a group of people across the way, the leadership over there, that have proposed that—and I am seeing, sadly, a momentum for that to happen right here on the floor of this Chamber—then I would tell you the black pill has been swallowed, and there is trouble and tough sledding ahead for the United States of America because the people who have been elected to fight that are acquiescing.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate his bringing up the supplemental, because I want to give Speaker Johnson credit for what he did with that House supplemental.

The supplemental, the \$106 billion package that was proposed by the President and the Senate majority leader of the Democrat-controlled Senate, represents everything that is wrong with Washington.

To the point, we are running a \$200 billion deficit, and yet we have a supplemental, which again, as he said, means we don't pay for it. We add it on; we tack it on; we borrow more; let's borrow \$106 billion. Virtually everyone in Congress, I think—certainly all Republicans and most Democrats—want to support one of our true allies on the global stage—one of our, I would submit, two or three allies at a minimum—Israel, through the brutal terrorist attack by Hamas. We want to come to the aid of our friend and our genuine ally Israel and give them the help that they need, but Israel doesn't have \$34 trillion in national debt. Israel is not running a \$200 billion deficit. Israel is fiscally solvent. We are not. Even for something so worthy as this cause, we have a responsibility to pay for it, if we can, and we can.

Therefore, Speaker Johnson met the moment and said let's pay for it by taking some of the \$80 billion that was allocated for the 87,000 IRS hirings in the inflation increase act last summer, let's cut \$14 billion from there to pay for the \$14 billion for Israel, and it

passed on a bipartisan basis in this Chamber. Twelve Democrats voted for it.

Honestly, I thought, you know what? We are plowing new ground in the House. We are separating the Israel aid. We are not doing again that which is represented by what we typically do here in Washington, which is all that is wrong with Washington. We say, we are going to hijack or hold hostage our desire to support Israel. We can't give them that \$14 billion unless you also give them the \$92 billion that has nothing to do with Israel: \$60 billion for Ukraine, as was said, humanitarian support for Hamas, and more money for Mayorkas to process illegals in the country more quickly and more deceptively, another ill-defined, disastrous humanitarian system. We are going to hold hostage \$14 billion for Israel with the \$92 billion we have got to choke down.

I thought when Speaker Johnson and this Republican majority rose to the occasion with the support of 12 Democrats, who courageously crossed the aisle and did the right thing, that the Senate would have to take it up, that they wouldn't hold up support for Israel on a bipartisan bill just because it was paid for and just because it was going to cut by \$14 billion the \$80 billion IRS expansion and just because it didn't include the \$92 billion that didn't have anything to do with Israel.

I know my colleague joined me in calling upon the Speaker and calling upon our Republican majority to stand with our Speaker. He needs to know we have his back and we stand with him. We have passed Israel support out of this House. We are requiring it to be paid for because that is the responsible thing for our kids and our grandkids and for the American people. We are not going to take up any other supplemental that has support for Israel, and every supplemental must be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) to hear some additional thoughts.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, when the gentleman starts talking about that, he raises a point that I have been arguing vociferously about for some time, and that is Republicans manage to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory over and over again. We negotiate against ourselves. That is what is happening on the supplemental. That is what is happening on the NDAA.

We passed out of the Judiciary Committee today a bill, hugely bipartisan, 35 people voted for it, 2 against it, including massive reforms, reforms that groups across the spectrum, from right to left, Republican and Democrat, have said these are the reforms we need to see.

□ 1945

The leverage goes away when you give an extension into April for FISA in its current form, which is what the Speaker is acquiescing to after telling us he wasn't going to go there. That is

negotiating against yourself. Why is that? What happens?

The leverage against the Senate on FISA then goes away. I was not surprised to know that Chairman TURNER said he will let the Judiciary bill come to the floor. Why wouldn't he?

Because he knows that the leverage is now gone and the Senate has no incentive to take up a meaningful reform bill. That is the problem. It goes back to the border.

The border is the same way. There were 12,000 people that came across yesterday. That was an all-time single-day record. There were 12,000 people encountered. That does not include the 10,000 people that got away.

You are looking at 300,000 plus for the month of December that we can project already. That will be a record. We say, oh, let's do H.R. 2. We did H.R. 2. That was a good, solid border security package.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That you were responsible in helping to craft that bill—you and our friend CHIP ROY.

Mr. BIGGS. We got it through. It went through and is languishing in the Senate. We say things like: I will tell you what, let's put the H.R. 2 bill on the supplemental. We are not going to do anything with regard to the supplemental unless you actually give us border security. It isn't policy anymore because the policy doesn't work unless you have a lawful, rule of law type of government. We don't. We flat out don't.

This administration is lawless. They are not going to follow the law. They are not following the law now. They are not following the law on FISA, which is why we have to reform FISA. They are not following the law on the border policies and the border laws. This is why we have got to say we are going to stop funding a government that is lawless and surveils American citizens and allows us to be overrun.

Did you know that in Portland, Oregon, they had more than 300 fentanyl overdose deaths in the first 3 months of this fiscal year? They are on track for over 1,200.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Just in Portland?

