



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2023

No. 205

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 13, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JERRY L. CARL 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.

FREE SPEECH IS ANTI-SEMITISM CURE, NOT CAUSE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the presidents of MIT, Harvard, and the University of Pennsylvania were invited to denounce open race hatred on their campuses, they wrapped themselves in the mantle of free speech.

People have a right to say what they think as long as it doesn't become

threatening conduct, they said. On this narrow point, they are right, but that does not explain why anti-Semitism is rampant on their campuses.

It is not a tolerance for outrageous speech that is the problem. It is a complete intolerance of patriotic speech.

According to the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, the two most intolerant and oppressive universities in the country are Harvard and UPenn. MIT ranks 136 out of the 254 universities surveyed.

How is it possible that such depraved and discredited philosophies as Marxism, totalitarianism, racism, Islamic fascism, and anti-Semitism now flourish on these college campuses? It is because, for years, the antidote to these social pathologies—the American founding principles of freedom, democracy, tolerance, and justice that have always kept them in check—have been systematically suppressed and removed from campus discussions.

A generation ago, only the lunatic fringe of our society would deny or minimize the Holocaust, cheer the slaughter of innocents in their cribs, or praise the fascist governments that produce such horrors. The spectacle of university presidents maintaining that genocide was a contextual matter would have been absurd. Why? Because people of good will had the freedom to present the other side, and the other side was always compelling.

The only way to separate truth from lies or wisdom from folly or good from evil is to place the two side by side and then trust the common sense and good judgment of the American people to know the difference.

This free exchange of ideas is the beating heart of democracy. It is the sole purpose for which this Capitol Building was constructed.

We have based our entire form of government on the assumption that more than half of the people are right more than half of the time, but it assumes

that people have the full and unfettered freedom to express themselves and to challenge the claims and opinions of each other. In such an exchange, the good, the moral, the wise, and the right will ultimately rise to the top.

There are only two ways to resolve disputes among human beings: reason and force. The American Founders built an empire of reason enshrined in the First Amendment. Freedom of speech, of the press, of religion, and of peaceful assembly are the very tools that Americans have used for two and a half centuries to resolve our differences civilly and chart a path to a better future.

In this brave new Orwellian woke world that we have entered, speech in opposition to leftist views is violence; violence in support of leftist views is speech; racial discrimination is social justice; and force rather than reason is the legitimate way to resolve our differences.

They tell us that shouting down opponents, disrupting civil discussions, rioting in the streets, and threatening or even practicing violence against opponents is freedom of expression. The ultimate expression of this rot is the moral confusion that sees the killing of babies as a legitimate way to resolve grievances.

Polls on campuses tell us that the vast majority of college students fear even expressing views that conflict with leftist orthodoxy.

We are now learning that the Federal Government itself colluded with tech companies to deny the American people crucial facts and analysis over everything from COVID to the Russian collusion hoax to Biden family influence peddling.

Major newspapers that once thrived on vigorous debate have said they won't even print opinions contrary to leftist orthodoxy on climate change.

Free societies do not fear words and thoughts, even those that are hateful,

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.

H6863

ugly, evil, or obscene, because the same freedom that protects these darkest impulses of our nature also protects the right of men and women of good will to confront them, expose them, and reject them.

This is what these university presidents and their many confederates have taken from our campuses, and this is what the left is taking from our society. This is what we must restore if we are to resume the upward path toward peace, prosperity, happiness, and justice that our freedom ensures and that our First Amendment protects.

WE NEED TO END THREAT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the growing threat of the use of a nuclear weapon in armed conflict and the threat of a new nuclear arms race. Such threats should scare every single Member of this House. I know it worries my constituents.

The world has not been in such an unstable nuclear situation since the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Since that time, the risk of nuclear war has not been high, but it has never been zero.

A web of nuclear arms control agreements was created over decades that reduced the number of nuclear warheads and set limits on nuclear testing. Over 50 years of such agreements, the number of nuclear warheads was reduced by 86 percent.

However, Mr. Speaker, after decades of progress in nuclear arms control and disarmament, in a very short period, we have seen much of the architecture of these agreements undermined. While not quite dismantled, they are significantly weakened as both the Russian Federation and the United States have withdrawn from some, and Russia has unilaterally withdrawn from others.

We have seen the nuclear weapons agreement with Iran, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, erode following the U.S. withdrawal by President Donald Trump in 2018. As a result, every day, the Iranian Government increases its capacity to build a nuclear weapon.

Throughout Russia's unprovoked and unlawful invasion of Ukraine, we have frequently heard Russia threaten to use nuclear weapons against Ukraine. In late November, President Putin's mouthpiece, Vladimir Solovyov, who hosts a show on Russian state TV, warned that nuclear war is "unavoidable."

Each of these actions—let alone taken together—exposes the unbearable truth about nuclear weapons: Nuclear weapons do not prevent wars. To the contrary, they are used to threaten, coerce, and facilitate war.

Mr. Speaker, we need an urgent call to action. There is leadership in this

House seeking to renew and reinvigorate the urgent need for nuclear arms control.

Congressmen DON BEYER and JOHN GARAMENDI lead a working group on nuclear weapons and arms control.

Congressman TED LIEU has introduced H.R. 669 to restrict the first use of nuclear weapons and H.R. 2894 that would block a nuclear launch by artificial intelligence.

Along with Congressman BLUMENAUER, I introduced H. Res. 77 that calls on the United States Government to work toward the goals and aspirations of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, the TPNW.

Along with Senator MARKEY, I have also introduced H.R. 3154, the HALT Act, to freeze nuclear weapons production and urgently return to negotiations.

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has introduced H.R. 2775 to direct the U.S. to sign the TPNW and convert the funds that maintain and sustain our nuclear arsenal to address urgent domestic needs.

At the end of November, I was privileged to attend a meeting of parliamentarians at the United Nations to discuss these urgent questions. The meeting was coordinated by a Nobel Peace Prize recipient, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. Each of us was from a nation that has not yet joined the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. We discussed what needs to happen in our countries and our parliaments to accelerate the debate on ending the threat of nuclear weapons.

We were at the U.N. because the 93 nations that have joined the TPNW were meeting to discuss concrete steps to implement the treaty's provision. Such leadership should be recognized and supported, Mr. Speaker, but it is not enough. It is simply not enough.

I wish the United States would be bold. I wish the United States would join the TPNW and abolish nuclear weapons once and for all. At a minimum, we need a path back to dialogue in arms control negotiations.

If we are going to move the major nuclear powers to action, including the United States, we need a massive outpouring of grassroots action in support of ending the threat of nuclear weapons. Without large-scale citizen movements, I fear that the nuclear powers will continue to move in the wrong direction, and we will see the unraveling of all nuclear agreements, a renewed nuclear arms race, and even the actual use of nuclear weapons in current and future conflicts.

We cannot wait to change direction, Mr. Speaker. We live at a time when the world as we know it can be destroyed in one terrible nuclear flash. The time to act is now.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record the "Parliamentarian Statement to the 2MSP."

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATEMENT TO THE 2MSP
(Delivered by Guillaume Defossé,
Parliamentarians for the TPNW)

As a delegation of 23 parliamentarians from 14 countries, we are honoured to address this second Meeting of States Parties to the TPNW. This meeting represents a pivotal moment in our collective journey toward a world free of these devastating weapons. We extend our appreciation to the governments, organisations, and civil society representatives who have tirelessly championed this cause. The TPNW remains a bright and powerful reason for hope when many other international developments point in the wrong direction.

We congratulate the state parties and signatories of the TPNW for their unwavering leadership on the global abolition of nuclear weapons since the last meeting of states parties. Your dedication showcases the immeasurable value of the TPNW within the international legal regime that prohibits weapons of mass destruction, offering a clear pathway to their global eradication.

We applaud our colleagues who have worked tirelessly to convey the significance of this Treaty to their respective governments and advance the process of ratification. Our commitment remains resolute, grounded in the belief that the citizens we represent, along with all citizens, should never have to bear the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons use or testing. We pledge to redouble our efforts in expanding the membership of this Treaty and supporting its effective implementation. We will tirelessly strive to garner support among parliamentarians for this Treaty and call on all governments to sign and ratify it as a matter of international urgency.

We stand united in denouncing any and all nuclear threats, regardless of their form and irrespective of the circumstances. As recalled by TPNW, and in accordance with the UN Charter, all States must refrain from the threat or use of force. Leaders around the world must confront the reality that nuclear threats now being voiced by certain policymakers reveal the folly of continued legitimization of nuclear weapons including through promoting so-called nuclear deterrence. It is encouraging to see that many leaders, even from nations not yet party to this Treaty, have adopted a similar stance, firmly rejecting the unacceptable rhetoric surrounding so-called tactical nuclear weapons and loose discussions of their use.

However, despite repeated assurances and commitments to disarm, nuclear-armed states collectively maintain over 12,000 nuclear weapons and continue to allocate vast resources for the modernization and expansion of their arsenals. In 2022, \$82.9 billion were spent on nuclear weapons. Money that would be better invested in a sustainable, just, and peaceful future. We deplore the reliance on the perilous doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the renewed emphasis on the nuclear dimension of military alliances, which obstructs progress toward nuclear disarmament, elevates nuclear risks, and undermines non-proliferation efforts. We also vehemently object to the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of other states, a direct contradiction to the objectives of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a violation of Article 1 of the TPNW.

In striking contrast to the reckless rhetoric of certain nuclear-armed states and their allies, we commend the state parties to this Treaty for their unwavering dedication to implementing the TPNW. We, too, are committed to taking every conceivable action to advance the prohibitions of the Treaty. The regrettable decision of Russia to denigrate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

reminds us of the importance of upholding the unequivocal prohibitions on nuclear testing as stipulated in the TPNW and the CTBT. We call on all states to refrain from actions that undermine the integrity of either treaty.

We join the states parties in emphasizing the complementarity of the TPNW with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and remain unwavering in our support of all measures contributing to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Through constructive engagement with policymakers in nuclear-armed states and their allies, we aim to enhance international security and make substantial strides toward the shared goal of universalizing the TPNW.

We recognize the importance of not confining discussions on nuclear disarmament solely to designated diplomatic fora. The threats posed by nuclear weapons extend far beyond national security concerns; they encompass the well-being of our planet and humanity as a whole. The environmental consequences of nuclear weapons devastate the health and livelihoods of our communities. It is our duty to recognize the multifaceted nature of this issue and actively work towards integrating nuclear disarmament into all policy areas.

More than 1000 sitting parliamentarians have signed ICAN's parliamentary pledge. We are from 27 countries that have not yet ratified the TPNW. We span the political spectrum, and might not see eye to eye on other issues, but we are united in our commitment to work for our countries' ratification of the TPNW, as we consider the abolition of nuclear weapons to be a global public good of the highest order and an essential step to promote the security and well-being of all peoples.

In fulfilling our pledge, we have instigated parliamentary debates on the TPNW; we have tabled resolutions in support of it; we have questioned governments on our national positions; and we have engaged with our constituents in a public conversation about the urgent need for disarmament. To repeat the promise of the TPNW states parties in the Vienna declaration: "We will not rest until the last state has joined the treaty, the last warhead has been dismantled and destroyed, and nuclear weapons have been totally eliminated from the Earth."

In conclusion, we echo the collective sentiment that many pressing challenges underscore the urgency and relevance of the mission embodied by the TPNW. Let us persist in our collaborative efforts for a future where humanity thrives in a world free from the ominous shadow of nuclear weapons.

CONGRATULATING JUNIATA COLLEGE EAGLES WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since 2022, the Juniata College Eagles women's volleyball team has played 70 matches. During that time, they have lost only twice.

Today, I rise to congratulate the Juniata Eagles on winning their second consecutive NCAA Division III national championship.

Playing with technical skill, agility, and power, these young women have built a program that has stood the test of time, becoming a dominant force and drawing more attention to the

sport of volleyball in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Last week, the Eagles showed that their hard work over the past 2 years was well worth it—defeating Hope International three sets to zero in the championship match.

Standing behind these incredible athletes is their dedicated coaching staff and mentors who have dedicated their expertise, guidance, and support to nurture these exceptional student athletes.

Coach Heather Pavlik and Assistant Coach Casey Dale have committed themselves to shaping not just skilled players but also well-rounded student athletes.

On behalf of all the people in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I congratulate the Juniata College Eagles under the leadership of President Jim Troha and wish them every continued success in the years to come.

□ 1015

SHUT DOWN LINE 5 PIPELINE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, we know that oil and water don't mix. Right now, there is a dirty oil pipeline, called Line 5, running through the most critical part of the Great Lakes, operated by a company called Enbridge, with a disturbing history of faulty infrastructure and environmental destruction.

A Line 5 spill would be catastrophic for the Great Lakes region and the entire country. The Great Lakes hold 21 percent of the world's fresh surface water; are home, as we all know, to precious ecosystems and wildlife; and tens of millions of people rely on them for water, jobs, and recreation.

We cannot allow the water we rely on to live, the water that helps make Michigan such a special place for so many, to be sacrificed for corporate greed.

The good news is that President Biden could end this threat today by revoking Line 5's Presidential permit and committing to the truth that water is life and that it is critical to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Biden administration to stand with the people of the Great Lakes and shut down Line 5 once and for all.

BUILDING A DEMOCRATIC FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, big banks bring in billions in profits while our financial system promotes inequality and instability for many of our families.

Right now, millions of people—millions—the majority being people of color, lack access to a checking or savings account, but an alternative does exist. We can build a democratic financial system that puts the livelihoods of our residents above private profit and greed.

Instead of serving Wall Street, public and postal banks can ensure that ev-

eryone has access to basic financial services. Instead of investing billions of dollars annually in fossil fuels, like JPMorgan Chase and Wells Fargo does, public banks can facilitate the transformative changes that our communities desperately need, like real affordable housing for all, disaster preparedness, and a clean energy future that creates real jobs for all.

That is why Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ and I introduced the Public Banking Act of 2023, which provides a regulatory and institutional framework for the creation of State and local public banks, like the Bank of North Dakota, which has been incredibly successful for over a century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please join us in supporting a financial system that works for everyone.

END-OF-YEAR WINS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I take a moment to celebrate the incredible accomplishments that my team and I have been able to do on behalf of our constituents.

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

Through the Neighborhood Service Centers, we have returned over \$5.5 million in constituent services dollars that goes directly into the hands of 8,000 residents, returning over \$306,000 this year alone.

We served and responded to over 164,000 letters from our neighbors ranging from advocating for clean water, clean air, utilities for all, housing for all, and so much more. We have hosted and participated in over 120 events, including coffee hours and townhalls and resource fairs and more, really trying to help our families get through everyday challenges and issues.

Our legislative advocacy has spanned from affordable housing to automatic debt cancellation and ending auto insurance discrimination once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, we have introduced 160 bills and amendments, and 39 of them have actually passed.

This year, we celebrated the 1-year anniversary of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus where we are committed to advocating for working mothers and their families on issues of affordable childcare, pay leave, Black maternal health, and economic justice.

These accomplishments would not have been possible without our residents. Thank you for believing in me and sending me here to Congress to do the people's work. It has been truly an honor to serve you and to be your Congresswoman.

This is just the beginning of what we all can continue to accomplish.

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING PENNSYLVANIA STUDENTS AWARDED BENJAMIN A. GILMAN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 10 outstanding students across Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District who have been awarded the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship.

The Gilman program is named after former Congressman Benjamin A. Gilman, who served in Congress from 1973 to 2003. He was chair of the House International Relations Committee and represented Upstate New York.

Established in 2001, the Gilman program is part of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. This scholarship sponsors students to study or intern abroad during the academic year.

This program is an important part of the Federal Government's effort to expand and diversify U.S. study abroad and allows Americans to gain the global competencies that are crucial to our national security and our economic prosperity.

Since 2001, this program has allowed more than 41,000 Americans from 1,350 U.S. colleges and universities to study or intern in more than 160 countries. The Gilman program advances people-to-people diplomacy and strengthens America's role in the global marketplace.

The Gilman program continues to expand the American student population that studies abroad with nearly 70 percent of Gilman scholars identifying as students of color, 60 percent from small towns or rural parts of the United States, and nearly 50 percent are first-generation college students.

Congratulations to Rik Bhattacharyya, a student from Penn State University studying in India; Ashlyn Bird of Lycoming County, a student at Drexel University studying in the United Kingdom; Deven Dancy of Union County, a student at Susquehanna University studying in Ghana; Hannah Dees of Centre County, a student at Juniata College studying in the United Kingdom; Shawnee Geletka of Venango County, a student at College for Creative Studies studying in Italy; Saoirse Hopp of Centre County, a student at University of Pittsburgh studying in Spain; Kimberly Johnson of Potter County, a student at Drexel University studying in Italy; Luke Kantz of Snyder County, a student at University of Pittsburgh studying in India; Rute Pires of Union County, a student at Bucknell studying in Ireland; and Casey Sennett of Centre County, a student at Penn State University studying in Italy.

These students are currently studying or interning across the world.

Good luck in your studies, and enjoy your time abroad.

JAYDEN DANIELS, HEISMAN TROPHY RECIPIENT

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

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an extraordinary talent and force in the world of college football, LSU's Jayden Daniels, the recipient of this year's Heisman Trophy.

Jayden's journey has been remarkable, defined by grit, determination, and a love for the game. Winning the Heisman is not just a personal victory, it is a testament to the countless hours of hard work, sacrifice, and unwavering support of your teammates and coaches.

It truly takes a village.

Jayden's skill on the field has captivated fans, and his leadership has inspired generations of future athletes.

As Jayden holds this coveted trophy, may he know that he has etched his name in football history and Louisiana history. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Jayden on this well-deserved honor. I know it will be a stepping stone to even greater heights.

THE CITY OF LOVE

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the pastoral anniversary of Bishop Lester Love and Pastor Fran Love. Twenty-five years of faithful leadership have shaped The City of Love into a beacon of hope and inspiration.

Bishop Lester Love has shepherded The City of Love with a clear vision. His exemplary leadership has not only guided his congregation but has become a blueprint for leadership excellence in churches and corporations alike.

Alongside him, Prophet Fran Love, a woman of unwavering faith, has demonstrated her commitment to social justice through initiatives like the Daughters of Life and Love, DOLL. I admire her active devotion to uplifting others and serving mankind and womankind.

Together, they have led The City of Love with passion and a commitment to community service. Their outreach organization, LOVE365, has touched thousands of lives.

Beyond the pulpit, Bishop Lester Love and Prophet Fran Love have become pillars of support for the greater New Orleans community. Their influence extends far beyond the walls of The City of Love, reaching into the hearts and lives of those they touch.

As I congratulate this remarkable couple, I also express my gratitude for their friendship and guidance.

May the next chapter of your journey be filled with continued blessings and fulfillment for the mission of love and the people that you serve.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO MONTFORD POINT MARINES

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the valor and resilience of the Montford Point Marines whose invincible spirit has left a permanent mark on our Nation's history.

Eighty years in the making, eight courageous New Orleanians received the Congressional Medal of Honor this

November, a long overdue recognition of their pivotal role as the first African Americans to join the Marines.

Their names are:

Private First Class Granville "Jack" Alexander, Sr.

First Sergeant Nolan A. Marshall, Sr.
Staff Sergeant Charles E. Allen, Sr.

Corporal George A. Dupre, Sr.

Private First Class, Andrew J. LeBlanc.

Staff Sergeant Melvin O. Parent, Sr.
Sergeant Gilbert Smith, Sr.; and
Private First Class Lloyd B. Wills, Sr.

These heroes who fought to fight for America and made a way from no way, faced adversity head-on and did it with pride and honor.

Barred from the national marines boot camp, they persevered at Montford Point, enduring grueling training and overcoming the stigma that African Americans couldn't serve as marines. They not only served honorably, but they blazed a trail for 20,000 African Americans who followed in their footsteps.

In 1949, Montford Point was decommissioned but their legacy endures. Their sacrifice paved the way for diversity and inclusion in the Marine Corps, and we proudly embrace their history and their service today.

Thank you for your incredible service.

God bless you, and God bless America.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN ZACH EVANS AND CAPTAIN JOSHUA SADDLER FOR THEIR LIFESAVING ACTIONS

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the valiant actions of two Air Force officers from our community who placed their own physical safety on the back burner to save citizens from a burning vehicle crash.

Captain Zach Evans, a pilot with the 3rd Airlift Squadron, and Captain Joshua Saddler, a MQ-9 Reaper pilot with the 65th Special Operations Squadron, are not just heroes but are sons from Nebraska. I am proud to say that Captain Evans is a former member of our district staff.

When Zach joined the Air Force, I knew he would go far. Needless to say, Zach and Josh are both living up to, if not surpassing, all expectations and are bringing great honor to our community.

On May 5, Captain Zach Evans and Captain Joshua Saddler, good friends and graduates of the University of Nebraska, witnessed a truck driving erratically on a poorly lit road in Dover, Delaware. The truck swerved between lanes, crossing medians, and ignoring traffic signals.

Captain Evans and Captain Saddler called 911 to report the driver and kept a safe distance. However, the driver

soon ran a red light directly into an SUV, resulting in a burning two-car collision.

They pulled over, and along with two civilians, assisted the victims in both vehicles.

While Captain Saddler attended to the trapped people in the SUV, Captain Evans, at great personal risk to himself, sprinted to the burning truck to remove the suspected drunk driver, who had two broken legs, from the vehicle.

Thankfully, Captain Evans saved the man just before the truck became fully engulfed in flames. Captain Evans and Captain Saddler stayed with the victims until first responders arrived on scene and remained to direct traffic.

Captain Evans and Captain Saddler were each recognized on October 23 with the City of Dover Gold Medal for their lifesaving actions and were presented with the Dover Police Department's Distinguished Citizen Award.

I salute both Captain Zach Evans and Captain Joshua Saddler and the two civilians for their actions that day.

RECOGNIZING BARBARA FELDEN ON HER
RETIREMENT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Barbara Felden, who, after 43 years of honorable service to our country as an enlisted airman in the Air Force and as a senior civilian liaison in Germany, is retiring.

I worked with Barbara starting in 2008 when I was commander of the 435th Air Base Wing at Ramstein Air Base in Germany.