Mr. BIGGS. Just in Portland. I am telling you that this is a regime that is okay with dismantling our country. It is time that we stand up and say no more. No more.

I am happy to talk about any other topic that you want.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I want to go back to what you were talking about in the supplemental, actually on the spending, as well as on the FISA reforms.

This is a town of power and persuasion of leverage. I'm not sure we effectively know how to use leverage when we have it. We are a town that does things—a body that only does things when we have to, when there is a deadline and when there is the pressure.

You talked about relieving the pressure on the FISA reforms because of



the approaching deadline, the expiration of the current authorization. Why would we be so fearful of that expiration to the extent that we are unwilling to force upon the Senate the reforms that we are trying to pass out of the Judiciary Committee? The Judiciary Committee voted 35-2 on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis that would pass this body if we put it on the floor today.

The Senate apparently isn't so worried about the expiration that we think they will take up our bill and pass it. There we would relieve the pressure to reform FISA so it doesn't expire.

You can apply that to the debt situation. We did another continuing resolution where we extended the Biden, Pelosi, and Schumer policies and spending levels into mid-January and early February with the promise that we work on passing our remaining five bills.

I am sorry to say and disappointed to acknowledge, we have not had any demonstrated effort to bring those remaining five bills to the floor. We don't have the commitment to the top line total programmatic spending levels. Our commitment to cut spending, no matter how modest, to cut spending from a year ago. This is something Congress hasn't done—you know your history better than I do—in how many years, where they cut the spending year over year.

We relieve the pressure. And then instead of trying to work during the time that we have to pass these spending bills, we are not doing it as we approach January 19. I expect this body is going to go home next week and not report for nearly a month to work on the spending bills that, in theory, we are supposed to pass before January 19's expiration, this continuing resolution.

Where is our unified commitment?

We talk a lot about unity here. Unity requires a unified mission, a unified purpose, and a unified vision to accomplish what?

We could point to so many existential crises created by our friends on the other side, the Democratic majority when they had control, the Senate majority, and the White House. I think you might agree, the two most pressing are the two we mentioned tonight: the border and the spending.

What, in the words of one of my favorite movies, "The Untouchables," Sean Connery saying, "What are you prepared to do?"

What are we prepared to do to force a lawless administration to secure the border?

What are we prepared to do to deal with the unprecedented level of spending that is literally crushing us, creating the greatest fiscal crisis the country has every faced?

What are we prepared to do as a Republican majority to come together in a unified manner?

Why would we continue to fund our fiscal demise?

Why would we continue to fund an open border?

You know the border issue better than anybody. Some 8 million plus were helped across this border by this administration and this President's policies. Helped across.

There would be irreparable harm done if we secured the border today. There are some 2 million known got-aways. These are the ones who don't want all the free stuff and don't surrender to Border Patrol under the policies of this administration for free travel, free housing, free social services, free education, free—just about everything—benefits that the American people don't get as citizens.

These are the ones who don't surrender for that because they have criminal backgrounds and terrorist ties. We find 100 a year, the dumb terrorists who Border Patrol apprehends. There are 100 a year with terrorist ties. How many are among the 2 million?

If we sealed the border today, only time will tell on what scale the American people will suffer catastrophic harm because of this President's policies—far beyond what we have seen across the ocean with our friends in Israel. What are we prepared to do?

Mr. BIGGS. What I would tell you is that when you have—let's take Lukeville, Arizona, a small port of entry. There are people going from Phoenix and Tucson down to the Sea of Cortez and they are going to go down to Rocky Point, which is a lovely seaside village. It is a small town, and people love to go down there. It is closed now. Do you know why it is closed?

Because so many people, groups of 1,000 illegal aliens, are coming to that port of entry. There is no way to process them. There is no way to get them to Ajo or the Three Points Station or the Casa Grande station because that takes hours. They closed that down.

You can now see sitting there 1,000 individuals. If you look closely, you won't find a single woman or a child in that 1,000. They are all men ages 18 to 35 from multitudes of nations.

You say: What are we willing to do?

I am going to offer a humble suggestion.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I thought you might.

Mr. BIGGS. It is my suggestion and it is this: This administration is lawless and has no desire to enforce the laws already in place. What I would say is, how do you incentivize them?

Do you incentivize them by allowing them to keep the FRA spending?

Do you incentivize them when you say, okay, I will tell you what, we are going to keep your Green New Deal subsidies that you said would not cost more than \$350 billion, which will now cost more than \$2 trillion?

Will you do anything if we don't stop funding the things you desire?

The answer is no.

What I would say is, we know that Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and veterans' benefits will continue on. Why not then identify that we are

going to pay for ICE, CBP, the air traffic controllers, TSA, the military men and women, and then say that is it, Mr. Biden. That is all we are going to continue funding. That is the basic minimum to make sure that Americans are safe.

We refuse to do more spending. By the way, we are having to borrow significant portions of that. We refuse to keep borrowing money and go in debt so future generations will go bankrupt themselves until you secure the border with demonstrable and measurable metrics.

I will give you one example. Yuma, Arizona. Yuma has one hospital and there are about 80,000 people in Yuma. The emergency room on most days is completely filled with illegal aliens. The local people, people who are going to have babies. If there is a woman ready to deliver, do you know where she is going?

She is driving 3 hours up to Phoenix or 3½ hours over to San Diego. The people with heart conditions that need procedures on an emergency basis, same thing, they are getting Air Evac'd up to Phoenix or San Diego.

Here is the deal. Under the last full year of Donald Trump as the President, do you know what they had?

They had a total of 8,600 encounters. That is for a year. Do you know what they are doing in a week now?

About 8,000 a week. That is under this administration.

Do you think it is not a crisis?

Go down there and talk to the planters who have had to literally plow under fields because these people come across, they go walking through the fields. These are sensitive fields. Why is that important?

Because more than 90 percent of all green vegetables provided to this country during the winter months come out of Yuma, Arizona. It is a hazard to our food supply.

This administration doesn't care if it is a hazard to food supply. They don't care if you have got 1,200 people going to die of fentanyl overdose in Portland, Oregon. They just don't care. They are not going to actually follow the law, so we have got to incentivize them.

If we do not have the courage to incentivize them, then why the hell did we come to Congress?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. You cannot overstate the harm being done and the damage to our country by this border invasion. It is a border invasion. As we have had hearings on this issue in the Budget Committee or in the Education and the Workforce Committee, my friends across the aisle don't like that I call it a border invasion.

Mind you, they don't care about the border invasion. They just don't like me to call it a border invasion. This is on purpose. This is intentional. Every resource and every effort directed to the border over these past 3 years from this administration has been with the intent to get as many illegals, as quickly as possible and as successfully as possible, into the country.

To your point, why would we continue to fund and give billions of dollars a month—hundreds of billions of dollars a month—to a lawless administration that is perpetrating this kind of harm on the country?

I would submit that never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the United States than what is happening with this border.

□ 2000

I will say it again. Never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the United States than what this President has done with the border. Give me an example of something that comes close.

The American people are counting on us. They gave us the majority a year ago because we ran on fiscal responsibility. We have not met that responsibility. We ran on securing the border, yet we continue to maintain the spending levels and policies with continuing resolutions and extensions that don't deliver for the American people.

They are trusting us, and they are putting their faith in us to stand in the gap to be that one barrier to the policies under which they are suffering and that are destroying the America that we know and love.

I am proud to serve with the gentleman from Arizona and many of my colleagues here in Congress who are ready to do what needs to be done, to make the tough choices, to cast the tough votes, and to honor the trust and faith that the American people placed in us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to serve with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Let me say two things. I am more than willing to be here over the next 5 weeks if it means that we can work to get these things addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you one more reason why you should not be giving up on FISA and why you should not be extending it. It is because the authorities and warrants issued before April 10 will continue on into 2025. We will have lost, perhaps even forever, our ability to reform a program that has been weaponized against the United States of America and our beloved fellow citizens.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### ISSUES IGNORED BY THE MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to talk about some issues

that our press corps has not adequately covered. All of these issues will be brought to the fore sometime in the next 3 months, and well-informed citizens should have an opinion on them. That means that, to a degree, the press corps has to do a good job of educating the citizenry on these issues.

The first issue I am going to talk about one more time is immigration. There is some time in the next 8 weeks in which an agreement is going to have to be reached regarding the huge problems we have on the southern border. These problems have been largely ignored under the Biden administration, and it is time that something be done.

I want to recount right now that, in the most recent months, we are having about 240,000 people cross the southern border. Every month, we hit new records for that month. In October, we again exceeded where we were 12 months ago and 24 months ago.

In addition to the fact that we have about 240,000 people crossing the southern border, we have a situation in which about 9,000 unaccompanied minors, people under the age of 18, are coming here without either parent.

We also have a situation where of the about 240,000 people who are crossing the border, about 60,000 are what they call got-aways. In other words, they have had no contact at all with the officialdom of the United States Government. Of course, these people are particularly dangerous because they haven't even gone through the perfunctory check that other people go through when they show up at the southern border.

It should also be pointed out that the United States is not being pikers at all when it comes to allowing other people into this country. The American citizenry should know that, in the most recent year available, over 1 million people were sworn in as new citizens to the United States. This is the third highest on record at a time when we are following a year that was over 900,000. We are kind of in unprecedented territory for a 2-year period.

When I was a child in the 1960s, by comparison, about 100,000 people a year were sworn in in the United States. We worked that way up in the 1980s to be about 200,000.

So, when we say 1 million people a year are being sworn in as citizens of the United States, we are really changing things in this country. As a result, nobody can say or should be able to say that we are not doing our fair share in welcoming more people into the United States.

It should also be pointed out that the number of people who are being deported from this country is now a fraction of what it was a few years ago. In fiscal year 2019, about 270,000 people were deported. In the most recent year available, that number has fallen to 72,000.

On one level, we are multiplying the number of people coming across the border by a factor of 10, and then once

people come here and break the law or whatever, we are now kicking out or deporting about one-quarter of the number that we were 4 years ago.

The Biden administration has not cared about this at all. However, there are going to be multiple discussions with the Biden administration not only with regard to appropriations bills that are coming up but supplemental bills that are coming up.