Since 2011, she has been the Host Nation Advisor to the Commander of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe and U.S. Air Forces Africa.

At 21, Barbara, a German citizen, married to a U.S. airman, qualified to join the U.S. military service. She was assigned to Robins Air Force Base after basic training, and returned to Germany where she served in various liaison assignments, first as an interpreter, then taking on command-wide responsibilities dealing with Federal officials.

In 1948, she transferred to the 86th Tactical Fighter Wing liaison office where she developed first-time liaison initiatives with local communities, such as the organization of German civic leaders and familiarization to the United States.

One of Barbara's most challenging assignments was closing down the historic Rhein-Main Air Base in Frankfurt and transferring their operations to Ramstein Air Base.

Barbara also served as director of the liaison for the U.S. Kaiserslautern Military Community, the largest military overseas community in the world.

During my time as commander at Ramstein, Barbara organized events and meetings with the community. I recall that one time she helped arrange for me to deliver the opening remarks at the world's largest wine festival where I had the opportunity to lead a parade and conduct the orchestra.

Barbara has provided critical support and assistance for a variety of major projects during her tenure at headquarters for the U.S. Air Forces in Europe and U.S. Air Forces Africa.

During the COVID pandemic, she liaised with Federal and State officials to ensure military missions could continue, while ensuring alignment with the host nation protective measures.

□ 1030

In the late summer of 2021, the emergency evacuation of Afghan nationals to Ramstein Air Base presented many challenges for Ms. Felden and her team. While initial expectations were for 5,000 evacuees, about 35,000 people were actually processed at Ramstein.

Barbara has always displayed the utmost professionalism in the various positions she held during her 43 years. I am proud of her accomplishments, and I am honored to call her and her husband, Claude, my friends. I salute you both. I thank Barbara for all she has done in her stellar career.

MOMENT OF CRISIS IN UKRAINE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, in a moment of crisis, the people of Ukraine and around the world are looking to the United States for support and leadership.

After an 80-day hiatus, Russia launched a wave of cruise missile attacks on Ukraine on the Remembrance Day of the Holodomor, which is a reflection of when the Soviet Union imposed a famine and killed millions of Ukrainians in 1932 and 1933.

These attacks come just days after the Senate Republicans blocked funding for Ukraine and Israel. Putin is watching. He is enjoying these political fights, which is only giving him an advantage, he believes. His propaganda machine is celebrating the legislative blockade that is occurring as the first step to withdrawing total support for Ukraine. Believe it.

The United States must send a strong message to Putin that we stand strong and united with the people of Ukraine.

I have met with brave Ukrainian soldiers and their families who shared that our support has given them hope that Ukraine will win this fight. They will. Those who say Ukraine is losing the war are wrong. Putin's goal to conquer Ukraine has failed. Ukraine has regained 50 percent of the land Russia originally took and has reopened the Black Sea to allow them to export grain.

Meanwhile, the Ukrainian military has depleted the Russian army. From a total of over 480,000 soldiers, Russia has lost over 320,000 who have either been wounded or killed—think about that, over half their army—forcing Putin to take coercive actions for new and inexperienced personnel, even people from prison, and has desperately turned to

North Korea for supplies—all this at a cost for the United States of less than 1 percent of our GDP and all without U.S. troops on the ground. That is a very good deal.

Less than 10 percent of our annual defense budget has gone to assist Ukraine's military, and it has destroyed almost 50 percent of Russia's army. Compared to our allies in Europe, we rank 20th in giving to Ukraine, when you factor in GDP. We need to pass a supplemental aid package to provide immediate assistance, and we need to do it in an overwhelming bipartisan way as we have before.

We are living during a seminal moment in the history of America and the world we live in. Historians will look back years from now and determine whether or not we made more good decisions than poor decisions. This is an opportunity to make a good decision. We need to pass the supplemental package to provide immediate assistance that our ally Ukraine needs now.

We must provide humanitarian assistance for the Palestinians that have been afflicted by the war and for Armenian refugees who have been removed from their historical home in Nagorno-Karabakh.

We need to pass a package to let our European allies know that the United States is reliable and consistent in support of democracies around the world. The passage of this supplemental package also provides support for Taiwan and restores American military inventory that is so critical.

There is nothing more that Putin wants than to see this Congress and our country divided. The Congress in November and December seemed to have time for baseless impeachment inquiries but not the time to do the most important things like provide funding for national defense, the Federal Aviation Administration, and, most importantly, resolving our differences and passing a budget.

I ask my Republican colleagues: What have we done? What are we doing? When we gather around the holiday tables in the next 2 weeks and we ask for good tidings in the new year, as Members of Congress, I think we must ask ourselves: What have we done? What have we done to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass these critical bills? The answer is nothing.

We must do more important things to provide for the American people and the world that we live in. This is a seminal moment, as I said before, in world history, and the world is watching. We cannot lose sight of what is at stake. If we do not stop these threats against freedom and democracy, we will fail. This, make no mistake about it, is the test of our time.

I also wish for one and for all a happy holiday season. May the new year bring us good tidings. Let us not forget about our responsibilities as the world's lone superpower. We have responsibilities. We are still, as President Reagan said, the beacon of light on that shining hill.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ANGIE WOOD

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Angie Wood. Angie was a leader in Illinois who touched the lives of countless people. She was someone who empowered the people around her and was an inspiration to everyone she met.

She was quick to invite new friends to dinner and was always there to help someone in need. Angie embodied selfless devotion to her family, her community, and her country.

Everyone knew Angie as a patriot because of her love for our Constitution and her devotion to serving our country. She organized women's constitutional luncheons to teach people about our history, our rights, and our freedoms. She firmly believed that knowledge is power, and she was devoted to our Founding Fathers' vision of self-government.

Angie's patriotism was not merely something she talked about. It was something she lived out every day because of her love for God and country.

At her core, Angie was a Christian whose faith in Christ was evident to everyone around her, and she sought to carry the love of Jesus into the world. She organized Bible studies and was always first to offer prayer. She was sure to remind her friends about the peace and comfort that comes from the Lord. Angie would remind people that the only hope for our Nation and the world is Jesus Christ.

Angie's legacy will continue to inspire everyone who knew her. She exemplified servant leadership, and her patriotism, optimism, and faith will be lived out by the people whose lives she touched. No matter how the future looked, Angie would always say that the best is yet to come.

Now, I want to read one of her favorite passages from Philippians: Whatever happens, keep living your lives based on the reality of the Gospel of Christ. Then, when I come to see you or hear good reports of you, I will know that you stand united in one spirit and one passion, celebrating together as conquerors in the faith of the gospel. Then you will never be shaken or intimidated by the opposition that rises up against us. Your courage will prove to be a true sign from God of their coming destruction.

I pray that her memory will serve as an example to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a moment of silence.

SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN HOSTAGES AND DETAINEES ABROAD

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, as a co-chair of the Congressional Task Force

on American Hostages and Americans Wrongfully Detained Abroad, I rise in support of the Conference Report to Accompany the National Defense Authorization Act.

In the past decade, we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of Americans taken hostage by rogue states and bad actors who are trying to leverage civilians to get what they want.

Right now, according to the Foley Foundation, there are currently at least 64 Americans held hostage or wrongfully detained in countries overseas. They are held in 16 different countries and territories.

Now, more than ever, we must keep up the drumbeat to bring these individuals home. That is why I am so heartened that the NDAA includes two of my bills to support and assist Americans wrongfully detained abroad and their loved ones fighting to get them safely back home.

First, the U.S. Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day Act designates March 9 as Hostage and Wrongful Detainee Day and requests that the President issue a yearly proclamation urging Americans to observe this day in remembrance for those held hostage.

The bill also requires the Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag be flown at the Capitol, the White House, and numerous other Federal buildings.

These families need our support. These families need the Nation's attention. These families need this legislation. By designating a day and a flag to be flown on Federal property, we will bring much-needed awareness to the plight of these Americans and the heartache of their families.

In addition, I am so very pleased to see that the NDAA includes the Supporting Americans Wrongfully or Unlawfully Detained Abroad Act. Families of the wrongfully detained often spend thousands and thousands of dollars traveling back and forth to Washington to advocate for the release of their loved ones and to work on their safe return home.

This bill would help families defray these costs by providing financial assistance to cover the costs of travel to and from Washington, D.C., including travel by air, train, bus, or other transit, as well as covering lodging expenses.

These families who are already dealing with the detention of a loved one shouldn't have to worry about going broke or spending a life savings because they are working alongside the Federal Government to do what is right. This bill will help ease that financial burden.

Finally, when detainees return home after years of wrongful detention, we must do more to ensure that they have the resources they need to return to normal life. They have often been stripped of employment, housing, and life as they knew it before they were taken hostage.

We must remember that the wrongfully detained have been imprisoned of-

tentimes for years, if not decades, which is wrong. They may come home, but they won't necessarily come home to a job. We cannot let these individuals fall through the cracks when they return. We need to help them return back to society.

That is why I am so proud that this bill will also seek to make available physical health services, mental health services, and other support, including providing information on available legal or financial resources for up to 5 years following the release of a detainee.

We need to make sure that these individuals have the physical and mental health assistance that they need to recover from unspeakable trauma.

While nothing can give back the years that our adversaries or the time that our adversaries have taken from these Americans, we have a responsibility to help them get back on their feet.

I sincerely thank the other co-chair of the American Hostage and Americans Wrongfully Detained Abroad Task Force, Mr. FRENCH HILL from Arkansas, for working with me on both of these bills.

I also pay recognition to the families of the hostages, particularly the family of my constituent, Paul Whelan, who is about to hit 5 years wrongfully detained in Russia. We are continuing to shine a light on Paul and demand and call for his release from the Russian Government.

To those held hostage, Congress stands behind you. Congress continues to work alongside our ally, Israel, in calling for the return of the 138 hostages currently still being held in Gaza.

HONORING DEAN DALE GREENE

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dean Dale Greene of the University of Georgia's Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, a role in which he has served since 2015.

After decades of service to UGA and our great State, Dean Greene will retire at the end of this year. Dale is an accomplished man. He is a graduate of Louisiana State University, holds a master's degree from Virginia Tech and a Ph.D. from Auburn University.

□ 1045

He joined the UGA faculty in 1986 and has served our school and this State in so many ways since.

Dale currently sits on the board of trustees for the American Forestry Association and has been on the board of directors for the Georgia Forestry Association since 1992. He was appointed by two Georgia Governors to the State Board of Registration of Foresters, first in 2004 and then again in 2010.

In 2007, Dean Greene received an Outstanding Research Award from the Society of American Foresters, the Herick Award for Superior Teaching, and was later inducted into the Georgia Forester's Hall of Fame.

His accomplishments don't end there. In 2008, Dale became a UGA senior teaching fellow and, in 2011, received the Georgia Forestry Association's Wise Owl award.

These are just a few ways that Dale Greene has been recognized for his outstanding service to the State of Georgia, countless students, and the field of forestry.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend embarks on his next chapter of life, he must know that his leadership has built a strong legacy. The Warnell School has grown and become so successful with him at the helm.

I thank him for all he has done, and I wish him continued success in his retirement. Go Dawgs.

THIS SHOULD NOT BE NORMAL

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

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as southern Nevada is reeling in the wake of a horrifying mass shooting at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

We remember Jerry Chang, Patricia Navarro-Velez, and Naoko Takemaru. All three of these faculty members were killed last week at work in the middle of the day while teaching our next generation of leaders.

Once again, 6 years after Las Vegas witnessed the Nation's deadliest mass shooting, our community is coming together to mourn another entirely preventable loss of life this week when four more people were shot and killed in the northwest valley.

As we pick up the pieces of these tragedies, our community is once again asking why. Why do we continue to accept these atrocities as normal? Why do we tolerate this violence when we have legislation before us that could save lives and stop the next tragedy before it is too late?

Mr. Speaker, I have a son in college. He is a freshman. I worry every day about the possibility that a tragedy like this would strike his campus. For many parents in my community, that worry became a reality last week. They saw texts and tweets with the breaking news that every parent in this country has come to fear: an active shooter at their child's school.

Students were instructed to run, hide, and fight. That is not normal. For our kids, this reality is even more traumatic—the sound of gunshots, barricading classroom doors, everyone hiding under their desks, silence, not knowing whether the next person to walk through that door is someone to save them or a murderous assailant. That is not normal.

Let's not forget the resulting emotional trauma that will plague everyone involved for years to come.

We are all incredibly grateful for the quick action of the first responders, the University Police Services, and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, who all bravely prevented that day from becoming even deadlier.

Like so many mothers in this country, I am angry, and I am exhausted. This has become a reality for far too many Americans for far too long.

Last week's shooting at UNLV was the 80th shooting at a school this year, a year that has broken the record for mass shootings and claimed the lives of over 40,000 children, parents, and neighbors. That is not normal.

On that same day that we lost three of our own in southern Nevada, Senate Republicans were busy blocking legislation that could prevent another tragedy. Students, faculty, and university staff were hiding for their lives, cowering in fear, while Washington politicians were cowering behind the gun lobby that refuses to support policies demanded by an overwhelming majority of Americans.

That should not be normal.

Nevadans are tired of it, and so am I. We cannot and should not continue to accept this violence. Weapons of war on our streets are not normal. Barricading classroom doors is not normal. Parents being afraid to send their children to school, from kindergarten to college, is not normal.

I don't want to hold another vigil. I don't want to hold another moment of silence. What I want to do is I want this institution, which Nevadans sent me to help fix, to stop accepting this violence and to end this sick cycle of inaction.

Mr. Speaker, I am not naive enough to think that we can't prevent every shooting, but, God, please, let us at least get caught trying.

Mr. Speaker, I am begging my colleagues and anyone who is listening to consider why we have accepted this for so long. Please, let's honor these victims with action.

SALUTING EDWARD J. "DOC" MCGANN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. D'ESPOSITO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to salute a good friend, a gentleman with one of the biggest hearts I have ever met. Doc McGann was a piece of the very community that I grew up in back home on Long Island in a small village called Island Park.

Back home in Island Park, one of the beacons of our community is our local firehouse, and Doc McGann served that fire department for 72 years. He served as chief of our department from 1963 to 1964 and had the opportunity to serve every rank in that department. Even in his elder years, he was a calm voice, someone who gave the younger members advice on how to serve their community.

He was active in our Church of Sacred Heart.

He was the executive leader of the Island Park, Lido, Point Lookout Republican Committee. In that capacity, in 1980, he was one of the architects that sent an unknown guy from a small village of 6,000 people by the name of Alfonse D'Amato to the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, 42 years later, he helped send another guy from a village of 6,000 to the United States House of Representatives, that being me.

He was married to his lovely wife, Gerri, for 66 years. He leaves behind four children: Danny, Kevin, Kerrie, and Jackie. He is the proud grandfather and great-grandfather of beautiful children.

Today, I salute Doc McGann. When he died just less than a month ago, a piece of Island Park died with him.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN SULLIVAN ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. D'ESPOSITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Brian Sullivan, the president of the Nassau County Correction Officers Benevolent Association.

After a long and storied career in the Nassau County Sheriff's Department, Mr. SULLIVAN has retired, leaving behind a legacy of excellence.

Brian Sullivan was appointed as a correction officer in Nassau County in 1988, marking the beginning of over 35 years of service. Brian Sullivan worked his way through the ranks of the department, ultimately achieving the rank of captain in 2022.

Throughout his time in corrections, Brian Sullivan served in a multitude of positions, including the Behavioral Management Unit, which comprised some of the most dangerous inmates in custody in our county.

In addition to safeguarding the public from violent offenders, Brian demonstrated his leadership among colleagues and was elected in 2002 to serve as a delegate of his union. As he did in his uniformed career, Brian rose through the ranks of the union, having been elected first as a delegate, twice as the union's first vice president, and then twice as president of the organization.

In his tenure as union leader, he was wildly successful and managed to help pass several laws at the State level to protect pensions and death benefits for Nassau County corrections officers.

Brian's work both safeguarding the people of Nassau County and advocating for his brother and sister correction officers is worthy of great praise. I am honored to recognize the incredible career of my Nassau neighbor and friend.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Brian Sullivan the best in this next chapter, and I know he will continue being a selfless community servant wherever life takes him. I wish him the best of luck in his retirement.

WHAT WE DELIVERED IN THE
EIGHTH DISTRICT IN 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we close out 2023, I want to talk about the results my team and I have delivered for New Jersey's Eighth Congressional District during my first year in office.

Our team has solved over 1,100 constituent cases, which have ranged from getting evacuees out of Afghanistan, to resolving passport issues so constituents can visit their loved ones, to returning over \$270,000 to our constituents. We have sent over 26,000 letters communicating directly with our residents about the issues they care about.

We have also secured over \$11 billion in Federal grants for projects in our district. That includes over \$6.9 billion for the Gateway Program, the largest critical infrastructure project in the country. We also secured over \$4 billion to overhaul the Northeast Corridor, drastically improving the commuter experience on the busiest passenger rail line in the country.

We secured millions for additional priorities such as community policing, environmental justice, and tackling climate change, all in less than a year.

I have also introduced six bills and cosponsored over 100 bills that address affordability, improve the quality of life for residents in our district, and fight for our Democratic values and priorities.

The first bill I introduced was the Working Families Task Force Act, which would establish a whole-of-government approach to improve the standard of living for working families in our district and across the country, including access to childcare and healthcare and creating good-paying jobs.

I made quality-of-life issues a priority, introducing legislation to battle helicopter noise in our communities. I am proud to have cosponsored legislation to protect reproductive rights, support our LGBTQ community, and fight gun violence.

As a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I have worked hard every day to improve critical infrastructure across our district. This includes strongly advocating for commuting alternatives for you and your family, such as extending New York City's 7 line to New Jersey.

Serving on the House Committee on Homeland Security, I have prioritized our work to keep our country safe while following our American and Democratic values.

I have tackled the work of reforming our broken immigration system head-on as co-chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Immigration Task Force. I have fought to close the privately run Elizabeth Detention Center, which has had a decades-long record of abuse and neglect of migrant detainees.

I have stood alongside my colleagues to call for relief for cities that are han-

dling an influx of asylum-seekers. I have led efforts to oppose harmful Republican targeting of migrants.

This year, alongside House Democrats, my team and I have delivered significant and meaningful results for every single resident of New Jersey's Eighth Congressional District despite the House Republicans' dysfunction and division. We are just getting started.

My top priority is and has always been serving you. I love this district and every community I have the honor of representing. Delivering real, tangible results is what motivates me every day.

I look forward to working for you in Washington and in the district. My team and I are available to help you and your family with any issues you may be having with the Federal Government. We are here to serve you. I thank you for this incredible opportunity, and I look forward to continuing to deliver for all of you in 2024.

□ 1100

PIERCE COUNTY FOOTBALL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Pierce County Bears who won the Georgia High School Association class 2A football State championship yesterday in Atlanta, Georgia.

This win is the second State championship for the Bears and Coach Ryan Herring, and it was not earned easily. This game was tied 14-14 all going into halftime, and it didn't get any easier from there.

The Bears had to fight to the very end, eventually sealing the victory in triple overtime.

Pierce County quarterback, Caden McGatha, was phenomenal in this victory throwing for two touchdowns to receiver Carson Sloan and running for an additional four touchdowns himself.

The Pierce County defense was also outstanding, sacking the opposing quarterback six times.

To the Pierce County Bears and to Coach Ryan Herring, I say congratulations on this amazing win. This team earned this championship, it was not given to them.

REMEMBERING PASTOR CLARENCE WILLIAMS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Reverend Dr. Clarence Williams who passed away at the age of 64.

Dr. Clarence Williams was a Savannah resident and a longtime pastor of Pilgrim Baptist Church of Savannah.

In addition to his work leading Pilgrim Baptist Church of Savannah, Pastor Williams previously served as the moderator of Berean Missionary Baptist Association, vice president of the National Baptist Convention, music auxiliary, State music director of the General Missionary Baptist Convention of Georgia, and many other positions.

He also served as chaplain of Chatham County Sheriff's Department and the Savannah State University National Alumni Association.

Pastor Williams will be remembered by many for his charismatic personality, his unwavering faith, and his dedication to serving others.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF RONALD
BOOKER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of Ronald Booker, a Savannah resident.

After spending 34 years as head basketball coach for the Beach High School women's basketball team, Ronald Booker was named the special assistant to the head coach for the women's basketball team at Savannah State University.

During his career, Coach Booker led the Lady Bulldogs to 12 subregional championships and made 30 State championship basketball tournament appearances. His teams were ranked by The Atlanta Journal-Constitution in the State's top 10 teams for 26 seasons.

He concluded his coaching career—get this—with a 786-190 overall record.

In his honor, the city of Savannah has decided to name a portion of Hopkins Street in front of Beach High School Coach Ronald Booker Way.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Booker on his remarkable achievements and on his well-deserved honorary designation.

FRANK CALLEN BOYS & GIRLS CLUB

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Frank Callen Boys & Girls Club in Savannah, Georgia.

The Frank Callen Boys & Girls Club was started by Frank Callen in 1917, and the club was accepted into the national organization in 1922.

Since its inception, this club has served Savannah youth by being a safe place to learn and a safe place to play. It also serves as the home of some world-class athletes.

LSU basketball star, Flau'jae Johnson and University of Georgia football star Nolan Smith are both proud alumni of the Frank Callen Boys & Girls Club. Both of these amazing athletes have graduated to winning national championships in their respective sports, and they have not forgotten their roots. Both have recently made generous donations to the place where they got their start.

I also thank Mark Lindsay who serves as the executive director of the club. People like Mark are essential in the development of our youth and our communities as a whole.

I, again, thank everyone involved with the Frank Callen Boys & Girls Club for the positive impact they are having on our community.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

AMERICA MUST STAY THE
COURSE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have less than 10 hours left until we go home for the holidays, less than 10 hours when we leave the field, and less than 10 hours before we act responsibly.

The men and women of Ukraine will not go home for the holidays. They will not leave the lines in eastern Ukraine. They will not have a Christmas dinner without the fear that they will be bombed in Kyiv or assaulted in eastern Ukraine.

Why is that?

I ask that to both Chambers: Why are we going home and leaving our Ukrainian allies unarmed?

Why do we shrink from our responsibility to confront those who would undermine democracy, freedom, and international law?

Why, Mr. Speaker, do we retreat from the field while our Ukrainian allies are at risk?

Mr. Speaker, we have 1 day left. We can accomplish the goal of passing Ukrainian dollars.

We can achieve the goal of giving aid to our ally, Israel.

We can achieve the goal of making Taiwan a little bit stronger.

Or we can send a message to Mr. Putin, to Mr. Xi, to Iran, and to Hamas that America is unable to stay the course.

I am told that the reason we can't do that is because it is absolutely essential to have border security addressed. It is. I am for doing that.

Nevertheless, I want to call to the Speaker's attention, so that he can remember that in the 115th Congress, as a Member of Congress, he cosponsored a bill, H.R. 395. Some others cosponsored that bill who may be at least hearing me, Mr. Speaker, or maybe even on the floor. That bill said that it was incumbent that we "end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject."

Was that situational ethics, situational principles, or just temporary principles to be thrown away when they are not convenient, perhaps?

That bill was sponsored by Speaker JOHNSON; by Mr. Meadows who became Chief of Staff of Donald Trump; by Mr. EMMER, the majority whip; and by Mr. DeSantis, candidate for President. It was a temporary, perhaps just political, piece of rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, America is better than that. America needs to be a more reliable ally than that. America needs to create confidence, not undermine confidence. America needs to be reliable. America needs to confront the criminality, the venality, and the murderous acts of Vladimir Putin.

Yet we are scheduled to go home in just a few hours.

John Kennedy wrote a book, "Why England Slept." It was about why they

thought that Hitler was going to stop. It just involved, after all, the mainland, not England, and they paid a terrible price for that negligence, and the free world paid a terrible price for that negligence.

Mr. Speaker, let us not go home, let us do our duty, and let us be the kind of America that we say we are.

NEBRASKA LOVES ITS LAW
ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as National Law Enforcement Day approaches, I rise today to salute our men and women who keep our communities safe each and every day.

It wasn't long ago that law enforcement was almost universally respected in America. The blue uniform was a symbol not just of law and order but also of community peace and harmony. Policemen and policewomen belonged among the most trusted community members, alongside nurses, teachers, firefighters, and postal workers.

However, something happened in 2020. Antipolice riots erupted in communities across the country. Places like Seattle, Minneapolis, and Chicago were besieged by violence. Violent protestors set up a law enforcement-free zone in Seattle known as CHAZ.

Civil unrest in Minneapolis led to one-half billion dollars' worth of damage while city leadership failed to keep order after George Floyd's death. Folks looked at the Magnificent Mile in Chicago while the world watched America burn.

Nevertheless, this destruction wasn't tolerated in Nebraska.

When disorder erupted in two of our major cities, then-Governor Pete Ricketts cracked down. He deployed State patrol and National Guard members to assist communities and protected businesses and homeowners.

Since the national unrest in 2020, Nebraska has doubled down on our commitment to supporting our men and women in blue. While some States have repealed traditional protections for law enforcement, Nebraska has maintained qualified immunity. This is critical to ensuring law enforcement officers can do their jobs without the threat of frivolous lawsuits or complaints.

Last year, before I came to Congress, I was the proud cosponsor of the Law Enforcement Attraction and Retention Act in the Nebraska legislature. This bill provides a variety of cash incentives for individual officers to help law enforcement agencies retain their workforce. It received almost unanimous approval from that body.

This year—and I want to double down on this—the legislature in Nebraska passed the First Responder Recruitment and Retention Act. It covers 100 percent of tuition for law enforcement officers, firefighters, and their children who want to get a college degree from

a community college or a State college or university. We are the first State in the Nation to give police officers, their families, and their children free college, recognizing that what they do is important and that it is needed.

If someone is living in one of those places where law enforcement is under attack, I want them to look at Nebraska. Look at what we can do for them and their family. We have a variety of opportunities available in law enforcement. The Nebraska State Patrol is the finest statewide agency in the Nation led by an outstanding colonel, John Bolduc.

Our two biggest cities have fantastic large agencies that provide lots of opportunities to advance. If someone likes to hunt, we can help them there, too.

We have lots of opportunities in smaller agencies, mid-size communities, a plethora of opportunity.

There is truly an opportunity in Nebraska for every law enforcement officer, and it comes with a low cost of living and competitive salaries. Our communities need police officers. Rural communities need police officers. We are doing what we can in Nebraska to make it as attractive to people across the country as humanly possible.

As we honor our peace officers on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I invite anyone working in the profession to consider my great State as they think about their career and what is best for their family and know that Nebraskans support them. We salute their work; we wish them all the best as they continue to protect communities and the good life across our country.

May God bless our law enforcement, and may God bless the United States of America.

THE VALUE OF WATER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it can't be overestimated the value and the need for water in our lives, in what we consume foodwise and what it provides in flood control, what it provides in hydroelectric power, just water at the tap, and even environmental water.

As a Representative from California, we certainly go through a lot of gyrations and a lot of fights over water. Mark Twain is quoted as saying: "Whisky is for drinking, and water is for fighting over." There is plenty of that in California.

□ 1115

What is going on?

Back in the 1930s and the 1960s, two major projects were built to turn California into the blooming land that it is of so much bounty, so much great agriculture, so much opportunity, with the Federal water project started in the 1930s and the State water project conceived in the 1950s and much of it built in the 1960s.

In my own district, we have two very large dams—Shasta Dam at 4½ million acre-feet and Lake Oroville at 3½ million acre-feet. Those have made so much possibility for people in California, but not just California. It has helped the whole country.

I will tell you why. Because agriculture is a key element of the sustainability for this country. It is strategic for being able to feed itself, defend itself. You can't overestimate how important that is as well.

What we currently have happening in California and in the Western States is the extreme environmental left is moving to remove more and more dams as we speak. Right now in the Klamath River, up in the north end of my district, there are four dams in the target sites for that. They make hydroelectric power.

Now, as a sidebar here, what do we hear constantly in this Chamber? Almost every conversation is filtered through climate change. When you have sources of power that are zero CO₂, such as hydroelectric power, as well as nuclear power, and very clean efficient power such as natural gas, which is being phased out or pushed out by the Biden administration as we can't explore or build pipelines for it, where are we going to get the power if you tear these dams out?

Why would you take all of these inputs for producing electricity in this country, while at the same time, you are forcing more and more things to be powered by electricity, vehicles, big trucks?

I see on the internet there is a major cargo carrier saying we need to electrify our aircrafts. How heavy will an airplane be when you load it up with batteries? Will it have any cargo capacity remaining? A big semi-rig for the highways is 80,000 pounds GVW. By the time they electrify it and add two 8,000-pound batteries to that, that is 16,000 more pounds of cargo you will have to take off. That means five trucks will have to now do the job of four trucks. This is where we are going.

Hydroelectric power is extremely important to fuel whatever levels of electricity we are going to be using. They want to ban gas stoves. They want to ban gas heaters. If we are going to have more and more of a reliability on the electric grid, which I hope we don't go through with these crazy policies, we are going to continue to need this power.

Why are we tearing dams out? They want to tear them out in the State of Washington. We just visited the Colorado River, the Western Caucus, over the weekend. The Hoover Dam, what a mighty structure that is, with eight great big power plant turbines in there. Above that, Lake Powell; they are talking about maybe we don't really need Lake Powell anymore because we are in the middle of a drought situation. We are in a tough drought, but what if we didn't have those to begin with? We wouldn't have stored that

water that has helped us sustain through many years of drought, actually.

Back in my own district with a full Lake Shasta and a full Lake Oroville, under the regional conditions, that would get you through 5 years' worth of drought. Still storing water for agriculture, for people at the tap, for hydroelectric power, and even recreation.

What is the agenda? They want to force more and more electric vehicles and electric everything, but at the same time, they want to rip out the means to make the power. It doesn't make a lick of sense.

I just see where Ford Motor Company lost about \$4½ billion last year electrifying. They had the original influx of people buying those electric vehicles, but now that has fallen off because once the incentives go away or once you can get a sticker to drive it in the fast lanes in certain areas in California, the rest of the market probably isn't too interested in that.

Their F-150 Lightning, they are pulling back production by at least half, maybe more, because people aren't buying these vehicles like they supposedly are projecting.

Stored water is an incredibly good thing. Why it matters to the rest of the country as well is California has grown so many amazing crops over the years with the innovation and ability to farm the lands that we have had in the San Joaquin Valley. We would not have the food that the whole country eats since 90 percent to 99 percent of these crops are grown in California.

CONGRATULATIONS TO OFFICER ALLEN BRANDON ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officer Allen Brandon for his retirement following 30 years of service in public safety.

Officer Brandon has served the Fifth District of South Carolina in many roles. In each, he displayed incredible leadership, bravery, honoring his community with incredible work and dedicated service throughout his career.

In 1983, he began his service as a patrolman at the Tega Cay Police Department and was quickly promoted to a supervisor in 1985. He then moved to the York County Sheriff's Office where his work proved to make a true impact in the community. He held many roles, operating in the narcotics department for many years before being promoted again to the patrol lieutenant and the captain of the Uniform and Field Services Division.

Officer Brandon's service is reflective of the values that the police force holds most important: accountability, integrity, honesty, and courage.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take the time to recognize Mr. Bran-

don's family—his wife, Melanie; and his two children, Sarah and William. Working in the police force requires sacrifice and support from the entire family.

In addition to his service on the police force, Officer Brandon has served the community as an elder at Forest Hills Church, a Keystone Board member, member of the Palmetto Boy Scouts Board, and a leader for the United Way of York County.

Officer Brandon has set the gold standard for representing his community with pride and prioritized fairness and justice. Please join me in honoring Officer Brandon for 30 years of impactful service to the Fifth District of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer Officer Brandon Godspeed in his retirement.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. ANNE SKLEDER

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Brenau University's 10th president, Dr. Anne Skleder, who tragically passed after bravely battling cancer at Emory University Hospital in Atlanta.

Born in Pittsburgh, Anne studied psychology at the University of Pittsburgh and later earned her doctoral degree from Temple University. Dr. Skleder then incorporated her passion for people and learning into a successful career in academia—mentoring, teaching, and serving students for years.

Breaking glass ceilings, Anne went on to become the 10th and 1st woman president of Brenau University in Gainesville, Georgia. Yet it was not the title that she cherished, but rather the opportunity to improve the lives and futures of Brenau University students.

Her leadership extended beyond the campus, as she served on the executive committee of the Atlanta Regional Council of Higher Education and was a board member for numerous organizations, including the Women's College Coalition, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the Greater Hall Chamber of Commerce.

Our sincere condolences are with Anne's family as they mourn her loss. While her leadership and impact on our community will surely be missed, we cherish Dr. Skleder's legacy and find comfort in knowing that she has found eternal peace with her beloved parents and brother in the presence of our Heavenly Father.

Georgia's Ninth District will always remember the incredible impact that Dr. Skleder had on students at Brenau University and on our community as a whole.

HONORING EXCEPTIONAL BUSINESSES IN LUMPKIN COUNTY

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the exceptional businesses in Lumpkin County. The

Dahlonega-Lumpkin County Chamber of Commerce recently held its annual State of Economic Development meeting to recognize outstanding businesses in our community.

On behalf of the Ninth District, I would like to honor this year's winners.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Development Authority of Lumpkin County's Economic Investment Award recipient, Dahlongo, a successful transportation and tour company in north Georgia. This honor is well-deserved as Dahlongo continues to make incredible investments in the Lumpkin County community.

Additionally, I recognize this year's Corporate Responsibility Award recipient, R-Ranch in the Mountains, which creates a positive impact in Lumpkin County by offering northeast Georgians and tourists alike exceptional experiences through its more than 800 acres of campsites, trails, and lodging. Nestled in the beautiful north Georgia mountains, R-Ranch brings tremendous value to the community through its unique amenities and activities, cultivating economic growth and providing memorable adventures for families and outdoor enthusiasts.

I also congratulate Blue Coolers, the recipient of the Workforce Development award. In addition to manufacturing top-notch, durable coolers, this thriving company received this exciting honor for its impressive initiatives to train and equip individuals with skills and knowledge needed to maintain a strong workforce.

Next, I recognize Satellite Industries, a leading innovator in the portable sanitation industry, for receiving the Business of the Year Award.

For over 65 years, Satellite Industries has been advance engineering their products, such as portable restrooms and restroom trailers to be strong and user-friendly for customers across the country. I congratulate Satellite Industries on this outstanding achievement.

In addition, the city of Dahlonega Downtown Development Authority recognized several downtown businesses for their significant impact on the community this year.

These honors include Black Bear Mercantile as Emerging Business; Dahlonega Inn on Main for Downtown Investment; The Station, as the Local Favorite; and Connie's Ice Cream and Sandwich Shop for Downtown Business of the Year.

I congratulate the Dahlonega-Lumpkin County Chamber of Commerce's 2023 State of Economic Development award winners.

Mr. Speaker, I thank each of the recognized businesses for positively impacting our community, strengthening the future workforce in north Georgia, and fostering economic prosperity in Lumpkin County.

SINGLE SUBJECT RULE

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the former majority leader on

the Democrat side, just reminded us of our single subject rule that our Speaker cosponsored back in 2015. That is the current rule of the House, and yet my Democrat colleague wants us to violate it by lumping in aid for Ukraine, Taiwan, and Israel together with border security in one bill. No.

We have already passed a bill to support Israel. We have already passed a border security bill, H.R. 2. Both are languishing in the Democrat-controlled Senate. Where was the call for the Senate to stay here and do their job? He should have called upon the Senate, as I do now. Pass the Israel bill, pass the Secure the Border Act, and give both countries a merrier Christmas.

HIGHLIGHTING THE WORK BEING DONE FOR OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the work being done on behalf of our veterans, the work that my office has been working on.

Arizona's Sixth Congressional District is home to over 70,000 veterans. Our district has a historic legacy of service to our country from the servicemembers at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and Fort Huachuca to incredible veterans like Walter Ram, a World War II veteran and Purple Heart recipient.

In my role as their Congressman, I have made it my mission to secure as much assistance as possible for those who risk their lives for our freedom. That is why I made it a priority to help our veterans, servicemembers, and their families as they navigate Federal agencies. This year alone, my team has been able to return \$345,000 to veterans.

The responsibility to provide for them is not one I take lightly, and I am committed to ensuring they receive the care and support that they deserve.

This is something that extends to my time here in Washington. As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have made a concerted effort to introduce commonsense bills to improve the lives of those who serve. My first bill ever introduced in Congress, H.R. 1378, the Veterans' Appeals Backlog Improvement Act, aims to address the lengthy waiting period our veterans face when trying to appeal a claim at the VA.

I also led an effort to ensure and expand access to our veterans in rural areas seeking disability claims with two pieces of legislation: H.R. 5470, the Veterans Medical Exams for Distant Areas Act, and H.R. 5938, the Veterans Exam Expansion Act. It is critical that we ensure our veterans receive the same care no matter their ZIP Code.

The same goes for the educational benefits they receive. That is why I spearheaded H.R. 5702, the Expanding Access for Online Veteran Students Act, legislation to ensure our student

veterans taking classes virtually receive the same housing benefits as their counterparts taking classes in person. I learned about that need when I visited the veterans center over at the University of Arizona. This was highlighted, and we took immediate action.

We must ensure our veterans are equipped with the tools they need to successfully transition out of uniform and into civilian life. That includes a meaningful career, which is what led me to introducing H.R. 1669, the VET-TEC Authorization Act. The bill reauthorizes a popular VA program that covers the cost of veterans seeking job training in high-tech industries.

Each of these bills is a small effort to improve the lives of those who sacrifice so much.

On behalf of the people of Arizona's Sixth Congressional District, I extend my deepest gratitude to the incredible men and women who have served our country. While we will never be able to fully repay all of them who have served, we have a duty to fight for them as they fought for us.

□ 1130

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL (RET.) FRANCIS D. FAULCONER

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud Kentuckian, a great American patriot, and my great-uncle, Lieutenant Colonel (Ret.) Francis D. Faulconer, who passed away on October 19 at the age of 100.

My grandfather's younger brother was better known to many of us in central Kentucky as Fearless Frank Faulconer, the first weatherman for WKYT, later WTVQ, and finally WKQQ, where he delivered for us the weekly "Fearless Frank's Five Day Forecast."

What many don't know, however, is that before he became our weatherman, Frank had a distinguished military career.

After graduation from Lafayette High School in 1941, he enlisted in the United States Army in 1943 and took basic training at Camp Crowder, Missouri, a signal training facility. Overseas in Europe in 1944, Faulconer was transferred to the Liaison G3 Section of the First United States Army. In this capacity, he traveled with Combat Command A of the 3rd Armored "Spearhead" Division from Meaux, France, to Roetgen, Germany.

Service in the European theater of operation earned him five Bronze Stars for his service in Normandy, northern France, Rhineland, Central Europe, and the Ardennes.

Additionally, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Award for helping to escort the reserve elements of the combat command at night, from the rear to the forward elements of the battle line.

I will always remember my uncle telling me about tearing down Nazi swastikas from the churches along the battlefield so that American flags could signal the path of liberation.

Frank has now taken his rightful place in Heaven and in the history books, chronicling the story of American freedom alongside his beloved brother, my grandfather, Major General J. B. Faulconer, Army veteran of the Pacific theater, with the millions of other heroes of the Greatest Generation.

God bless all these heroes. We thank them for their service and for serving as a continual and powerful reminder to all of us that freedom requires sacrifice. It must be fought for.

May their example, the example of the Greatest Generation, always inspire us to continually fight for freedom and democracy.

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 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, we pause in this brief moment, acutely aware that beyond these Chambers are a host of issues that demand urgent attention and compete for increasingly limited resources. Outside the silence of this place, the drumbeat of need is deafening and resounds across the globe.

We pray to You, O Lord, for our world, for the ever more precarious position in which Ukraine finds itself, for the fog of war that has descended on Israel and Gaza, and for discord in our own discourse on just these two topics alone. Each of these is a crisis in its own right, and each is fraught with competing concerns that complicate even our best intentions.

Lord, You are not the author of confusion but of peace. Bring Your peace into our world and into this place, that our eyes would be open to Your leading, that our ears would hear, among the cacophony of voices that clamor to be heard, Your word of truth and justice. Out of our mouths may our words sow Your peace and reap a harvest of righteousness.

We give ourselves fully to the work of You, O Lord. May our labor for You and for this Nation never be in vain. In Your merciful name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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

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

CELEBRATING CLARA BARTON

(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 celebrate Clara Barton, the founder of the American Red Cross.

Clara is one of the most honored women in American history. From a young age, she was dedicated to service and helping others.

Clara started her career in Washington, D.C., working in the Federal Government. She was in D.C. at the start of the Civil War. Clara recognized the immediate need to help these newly recruited troops.

Clara spent the early days of the war collecting food and supplies for the Union Army. She would later risk her life heading to the field hospitals to volunteer and deliver medical services.

More than 140 years later, the Red Cross continues its service through its strong network of volunteers, donors, and partners. They continue to serve those in need by mobilizing the power of volunteers in times of emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, Clara Barton's birthday is on December 25. Her passion for service is an example to all of us. Her selflessness and determination to help others continues to inspire us to this day.

RECOGNIZING SARA CAPEN

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Sara Capen, chair of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas.

Sara, who also serves as executive director of the Niagara Falls Heritage Area, is a dedicated leader, collaborator, and facilitator committed to preserving and celebrating the Niagara region's rich history.

From the growth of the Discover Niagara Shuttle to the success of the Niagara Falls Underground Railroad Heritage Center, Sara has been the energy behind projects connecting people to stories, destinations, and to one another.

At the national level, Sara was the driving force behind approval of the National Heritage Areas Act, which reauthorizes all 45 heritage areas for the next 15 years, safeguarding and strengthening economic opportunities across the country.

We thank Sara Capen for her passion and commitment to ensuring America's history is woven into our future for generations to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAROLD HUDSON "RIP" WALLACE, JR.

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

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a cherished son of south Texas, Mr. Harold Hudson "Rip" Wallace, Jr., who was called home earlier this year.

Rip lived a life marked by service, dedication, and love. His 58 years of marriage to his beloved wife, Donna, stands as a testament to his commitment and love.

A respected rancher and community pillar, Rip's contribution to local agriculture, the Texas Farm Bureau, and his unwavering support for the Live Oak County Fair enriches our lives.

His legacy as a lifelong member of the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo will not be forgotten.

My heart goes out to Donna, their family, and to all those who were touched by Rip's remarkable life.

HONORING MAJOR-SELECT TERRELL K. BRAYMAN

(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, it is with deep sorrow I rise to acknowledge the loss of U.S. Air Force Major-Select Terrell K. Brayman of Pittsford, New York.

On November 29, Major-Select Brayman, an Osprey pilot and flight commander, perished during a training exercise off the coast of Japan along with seven of his fellow airmen.

Major-Select Brayman, who would have celebrated his 33rd birthday a week from today, grew up in Rochester and was described as hardworking and hilarious by those closest to him.

Following his graduation from high school, he enrolled in Ohio State's ROTC program, successfully becoming

an officer in the United States Air Force. He went on to serve with great distinction, demonstrating commitment to a cause greater than himself. For that, our community and Nation will be forever grateful.

My heartfelt condolences go out to his family and all who knew him. I hope they take comfort in knowing Major-Select Brayman's profound sense of duty, patriotism, and dedication to our country will forever remain his legacy.

DISASTROUS BIDENOMICS

(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, last month, the Biden press secretary falsely fabricated: "The data shows that households remain in a strong financial position."

In reality, even CBS News admits: "The typical American household must spend an additional \$11,434 annually just to maintain the same standard of living they enjoyed in January of 2021," when Biden was sworn in.

Additionally, it now requires \$119.27 to buy the same goods and services a family could afford with \$100 before the pandemic, according to Bloomberg.

Bidenomics is disastrous for families.

House Republicans, led by Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will continue to pass legislation to reduce inflation and create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America with Biden open borders for terrorists. It is sadly clear there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent in our country, as finally revealed by the FBI.

CONGRATULATING FREEDOM HIGH SCHOOL OF WOODBRIDGE FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Freedom High School of Woodbridge, Virginia, for winning its second straight Virginia Class 6 State football title.