This is the biggest crisis facing America today. We are permanently changing the United States by allowing this many people to come across the border.

I want to point out to the American public that John Adams said that our Constitution was fit for a moral and religious people and totally unfit for anybody else.

Insofar as we are allowing people in our country who do not have a love of freedom and who want to turn their lives over to the government, we are going to ruin our country. It will no longer be the wonderful country that we grew up in. When we invite this many inappropriately vetted people, that is a definite concern.

There is also a concern for the American Government. We are right now in a position where we are borrowing 22 percent of our budget. A significant number of people crossing the southern border are going to have to be taken care of by the Federal Government. They won't be able to find jobs. Not only will they not be able to find jobs, but they are coming here without complete families. Their children are going to be educated. President Biden promised during the 2020 election that he would provide free healthcare to people coming here illegally. We are doing that. That is also very expensive at a time when we don't have money for more.

As a result, I think it is a situation that has to be cleaned up and finished before we pass any more of what we call supplemental bills in this Chamber.

In particular, people are asking for tens of billions of dollars in aid to Ukraine. I think everybody would like to see them get that money, but at a time when we are having to flood money in to take care of people crossing the southern border, I don't think we have that money until that problem is cleaned up.

I hope the American citizen is paying attention to this.

Again, to summarize, 10 times as many people are crossing the border as there were 4 years ago. The number of people being kicked out, usually for breaking the law, being deported, is about one-quarter of what it was 4 years ago. The number of people who are being sworn in legally—when people say, oh, we ought to let some people here—there are over 1 million right now. We are near historical highs on that level.

I hope the American press corps reports these numbers. They should certainly be in the paper. It should certainly be in the paper when eventually we get new information on the number of people who have come into this country in November.

Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is look on television to see it is getting worse and worse. That is an issue that not much attention is being paid to.

The next thing I want to talk to the American public about is what we call appropriations bills. Here in Congress, if things are done right, we do not pass one budget at the end of the year. We pass 12 separate bills as we divide the government into 12 separate agencies.

There are disagreements between the House and the Senate regarding each one of those bills. However, one of the things that touches all of these bills is the degree to which the Federal Government is going to get involved with diversity regarding what we could call affirmative action—or an obsession with judging people by their race or judging people by their gender. This is a debate that is going to be had between the Republican-led House and the Democratic Senate right down the line.

We have had a situation where we have been identifying people by race since Lyndon Johnson really kicked this into gear in 1965. At that time, companies that had at least 50 employees and did over \$100,000 of business with regard to the Federal Government had to submit information annually to the government.

As a practical matter, it meant that businesses were advised to pay attention to race when they hired somebody, when they promoted somebody, and when they let somebody go.

It also meant that the Federal Government was paying attention to race and gender when government contracts were let, and we have a bureaucracy that is advising American big businesses that are doing it in-house.

Right now, President Biden's goal is to greatly increase these roles of bureaucrats when hiring decisions are made in Federal agencies so that when we do government contracting and government grant writing, we are paying increasing attention to where people come from or where their ancestors came from.

In another area, the Biden administration is currently trying to set up a new ethnic group to get preferences or special consideration, and that is the group called Middle Eastern and North-African people.

It is a little bit unusual, but the American citizenry should be aware of this. They should be aware that the government is currently in the process of adding this group to the number of people who are going to get preferences. Before they do that, there should be an open debate of whether this is necessary or not.

It is kind of interesting in that I read some information on this topic. His-

torically, I think the reason for this type of thing was the feeling that people had been taken advantage of or were not given a fair shake in the past. Right now, people who are considered Middle Eastern and North African actually make considerably more than the native-born American. American median household income across the board is slightly under \$100,000 a year. Middle Eastern and North Africans are making about \$115,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, even if you buy into the idea that the American Government should be looking at people not on the basis of who they are today but on where their ancestors came from, we are really not in a position where we can say that these people have been put upon or not been treated very well.

When I go home and talk about these issues, I find that almost no people that I know are aware that we are about to add Middle Eastern and North Africans to the affirmative action mix, which means, of course, the American press corps is not doing its job. It is kind of a fundamental change in a given group if they apply for a government job, if they apply for a government grant, or if they are getting a government contract. If there are going to be preferences, then it is something that should be openly discussed on editorial pages, on talk radio, and what have you.

I think the American press corps has largely hidden this fundamental change in the way we do things, and it is time we have an open debate with regard to this.

It is a little bit interesting because other groups that are supposedly subject to discrimination or supposedly are different also do better than the average American. Right now, the wealthiest subgroup of Americans are Indian Americans. Also very wealthy are people from the Philippines, people from China, and people from Cuba. All of these people, in the mythology of the left, are people who are apparently being discriminated against, but actually, they are doing better than the average American right now.

I wonder why we would set up a bureaucracy to keep track of what these people are doing or making sure they somehow get preferences.

A debate is going to be had throughout putting together these appropriations bills, and in each one of the bills, that debate will, to a degree, focus on whether President Biden gets his new committees or commissions in every government agency doing all that he can to highlight differences between people and judge people by where their ancestors came from.