Last Saturday, Freedom defeated Highland Springs in a hard-fought championship game. The Eagles won by a score of 42-34 to claim the title, making them the first Prince William County high school to win back-to-back State titles since 1999.

This win capped off an undefeated season for Freedom, and the Eagles extended their winning streak to an incredible 29 games.

As the Representative for Virginia's Seventh District, I officially congratulate Freedom High School's players and coaches, including head coach

Darryl Overton. I also congratulate the parents and faculty for supporting these players and student athletes and guiding them through a perfect season.

Today, on the House floor of the United States House of Representatives, I proudly join my colleagues in recognizing the remarkable accomplishments of the Freedom High School Eagles of Woodbridge, Virginia.

LET THEM TRUCK

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying in the trucking business: If you got it, a truck brought it.

We need to work to make the ability to deliver the products, the raw materials, all the interactions of commerce that trucks bring easier and more streamlined. The regulatory load that the Biden administration as well as my home State wants makes it harder to buy trucks.

They have had an unnecessary Federal excise tax since World War I on trucks to help pay for the war that costs \$20,000 to \$30,000 for every new vehicle, yet we want them to replace trucks, so they are cleaner, more efficient, and safer.

They want burdensome regulations on driver duty time, putting speed limiters on them so that trucks can't stay with traffic. All these burdens make it much more difficult to deliver what you want.

We need to reel in the Biden administration and have them actually listen to the people out there on the roads, the truckers and the people that rely on them to deliver raw materials and finished products.

More regulations are not going to help that. Taking away the internal combustion engine is not going to help that. Electrifying every truck is not going to help that. Let them truck.

CELEBRATING TWO INCREDIBLE TEAMS

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate two incredible teams whose hard work, determination, and teamwork have made their mark in Boston's storied championship history.

For the first time in the program's history, the Dorchester Eagles 14U team are Pop Warner national champions. Not to be outdone, the Boston Lady Raiders won the Bantam Division Cheer National Championship.

These young men and women have been playing and cheering together for years, and this hard-won championship is all the more sweeter after coming up just short in last year's tournament.

They rallied around their teammates, recommitted to their sport, put in the

work day in and day out, no matter what the New England weather could throw at them, and proved themselves to be the best of the best.

Your Congresswoman is proud of you.

Congratulations to the entire Metropolitan Pop Warner League, Coach Terry Cousins, the families and friends, and most of all, the athletes who were already champions in our community but now have the trophy and national recognition they so richly deserve.

Let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect the Dorchester Eagles and Boston Lady Raiders are the 2023 national champions. Congratulations.

□ 1215

IN RECOGNITION OF BILL OVERTON

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Bill Overton, a Vietnam veteran from Ohio who served his country and continues to serve his fellow veterans.

Bill has been the loudest spokesperson for veterans and veterans programs in northeast Ohio. He has assisted over 300 veterans with their compensation and benefits.

Bill has been able to ensure hospice veterans receive care, injured veterans receive compensation, and disabled veterans obtain vehicles and adaptive housing. His work has brought approximately \$5 million to veterans in our community alone.

When the Battlefield Cross was removed from the Ohio Western Reserve in 2017, Bill was instrumental in applying public pressure on the National Cemetery Administration to return it.

Ohio's Seventh District is thankful to have Bill Overton and is grateful for his years of service, and for his service that will still continue.

Mr. Speaker, Bill is loved. We thank him for everything he does.

SHAM IMPEACHMENT PUSH

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, the Rhode Islanders who I talk to are so disappointed in this Congress. They sent us here to fight to make their lives better, not to play political games, like the sham impeachment push that House Republicans are making against the President, despite no evidence of wrongdoing.

The people expect us to fight to lower costs, to go after the companies that are price gouging working Americans. They expect us to fight for Social Security and Medicare and abortion rights, and to fix roads and bridges.

Instead, the extreme House Republicans are pushing for impeachment of the President, despite having no evidence of wrongdoing after a year of investigations. We need to remember who

sent us here and what they sent us here to fight for.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to fight for working people in this country. Stop the political games. Stop the nonsense.

RECOGNIZING DR. G.B. ESPY ON HIS 88TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. G.B. Espy, obstetrician, gynecologist, world traveler, entrepreneur, man of God, and one of the finest men I have ever known.

On January 8, Dr. Espy will turn 88 years old.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Espy has delivered over 65,000 babies; has performed at least as many surgeries; has run 40 consecutive New York marathons, including the last one at the age of 80; and he has contributed to countless scholarships, missions, and supported friends all over the world.

Congratulations on a life well lived. God bless you. We love you. Semper Fidelis.

MAUI MINUTE: MAUI MAHALO

(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, for my final Maui minute this year, I rise on behalf of my constituents to offer a heartfelt "mahalo," "thank you," to everyone who has played a role in our recovery so far:

To the first responders on that dreadful day who fought the fires and brought people to safety;

To the countless Federal workers, disaster personnel and volunteers, and everyday citizens who have worked tirelessly each day since August 8 to ensure our people get the help they need and deserve;

To the people of Hawaii and from all 50 States and over 100 countries for their outpouring of support and aloha, including raising hundreds of millions of dollars for our Maui community;

To my colleagues here, who have joined me on the ground and reached out since, mahalo.

For too many Maui survivors, this holiday season will be the first without a loved one, without a home they have known their whole lives, and with an uncertain future.

The road ahead to recovery will continue to be long and tough, but we will be there.

From the depths of my heart, mahalo.

CONGRATULATING MAYFIELD CARDINALS AND BOYLE COUNTY REBELS ON STATE CHAMPIONSHIP WINS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise to recognize two football powerhouses in the First Congressional District of Kentucky upon their recent winning of State championships.

First of all, I recognize perennial State champion, the Mayfield Cardinals on another class 2A State football championship, and I also recognize the Boyle County Rebels on their three-peat as State champions.

Mayfield won the 2A class title in Kentucky High School athletics and Boyle County won the 4A. These are common achievements for both football programs. I congratulate all the players, the staff, the faculty, and the entire communities of Mayfield and Boyle County on this great achievement.

REPUBLICANS ARE FOCUSED ON THE WRONG PRIORITIES

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

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats were in control, we put people over politics and passed the Inflation Reduction Act to lower costs and to create new jobs. We are also working with the Biden administration to eliminate junk fees, and we have legislation to address childcare costs, and to go after people who engage in price gouging.

What do Democrats care about? We care about how we lower costs, create new jobs, and get our economy going. Because of that, we have had record GDP growth and unemployment at a 50-year low.

What are Republicans focused on? They are focused on impeachment with no evidence. Even today, they cannot explain what action President Biden took that they thought was illegal or criminal.

That is right. They are going forward with impeachment, even though they cannot explain what crime they think President Biden committed, because he didn't commit any. It is a waste of people's time.

Republicans are, again, focused on the wrong priorities.

HONORING MAYOR STEVE TRIPP

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Steve Tripp for his 30 years of service to the residents of the town of Ayden, North Carolina, including the past 20 years as mayor.

Mayor Tripp has been instrumental in addressing critical housing needs and growth while reducing the town's utility rates. He is also known for his faith.

Mayor Tripp's dedication has set up the town of Ayden for decades and dec-

ades of success, and we are so grateful for him and his many contributions to eastern North Carolina.

I extend my most profound blessings to him and his wife, Susan.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY ON PRESIDENT BIDEN

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

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, we are about to begin the impeachment inquiry debate, and my Republican colleagues are going to show you how important it is to them.

They are going to show you how much evidence they have supposedly uncovered. They are going to show you how serious of an issue they think this is.

Do you want to know why? Because as soon as we take this vote today, you know what they are going to do? They are going to break for 3 weeks. They are going to run out of this place and leave for 3 weeks, even though it is so important and it is so overwhelming and the Nation must be focused on this, that they are going to run away and leave Washington for 3 weeks.

It is because there is no evidence on Joe Biden. The only thing they have uncovered is that Joe Biden is the father of Hunter Biden.

That is it.

LONG ISLANDERS SUBSIDIZING SPENDING

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

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Long Islanders have paid much more in taxes to both Washington and Albany than we have received back in investments.

Published recently, the Long Island Regional Planning Council's 2023 Balance of Payments comparison highlights this disparity—a Long Island-D.C. deficit of \$26 billion; and a Long Island-New York State deficit of \$15 billion.

Mr. Speaker, addressing this injustice where Long Islanders subsidize Albany's and Washington's bloated spending is vitally important to my constituents.

To right this wrong, Albany lawmakers must implement judicious spending cuts and reduce income taxes, while at the same time providing proper investments in Long Island's infrastructure and schools.

Here in Washington, Congress must increase the State and local tax deduction cap. By increasing the cap, Congress can make a substantial impact on lowering the cost for all New Yorkers.

The collaboration between State and Federal entities on these comprehensive measures is crucial for securing a brighter and more prosperous future for Long Islanders.

**ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 931

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Amo (to rank immediately after Ms. McClellan).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DIRECTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES
TO CONTINUE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF JOSEPH BIDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 918 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 918

Resolved, That the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary are directed to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Joseph Biden, President of the United States of America, including as set forth in the memorandum issued by the Chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary of the House of Representatives, entitled "Impeachment Inquiry", dated September 27, 2023.

**SEC. 2. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.**

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability

if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

(6) The Committee on Oversight and Accountability may issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Committee on Oversight and Accountability may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution. The chair may transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. Any report prepared under this paragraph may be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committees on Ways and Means and on the Judiciary.

**SEC. 3. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.**

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on Ways and Means may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on Ways and Means if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—

(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

(6) The Committee on Ways and Means may issue a report setting forth its findings and any recommendations and appending any information and materials the Committee on Ways and Means may deem appropriate with respect to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

The chair may transmit such report and appendices, along with any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views filed pursuant to clause 2(l) of rule XI, to the Committee on the Judiciary and make such report publicly available in electronic form, with appropriate redactions to protect classified and other sensitive information. Any report prepared under this paragraph may be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability and on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

For the purpose of continuing the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to conduct proceedings pursuant to this resolution as follows:

(1) The chair of the Committee on the Judiciary may designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section.

(2) Notwithstanding clause 2(j)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, upon recognition by the chair for such purpose under this paragraph during any hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1), the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than five minutes, as determined by the chair. The time available for each period of questioning under this paragraph shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member. The chair may confer recognition for multiple periods of such questioning, but each period of questioning shall not exceed 90 minutes in the aggregate. Only the chair and ranking minority member, or an employee of the Committee on the Judiciary if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member, may question witnesses during such periods of questioning. At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the five-minute rule pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(A) of rule XI.

(3) To allow for full evaluation of minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony relevant to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution within 72 hours after notice is given for the first hearing designated pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of this resolution.

(4)(A) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(i) by subpoena or otherwise—
(I) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(II) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(ii) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(B) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to subparagraph (A), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(C) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking mi-

nority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(5) The chair is authorized to make publicly available in electronic form the transcripts of depositions conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary in furtherance of the investigation described in the first section of this resolution, with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.

SEC. 5. IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY PROCEDURES IN THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

(a) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to conduct proceedings relating to the impeachment inquiry described in the first section of this resolution pursuant to the procedures submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on Rules, including such procedures as to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel.

(b) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to promulgate additional procedures as it deems necessary for the fair and efficient conduct of committee hearings held pursuant to this resolution, provided that the additional procedures are not inconsistent with the procedures referenced in subsection (a), the Rules of the Committee, and the Rules of the House.

(c)(1) The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation—

(A) by subpoena or otherwise—
(i) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition); and

(ii) the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents; and

(B) by interrogatory, the furnishing of information.

(2) In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member pursuant to paragraph (1), the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the chair shall convene the committee promptly to render that decision, subject to the notice procedures for a committee meeting under clause 2(g)(3)(A) and (B) of rule XI.

(3) Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be signed by the ranking minority member, and may be served by any person designated by the ranking minority member.

(4) The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to report to the House of Representatives resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations.

SEC. 6. ADOPTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 917.

House Resolution 917 is hereby adopted.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to re-

vide and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 918.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad day for myself, for the institution, and most of all for the American people. My duty today is one I do not relish. I am sure that every other Member of this institution feels the same way.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported out a measure under our original jurisdiction. H. Res. 918 formalizes an inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President of the United States.

Three months ago, at the direction of then-Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY, three committees—those of Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary—began this impeachment inquiry.

Over the succeeding months, the committees have done their work and have done it well. The inquiry is now at an inflection point. The three committees are nearing the end of their investigations. The White House has chosen this moment to stonewall and resist the legitimate investigative powers of the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe the House must hold a vote on the floor to initiate an impeachment inquiry, doing so may be said to be best practice.

We are taking up today's resolution that will formalize the impeachment inquiry that has already begun. This will ensure not only that the inquiry has the full authority of the House but also that the House can enforce its subpoenas and ensure that the Biden administration can no longer refuse to cooperate with the investigation.

I will briefly describe the procedures for this inquiry. The resolution tasks three committees—Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary—with continuing their current inquiries. It establishes procedures for conducting hearings and calling and questioning witnesses. It grants the minority equal time to question witnesses and the right to request their own witnesses.

At the conclusion of their proceedings, it provides for the Committees on Oversight and Accountability and Ways and Means to transmit their findings and supporting documents to the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the committee that traditionally considers impeachment matters. It gives the President the right to participate in the proceedings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Finally, the resolution authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to transmit to the House resolutions, Articles of Impeachment, or other recommendations.

The procedures we are adopting today closely parallel those the Democrats created in 2019. In fact, H. Res.

660 from the 116th Congress was our guide. After all, those procedures are now a precedent of the House.

Mr. Speaker, impeachment, especially impeachment of a President, is a starkly serious matter. It is something that no Member of the House should want to do. The House has rights and obligations under the Constitution. We are charged with providing the oversight of the executive branch, and we are the sole institution in the country granted the awesome power of impeachment. It is a power that must be used selectively and wisely, and only after full deliberation.

With today's resolution, we are ensuring that the House will be able to complete its inquiry. We will secure the evidence we need and uncover the facts we need to make that full and fair determination.

Only at the end of the road can we make a decision on how to proceed. I take no joy in today's resolution, but I know the House will do its duty. We owe our committees, the institution, and the Constitution no less.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here for one reason and one reason alone: Donald Trump demanded that Republicans impeach, so they are going to impeach.

These Republicans don't work for you, the American people. They work for Donald Trump. He says, "Jump." They respond, "How high?"

□ 1245

This whole thing is an extreme political stunt. It has no credibility, no legitimacy, and no integrity. It is a sideshow and a distraction from the fact that Republicans have done nothing.

They have the wrong priorities. The American people think they are failing miserably, and Republicans need a diversion. So they are weaponizing and abusing impeachment—one of the most somber and serious things that Congress can do—to attack President Joe Biden.

I get it. They are upset Donald Trump lost. Some of them still don't believe he lost. Many of them are upset that his violent insurrection did not succeed on January 6, and today they want to finish the job. This is a continuation of their crusade to overturn the election.

They have spent a year dredging up every conspiracy you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, against Joe Biden, and still their own investigation, their own Members, their own witnesses, and their own internal documents all say that President Joe Biden is a man of integrity who follows the law. Every single one of their crazy claims has been exhaustively debunked, and, yet, here we are.

The only thing they have uncovered is that Joe Biden is a good dad and that he loves his family. His son Hunter lost his mom and sister in a terrible car accident and lost his brother to cancer. He experienced a lot of traumas, and, sadly, he got caught up with drugs. Republicans are weaponizing this addiction and using it to attack President Biden, a man of decency and integrity.

Frankly, it is one of, if not the most, despicable thing I have seen in my whole career here in Congress.

Republicans talk about an open and transparent process. Give me a break.

Yesterday, Rules Committee Republicans blocked Democrats from adding the words "open and transparent" to this resolution. They voted against requiring a single open hearing. They didn't even put our amendment in the official committee report. I have never seen anything like that. They are so afraid of openness and transparency that they are literally trying to hide our amendments from the public record.

They don't want an open and transparent process. They are allergic to transparency. They want no transparency, so they can go on FOX News, distort the facts, and keep this whole ridiculous charade going. Their whole investigation is built on lies. It is an extreme political stunt designed to distract from how incompetent Republicans are and how obsessed they are with Donald Trump, a twice impeached ex-President who has been indicted more times than he has been elected. How pathetic.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), who is the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 918. Joe Biden has repeatedly lied to the American people about his family's corrupt influence-peddling schemes. He told the American people he never spoke to his son about his family's business dealings. He claimed there was an absolute wall between his official government duties as Vice President and his family. He said that his family never made money from China.

All of these are blatant lies. Our investigation has revealed how Joe Biden knew of, participated in, and benefited from his family cashing in on the Biden name around the world.

Since January we have learned some of the following:

The Bidens created 20 shell companies, most of which were created when Joe Biden was Vice President. The Bidens and their associates then raked in over \$24 million through these shell companies from China, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Romania between 2014 and 2019. At least 10 members of the Biden family have benefited or participated in these schemes.

The Bidens layered these payments through their bank accounts to hide

the sources of the money. The banks even flagged many of these transactions in more than 150 suspicious activity reports to the Treasury Department.

One bank investigator was so concerned about Hunter Biden's financial transactions with a Chinese company that he wanted to reevaluate the bank's relationship with him. He noted that his transactions served no current business purpose. That is what I call a shell company.

According to Devon Archer, a Biden family associate, Joe Biden was the brand of the business. The brand showed up.

Joe Biden spoke to his son's associates by speakerphone more than 20 times, dined with foreign oligarchs and a Burisma executive, and had coffee with Hunter's Chinese associate all when he was Vice President.

Weeks after Joe Biden left the Vice Presidency, money from this Chinese Communist Party-linked entity began to make its way to the bank accounts of several Biden family members.

Based on one Biden associate's interview with the FBI, these payments were sent to the Bidens as a thank you.

Ask any Justice Department public corruption investigator about the importance of payments received after one leaves public office. It is a hallmark of corruption.

We are now at a pivotal moment in our investigation. We will soon depose and interview several members of the Biden family and their associates about these influence-peddling schemes, but we are facing obstruction from the White House. The White House is seeking to block key testimony from current and former White House staff. It is also withholding thousands of records from Joe Biden's time as Vice President.

Joe Biden must be held accountable for his lies, corruption, and obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this necessary and important resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would need a map to get out of the rabbit hole Mr. COMER just took us down.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, if you want to know what an impeachable offense looks like, here it is: When that man, the wannabe dictator, told that angry, violent mob to attack this Capitol Building where we all are right now to overturn a free and fair election. That is what a smoking gun looks like.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), who is the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason mysteries are called whodunits is because they start with a crime, and then you have to try to figure out who did it.

The Biden impeachment investigation isn't a whodunit, it is a what is it.

It is like an Agatha Christie novel where the mystery is: What is the crime?

That gets very tedious very fast. After 11 months of this, no one can tell us what President Biden's crime was, much less where it happened, when it happened, what the motive was, who the perpetrators were, or who the victims were.

Maybe the funniest thing I have ever seen in Congress was yesterday in the Rules Committee when Congressman NEGUSE kept asking Congressman RESCHENTHALER what the crime was? Congressman RESCHENTHALER—who is not on the Oversight and Reform Committee and is apparently just waking up to the joke—kept saying that he didn't know what it was, but that is why we need an impeachment investigation, to find out.

Congressman NEGUSE kept asking him: But what will the impeachment investigation be looking for?

Finally, Congressman RESCHENTHALER said: A high crime or misdemeanor.

And Congressman NEGUSE said: Yes, but which one?

Now Congressman NEGUSE, of course, was involved in a real impeachment investigation of a real Presidential offense: the incitement of a violent political insurrection against this Congress, against the Vice President of the United States, against the Constitution, and against the election of 2020.

We did not need Sherlock Holmes and a magnifying glass to find the Presidential crime with Donald Trump. It came right into this House and smashed us in the face.

Now, it is true Chairman COMER has collected a mountain of evidence over the last 11 months: tens of thousands of pages of documents and dozens of hours of interviews with dozens of officials, but all of it clearly shows that Joe Biden committed no crime. Even their own witnesses, whom they called to the only public hearing they had, said that there is not remotely enough evidence to justify impeachment.

Chairman COMER has bragged on FOX News about procuring 100 percent compliance with his subpoenas, so forget about obstruction, which I hear them muttering about today.

Mr. Speaker, I played a game with the little kids at our family Thanksgiving. I asked them whether they had seen my henway. When they said, What's a henway? I said, about 4 or 5 pounds. It is a dad joke, and some of the bigger kids got it.

Nevertheless, when I asked the little kids, like 3 or 4 years of age, if they had seen my henway, they said: What's a henway? I said 3 or 4 pounds. They started looking for it. When the other kids came along and asked what they were doing, they said: We are looking for Uncle Jamie's henway. Then for hours they were looking everywhere for my henway, under the sofa and under the chairs, and it could go on for days like that.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for the Republican Party's henway. It just weighs 3 or 4 pounds, but it is costing us tens of millions of dollars. So please forgive me for spoiling the party here, but I want to say this to America: There is no henway. This stupid, blundering investigation is keeping us from getting any real work done for the people of America.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a story as old as the hills.

You have got a politician who does certain things. Those actions then benefit his family financially. Then there is an effort to conceal it and sweep it under the rug.

The best example is to go back to the Ukrainian energy company Burisma.

There are four key facts about Hunter Biden's involvement with this company and Joe Biden's involvement.

First, Hunter Biden gets put on the board of Burisma. Second, he is not qualified to be on the board of Burisma. Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker, he said it himself.

Third, he is asked by the executives of Burisma: Can you weigh in with Washington, D.C., to help alleviate the pressure we are under?

Three days later the Vice President of the United States, now-President Joe Biden, goes to Ukraine and conditions American tax dollars for Ukraine on the firing of the prosecutor who was applying the pressure to the company Hunter Biden was on the board of.

That is why we are going with an official impeachment inquiry vote today. That is why this needs to be investigated.

There are two resolutions we are considering. They are H. Res. 918 and H. Res. 917, incorporated if we pass H. Res. 918.