□ 2015

Before I move on from this topic, I should point out that these people self-identify. Insofar as you hear that diversity is important to have a well-running company or a well-running government agency, in order to buy into that, the government, in deter-

mining whether or not you are a member of a preferred group, allows you to be a member of that group if you are maybe only a quarter or a half of that ancestry, which seems a little bit unusual.

You can be, for example, a quarter Mexican and have yourself classified as a person bringing a diverse view to the world, even though you perhaps have never set foot in Mexico and grew up in an average American suburb and even if people didn't know that you had a different background.

I think in a desire to cause more importance for this occupation of these diversity bureaucrats, and in an effort to drive up the number of people who supposedly need help from the government, we allow people to self-identify. People who are one-half or one-quarter members of a group get preferences of that group.

We allow the fiction to come into play that even though you have never stepped foot in the country of your ancestors—somebody comes here from the Philippines, and their grandchildren never step foot in the Philippines. They know very little about the country, but for diversity's sake, we are supposed to make sure we have a given number of people who apparently have the Filipino-American viewpoint of the world.

I think that is something that ought to be discussed, as well, before we continue down this path and give the Biden administration any more victories in these appropriations bills by hiring new bureaucrats to enforce the new laws.

These bureaucrats, people with majors in diversity, are not all hired by the government. They have become increasingly common in large industry. I think they are afraid of lawsuits or whatnot, so big businesses hire these people and decisions as to who is going to be hired are increasingly made in big business to meet the targets that these diversity specialists give people.

Of course, it can result, first of all, in hard feelings as people are judged not by their skills but, to a certain extent, by their ancestry.

I have talked before about what happens in other countries where we have affirmative action. Hard feelings develop over time. Sometimes they result in civil wars, as they did in Sri Lanka.

In any event, I think the efforts that the Biden administration is making to bring in new groups and to increase the apparent number of people who are advising our government agencies as to who to hire, before this goes up, it ought to be subject to an open debate.

It is not being debated. I think it is not being debated because the mainstream media has not explained to the American public the huge role that these groups play or these occupations play in personnel decisions, both in private businesses and in the government.

The other thing that I want to bring up is kind of a leftover from President Biden and his last State of the Union Address.

President Biden has talked about his respect for members of the trans community, and he has done what he can to highlight them in a positive light.

I want to bring to the public's attention a book I have read, "When Harry Became Sally," in which a discussion is made as to how we should handle people who come out as transgendered, particularly when they are young.

I think it is of interest when our society is deciding how to deal with these people in school, to deal with them medically, what the compassionate thing to do is. I think one thing that is not brought up enough when we talk about the transgender situation is that, left to their own devices, over about 90 percent of the young people who identify as transgender work their way out of it.

I don't think it has been adequately reported in the news media that other countries that went through this transgender situation just like America—I am talking about Great Britain, Sweden, Norway—have all backed away from embracing transgenderism in young people, which can include not just puberty blockers but things up to and including physical surgeries, having body parts removed even while people are minors. I think even a lot of people who have this done when they are adults regret it.

Nevertheless, the mainstream media and our President have largely encouraged people down this path and say they are fighting for them, giving people, I think, still more attention.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider that over 90 percent of the people who begin down this path break their way out of it, you would have to say that positive attention is going to slow down the decision of so many young people to stop going down the transgender path.

I don't think this has adequately been talked about in the media. President Biden and his Department of Education are doing what they can to try to force acceptance of this lifestyle on school districts. By forcing it on people, they have to realize they are going to create a situation in which more young people wind up doing medical things, some of which are irrevocable, cannot be undone.

I hope that President Biden will change his mind on this. I wish he would stop highlighting this community in a positive light because when you do that, I believe, you are causing people who are going to change their minds to not change their minds. One has to look at the long-term effect these people are having, particularly when you consider that over 90 percent of the people will not continue down that path unless perhaps they are encouraged to do so by people like the President of the United States.

In any event, those are three issues that I think we read about in the paper. I think only one side of all these three issues is too often presented, but I leave you, Mr. Speaker, with statistics on the number of people crossing

the border and whether we can continue down this path. I also leave you with a little bit of information as to the increasing role these race specialists play in society and a little more information regarding the efforts by the President and his administration to, I would argue, encourage people to go down the transgender path.

Mr. Speaker, these are my comments for the week, things that I hope the press corps picks up on a little bit to educate the public.

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

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2154

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah) at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2670, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2670) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 6, 2023, published in Book II.)

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 2023, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2485. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Agreements Concerning Procedures for the Implementation of the United States Economic Assistance Provided in the 2023 Amended Compact Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Is-

lands, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1921(f); Public Law 108-188, Sec. 101(f); (117 Stat. 2725) (H. Doc. No. 118-87); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EC-2486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Agreements Concerning Procedures for the Implementation of the United States Economic Assistance Provided in the 2023 Amended Compact Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1921(f); Public Law 108-188, Sec. 101(f); (117 Stat. 2725) (H. Doc. No. 118-88); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### 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. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Siletz Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering rights of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama: Committee on Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2670. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-301). Ordered to be printed.