There are three names mentioned in those two resolutions. One name, of course, is Joe Biden, the President of the United States. However, the other two names in H. Res. 917 are two Department of Justice tax lawyers, Mark Daly and Jack Morgan. They are the two guys we want to talk to that the Biden Justice Department says we are not going to let you talk to.

With this vote we think we will get to talk to those individuals. Here is why it is important: These two individuals initially said that there should be felony tax charges for 2014 and 2015 in the Hunter Biden investigation.

That is important because those are the years when the bulk of the income from Burisma came to Hunter Biden. They initially said that there should be felony tax charges for those years. Then they changed their position. Eight months later they changed their position, and we want to know why.

Why did you intentionally let the statute of limitations lapse for those years?

My theory is that it is one thing to charge Hunter Biden on a gun charge in Delaware, but it is another thing to charge him on Burisma tax years because that gets you to Joe Biden and that gets you to the White House. That is why we need this vote.

The impeachment power, as the chairman said, is the power that solely resides in the House. When you have a majority of the House of Representatives go on record, that then sends a message. We think we will get timely participation from the witnesses we need to talk to, and the documents Mr. COMER has been seeking.

Finally, I would say this about this changing story from the White House and this changing story from the Justice Department. Today, Hunter Biden did a press conference. He was supposed to be in a deposition, but he did a press conference. At that press conference he said: My father was not financially involved in the business.

That is an important qualifier. We haven't heard that. For 3 years we haven't heard that. All we have heard is that Joe Biden had no involvement. Now his son does a press conference when he is supposed to be deposed, and he says that he wasn't financially involved.

What involvement was it?

We know there were phone calls, dinners, and meetings.

What involvement was it?

That is why we want to ask these questions with important witnesses, and that is why this resolution is important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I need to get a decoder ring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a distinguished member of Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, every conspiracy theory we just heard has been debunked, not true, and distorted from the facts because this impeachment inquiry is political vengeance directed by a twice-impeached, four times indicted President and carried out by extreme MAGA Republicans.

Republicans rejected my amendment to require the committees to hold at least one public hearing.

Why?

It is because 11 months and a mountain of evidence and documents gathered so far prove that President Biden respected the rule of law and fought corruption.

Republicans want to continue a secret investigation so they can distort the facts.

For example, Republicans tried to create a scandal about the \$4,140 Hunter paid to his dad in 2018.

What really happened?

Joe Biden paid his son's truck payments while Hunter struggled with addiction. Hunter paid his dad back. A parent's love is never without pain. A

parent doesn't stop loving a child struggling with addiction.

Americans will see in those truck payments some of their own attempts to help their struggling kids.

Shame on my colleagues for politicizing a parent's pain. Americans know what evidence of an impeachment looks like.

The Capitol Police who were battered and beaten as Trump tried to overturn an election know what an impeachable offense feels like.

This puppet show is more of the same attack on our democracy that we saw here.

□ 1300

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, today, on the very day Hunter Biden ignored a subpoena from this body, we will vote to take the next critical step in formalizing the House's impeachment inquiry into President Biden.

For months, the White House and Hunter Biden have been stonewalling our investigation trying to hide the truth, and this stonewalling is what has caused us to be here today. Like Chairman COLE said yesterday, it is deeply sad and not something any of us want to be doing on this House floor, but it has become necessary.

Following today's floor vote on H. Res. 918, the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary will have greater legal position and subpoena power to fully investigate allegations of influence peddling and wrongdoing by President Biden, his family, and his associates.

The American people deserve transparency and accountability. They deserve the truth, and that is exactly what they are going to get from this Republican House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I remind the gentlewoman that Hunter Biden was here today. He wants to testify in public, but Republicans said no because they want to do it behind closed doors so they can go on FOX News and cherry-pick facts and figures and distort the truth.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans aren't interested in transparency in this investigation, and apparently the Rules Committee isn't either. In our markup yesterday, Democrats offered nine amendments. They were all voted down by Republicans, but in the official Rules Committee report, contrary to years of committee practice and tradition, the majority left out descriptions of those amendments.

Instead of reading, for example, that Republicans defeated an amendment to add "open and transparent" to investigative proceedings, members of the public will only see that Republicans voted down "amendment No. 4."

Instead of defeating an amendment requiring committees to hold an open

hearing as part of the investigation, the RECORD will show that the majority simply voted down "amendment No. 5."

Republicans are literally hiding Democratic amendments about transparency. You cannot make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker, and this is especially shocking to me because it is so out of line with the way this committee has run historically under this chairman. I am deeply disappointed, and I hope that this isn't an indication of how the majority intends to operate in the future.

Further, to make sure that these amendments show up somewhere in this historical RECORD, I am going to put the summaries in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the summaries of our nine amendments, which Republicans intentionally left out of the Rules Committee report.

DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS TO H. RES. 918

1. Offered by Rep. McGovern—adds a preamble describing President Joe Biden's career of honorable public service and former President Trump's multiple impeachments and 91 pending felony charges.

2. Offered by Rep. Leger Fernandez—Adds a preamble stating that the months-long Republican-led investigation into President Joe Biden has yielded no evidence of wrongdoing by the President.

3. Offered by Rep. Scanlon—Adds a preamble describing the tens of thousands of pages of records provided by the Administration and dozens of hours of testimony heard as part of the investigation.

4. Offered by Rep. Neguse—Adds "Open and Transparent" to investigative proceedings by the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary.

5. Offered by Rep. Leger Fernandez—Requires the committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary to each hold at least one open hearing as part of the investigation.

6. Offered by Rep. Scanlon—Provides that a chair or ranking member cannot issue a subpoena in furtherance of the impeachment inquiry if they did not comply with a House, committee, or select committee subpoena.

7. Offered by Rep. McGovern—Strikes the provision deeming H. Res. 917 as adopted.

8. Offered by Rep. McGovern—Amends H. Res. 917 to exclude access to grand jury material related to a pending criminal prosecution, a prosecution arising from the January 6 attack on the Capitol, or a case in which former President Trump is a defendant.

9. Offered by Rep. Neguse—Adds a preamble stating that by December 11 in the first session of the 117th and 116th Congresses, 71 and 78 bills had been enacted, respectively, versus 22 in the 118th Congress; and stating that the House spent 26 days electing two Speakers in 2023.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just for the RECORD, all these amendments are on the website of the Rules Committee. It is not like they are mysteriously hidden someplace. They are in plain view on the website of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.

NORMAN), my good friend and also a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this impeachment inquiry. I hope all the public tuned into the Rules Committee yesterday. My question: What are you scared of? What facts do you not want to come out? That was so evident. You spent more time quoting Donald Trump, January 6, anything but the facts about what Hunter Biden and his family did.

The checks don't make themselves up that are written to this family. LLC accounts don't make themselves up. These are facts. What more to come out that you are hiding is so evident.

This resolution follows the bar set by Democrats during the impeachment proceedings in 2019. We are playing by the same rules the Democrats set. If Democrats thought this process was fair for President Trump, they should think it is fair for President Biden.

The evidence against the Bidens I think will come out and finally show what the trail is and the fact that there are consequences. You cannot just say you are innocent and not have to prove it. I fully support this inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Members should be advised that Joe Biden, not Hunter Biden, is President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we all know why we are here today.

The majority has no accomplishments to speak of. Their own Members have said so, and the rightwing is getting restless.

So since they can't legislate and run on anything positive, they have decided to tear down President Biden instead. They have no evidence, of course, to support this inquiry, but since this majority never lets facts get in the way of a good set of FOX News talking points, here we are.

Dozens of witnesses have sat for transcribed interviews. Every one of those witnesses tells us the same thing: There was no political interference in the Hunter Biden case. Nobody at the Department of Justice ever blocked the special counsel from bringing charges. Unfortunately, the American public does not have most of this story because Chairman JORDAN refuses to release the transcripts from our interviews.

In fact, of the 85 interviews our committee has conducted so far, he has released exactly one transcript. He knows if he releases any more than that, his preferred narrative will crumble. The evidence simply does not support these baseless charges. Why is the MAGA wing of the Republican Party resorting to this political stunt? Two words: Donald Trump.

The likely nominee of the Republican Party, who faces 91 criminal charges in various courts, was also impeached not once, but twice, and we had evidence. Whenever the former President is accused of wrongdoing, his favorite move is to accuse his opponent of doing the same.

For this to work, of course, he needs President Biden to be impeached, too. Therefore, he asked his enablers in Congress to invent an impeachment, even if there is not a shred of evidence to back it up. Even if everything Chairman COMER said were true, which none of it is, an impeachable offense committed by Vice President Biden would not be under our Constitution grounds for impeaching President Biden.

This is political hackery, not serious work. We should be focused on doing the work of the American people and not be distracted by pernicious nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote “no” on this ridiculous resolution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, this is an impeachment inquiry, defined as an act of asking for information—nothing more, nothing less.

The inquiry is to further investigate at least three things: One, the extent to which Joe Biden as Vice President was involved with the flow of millions of dollars from foreign companies and interests in China, in Ukraine, into the Biden family, into numerous shell companies, including Hunter and his involvement. Devon Archer testified the Vice President was, in fact, at Hunter’s business meetings and there are numerous emails and other evidence indicating that the “Big Guy” or “Dad” was involved.

Two, the extent to which Joe Biden has lied about his involvement, involvement that Hunter all but acknowledged today when avoiding his deposition in a show press conference on the Capitol steps by carefully saying his dad was not involved financially in his businesses.

Three, the extent to which Biden and his administration have obstructed justice by preventing Jack Morgan and Mark Daly with the Department of Justice from testifying to their involvement in DOJ and IRS deciding to slow-walk 2014 and 2015 tax charges so the statute of limitations would lapse.

This is made all the more interesting in light of Hunter Biden being indicted just last week on nine counts of tax offenses for failing to pay \$1.4 million in back taxes after writing off hookers and sex clubs. All of this was only brought to light because the judge called the bluff of Weiss’ sweetheart deal; second, by only providing 14 of 82,000 emails with pseudonyms of which 29,000 were tied to Biden’s family businesses; third, by limiting the scope of witness testimony from Department of

Justice witnesses over and over and over again.

This is an impeachment inquiry. That is all. What are my Democratic colleagues afraid of if there is nothing to see there? Maybe that is all the more reason for the inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in shock and frustration at our Republican colleagues’ do-nothing Congress. Seinfeld would have called this the impeachment about nothing. They are leading the most unproductive session since the Great Depression, and after manufacturing crisis after crisis, weeks of trying to choose a Speaker, and putting their record-breaking economic recovery, which is nonexistent, under the spotlight, they think that formalizing a fishing expedition will dress it up enough for the American people to believe them.

This is not the work of the Ways and Means Committee. The greatness of this committee has nothing to do with an impeachment proceeding, and how the Ways and Means got involved in this baffles Republican and Democratic members of the committee.

The truth is, it has been nearly a year and not a shred of evidence has shown any wrongdoing or interference by Joe Biden.

Their recycled conspiracy theories continue to be debunked. They continue to mistake Congress, a legislative body, for a law enforcement body. In their only public hearing, their own witnesses conceded that there isn’t evidence to warrant moving forward.

The gentleman from South Carolina said we are trying to hide something. I moved in the Ways and Means Committee to have the whistleblowers’ testimony done in full public for observation. They turned it down.

Meanwhile, we are staring at another Republican government shutdown at the beginning of tax filing season. Enough with this obsession with one person, Joe Biden. The Ways and Means Democrats are concerned about all members of the American family and for the taxpayer that is about to be impeded because of the work that is being done on impeachment instead of on tax reform.

This is where we find ourselves—nothing here, no evidence, no wrongdoing after a year—a waste of time for the American people, a waste of time for a Congress that should be addressing the real problems of the American family.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), my very good friend and distinguished Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, President Biden has hidden from the American people his knowledge of and role in his family’s overseas business dealings.

Even in the face of overwhelming evidence, showing his knowledge and involvement, President Biden still refuses to come clean. So far, two key DOJ witnesses have failed to show for congressionally subpoenaed depositions after DOJ directed them not to appear. Other witnesses have refused to answer certain questions from investigators and the Biden administration has refused to turn over many of the documents requested by Congress, claiming this inquiry was not properly authorized.

Let there be no mistake: Today’s vote asserts Congress’ authority to conduct an impeachment inquiry and gather all the evidence to proceed with our investigation.

The American people deserve answers.

Here is what we know so far: The existence of multiple email aliases suggest that Joe Biden was deliberately trying to conceal his activities from the public, including one-on-one communications with a key Hunter Biden business partner during his Vice Presidency.

We also learned that investigators were blocked from looking into potential campaign finance crimes by the Biden campaign. Hunter Biden had only known Kevin Morris, a Democrat donor, for 2 months before Morris started settling his tax debts to the tune of about \$2 million and then spent about \$3 million more to cover Hunter’s lifestyle.

In the midst of the 2020 campaign, just weeks before Super Tuesday primary elections that would decide the future of Joe Biden’s candidacy, Morris emailed Hunter Biden’s business associates and there was “considerable risk personally and politically” to not filing his late taxes, but the only person who faced political risk was Joe Biden, whose campaign the whistleblowers had reason to believe Morris was speaking to.

As Members of Congress, we have to abide by campaign finance limits and so must the President. Morris’ millions in payments to cover Hunter Biden’s taxes and other financial obligations appeared to the whistleblowers to be an illegal donation to the Biden campaign.

Unfortunately, they were blocked from investigating further. Time and again, when investigators found a lead that pointed to Joe Biden, DOJ stepped in and prevented them from pursuing it.

□ 1315

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the evidence released by the whistleblowers, the DOJ indicted Hunter Biden on nine tax charges, including three felonies. Everything the whistleblowers told us about the Hunter Biden tax case has been proven

right. I am convinced they are also right about the links to Joe Biden they were prevented from following.

Mr. Speaker, Congress owes it to the American people to follow the facts wherever they lead and pass this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from Time magazine titled, “‘Absolutely Shocking’: Impeachment Experts Say Biden Inquiry May Be Weakest in U.S. History.”

[From TIME, Sept. 12, 2023]

‘ABSOLUTELY SHOCKING’: IMPEACHMENT EXPERTS SAY BIDEN INQUIRY MAY BE WEAKEST IN U.S. HISTORY

(By Mini Racker)

Speaker Kevin McCarthy took the rare step on Tuesday of announcing the launch of an impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden over his son Hunter’s foreign business dealings.

The House has voted to impeach just three Presidents: Andrew Johnson, Bill Clinton, and Donald Trump, who was impeached twice. But even the launch of an impeachment inquiry against a President has only happened a handful of times. Two impeachment experts tell TIME that there is less evidence implicating Biden of wrongdoing than in any of those previous inquiries.

“This is very disturbing for people who study past impeachments, because impeachment is really a very extreme measure,” says constitutional scholar Philip Bobbitt, a professor at Columbia Law School and expert on the history of impeachment who co-authored an updated edition of Charles Black’s classic legal text, *Impeachment: A Handbook*, in 2018. “I honestly don’t know that there is any evidence tying the president to corrupt activities when he was vice president or now.”

Frank Bowman, professor emeritus at the University of Missouri school of law and author of the book *High Crimes and Misdemeanors: A History of Impeachment for the Age of Trump*, said that McCarthy’s decision did not appear to be based on the evidence House Republicans have gathered thus far.

“Biden’s Republican pursuers have got exactly zero, zip, bupkis, on any matter that might be impeachable,” says Bowman.

The Constitution gives Congress the right to impeach and remove from office a president, vice president, or federal civil officer for committing “treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.” Historically, before the House votes on impeachment itself—the misconduct charge brought by a legislative body—it has usually launched an impeachment inquiry, a formal mechanism that moves the process along. However, an inquiry is not a legal requirement for impeaching a president, and the rules around what constitutes one are poorly defined.

According to Bowman, setting aside whether the five previous presidents who faced impeachment proceedings ought to have been impeached and convicted, there was at least some evidence indicating that they committed misconduct. The impeachment inquiry into President Richard Nixon, who resigned before the House could formally impeach him, was preceded by a special prosecutor investigation examining his ties to the Watergate burglary, as well as a Senate Special Committee inquiry into the break-in that stretched more than a year and reporting by journalists suggesting that responsibility for the incident and attempts to cover it up stretched into the administra-

tion. Two decades later, nearly a month before the House launched an impeachment inquiry into President Bill Clinton, independent counsel Ken Starr released a report outlining 11 possible grounds for impeachment, including lying under oath and obstructing justice.

“In every single case, there was very significant evidence of presidential wrongdoing before the formal inquiry was begun,” Bowman says. “The House, and House leadership, took the responsibility of formally opening such an inquiry extremely seriously. Nancy Pelosi, in the first impeachment, resisted calls for impeachment of Trump for two years.”

McCarthy’s inquiry, Bowman suggests, lacks that discipline.

“What they’re doing here is absolutely shocking,” says Bowman, who added that House Republicans “have no interest at all in preserving the basic integrity of the process, or indeed their own power as legislators in legitimate opposition and tension with the executive branch.”

House Republicans have spent all year investigating Hunter Biden in hopes of proving that Joe Biden profited off his son’s business dealings, particularly while Joe Biden was Vice President. There has been no conclusive evidence indicating Joe Biden did anything wrong.

McCarthy previously indicated that the full House would hold a vote to open an impeachment inquiry into Biden. Such a vote would need the support of nearly every Republican in the narrowly-divided chamber. But nearly 20 House Republicans have expressed resistance to voting for it, and a full House vote could open them up to political liability.

The Speaker’s decision to open the inquiry without a vote has precedent; Pelosi did the same thing ahead of Trump’s first impeachment, holding a full House vote to formally endorse the inquiry only weeks later. Trump’s second impeachment, following the January 6, 2021, attack on the Capitol, was not preceded by any inquiry at all. Congress has also voted to impeach federal judges without first opening inquiries.

Back in 2019, when Democrats controlled the House, McCarthy and his Republican allies slammed them for opening an impeachment inquiry against Trump without a vote, suggesting that doing so made the process illegitimate.

“The fact that, for a period of time between September 24 and October 31 of that year, the impeachment inquiry for Trump was going on without a full House vote, became an excuse for Republicans, first in the House, and then in the Senate, to vote against impeachment for Mr. Trump,” Bowman says.

There are no clear standards for launching an impeachment inquiry, nor are there specific signifiers differentiating it from other kinds of investigations. Ultimately, the decision to initiate one is usually left up to House leadership.

“To the extent they have a plausible end game here, other than just to keep this in the news and to dirty up Biden broadly speaking, presumably it will be to issue subpoenas that are sufficiently intrusive, either to Biden’s personal life or administration workings, that Biden will resist, and then to try to impeach him for obstruction of Congress,” says Bowman.

There’s some historical precedent for that theory; the third article of impeachment ultimately issued against Nixon centered on his refusal to comply with congressional subpoenas brought as part of the impeachment inquiry into him. Plus, McCarthy previously suggested that boosting Congress’ ability to subpoena Biden’s financial documents was a key motivation for the inquiry.

Both Bowman and Bobbitt suggested the current inquiry could weaken the federal system of checks and balances by devaluing the very concept of impeachment.

“This is supposed to be the most extreme sanction in American politics, and if you reach for it every time you think it’ll help you in the polls, I fear it will become degraded,” Bobbitt says. “It just becomes one more very divisive, poisonous event in a Congress that is already deeply divided and alienated.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, This article quotes Philip Bobbitt, a constitutional scholar at Columbia Law saying impeachment “is supposed to be the most extreme sanction in American politics, and if you reach for it every time you think it will help you in the polls, I fear it will become degraded.”

Mr. Speaker, everything the gentleman just said has been debunked, and it is just nuts.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in 2019, Donald Trump attempted to extort the President of Ukraine by withholding military aid unless Zelenskyy agreed to announce a sham investigation of Joe Biden. The evidence of Trump’s impeachable offenses was overwhelming, and Trump was impeached.

In 2020, after losing the election, Trump incited a violent insurrection against our own government. The evidence of that high crime was witnessed by everyone in this Chamber. He was impeached again.

In 2023, Donald Trump is once again seeking illicit help in his campaign, this time by badgering Republicans to impeach Joe Biden. Even with no evidence of wrongdoing by President Biden, Republicans are all too willing to do it.

There is a through line to all of this.

Donald Trump will violate the law and Constitution to gain power and to keep it, and Republicans will enable him every step of the way no matter how destructive the consequences to our institutions or to the country.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my very good friend.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, short of declaring war, impeachment is the most serious act that Congress can take. It must be confined to the narrow grounds established by the Constitution and never used to settle political differences.

However, the Democrats would have us simply turn a blind eye to mounting evidence of a family influence-peddling scheme that implicates the President. This we cannot do.

We owe it to the country to get to the bottom of these allegations, and that requires the House to objectively invoke its full investigatory powers, respect the due process rights of all involved, and lay all of the facts before the American people.

Last session, the Democrats made a mockery of impeachment, and we cannot allow them to become our teachers.

Shrill voices should be kept far from this inquiry lest they undermine its legitimacy and credibility.

Congress has an obligation to approach serious accusations seriously. With this vote, we do so.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman what is a mockery: This is a mockery. We hear the same tired, old conspiracy theories being recycled over and over again that have all been debunked.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) to further debunk them.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in staunch opposition to this resolution.

The Republicans have already spent 12 months on this exact investigation. They have obtained more than 100,000 pages of documents and dozens and dozens of hours of witness testimony, but there is simply not a shred of evidence proving any wrongdoing by President Biden related to his son or otherwise.

Whatever complaints that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have about how the Department of Justice investigated a private citizen, Hunter Biden, you should ask Donald Trump and Bill Barr, who were in power at the time that this investigation was going on.

Since there is no evidence, now we are going to move the goalposts, claiming an impeachment inquiry is necessary to gather more evidence, but Chairman COMER himself said earlier this year that he had received 100 percent compliance from the administration, and they can only cite two low-level career officials at the Department of Justice who have not testified, even though their supervisors have.

Just this morning, Hunter Biden showed up to the Capitol ready to provide evidence. The Republicans refused to take his testimony.

How can you sit there saying you need more evidence when you prevent the central witness in the investigation from giving you evidence?

What are you afraid of?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS), my good friend.

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, Americans have lost faith in the impartiality of the Biden administration. We have ample evidence that the DOJ, FBI, and IRS have refused to do their jobs. Americans deserve to know the truth, and Congress has a duty to investigate.

The question is simple: What did President Biden know about his family's criminal enterprises and when?

That is the question. That is why this inquiry is necessary.

We have already uncovered that the Biden family received \$25 million in payouts from foreign adversaries. Their scheme was simple: Foreign client has a problem; client pays a Biden; Vice

President Biden travels to the foreign country; Vice President Biden leverages U.S. influence to force favorable outcomes for the client; and the Biden family earns their fee.

That is the scheme. The proof of concept was Burisma in 2014, and they replicated it again and again. If President Biden was complicit, then our national security is vulnerable. His administration keeps stonewalling while the President repeatedly lies about his involvement.

As a member of the Oversight Committee, I believe the evidence we have uncovered thus far demands further investigation. This vote is the only logical next step. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this perverse, illegitimate effort to do Donald Trump's political dirty work.

This resolution is nothing more than an extreme political stunt built on absolutely zero evidence of wrongdoing. The one thing it does prove is that Republicans are focused on the wrong priorities. This resolution clearly has nothing to do with protecting the Constitution from high crimes and misdemeanors.

How do we know? Because a year of investigation, piles of documents, and a herd of the Republicans' own witnesses confirm there is zero evidence of wrongdoing. Instead, the Republicans' wasteful witch hunt just confirms that President Biden is a good and honorable man.

What this resolution really does is cover up a full year of do-nothing Republican policies that ignored our families' needs and neglected an array of global threats to democracy.

Worse, this resolution tries to obscure the corrupt and criminal acts of the former President and want-to-be dictator Donald Trump.

This extreme political stunt is built upon the sick, twisted extremism of House Republicans and totally unmasks their complete absence of an agenda that helps the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), my good friend.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 918.

This year, House Republicans have conducted a methodical investigation into the alleged actions of the Biden family, including Joe Biden himself, in his family's foreign business dealings and foreign-peddling schemes.

As a member of both the House Judiciary and Oversight Committees, I can say that our investigation has peeled back layer upon layer of Biden family scandals and has exposed the safety nets designed to insulate the Biden family and Joe Biden from impending accountability.

There is an old legal saying, Mr. Speaker, that if you don't have the facts, you argue the law. If you don't have the law, you argue the facts, and if you have neither, you pound the table.

What we are seeing from the other side today is that they want to talk about Donald Trump and January 6. They want to talk about a perceived lack of transparency, about how nothing is happening out in the open.

Well, let me assure you that we have done this for months. We have done more in 10 months than law enforcement agencies have done in 5 years.

Let's talk about the facts: \$25 million has flowed to members of the Biden family; 20 corporate entities and 9 members of the Biden family have received these moneys; a \$40,000 direct payment to Joe Biden himself; a \$200,000 direct payment to Joe Biden himself, allegedly under a loan. We have WhatsApp messages, pseudonyms, fake email addresses, and 22 meetings in which Joe Biden himself met with Hunter Biden and his business associates.

We have been stonewalled. We have even seen this today, as Hunter Biden paraded onto the Senate side and did not come to a lawfully issued subpoena deposition in front of the House Oversight Committee.

Now is the time for an impeachment inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the MAGA majority is putting forward an impeachment inquiry even as their own leaders admit there is no evidence of wrongdoing.

They have already reviewed tens of thousands of documents, interviewed dozens of witnesses, and nothing.

Why?

This has never been about the truth. This is about avenging Donald Trump. This is about undermining our democracy and influencing the 2024 election.

President Ford once said, "Truth is the glue that holds government together."

Mr. Speaker, it is truth that allows this Chamber to function. Abandoning truth in favor of political gamesmanship creates nothing but chaos. That dysfunction isn't a byproduct of the majority's behavior, it is the point.

They don't want the government to function. They have sought nothing in service of the American people, nothing to lower costs, nothing to create good-paying jobs, to grow the middle class, to make everyday people feel more secure.

What has the majority delivered?

The kind of extremism that chooses rich tax cheats over working people, that obstructs the ballot box and hikes the cost of healthcare, that protects guns over kids, that bans abortion and criminalizes doctors, that rewards polluters and corporate greed and tells everyday Americans, you foot the bill.

This sham impeachment is below the dignity of the people's House. It is an affront to the people who sent us here to work for them. What a disgrace.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS), my very good friend.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is telling us that they care about taxpayers, but the son of the President of the United States is a tax cheat. He ignored Federal tax law on purpose. He laundered money through 20 LLCs. He concealed millions of dollars of overseas money, and the only reason he was able to accomplish these feats of getting so much money into his companies is because the President is his father. That is it.

If you are asking why we are looking for an impeachment inquiry, it is because there were 170 suspicious activity reports at the Department of the Treasury, which we went and looked through, and every one of those reports said very clearly that there was evidence of money laundering and potentially tax evasion. There were hours of depositions. There is a web of LLCs with company names that have no business interests whatsoever.

We have finally uncovered one example, Mr. Speaker, \$5 million from a foreign company going to a joint venture partly controlled by Hunter Biden.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, the next day, \$400,000 goes from Hunter Biden to an account controlled by Jim and Sarah Biden. Sarah Biden writes a check to herself, and then \$40,000 is in a check to Joseph Robinette Biden, the President of the United States. That is your evidence. If you want to talk crime: bribery, co-conspirator to firearm violations, and we can go on and on.

Vote for the resolution. Congress must investigate these crimes.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing. A pattern is developing. If you will notice, my Republican friends never talk about Joe Biden. It is all Hunter Biden. They seem to be obsessed with him. I don't know. They need to get some help.

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

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, this impeachment is a continuation of the insurrection that came here on January 6.

This gang has never accepted Joe Biden as the President. The architect of the idea that you could overturn the election is the current Speaker of the House.

Donald Trump sent that violent mob here. It didn't work, so now we are here where they are going to try to use this

House to overturn the election through this inquiry.

The problem is they have zero evidence. The only crime is that Joe Biden blew out Donald Trump in the 2020 election. That is a problem because this place is the largest law firm in D.C., with these lawyers working on behalf of just one client, Donald Trump, at the expense of everything else that matters.

I want to give JAMES COMER some credit because after 50,000 pages of depositions, secret hearings, and closed hearings, I think if we give him enough time, he is going to prove that Hunter Biden is Joe Biden's son.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished 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 impeachment inquiry effort.

We are here today on the House floor wasting time and taxpayer dollars on an illegitimate impeachment inquiry because Donald Trump, the puppet master, has directed extreme MAGA Republicans to launch a political hit job against President Joe Biden.

There is no evidence that President Biden has engaged in an impeachable offense. There is no evidence that President Joe Biden has engaged in wrongdoing. There is no evidence that President Biden has broken the law.

We know that President Joe Biden is a good, honorable, and decent man who dedicated his life to public service and to making a difference for the American people.

The puppet master in chief, Donald Trump, has directed the sycophants to target Joe Biden as part of an effort to undermine President Biden's reelection.

That is the pattern. That is the process. It reveals that our extreme MAGA Republican colleagues have done nothing—nothing whatsoever—when it comes to making a difference in the lives of everyday Americans.

From the very beginning of this Congress, House Democrats have made it clear that we are ready, willing, and able to find common ground with our Republican colleagues in a bipartisan way on any issue.

This do-nothing Republican Congress has chosen to do nothing to solve problems for hardworking American taxpayers—nothing on the economy, nothing on inflation, nothing on affordability, nothing on gun safety, nothing on trying to improve the quality of life of the American people.

What we have seen from the very beginning of this do-nothing Republican Congress is chaos, dysfunction, and extremism being inflicted on the American people.

When it comes to this fraudulent impeachment inquiry, more than 100,000 pages of documents have been produced

and reviewed. Not a scintilla of evidence exists that President Biden has broken the law.

It is interesting to me. I wonder how my colleagues in New York and California who were sent here to make life better for the American people explain this vote, which is not designed to improve the lives of the folks that we are privileged to serve but is a political hit job, a political stunt, political gamesmanship.

The American people are tired of the partisanship, tired of the brinkmanship, tired of this effort to score political points on a partisan basis as opposed to actually making a difference.

House Democrats will continue to put people over politics. We will continue to fight for lower costs, to grow the middle class, for safer communities, for reproductive freedom, to defend democracy, and to build an economy from the middle out and the bottom up as opposed to the top down.

House Democrats remain committed to joining President Biden in advancing the ball for the American people, for the middle class, for low-income families, for working families, for all of those folks who aspire to be a part of the middle class, for young people, for older Americans, for our veterans.

We plan to continue to build upon the progress that we have made under the leadership of President Biden on behalf of the American people.

It is time for the extreme MAGA Republicans to join us or get out of the way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, this impeachment inquiry is a political stunt with zero evidence.

We are here today not because of any wrongdoing by President Biden but because Donald Trump wants revenge. Welcome to the Donald Trump revenge show.

He is running a campaign promising to destroy democracy and the rule of law and will soon be found guilty of serious crimes. The American people reject this toxic and disgusting agenda.

That is why Trump's allies here in Congress are trying to rescue him. They are throwing everything they can at President Biden, from misleading leaks to outright fabrications and lies. They are even trying to sell debunked Rudy Giuliani conspiracy theories.

Let's be clear: The White House has provided thousands of pages of bank records, statements from personal bank accounts, and testimony from the President's family, but none of this is enough for the extreme MAGA GOP.

This is all to appease the con man and the criminal Donald Trump, but make no mistake: The American people will see through this entire impeachment sham.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Ranking Member for yielding time.

Republicans have had the majority in this House for 11 months, and what do they have to show for it? Nothing—no efforts to grow the middle class, no efforts to lower costs, no efforts to build safer communities; instead, an effort to default on our Nation's debt, two attempts to shut down the government, vacating their own Speaker, and now a baseless impeachment that they are pursuing for one reason and one reason alone—because former President Trump ordered them to do so.

Ask them to articulate what crime they are investigating, and they can't give you an answer. Ask them to identify any evidence of wrongdoing by President Biden—crickets.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, I can assure you, are deeply disappointed in the actions that House Republicans have taken for the better part of the last year, and this action is no different.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this farce of a process. Let's get back to doing the important work that the American people expect us to do.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would ensure every American has full access to essential reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, this entire charade is ridiculous.

Speaker JOHNSON is about to send Members of Congress home for the rest of the year. Instead of lowering costs for families before the holidays or protecting women's freedom to make their own health decisions, House Republicans are taking orders from Donald Trump to force through a partisan, political impeachment with no evidence, no witnesses, and no wrongdoing on behalf of the President.

Meanwhile, as we speak, Kate Cox, a pregnant woman from Texas, is being forced to flee her home as Republican leaders try to force her to carry to term her baby, who was diagnosed with a terrible condition that would result in miscarriage, stillbirth, or death soon after birth.

We could have come to the floor today to pass legislation like the Women's Health Protection Act to protect women like Kate Cox and to prevent that kind of physical harm and trauma from being inflicted on women living under Republican abortion bans, but House Republicans choose impeachment. The American people won't forget.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Oklahoma have any other speakers?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, extreme MAGA Republicans in the House are on a Donald Trump-directed fishing expedition. In fact, they have been on a fishing expedition for months with embarrassing results—nothing—no bites, no evidence for anything that justifies impeachment.

There are no fish to catch in this Republican swamp, and good luck to all these Republicans who have to go home and justify a sham impeachment to their districts while telling them that we haven't passed the budget, haven't reauthorized the farm bill, haven't done a single thing that helps Americans live their lives. Instead, we are wasting time on bogus censure resolutions and bogus impeachment inquiries.

We have 1½ legislative business days left in the year. We should be passing bills to help working families, but that is not what we do under extreme Republicans' control. Vote "no" on this new fishing expedition.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are saying the quiet part out loud.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Rolling Stone article from today titled: "GOP Rep. Explains Impeachment Push: 'Donald J. Trump 2024, Baby!'"

[From RollingStone, Dec. 13, 2023]

GOP REP. EXPLAINS IMPEACHMENT PUSH:

'DONALD J. TRUMP 2024, BABY!'

(By Nikki McCann Ramirez)

House Republicans will vote Wednesday on whether to formalize their impeachment inquiry into President Joe Biden. The party has struggled to gin up a legitimate rationale for moving forward with the inquiry, which has yet to produce any credible evidence of wrongdoing, but one Republican is saying the quiet part out loud.

When Rep. Troy Nehls (R-Texas) was asked Tuesday on Capitol Hill what he's hoping to gain from an impeachment inquiry, Nehls responded: "All I can say is: Donald J. Trump 2024, baby!"

Video of the encounter was obtained exclusively by Rolling Stone. When reached for additional comment on Wednesday, Nehls said in a statement to Rolling Stone that Republicans "will follow the rule of law and go where the facts lead us."

Nehls is one of Trump's most ardent supporters in Congress, and even floated the former president as a potential House Speaker after Republicans booted Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.) from the role in October. His comments are essentially an admission of what has long been obvious to many, which is that the GOP's fraught effort to dig up dirt on President Biden and his family is nothing more than a ham-fisted political stunt meant to hurt the president's reelection chances and place Trump back in the White House.

Republicans for months have been trotting out flimsy bits of evidence they say point to Biden's corruption. They've produced nothing substantial, however, nor have they been able to articulate exactly which high crimes and misdemeanors the president may have committed. Hunter Biden, the president's son whom Republicans believe worked with his father on illegal financial dealings, bashed the investigations while defying a GOP subpoena for closed-door testimony on Wednesday.

"I'm here today to make sure the House committee's illegitimate investigations of my family do not proceed on distortions, manipulated evidence, and lies," he told reporters outside the Capitol. "For six years MAGA Republicans including members of the House committees who are in a closed-door session right now, have imputed my character, invaded my privacy, attacked my wife, my children, my family, and my friends. They've ridiculed my struggle with addiction, they've belittled my recovery, and they have tried to dehumanize me, all to embarrass and damage my father."

Meanwhile, Trump is embroiled in a sea of criminal and civil legal trouble. Cases in Washington, D.C. and Georgia relate directly to his effort to undermine the results of the 2020 election and his role in the Jan. 6 attack on the Capitol. He's also been indicted in New York over a hush-money scandal ahead of the 2016 election, and by the Justice Department in Florida over his handling of classified material after leaving the White House. A civil trial in New York, where Trump has already been found liable for using fraudulent financial statements for his business, is expected to wrap up this week.

Trump is also the clear frontrunner for the Republican 2024 nomination, and a showdown with Biden in the general election now seems inevitable. Republicans have tied themselves to Trump's erratic trajectory, and an impeachment inquiry in an election year is just the kind of circus they need to compete with the vortex of trials, depositions, and court appearances swirling around their all-but-official nominee.

The circus will continue with the vote on Wednesday to formalize their impeachment inquiry, the push to hold Hunter Biden in contempt of Congress over his defiance of their subpoena, and a new round of Fox News appearances to try to legitimize the party's never-ending fishing expedition. Oversight Committee Chair James Comer (R-La.) won't be going on one of the network's most popular anytime soon. He said on Tuesday that he's boycotting Fox & Friends because one of its hosts keeps asking him questions he can't answer about what actual evidence the GOP has on Biden.

House Speaker Mike Johnson (R-La.) also avoided giving specifics in an op-ed announcing the vote to formalize the inquiry on Tuesday, writing—sincerely, absurdly—that

“impeachment is among the most solemn constitutional authorities the U.S. Congress holds, particularly when it comes to a president.”

If that’s the public line Johnson wants House Republicans to use, he’d better get them some additional media training. At the very least, he should make sure they don’t offer up the real reason for the inquiry as easily as Nehls did on Tuesday.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend and the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, here is what we know.

We know that President Biden’s transition team ran interference for Hunter Biden and obstructed law enforcement’s attempts to interview the President’s son.

We know that somebody in the FBI decided not to investigate bribery allegations against Hunter Biden and Joe Biden provided by a confidential informant. That source is so important and the FBI has deemed him so credible that they oppose the release of the report and only agreed to a review in a classified setting.

We know that IRS investigators were not allowed to follow leads that had the potential to implicate President Biden in Hunter Biden’s alleged financial crimes.

We know that recommendations for prosecution of Hunter Biden were denied or delayed until the statute of limitations had run.

We know that a plea deal was offered to Hunter Biden by the DOJ that offered him global immunity for crimes outside the scope of the charged conduct and that that plea deal only fell apart after whistleblowers came forward to Congress.

Set aside for a minute the \$24 million, the 20-plus shell companies, the payments to President Biden, and the changing narrative from this White House every time a new bad fact comes to light. Set that aside.

□ 1345

These instances alone should concern all Americans because it appears that people in the highest echelons of our government were running interference for the President’s son.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have an innocent explanation for every single incident. The problem is, it is very difficult to see an innocent explanation for all of the incidents.

The FBI, the DOJ, the IRS, and the President’s political operation have all frustrated attempts to investigate the Bidens.

Obstruction is a crime, and it is no less of a crime if it is being used within the highest powers of government to perpetrate that coercion.

Take all of the politics out of this, there is no investigator in any jurisdiction in the world that would not continue this investigation with these facts.

The purpose of the impeachment inquiry is for the House to authorize impeachment and strengthen its ability to compel testimony and document production in response to Congressional subpoenas. This will allow the House to continue its investigation into whether President Biden changed U.S. policy due to payments received by the Biden family members from hostile foreign powers; or whether he knowingly allowed foreign powers to believe that the payments were being made and to employ the Biden family members would result in access and the ability to alter U.S. policy; or whether the President and the President’s administration were using government agencies to obstruct investigations into Hunter and Joe Biden.

This inquiry is warranted. It would put the House of Representatives in the best legal position possible to uncover the facts, and the American people deserve nothing less.

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

Mr. Speaker, this inquiry has nothing to do with Joe Biden. It is about the Republican Party and how radicalized and extreme they have become. They are allergic to truth and transparency.

Republicans say this is not about a preordained outcome. It is. They are going to try to impeach President Biden despite the fact that there is no evidence against him at all.

Trump sent a violent MAGA mob here to the Capitol to reverse the election results and certify that he won, even though he lost.

What they couldn’t do on January 6 they want to do with this extreme political stunt. They have contempt for our democracy. They want to finish the job.

Republicans say this is all about process, about how the House will proceed. It is not. The truth is this process has already proceeded for 10 months. They have been investigating all year, obtaining tens of thousands of documents and hours and hours of witness testimony. All of it says there is no wrongdoing by President Biden.

Republicans say the White House is stonewalling their inquiry. Again, that is not true. The White House has provided over 35,000 pages of financial records, dozens of hours of testimony and interviews. Hunter Biden is here to testify today, and Republicans won’t let him because they want to do it in secret so they can cherry-pick and distort his testimony.

This whole inquiry has nothing to do with the integrity of President Biden and everything to do with the lack of integrity in the Republican Party.

No amount of evidence could convince Republicans that Joe Biden did nothing wrong because they aren’t looking for the truth. They are looking for revenge.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say directly to the American people, that the Republican Party works for Donald Trump; not for you, for Trump.

That is why they are pursuing this extreme political stunt. That is why they are doing everything in secret. They want to hide the truth from you because they know their whole impeachment inquiry is a sham, and it will evaporate into thin air when people realize what a pathetic joke it is.

This shameful process has no credibility. It has no legitimacy and no integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close, and I urge all my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot today, heard a lot about Donald Trump. We have had ad infinitum insults to the majority. We have had pejorative language. We have had pounding on the table.

Why? Simply because we want to empower three committees in Congress to do what the White House asked us to do; that is, to have a formal vote on the floor before they fully cooperate. That is all we are doing.

If my friends are so confident—again, as one of my colleagues mentioned from the Rules Committee—what are you worried about? It is an investigation. It is open.

We hardly talked about what the resolution is about, which is how we are going to proceed.

How are we going to proceed? Almost exactly as my friends proceeded in 2019. Their playbook, their play, their approach. There is nothing unfair that we are asking to be done.

Since September, the House has been engaged in an impeachment inquiry, examining whether sufficient grounds exist for the House to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President of the United States.

Today’s resolution simply formalizes that inquiry and grants the House full authority to enforce its subpoenas—subpoenas that have been denied as recently as today.

My friends have some pretty experienced lawyers on their side. Most of them will tell you it is better to have a deposition before you have a hearing, let alone a trial.

All we are trying to do is get the needed people who have been blocked or refused to cooperate to come in and testify under oath before Congress.

The resolution follows closely, again, as I said, the procedures established in 2019. It empowers the three committees to continue their existing inquiries. At the end of the inquiry, it provides for the Committee on the Judiciary, the traditional impeachment committee, to report to the House resolutions, Articles of Impeachment, or other recommendations.

It is deeply unfortunate that we are here, Mr. Speaker, but today's resolution will ensure that the House can fulfill its obligations under the Constitution. So it is with respect for the Constitution, for this institution, and for this great Nation that we proceed. That is all we are trying to do today. We had very little discussion of that, but we ought to entertain that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind everybody of a few facts.

We have millions of dollars from foreign entities that have flowed towards shell companies that we didn't even know existed until the investigations uncovered them. We have whistleblowers, public servants of long standing that have come in and told us their efforts to investigate either Hunter Biden or the wider schemes that have been obstructed.

We have lots of things to be concerned about. Our committees need to be empowered with the tools that are required to pursue the truth and then come back and tell us what they found and have a recommendation as to how we should proceed. That is all today is about.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to yet another shameful effort to erode the founding principles of our democracy.

This resolution is a pitiful attempt to continue the politicization of our government's ability to function once those who are duly elected to serve seek to govern.

Impeachment is not a punishment, sought to be inflicted when one branch of government merely disagrees with or dislikes what a coordinate branch has done.

It is a serious remedy designed to prevent abuses of power and is designed to ensure that ours remains a government of, by, and for the people.

This is about the duty of the President of the United States—you do not impeach people because you disagree with their approach to their service to the country or to the provisions on their policy. We do not impeach people on that basis.

No, this resolution does not provide any meaningful or sincere effort to protect the American people.

Rather, this resolution sets forth nothing more than a partisan fishing expedition and should be rebuked as such.

Impeachment is serious, yet here we are engaged in a baseless political stunt to impeach our current President.