#### 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. ISSA (for himself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 6610. A bill to provide for the modernization of the passport issuance process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 6611. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to make certain reforms to the authorities under such Act, to reauthorize title VII of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. BABIN (for himself, Mr. HERN, Mr. ROY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. OGLES):

H.R. 6612. A bill to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens

of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JAMES, Mr. CORREA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 6613. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish Regional School Safety Development Centers to provide consultation for schools to develop or improve a school safety plan based on evidence-based best practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 6614. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 relating to licensing transparency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALTZ, and Mrs. HOUCHIN):

H.R. 6615. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Unlawful Discrimination in Higher Education within the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOWMAN (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FROST, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6616. A bill to establish collective bargaining rights for college athletes, and for other purposes, establish collective bargaining rights for college athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 6617. A bill to require a report on payments provided to the Taliban and congressional review of agreements signed with the Taliban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 6618. A bill to require the transfer of regulatory control of certain munitions exports from the Department of Commerce to the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. McCLAIN, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. OGLES, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. FRY):

H.R. 6619. A bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from bringing a civil action against a State under section 9 or 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899, for certain border security measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. CRANE:

H.R. 6620. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being provided to institutions of higher

education with endowment funds equaling or exceeding \$5,000,000,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas):

H.R. 6621. A bill to provide technical assistance for geographically underserved and distressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a carbon border adjustment based on carbon intensity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 6623. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CARL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 6624. A bill to amend the Justice for United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Act to provide rules for payments to Havlish Settling Judgment Creditors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRY (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 6625. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report about the effects on national security of the surveillance conducted by the People's Republic of China via the high-altitude surveillance balloon shot down in the airspace of the United States in February 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6626. A bill to take certain actions with respect to Saudi Arabia in response to the shootings that occurred at Naval Air Station Pensacola in Florida on December 6, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Armed Services, 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. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 6627. A bill to reinstate pilots fired or forced to resign because of a COVID-19 vaccine mandate; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. CISCOMANI, and Ms. VAN DUYN):

H.R. 6628. A bill to provide direct hire authority to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subse-

quently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ):

H.R. 6629. A bill to reauthorize the YouthBuild program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 6630. A bill to prohibit individuals and entities from owning more than 75 single-family residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. KILMER (for himself, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMERE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MANNING):

H.R. 6631. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical adult education and literacy objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 6632. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make timely decisions on applications of retail food stores to accept benefits from recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance through on-line transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. LUNA (for herself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MILLS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 6633. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9355 113th Street in Seminole, Florida, as the "Army SSG Ryan Christian Knauss Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. MCGARVEY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CASAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELUZZO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 6634. A bill to increase the capacity of the Department of Labor and labor enforcement agencies of States to address labor violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 6635. A bill to prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services from treating pregnancy as an illness for purposes of approving abortion drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BOEBERT):

H.R. 6636. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are notified, before giving informed consent to receive an abortion, of the medical risks associated with the abortion procedure and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. SELF, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 6637. A bill to prohibit regulations implementing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act from applying to abortion or the coverage of abortion or abortion-related services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. MOYLAN:

H.R. 6638. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, adjust the number of cadets to be nominated to the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Airforce Academy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 6639. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to update the Federal poverty line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 6640. A bill to secure the rights and dignity of marriage for Disabled Adult Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. MOYLAN, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon):

H.R. 6641. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to establish a working waterfronts Task Force and working waterfronts grant and loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 6642. A bill to require the disclosure of foreign support provided to a recipient after the award of a research and development award, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Intel-

ligence (Permanent Select), 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. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 6643. A bill to guarantee the right to vote for all citizens regardless of conviction of a criminal offense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 6644. A bill to amend title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide for the timely payment of black lung benefits pending liability determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. ROY (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 6645. A bill to terminate membership by the United States in the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 6646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the order in which the business credits are taken into account by corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6647. A bill to strengthen the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6648. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to ensure consideration of affordable housing in the reconnecting communities pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6649. A bill to facilitate non-motorized border crossings across the Gordie Howe International Bridge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for investment in Community Development Financial Institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. TIFFANY (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 6651. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 603 West 3rd Street in Necedah, Wisconsin, as the "Sergeant Kenneth E. Murphy Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NICKEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 6652. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQI-owned businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H. Res. 913. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H. Res. 915. A resolution urging the Government of Ukraine to review and modify its decision to suspend adoption by foreign nationals with a view to resuming such adoptions, particularly in cases where the mutual concerns of the Governments of Ukraine and of the United States can be substantially addressed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H. Res. 916. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 625) to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on Rules.

## 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. ISSA:

H.R. 6610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The legislation modernizes the system by which the State Department processes passport applications.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 6611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 provides, in part, that "Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to make certain reforms to

the authorities under such Act, to reauthorize title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 6612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18; Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To clarify who is eligible for birthright citizenship.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 6613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Grants to create school safety resource centers.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:

H.R. 6614.

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:

To improve transparency with regards to export controls.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 6615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

College admissions

By Mr. BOWMAN:

H.R. 6616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

College athletes' right to organize

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 6617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require a report on payments provided to the Taliban and congressional review of agreements signed with the Taliban.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 6618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressman Joaquin Castro

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for

The single subject of this legislation is:

Resolution reaffirming the United States commitment to respecting the sovereignty of Mexico and condemning calls for military action in Mexico without Mexico's consent and congressional authorization.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 6619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prevent the Department of Justice from utilizing the Rivers and Harbors Act to sue

any state that implements border security measures.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 6620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper)

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 6621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commerce

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 6622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Defending American industries and workers.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 6623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill provides for the creation of venture exchanges.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 6624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

US Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism (VSST) Fund

By Mr. FRY:

H.R. 6625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Surveillance

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

the Saudi Arabia December 6, 2019, Anti-Terror and Accountability Act is a single subject bill that would impose the single-subject rule on federal legislation.

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 6627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reinstate pilots fired or forced to resign because of a COVID-19 vaccine mandate.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 6628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Hiring at BOP

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 6629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase the authorization of the YouthBuild program, and to improve program services and flexibility.

By Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina:

H.R. 6630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Taxes

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is: workforce development.

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 6632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const., Art. 1, Sec. 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Nutrition

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 6633.

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:

Post office renaming for Army SSG Ryan Christian Knauss

By Mr. MCGARVEY:

H.R. 6634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 6635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 6636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.R. 6637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 6638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article one of the United States Constitution Congress has the power to enact this legislation.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase the number of applicants from Guam to military service academies

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 6639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Poverty

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 6640.

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:  
Married Disabled Adult Child eligibility for services

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 6641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:  
Working Waterfronts

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 6642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:  
The bill requires the disclosure of any foreign support from a country of concern or an entity of concern provided to a recipient or covered individual after receiving a federal research and development award.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 6643.

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 ends felony disenfranchisement to ensure citizens have the right to vote.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 6644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:  
To allow miners with black lung to receive benefits from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund while the Department of Labor works to determine the responsible mine operator.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 6645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:  
Defunds the United Nations.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 6646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:  
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the order in which the business credits are taken into account by corporations.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:  
To strengthen the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:  
To amend the Infrastructure and Jobs Act to ensure consideration of affordable housing in the reconnecting communities pilot program.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:  
This bill mandates the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to streamline and expedite non-motorized border crossings, includ-

ing bicycles and pedestrians, on the Gordie Howe International Bridge. It also requires a report from the Comptroller General within two years of the bridge's opening, evaluating the progress and suggesting improvements or incentives for such non-motorized traffic

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 6650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:  
This bill allows investors a business-related tax credit for investment in a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI). The applicable percentage of such credit is 3% for the first 10 years of investment in a CDFI with a 1% increase after the initial credit allowance date and for investments without a fixed term or duration.

By Mr. TIFANY:

H.R. 6651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:  
postal bill

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 6652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:  
Small business loan data collection

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
H.R. 38: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 41: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.  
H.R. 175: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 177: Ms. BROWNLEY.  
H.R. 190: Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 451: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 533: Ms. WEXTON.  
H.R. 537: Mrs. LESKO.  
H.R. 563: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 620: Mr. THANEDAR.  
H.R. 661: Mr. DUNN of Florida and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.  
H.R. 700: Ms. BROWN and Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 727: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 770: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.  
H.R. 807: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. EDWARDS.  
H.R. 895: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 898: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.  
H.R. 902: Mr. DELUZIO.  
H.R. 953: Mrs. TRAHAN.  
H.R. 974: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 984: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 1006: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 1087: Mr. POCAN, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 1088: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 1097: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Ms. TENNEY.  
H.R. 1321: Mr. MOLINARO.  
H.R. 1322: Mr. LAWLER.  
H.R. 1359: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 1407: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. SCHOLTEN.  
H.R. 1437: Mr. KUSTOFF.  
H.R. 1478: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 1483: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 1624: Mr. LANDSMAN.  
H.R. 1634: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.  
H.R. 1680: Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 1770: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 1796: Ms. TOKUDA.  
H.R. 1818: Mr. ALLEN and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 1838: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 2365: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
H.R. 2367: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 2447: Mr. MCGARVEY.  
H.R. 2665: Ms. CROCKETT.  
H.R. 2703: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2722: Mr. NICKEL and Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 2781: Mr. CRANE.  
H.R. 2789: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 2821: Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 2871: Mr. TURNER.  
H.R. 2923: Ms. BROWN and Mr. HORSFORD.  
H.R. 2949: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.  
H.R. 3005: Mr. LANGWORTHY and Mr. LAWLER.  
H.R. 3018: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, and Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 3019: Mr. MOONEY and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 3087: Mr. THANEDAR.  
H.R. 3090: Mr. IVEY.  
H.R. 3137: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 3238: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 3240: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 3312: Ms. PETTERSEN.  
H.R. 3376: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 3381: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. MILLER of Ohio.  
H.R. 3433: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. ADERHOLT.  
H.R. 3470: Mr. TRONE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 3475: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. IVEY, and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 3492: Mr. STEUBE.  
H.R. 3519: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. RAMIREZ.  
H.R. 3541: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 3566: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 3625: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 3654: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 3662: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 3713: Mr. LAWLER.  
H.R. 3749: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 3759: Mr. LAWLER.  
H.R. 3854: Ms. OMAR and Ms. CRAIG.  
H.R. 3933: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 3949: Mr. PFLUGER.  
H.R. 3970: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. MFUME.  
H.R. 3985: Ms. MCCLELLAN.  
H.R. 4138: Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 4175: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. MORELLE.  
H.R. 4184: Ms. BROWN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 4193: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4202: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 4261: Mr. BERGMAN.  
H.R. 4306: Mr. DELUZIO.  
H.R. 4323: Mr. STEUBE.  
H.R. 4335: Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WILD, and Ms. WEXTON.  
H.R. 4422: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.  
H.R. 4519: Ms. PORTER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. LAWLER.  
H.R. 4569: Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 4704: Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 4708: Mr. PHILLIPS.  
H.R. 4713: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4844: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.  
H.R. 4886: Ms. SPANBERGER.  
H.R. 4897: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. LEE of California.  
H.R. 4937: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 4942: Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.  
H.R. 4988: Mr. HARDER of California.  
H.R. 5003: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.