The U.S. Constitution governs the order of our nation, and it dictates the work of the Congress.

Article I details the powers of the House and the exercising of these powers as they relate to the coordinate, coequal branches of government, codified in Articles II and Articles III: three equal branches of government coexisting and cohesively working to provide oversight to the respective actions of the Congress, the Executive and Judiciary.

Specifically, Article I, Section 2, Clause 5 indicates that the "House of Representatives . . . shall have the sole power of impeachment." Article II states that the "The President . . . shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason,

Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Article II also requires that the "President take care that the laws are faithfully executed."

That language is stark and clear—and throughout our history it has been used in varying periods where the assessment was that the law has been breached.

Sometimes Congresses are concerned that the weight and view of the American people should be considered. Sometimes they are moved by the urgency of the matter.

This has worked, with challenges of course, since 1789, yet the outright abuse of our constitution to use impeachment as a political tool is an abomination of our congressional duties.

As constitutional scholars have long laid out the historical guardrails and mandates upon which must heed, I would like to point to a few salient remarks from the September 28, 2023, Committee on Oversight and Accountability hearing entitled "The Basis for the Impeachment Inquiry of President Joseph R. Biden" as reminders for us all here today.

In the testimony of Michael J. Gerhardt, Burton Craige Distinguished Professor of Jurisprudence, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, he highlighted the clear warning from Alexander Hamilton in the Federalist Papers, and what he foresaw in the dangers of trivializing impeachment through petty partisanship.

As quoted in Alexander Hamilton, No. 65, the Federalist Papers (1961), he states that impeachment may "agitate the passions of the whole community, and to divide it into parties more or less friendly or inimical to the accused. In many cases it will connect itself with pre-existing factions, and will enlist all their animosities, partialities, influence, and interest on one side or on the other; and in such cases there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the relative strength of the parties, than by the demonstrations of innocence or guilt."

As Professor Gerhardt noted, "in other words, an impeachment proceeding, including the initiation of an impeachment inquiry, must rise above petty partisanship in order to ensure its legitimacy.

And as aptly stated in the testimony of Johnathon Turley, Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law at George Washington University School of Law, in highlighting the carefully crafted powers vested in the House of Representatives pursuant to Art. I, §2, cl. 5. is that:

"The Framers debated and crafted this standard and process to avoid an 'anything goes' mentality. That was the reason our Framers opposed the 'maladministration' standards as too malleable and indeterminate. While we continue to have passionate and good-faith debates over the meaning of the high crimes and misdemeanors standard, it is not intended to give the House carte blanche for any impulsive impeachment theory."

Nearly fifty years ago, my predecessor Barbara Jordan of Texas's 18th Congressional District, declared, in the first presidential impeachment inquiry in more than a century, that:

"My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution." She noted "those are impeachable 'who behave amiss or betray their public trust'"

(quoting from the North Carolina ratification convention).

In this vein, we should not be here today in efforts to betray and diminish our Constitution and rule of law.

The unsubstantiated accusations, that the President of the United States has abused his powers and that his conduct is in dereliction of his duties as President, flatly outrageous.

When the Framers of our Constitution designed our government, they bifurcated power between the federal and state governments, and divided among the branches.

They vested in Congress the capacity to make the laws, and in the Executive the power to faithfully execute those laws.

Because the House enjoyed a natural superiority, as most representative of the passions of the populace, the Framers vested in the House of Representatives the sole power of impeachment and made the Senate the judges.

Yet, entirely unlike the incredulous and now confirmed illegality of President Trump's behavior while in office, President Biden has certainly not earned the same stain of impeachment from the House of Representatives and his conduct absolutely does not merit conviction and removal from office by the Senate.

When the Founders inserted the Impeachment Clause in Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, they did so to preserve our democracy, protect the American people, and to prevent the abuses and excesses of the Chief Executive.

The Constitution has served our nation well for over two hundred years.

Yes, in order to keep faith with the Framers and with our future, we must preserve, protect and defend that Constitution and all its provisions.

This impeachment resolution, however, is not one that is within the national interest but a disgrace to our government and its entrusted duties.

My Republican colleagues are sadly focused on the wrong priorities.

The American people want us to focus on helping their families, not attacking the President and his family.

This so-called "impeachment inquiry" is just an extreme political stunt.

President Biden is a good and honorable man who has spent his life serving the American people.

Extreme House Republicans are pushing these lies to try to smear him for political purposes.

They have been investigating President Biden all year—obtaining tens of thousands of pages of documents and dozens of hours of witness testimony—but have found no evidence of wrongdoing by the President.

In fact, over and over again, Republicans' own witnesses and documents have embarrassed them by debunking their ridiculous allegations.

They now want to waste time on the House floor voting on this extreme stunt, instead of focusing on advancing important priorities like Ukraine aid or doing their job to avoid a government shutdown in a few weeks.

No vote will make this baseless fishing expedition legitimate.

They have proven all year just how illegitimate this impeachment stunt is.

All a vote would do is put every Republican who supports it on record pushing an extreme agenda.

This is not what Congress should be focused on.

Democrats and President Biden will stay focused on putting people over politics.

As such, I ask my colleagues to vote no on this shameful resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 918 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes 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.

WHOLE MILK FOR HEALTHY KIDS ACT OF 2023

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 to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1147.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONALDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 922 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. 1147.

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

□ 1355

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. 1147) to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to allow schools that participate in the school lunch program under such Act to serve whole milk, with Mr. DESJARLAIS 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 in strong support of H.R. 1147. It is Christmastime across America. For many, the season brings with it the annual return of cherished Christmas traditions, such as leaving milk and cookies out for Santa Claus and his reindeer to enjoy.

As for my family, our traditional choice of dairy has always been whole milk. We want only the most nutritious option for Santa.

The nutrients in whole milk, like protein, calcium, and vitamin D, provide the fuel Santa needs to travel the whole globe in one night. Whole milk is the unsung hero of his Christmas journey.

Protein helps build and repair Santa's muscles. Hoisting heavy sacks of gifts up and down the chimney is no easy task.

Calcium is vital for strong bones. It is calcium that keeps Santa strong and sturdy as he dashes from rooftop to rooftop.

Vitamin D is essential to a strong immune system. Santa absolutely needs one as he braves the cold, wintry night. You see, it is not just the magic of the season that helps Santa deliver presents worldwide, it is also the fortifying nutrients in whole milk.

Reflecting on Christmas traditions this year begs the question: If whole milk is a good option to fuel Santa's extraordinary Christmas Eve journey, then why isn't it an option for American schoolchildren in their lunchrooms?

That is why I support Representative G.T. THOMPSON's Whole Milk For Healthy Kids Act, a bill allowing unflavored and flavored whole milk to be offered in school cafeterias.

Since 2012, the National School Lunch and Breakfast Program has allowed only low-fat and fat-free milk options for American schoolchildren. This means 2 percent and whole milk have been excluded from the daily diets of an entire generation of kids.

The USDA intends to finalize another rule which will further limit milk op-

tions. Anti-milk advocates advance one main argument against whole milk: that whole milk is bad for kids.

□ 1400

Rather, milk has 13 essential nutrients that are needed for children to live healthy lives and succeed in school. It is an essential ingredient to growth and development. Research shows that whole milk is associated with a neutral or lower risk of heart disease and obesity.

Moreover, the USDA contradicts itself by limiting milk options for young children. On one hand, it recognizes that children are at risk of under-consuming dairy, yet on the other, it creates policies that will only exacerbate the problem.

If Americans have learned anything from these past 3 years, it is that scientific authorities tend to contradict themselves. The truth is that whole milk is a significant source of vital nutrients for children's growth and development. The Federal bureaucracy should never stand between your children and a nutritious lunch.

The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act isn't about advocating for one type of milk over another. It is about providing parents, schools, and food service providers with the option to choose what is best for our children's nutrition.

This act does not aim to diminish the importance of other milk varieties. Rather, it seeks to restore the availability of a wholesome, natural option that has been a staple for generations. This bill is about choice. It is a chance to empower parents and schools to make informed choices about what goes into our children's diets.

Whether it is a nutritional foundation for Santa's journey or your child's math homework, let's not discount the benefits of whole milk.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1147, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act.

School meals are critical to reducing child hunger and providing children with the healthy food they need. Milk, offered as part of these meals, can help deliver essential nutrients that are vital to a child's development. That is why it is so important that we provide students with the most nutritious milk options.

Child nutrition standards for school meals, including milk options, are guided by the science-based Dietary Guidelines for Americans, or the DGAs, which are periodically updated based on recommendations from child nutrition experts and input from the public.

The latest DGAs, along with the American Heart Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, and over a dozen other public

health advocates, agree that fat-free and low-fat milk are the healthiest options for children.

Regrettably, H.R. 1147 attempts to legislate nutrition standards and disregard the evidence-based recommendations made by the DGAs. Furthermore, the bill would undermine the Biden administration's ongoing rule-making to better align school nutrition standards with the latest science.

This bill would allow schools participating in the National School Lunch Program to offer whole milk and reduced-fat milk, violating the current science-based standards that protect children's health.

Whole milk contains far more saturated fat, cholesterol, and calories than fat-free and low-fat milk. Conversely, fat-free and low-fat milk options offer the same vital nutrients, including calcium, vitamin D, vitamin A, protein, and potassium, as whole milk.

Nutrition standards must be guided by scientists, not politicians. If someone wants to offer one study or another to be considered, use the DGA process, not the political process. This bill needlessly inserts politics into a science-based process.

Lastly, I am disappointed by the majority's decision to depart from precedent by moving a child nutrition bill outside of a comprehensive child nutrition reauthorization. Rather than improve our Nation's child nutrition programs holistically, the majority has decided to prioritize interfering with evidence-based nutrition standards for our children's school meals.

For that reason, Mr. Chair, I oppose the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I would just like to tell my colleague something that I think will be easy to remember about why we are doing this. Scientists/experts built the Titanic, and amateurs built the ark.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank Ms. FOXX for making Biblical allusions. Last week, we were here talking about National Bible Week. One of the phrases that you run across again and again as you read the Bible is that God promised Abraham a land flowing of milk and honey. I will let the body decide what type of milk the Lord was promising Abraham. I think I know.

As somebody who has been drinking milk my whole life, I can tell you a better tasting milk, and a milk that I think is more likely to be consumed, is whole milk. For some reason, the current administration is waging war on milk. The USDA's current restrictions on school lunches are limiting nutritious options for kids. This comes at a time when it is found that 90 percent of Americans do not eat enough dairy to meet the dietary recommendations.

Drinking milk leads to better bone health and lower risk for type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease. Addi-

tionally, milk stands as a leading and accessible source of nine essential nutrients that children often fall short of.

Proposed guidelines such as limiting milk options by age group and counting milk fat against weekly saturated allowance threaten to deprive students of essential nutrients.

It is crucial that students have access to the nutritional benefits of milk. With these restrictions, they might choose to forgo milk entirely, if you have to drink the less tasty 1 percent, or even worse, fat-free milk.

These proposed restrictions ignore several recent research studies examining the effect of higher fat milk consumption which found that it is associated with lower childhood obesity and concluded that dietary guidelines that recommend reduced-fat milk versions might not provide a benefit in lowering the risk of childhood obesity, which we are all for.

I implore each of you to consider the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act of 2023 as a commonsense solution to ensure that we have healthy children.

Mr. Chair, I ask my fellow Members to vote "yes" on H.R. 1147.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT for his time and leadership in this matter.

I rise today in opposition to this bill. Monday night, the Rules Committee considered my amendment, amendment No. 16, to H.R. 1147, which would have provided an alternative, a healthy alternative to our young people, people that cannot digest milk.

I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest that this was a choice. Well, if there were a choice, then why not add soy as a choice. Soy gives the equivalent of the nutritional values as whole milk, but it does not have the negative impact that whole milk has on a large swath of people in our community.

I will tell you those numbers. Ninety-five percent of Native Americans have lactose intolerance. Ninety percent of African Americans are lactose intolerant. Sixty-five percent of Latino Americans are, in fact, lactose intolerant. Asian Americans, 90 percent. These are real numbers. This is not about taste. This is not about profit. This is not about bottom line. This is not about a powerful lobby. This is about the safety, nutrition, and well-being of our young people.

We cannot ignore the impact that ingesting or attempting to digest things that your body cannot and what impact it has on one's ability to concentrate or do well in the classroom.

My colleagues and I formed a diverse group, represented by chairs of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Asian Pacific American Caucus, and a vice chair of the Congressional Black Caucus respectively. We all firmly believe that the full House should be al-

lowed to debate this important measure, making sure that we were given the opportunity on the floor to debate this amendment. I believe if given the opportunity to be heard, even the other side could have and would have been able to support.

What is most perplexing is how this amendment aligns with the purpose of the underlying bill, to expand choice and to deliver healthy beverages to the school counter. Our amendment is based on the text of my bill, H.R. 1619, the ADD SOY Act. It amends the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Program to strike the onerous "milk note" requirement and to stipulate that the USDA reimburse school districts to make a plant-based dietary alternative that is nutritionally equivalent to cow's milk available in school. Yes, a choice, a real choice.

When Congress enacted the milk mandate 80 years ago, the United States was less diverse, and we did not understand the exact science surrounding lactose intolerance. Between 70 to 90 percent of African Americans today are lactose intolerant. Ninety percent of Asians, 95 percent of Native Americans, and 65 percent of Latinos are, in fact, lactose intolerant.

The National Institutes of Health reports the majority of all people have reduced ability to digest lactose after infancy, and it adds that it is also very common in people from West Africa, Arab, Jewish, Greek, and Italian descent.

Currently, if a student wants a nutritionally equivalent alternative to milk, they need to get a doctor's note or parent's note to obtain a plant-based beverage. Oftentimes, parents are working two jobs. Oftentimes, unfortunately, parents don't pay as much attention or are as in tune and have an opportunity to get to the school or even have healthcare to go to a doctor to get a note. Should that child still be punished and forced to drink something that their body simply cannot digest?

How do you concentrate in the classroom when you are drinking and attempting to digest something that your body cannot? What happens to that child when they belly up to the desk and have to study or pay attention but their body is telling them that they have eaten something that does not agree with them? It causes a problem. It causes ridicule. It causes the ability or inability to concentrate and perform at their highest level. Because of this high barrier to entry, kids often don't. Many skip school or don't do well in school as an alternative.

If 75 percent of African Americans are lactose intolerant, which is true in my family, why should three-quarters of kids have to get a note. It is not a medical disability to be African American. It is not a medical disability to be Vietnamese American. It is not a disability to be Native American. It is not a disability to be Latino.

Lactose intolerance is genetic. This isn't complicated. Kids should be given

a healthy fluid beverage option that doesn't make them sick. Our amendment would have provided a sensible solution. Allow the USDA to reimburse school districts for soy milk, which so far is the only plant-based milk that has been recognized under the latest formulation of the 2020 American Dietary Guidelines to be healthy and nutritionally equivalent to cow's milk.

Moreover, there is a primary reason that more than half of all milk given to children is thrown into a cafeteria trash can unused, carton after carton after carton of discarded cartons of milk that have never been opened. At some point kids realize it isn't good for them and they don't drink it. Whatever nutritional value you thought you were affording by giving milk doesn't happen if young people can't consume or digest it.

Many kids don't want milk because it makes them sick. According to the USDA, 29 percent of cartons of cow milk served in our schools are thrown into the garbage unopened. This comes out to be somewhere around \$300 million in annual waste of taxpayer funds for milk cartons. It is clear that not only is it a food waste issue but a failure on the NSLP to supply food to kids that are consumed and meet their daily nutritional requirement. The present rate of food waste and taxpayer losses is not acceptable.

□ 1415

Mr. Chair, I ask whether my Republican colleagues think it is a good policy. Is that good stewardship of our tax dollars? Is that delivering good health outcomes for all kids?

If they believe it is, then they should agree and recognize that adding a true alternative is a good thing. I remind my colleagues that it is not a medical condition to be Black, Latino, Asian, Jewish, or other ethnicities.

This is an issue of racial equity and inclusion, as well as tightening government spending and waste. It is both a matter of squandering tax dollars and a matter of fairness. The kids who have the least and who have the most difficulty raising their voices are being denied a food staple that they simply cannot stand.

We must fix this. Let us strive to do better for the next generation and equip them with the nutritional sustenance at the lunch counter that can give them an opportunity to not just survive but thrive.

Mr. Chair, I implore you to think about the children. Don't think about the profits. Don't think about the lobby. Don't think about the efforts of a winner or loser. Let's put children first.

Let's make sure that we, as a Congress, recognize the value of fighting for those who have not been given the opportunity to fight for themselves.

Add soy. Create true alternatives. Do not force people to digest things that their bodies simply cannot.

Mr. Chair, it is for this reason and this reason solely that I cannot support this measure without true alternatives.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, we are very concerned about waste. One of the reasons there is so much waste is because whole milk is not allowed, and children don't like the taste of skim milk.

We are putting children first. We are not excluding soy drink. It is not milk. It is a plant-based food. It isn't milk, so you can't call it soy milk. You can call it soy drink.

It was under our first African-American President in this country that this was designed this way. The First Lady pushed through these rules and regulations to exclude whole milk, which, by the way, my colleague says has an enormous amount more fat.

The fat content of whole milk is about 3½ percent. We are foisting on children 1½ percent milk, which doesn't have a very good taste to many of them. We are excluding them from 3½ percent. We do not exclude soy drink. This is about inclusion and equity. We want people to be able to drink the kind of milk they want to drink.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1147, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, bicameral, and "udderly" fantastic bill.

I proudly represent Pennsylvania's 11th District, which is one of the largest dairy producers in the Northeast. In 2022, 1,300 Lancaster County farms produced 2.1 billion pounds of milk.

I have visited many of those farms, and I have had many discussions with local school administrators about the importance of child nutrition. We all agree that milk is a key vehicle for delivering protein, potassium, calcium, phosphorus, and vitamins A and D, especially for children.

Let's not skim over the facts here. Whole milk is truly the cream of the crop in delivering these key vitamins and nutrients to growing children.

Sadly, our Nation's kids are not consuming enough dairy. We have seen a decline in receiving those essential vitamins and nutrients since we banned whole milk in our schools. We can only begin to "cow-culate" the impact that has on their long-term health.

Let's not curdle away the opportunity to expand dairy consumption in our Nation's schools and ensure our children are getting the nutrients necessary to grow strong bones and teeth.

Mr. Chairman, all milk puns aside, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Expanding the universe of options for children to consume vital nutrients and vitamins is important for their long-term health. It also helps these kids be prepared for school, develop into adulthood, and cultivate a 21st century workforce.

Mr. Chairman, healthy kids and supporting our dairy farmers are "moo-tually" important.

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

Mr. Chairman, we received a letter from the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity, which says in part that the passing of H.R. 1147 "would be a departure from the longstanding tradition of establishing food and nutrition standards for Federal child nutrition programs based upon the findings of independent reviewers and the scientific community. There are evidenced-based strategies to increase school meal consumption—and, by extension, potentially school milk consumption—that do not involve weakening nutrition standards. Changes to school nutrition standards should be guided by the Dietary Guidelines, not special interests, and as such, we strongly urge you to put children's interests first and uphold the science-based process and oppose the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act of 2023. Our children deserve no less."

It is signed by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Advocates for Better Children's Diets, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Heart Association, American Public Health Association, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago, Balanced, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Chef Ann Foundation, Friends of the Earth, Healthy Food America, Healthy Schools Campaign, Life Time Foundation, National WIC Association, and Public Health Institute.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR
NUTRITION & ACTIVITY,
December 11, 2023.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, House Committee on Education and the
Workforce, House of Representatives.

Hon. ROBERT "BOBBY" SCOTT,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Edu-
cation and the Workforce, House of Rep-
resentatives.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: The undersigned members of the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity, the nation's largest nutrition advocacy coalition, strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 1147/S. 1957, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act of 2023. H.R. 1147/S. 1957 would allow school meals to offer full-fat (whole) and reduced-fat flavored and unflavored milk, and arbitrarily exempt full-fat and reduced-fat milk from current saturated fat limits in school meals, both of which are inconsistent with the recommendations of the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGAs).

School meal standards, by law, must be aligned with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, which are reviewed and revised every five years. The DGAs recommend full-fat (whole) milk only for children under the age of two, and fat-free and low-fat milk after that. In addition, the DGAs recommend saturated fat should account for less than 10 percent of calories per day. As such, both the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP) meal patterns allow only fat-free and low-fat milk and require that less than 10 percent of calories in the meal come from saturated fat over the week. Earlier this year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) proposed

updates to the school nutrition standards to more closely align with the 2020–2025 DGAs, which did not change the saturated fat limit nor increase the milkfat allowed to be served in school meals. Singling out milk—in this case, whole and reduced-fat milk—to be exempt from the recommendations of the Dietary Guidelines is a slippery slope for allowing—special interests to carve out exemptions in school meal program rules. Allowing the change in the service of whole and reduced-fat milk will negate the progress that has been made in the planning and service of healthier foods to children in schools.

Milk is an important part of a well-balanced diet. Milk contains nutrients of concern, such as vitamin D and calcium. However, unlike fat-free and low-fat milk, full-fat milk contains too much saturated fat to be part of a healthy food pattern. According to USDA data, one cup of whole milk contains around 4.5 grams of saturated fat. Full fat milk is so high in saturated fat that the government prohibits its labels from claiming that calcium can reduce the risk of osteoporosis; fat-free and low-fat milk, however, can make these claims. By allowing full-fat milk in lunch and adjusting saturated fat allowances accordingly, H.R. 1147/S. 1957 would allow an additional 4.5 grams of saturated fat daily in school meals beyond the science-based limit that is currently in place.

School meal nutrition standards were strengthened significantly in 2012. These updates were an overwhelming success, particularly for children in who are part of households with fewer financial resources. A 2021 study found that school meals are the single most healthy source of nutrition for children—more nutritious than grocery stores, restaurants, worksites, and others. Yet even with the current nutrition standards that limit saturated fat in school meals, most children, on average, still consume more saturated fat than is recommended. According to the DGA, more than 80 percent of children ages 5–8 years, more than 85 percent of youth ages 9–13, and over 75 percent of youth ages 14–18 consume too much saturated fat. Allowing full-fat milk in schools would only worsen this problem.