- H.R. 5010: Ms. TOKUDA.  
H.R. 5012: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 5027: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 5030: Ms. SCHRIER and Mr. GALLEGRO.  
H.R. 5035: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.  
H.R. 5041: Mr. CORREA, Ms. LEE of Florida, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MFUME, Ms. GARCÍA of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 5048: Ms. CRAIG.  
H.R. 5077: Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 5131: Mr. PANETTA.  
H.R. 5141: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 5155: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
H.R. 5192: Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 5308: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.  
H.R. 5361: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 5408: Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H.R. 5455: Mr. VEASEY.  
H.R. 5530: Mr. MCGARVEY and Mr. NEHLS.  
H.R. 5547: Mr. HUDSON.  
H.R. 5555: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.  
H.R. 5563: Ms. TOKUDA and Ms. OMAR.  
H.R. 5568: Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. MCGARVEY.  
H.R. 5569: Ms. SHERRILL.  
H.R. 5585: Mr. PFLUGER.  
H.R. 5601: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 5606: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 5608: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
H.R. 5610: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. RUIZ.  
H.R. 5685: Mr. MFUME, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. GALLEGRO.  
H.R. 5686: Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Mr. LIEU.  
H.R. 5757: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 5762: Mrs. STEEL and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 5778: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 5796: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 5799: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 5810: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 5822: Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 5856: Mr. HARDER of California and Ms. SLOTKIN.  
H.R. 5863: Mr. PFLUGER.  
H.R. 5867: Ms. SALAZAR.  
H.R. 5871: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.  
H.R. 5928: Ms. CRAIG.  
H.R. 5955: Mr. CASAR.  
H.R. 5976: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 5988: Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 6031: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 6049: Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
H.R. 6072: Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
H.R. 6101: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 6102: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. FOUSHEE.  
H.R. 6147: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 6154: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 6156: Mr. MCGARVEY.  
H.R. 6159: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 6161: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 6175: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
H.R. 6205: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. SALINAS.  
H.R. 6220: Mr. SMUCKER.  
H.R. 6283: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.  
H.R. 6318: Ms. OMAR.  
H.R. 6319: Mr. EVANS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KEATING.  
H.R. 6349: Mr. ALLRED.  
H.R. 6377: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELUZZIO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PETERSEN, and Ms. CRAIG.  
H.R. 6394: Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 6415: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. MOYLAN.  
H.R. 6443: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 6445: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
H.R. 6465: Mr. BUCSHON.  
H.R. 6470: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PETERS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. BALINT.  
H.R. 6490: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 6492: Ms. PETERSEN.  
H.R. 6516: Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PERRY.  
H.R. 6543: Mrs. LESKO.  
H.R. 6545: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.  
H.R. 6558: Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 6563: Mr. TIFFANY.  
H.R. 6570: Ms. NORTON, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCCLEINTOCK, Mr. ROY, and Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.R. 6573: Mr. FINSTAD and Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
H.R. 6578: Mr. LANGWORTHY.  
H.R. 6585: Mr. MILLER of Ohio and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 6586: Mr. WALTZ and Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 6593: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.  
H.R. 6594: Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 6596: Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 6598: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.  
H.R. 6605: Mr. LAWLER.  
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. ESTES.  
H.J. Res. 13: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.J. Res. 83: Mr. HUDSON.  
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. GOSAR.  
H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. PAPPAS.  
H. Res. 195: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H. Res. 198: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H. Res. 270: Mr. PANETTA.  
H. Res. 427: Mr. VASQUEZ.  
H. Res. 527: Mr. LANDSMAN.  
H. Res. 561: Mrs. HAYES.  
H. Res. 738: Mr. THANEDAR.  
H. Res. 765: Mr. LAWLER.  
H. Res. 806: Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania and Ms. LEE of Florida.  
H. Res. 830: Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.  
H. Res. 872: Mr. AMO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. SWALWELL.  
H. Res. 879: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H. Res. 883: Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
H. Res. 895: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H. Res. 905: Mr. JAMES and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.  
H. Res. 907: Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. DELUZZIO.

### NOTICE

*For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 6, 2023, Published in Book II.*