The fat content of school milk is neither the cause nor the solution to the decades-long decline in fluid milk consumption in the United States and the struggles of the dairy industry. According to a 2013 Economic Research Service (ERS) report, younger generations consume less milk than preceding generations, but this trend is not exclusive to schoolchildren. According to the ERS economists, “individuals born in the 1970s, for example, drank less milk in their teens, 20s, and 30s than individuals born in the 1960s did at the same age points. Those born in the 1980s and 1990s, in turn, appear likely to consume even less fluid milk in their adulthood than those born in the 1970s.” Rather than acknowledging the fact that 36 percent of Americans experience lactose malabsorption, (with African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, and Hispanics/Latinos experiencing at higher rates than non-Hispanic White Americans), H.R. 1147 perpetuates the cumbersome requirement that students must obtain a doctor’s note documenting a disability to receive a substitute for fluid milk, while arbitrarily increasing access to the less-healthy full-fat milk.

We thank you for your attention to this matter. Passing H.R. 1147/S. 1957 would be a departure from the long-standing tradition of establishing food and nutrition standards for federal child nutrition programs based upon the findings of independent reviewers and the scientific community. There are evidence-based strategies to increase school meal consumption—and by extension, poten-

tially school milk consumption—that do not involve weakening nutrition standards. Changes to school nutrition standards should be guided by the Dietary Guidelines, not special interests, and as such, we strongly urge you to put children’s interests first and uphold the science-based process and oppose the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act of 2023. Our children deserve no less.

Signed,

Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Advocates for Better Children’s Diets, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Heart Association, American Public Health Association, Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children’s Hospital of Chicago, Balanced, Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Chef Ann Foundation, Friends of the Earth, Healthy Food America, Healthy Schools Campaign, Life Time Foundation, National WIC Association, Public Health Institute.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the author of this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership and support.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of my legislation, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, that supports students and dairy farmers across America.

Milk is an essential building block for a well-rounded and balanced diet, offering 13 essential nutrients and numerous health benefits.

Out-of-touch Federal regulations have imposed dietary restrictions on the types of milk students have access to in school meals.

Our ranking member is a dear friend of mine, and we have worked together. I have been here for 15 years and him a little longer. We have a great relationship and have had a lot of bipartisan bills together, like we marked up yesterday.

Mr. Chair, I have to say, the only special interest here is our kids. It is our kids who have been cheated out of the nutrition that they need. Case studies have shown that the rate of obesity and being overweight increased dramatically after access to whole milk and flavor was taken out of the schools in 2007–2008, which was a baseline. In 2010, a Democrat-led initiative demonized milk fat. In 2020–2021, there was a study of that same cohort, and obesity has gone up without this beverage.

Mr. Chairman, regarding my good friend from Louisiana, who just spoke, everybody is entitled to their own opinion but not their own facts. The facts are that it is the underlying law that was passed back in 2010 by a Democratic House and signed by a Democratic President that, quite frankly, required a physician prescription for health reasons.

That is a good part of the law, and we didn’t touch that. We didn’t address that in this bill, so I am not sure why he is talking about it. It is not ger-

mane to the topic we are talking about today. That is the underlying law.

The bottom line is that students and parents do have choice. There is a mechanism to honor that. The only choice they don’t have, though, is access to the most nutritious beverage, which is whole milk—specifically, whole milk and flavor.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana sharing how much waste there was and what that amounts to in cartons and half pints and what it amounts to in dollars. That is because of the taste experience. It is not that these kids are throwing the milk away because it is unhealthy for them. It is just a terrible taste experience when you are drinking low-fat or nonfat milk.

Students have been limited to fat-free or reduced-fat milk since the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act was enacted in 2010.

While some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have argued that we should not reform individual aspects of child nutrition, it was that legislation more than a decade ago that singled out milk for regulation, which is why we are here today.

There are several reasons why these top-down regulations are harmful to students and school districts that are forced to comply with them.

First, we have seen students opt out of consuming milk altogether if they don’t have access to a variety that they enjoy. According to the “Scientific Report of the 2020 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee,” more than two-thirds of school-age children failed to meet the recommended levels of dairy. No kidding. We took out most nutrition and most taste and made it inaccessible to them.

Let’s face it, the only way to benefit from milk’s essential nutrients is to consume it. We are not force-feeding anybody anything. This is about choice. When students turn away from milk, they often opt for far less healthy alternatives that are highly caffeinated, sugar-sweetened, or lack key nutrients.

These regulations also perpetuate baseless claims that milk is bad for our kids. Research has shown time and time again that whole and 2 percent milk are not responsible for childhood obesity and other health concerns. In fact, these beverages are so nutritious that research shows positive health outcomes for kids who consume whole milk.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD academic studies from researchers around the world, including from top institutions such as Boston University and Tufts, who have studied the health effects of full-fat dairy.

[From the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition]

WHOLE MILK COMPARED WITH REDUCED-FAT MILK AND CHILDHOOD OVERWEIGHT: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Childhood obesity has tripled in the past 40 y, with nearly 1 in 3 North American children now overweight or obese (1–3). Over the

same period, consumption of whole-fat cow-milk has halved (4). The American Academy of Pediatrics and the Canadian Paediatric Society recommend that children switch from whole-fat cow-milk (3.25%) to reduced-fat cow-milk (0.1 to 2%) at 2 y of age to limit fat intake and minimize the risk of childhood obesity (5, 6). European (7), British (8), and Australian (9) health authorities have provided similar recommendations. Healthcare providers (10) and families (11) frequently follow this guideline, and school and child-care nutrition policies (12–14) often reflect them. Since 1970 whole-cow-milk availability has dropped by 80% in North America, whereas reduced-fat milk purchases have tripled (15, 16).

Given that cow-milk is consumed daily by 88% of children aged 1 to 3 y and by 76% of children aged 4 to 8 y in Canada (17) and is a major dietary source of energy, protein, and fat for children in North America (17, 18), understanding the relation between cow-milk fat and risk of overweight or obesity is important. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the relation between total dairy consumption and child adiposity have had conflicting findings. According to these studies, higher cow-milk intake in children is associated with taller height and better bone and dental health (19–21). Although these studies evaluated total dairy consumption, they did not consider cow-milk fat specifically. The objectives of this study were to systematically review and meta-analyze the relation between whole-fat (3.25%) relative to reduced-fat (0.1 to 2%) cow-milk and adiposity in children.

METHODS

A systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature was conducted. The study was designed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines (PRISMA-P) (22) and registered as a PROSPERO systematic review and meta-analysis (registration number: CRD42018085075).

INCLUSION CRITERIA

Types of studies

Studies included in the search were original works published in English in a peer-reviewed journal. Cross-sectional, cohort, case-control, and longitudinal studies, as well as intervention trials, both controlled and not controlled, were included in the search strategy. There were no restrictions on date or length of follow-up.

Population

Studies that included healthy children aged 1–18 y with ≥ 10 human subjects were considered. Studies that examined undernourished or disease populations (other than asthma) were excluded.

Exposures

The primary exposure was cow-milk fat, categorized as skim (0.1% fat), 1% fat, 2% fat, or whole or homogenized (3.25% fat). Measures of exposure included FFQ, multiday food record, 24-h food recall, or any other validated or nonvalidated measurement tool. Dietary pattern analyses were not included.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was childhood adiposity. These measures included BMI z-score (zBMI), BMI, weight for age, body fat mass, lean body mass, waist circumference, waist-to-hip ratio, body fat percentage, skinfold thickness, and prevalence of overweight or obesity as defined by the WHO (23), CDC (24), or International Obesity Task Force (IOTF) (25) cutoffs. When sufficient information was not available in the full text publication, study authors were contacted by email to obtain additional data.

Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis included studies that reported the number of children who consumed whole (3.25%), 2%, 1%, or skim (0.1%) milk regularly (a priori defined as typically, daily, or ≥ 4 times per week), as well as the number of children from each of these groups who were classified as either healthy weight, or overweight or obese (overweight and obese were included as 1 category) assessed using BMI standardized according to the WHO (23), CDC (24), or IOTF (25) criteria.

SEARCH METHODS

A comprehensive search strategy was developed by a research librarian (NT) with expertise in systematic reviews. From inception to August 2019, Embase, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature), MEDLINE, Scopus, and the Cochrane Library were searched on March 23, 2018 and updated on August 2, 2019 using Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and keywords (see Supplemental Methods for search strategies).

DATA EXTRACTION, MANAGEMENT, AND ANALYSIS

Study selection

To evaluate study eligibility 2 reviewers (MA and SMV) independently reviewed study titles, abstracts, and full texts if needed. Both reviewers applied inclusion and exclusion criteria and differences were examined and resolved by consensus, which was achieved 100% of the time. Full-text articles were retrieved for potentially eligible studies and reviewed. Characteristics of included full-text studies were summarized.

Data extraction

Two reviewers (MA and SMV) extracted data from eligible studies using standardized data extraction tables adapted from the Cochrane Data Extraction Template (26). Differences were resolved by consensus 100% of the time.

Data management

Covidence (27) software was used to select studies, review results, and resolve discrepancies between reviewers. All included study records were kept in spreadsheet format.

Data synthesis

Studies included in the analysis were described according to a standardized coding system that captured key elements of each study including descriptors of the study setting, population size and age (mean and range), exposure or intervention, comparator group, method of data collection, outcome measures, type of analysis, and results.

RISK OF BIAS AND STUDY QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Risk of bias was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (28) for non-randomized analyses, which expresses the risk of bias on a numerical scale ranging from 0 to 9; scores < 7 are considered low risk. (NOS criteria can be found in Table 2.) The NOS-guided review included an examination of participant selection, comparability of children consuming whole or reduced-fat milk, and exposure and outcome measure ascertainment. To allow sufficient follow-up time for a meaningful change in adiposity to occur, the minimum acceptable follow-up time was prespecified as 1 y. Study comparability, defined as whether studies adjusted for similar confounding variables, was specified a priori as studies that adjusted for important characteristics including: birth weight or baseline weight (for prospective cohort studies), milk volume consumed, and parent BMI. Studies that adjusted for each of these factors were awarded 2 points, whereas 1 point was allocated if adjustment was performed using ≤ 4 other covariates. Reports were assigned 1 point for ascertainment of

exposure only when structured interviews or medical records were used for data collection. Risk of bias was assessed by 2 reviewers (MA and SMV) and consensus was achieved 100% of the time.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

For each study, participant information, design, and results were summarized. We derived crude ORs and extracted adjusted ORs, whenever available, for overweight or obesity among children who consumed whole (3.25%) milk, compared with children who consumed reduced-fat (0.1–2%) milk regularly. A random effects model based on the restricted maximum likelihood estimator was decided a priori and used to separately pool crude and adjusted ORs of overweight or obesity. Each study was included as a random effect to account for between-study variation in this model. Sensitivity analyses were performed using the Knapp-Hartung method and inverse-variance weights. Because prospective cohort studies can reveal different relations than cross-sectional studies, we performed a subgroup analysis according to study design. Additionally, we analyzed studies in subgroups according to risk of bias (high compared with low) and age (1–5 y, 6–11 y, and 12–18 y). Subgroup analyses were accompanied by tests for interaction between each subgroup and the main effect from the random-effects metaregression, by using an interaction term in metaregression models for study design (cross-sectional compared with prospective cohort), risk of bias (high compared with low), and age group (1–5 y, 6–11 y, and 12–18 y). Heterogeneity across included studies was estimated using the I^2 statistic. Heterogeneity was considered low ($< 40\%$), moderate (40–60%), or high ($> 60\%$). Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot and Egger test.

Finally, we conducted a dose-response metaregression to quantify the association between percentage of fat in cow-milk consumed and the odds of overweight or obesity. Only studies that reported group-specific odds for < 3 types of cow-milk fat were included in this analysis. For the dose-response analysis, we first used a fixed-effect approach to estimate the dose-response relations within each study. Then, we used a random-effects approach to combine across studies the dose-response estimates that were generated in the first step for each study to obtain regression coefficients, and their respective standard errors. R software version 3.2.2 was used for all analyses, using the “metafor” package.

RESULTS

The database search identified 5862 potentially eligible studies. After exclusion of duplicates ($n = 1861$), 4001 reports underwent title and abstract review. Studies that did not meet inclusion criteria ($n = 3915$) were removed resulting in 86 published studies that underwent full text review. Reasons for exclusion included wrong exposure, wrong outcome, wrong patient population, dietary pattern analysis only, or wrong study design such as case reports or editorials. Twenty-eight studies met all inclusion criteria. Of these, 20 were cross-sectional and 8 were prospective cohort studies. No interventional studies were identified. Most studies ($n = 23$) compared consumption of whole milk (3.25% fat) with reduced-fat milk (0.1%, 1%, or 2% fat). Four studies (36–39) compared whole and 2% milk with 1% and skim milk. One study compared whole milk with 2% milk.

Nineteen studies used zBMI, 4 prospective cohort studies used percentage body fat change, and 5 studies used overweight or obesity categories as the primary adiposity outcome. Three studies used 2008 WHO growth standards, 14 studies used 2000 CDC growth

standards, 7 used 2000 IOTF growth standards, and 4 studies either did not specify or used other standards for zBMI measurement.

Eighteen (36, 38, 39, 41–45, 47–49, 51, 52, 57, 58, 60, 63, 65) studies reported that higher cow-milk fat was associated with lower child adiposity. Ten studies (37, 40, 46, 50, 53–56, 59, 61) reported no association between cow-milk fat and child adiposity.

RISK-OF-BIAS ASSESSMENT

Risk of bias assessed using the NOS suggested that 1 of 8 prospective cohort studies and 0 of 20 cross-sectional studies were low risk of bias. Common limitations that increased risk of bias included cross-sectional study design, nonstandardized dietary assessments that were either study specific or not validated, lack of adjustment for clinically important covariates (including volume of milk consumed, parent BMI, and child adiposity assessed prior to the outcome), and study duration too short to detect a meaningful change in adiposity (defined a priori as 1 y).

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN COW-MILK FAT AND CHILD OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY

Fourteen (38, 42–44, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 57, 58, 60, 62, 65) studies met the meta-analysis inclusion criteria; 11 were cross-sectional and 3 were prospective cohort studies. All studies included in the meta-analysis compared whole (3.25% fat) milk with reduced-fat (0.1–2%) milk consumption, allowing an OR to be calculated. A total of 20,897 healthy children aged 1–18 y were included in the meta-analysis. Children were from 7 countries (United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Brazil, Sweden, New Zealand, and Italy). Anthropometric standards used to determine overweight or obesity categories included the WHO, CDC, or IOTF growth standards in 6, 5, and 3 studies respectively.

Crude analysis of all 14 studies revealed that among children who consumed whole milk compared with reduced-fat milk, the pooled OR for overweight or obesity was 0.61 (95% CI: 0.52, 0.72; $P < 0.0001$). Heterogeneity measured by the I^2 statistic was 73.8% ($P < 0.0001$). A sensitivity analysis using inverse-variance weights did not reveal different results. Subgroup analysis by study design revealed no significant interaction between cross-sectional and prospective cohort studies. For the 11 cross-sectional studies ($n = 9413$), the pooled OR of overweight or obesity was 0.56 (95% CI: 0.46, 0.69; $P = 0.0001$), and for the 3 prospective cohort studies ($n = 11,484$) it was 0.76 (95% CI: 0.63, 0.92; $P = 0.006$).

Risk of bias (high compared with low) and age group were also not significant modifiers of the relation between cow-milk fat and child adiposity. Analyses of 5 studies (49, 51, 52, 57, 58) that reported adjusted ORs did not show differences between crude and adjusted estimates (adjusted OR: 0.53; 95% CI: 0.44, 0.63; crude OR: 0.55; 95% CI: 0.46, 0.66). Results of the sensitivity analysis using the Knapp-Hartung method to pool the 14 studies (crude OR: 0.62; 95% CI: 0.52, 0.73) were similar to the main results (crude OR: 0.61; 95% CI: 0.52, 0.72). Publication bias, visualized using a funnel plot was difficult to ascertain given the high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 73.8\%$) and relatively low number of included studies.

Data were available from 7 studies (38, 39, 44, 52, 57, 58, 65) which included 14,582 children aged 2 to 11 y, and demonstrated a linear association between higher cowmilk fat and lower child adiposity. For each 1% higher cowmilk fat consumed, the overall crude OR for overweight or obesity was 0.75 (95% CI: 0.65, 0.87; $P = 0.004$; $\tau^2 = 0.01$; $I^2 = 64\%$).

DISCUSSION

This systematic review and meta-analysis has identified that relative to reduced-fat cow-milk, whole-fat cow-milk consumption

was associated with lower odds of childhood overweight or obesity. The direction of the association was consistent across a range of study designs, settings, and age groups and demonstrated a dose effect. Although no clinical trials were identified, existing observational research suggests that consumption of whole milk compared with reduced-fat milk does not adversely affect body weight or body composition among children and adolescents. To the contrary, higher milk fat consumption appears to be associated with lower odds of childhood overweight or obesity.

Findings from the present study suggest that cow-milk fat, which has not been examined in previous meta-analyses, could play a role in the development of childhood overweight or obesity. Several mechanisms have been proposed that might explain why higher cow-milk fat consumption could result in lower childhood adiposity. One theory involves the replacement of calories from less healthy foods, such as sugar-sweetened beverages, with cow-milk fat. Consumption of beverages high in added sugar has been associated with increased risk of overweight and obesity during childhood. Other theories involve satiety mechanism such that higher milk fat consumption might induce satiety through the release of cholecystokinin and glucagon-like peptide 1 thereby reducing desire for other calorically dense foods. Another possibility is that lower satiety from reduced-fat milk could result in increased milk consumption causing higher weight gain relative to children who consume whole milk, as observed in the study by Berkey et al.

Cow-milk fat might offer cardiometabolic benefits. The types of fat found in cow-milk, including *trans*-palmitoleic acid, could be metabolically protective. Higher circulating *trans*-palmitoleic acid has been associated with lower adiposity, serum LDL cholesterol and triglyceride concentrations, and insulin resistance, and higher HDL cholesterol in several large adult cohort studies. However, diets that replace dairy fat with unsaturated fatty acids might also offer cardiometabolic protection.

Confounding by indication and reverse causality are plausible alternate explanations. Parents of children who have lower adiposity might choose higher-fat milk to increase weight gain. Similarly, parents of children who have higher adiposity might choose lower-fat milk to reduce the risk of overweight or obesity. The majority of children included in this systematic review were involved in prospective cohort studies, in which the potential for reverse causality is lower than in cross-sectional studies. Results from these 11,484 children were consistent with the overall findings. Two of the included prospective cohort studies attempted to address confounding by indication by adjusting for baseline BMI; 1 of these repeated the statistical analysis only among participants with normal-weight BMI values, with similar findings. Clinical trial data would have provided better evidence for the directionality of this relation; however, none were available.

This study had a number of strengths. The meta-analysis included a large, diverse sample of children from around the world. The number of potentially eligible studies was maximized by the comprehensive search strategy and contact with authors to obtain missing data. Also, study selection, data collection, and risk of bias assessment were performed by 2 independent reviewers, which improved accuracy and consistency. All studies included in the meta-analysis used trained individuals to obtain anthropometric measurements, and weight status was standardized using growth reference standards

(WHO, CDC, and IOTF). Using metaregression techniques, differences in study design, risk of bias, and age group were taken into account. Finally, a dose-response meta-analysis was conducted, which demonstrated a linear relation between higher cow-milk fat and lower child adiposity.

This study had a number of limitations. First, included studies were all observational. Only 1 study in this analysis was considered to have low risk of bias, and all studies in the meta-analysis had high risk of bias. Risk of bias included cross-sectional designs and lack of adjustment for clinically important covariates. For example, cow-milk volume was accounted for in only 11 of 28 studies in the systematic review, and in 5 of 14 studies in the meta-analysis. Adjustment for volume in future studies would allow for a clearer understanding of whether higher cow-milk fat protects against higher adiposity, or reduced-fat cow-milk increases adiposity. However, among these studies, comparison of adjusted compared with crude odds demonstrated consistent findings. Residual confounding by variables not accounted for in the individual analyses is also possible; this is a common limitation for meta-analyses of observational studies. Heterogeneity was relatively high ($I^2 = 73.8\%$), which might have been attributable to a variety of factors including varied methods of ascertainment of exposure and outcome, and differences in study design and follow-up duration. Although subgroup analyses of prospective cohort studies revealed results comparable to the overall metaregression, these comparisons might not have had sufficient power to detect clinically meaningful differences. However, 11,484 children were involved in prospective cohort studies making large differences in effect size unlikely. Although only studies with standardized dietary measurements were included, measurement error was possible due to recall bias or lack of validation of dietary assessment tool. Error in adiposity measurement could also have introduced bias, although weights and heights were measured by trained individuals and standardized protocols were used in all studies included in the meta-analysis. Differences in adiposity measurement (i.e., body fat percentage, zBMI, BMI), and different growth standards could have contributed to heterogeneity. For example, use of the WHO rather than IOTF or CDC standards could have resulted in a greater proportion of overweight or obese children being reported. Future studies using WHO growth standards, which are believed to represent optimal child growth, would help to minimize heterogeneity and overcome these limitations. Consideration for relevant outcomes such as cardiovascular risk should be included in future analyses to understand other effects of cow-milk fat. Publication bias was also possible as demonstrated by a funnel plot and Egger test.

In conclusion, observational evidence supports that children who consume whole milk compared with reduced-fat milk have lower odds of overweight or obesity. Given that the majority of children in North America consume cow-milk on a daily basis, clinical trial data and well-designed prospective cohort studies involving large, diverse samples, using standardized exposure and outcome measurements, and with long study duration would help determine whether the observed association between higher milk at consumption and lower childhood adiposity is causal.

[From the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition]

DAIRY FOODS, DAIRY FAT, DIABETES, AND DEATH: WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM 3 LARGE NEW INVESTIGATIONS?

(By Dariush Mozaffarian)

Dairy products are a major component of most diets, contributing ~10% of calories in the United States. Surprisingly, for such a major share of the food supply, their health effects remain remarkably uncertain, insufficiently studied, and controversial. Dietary guidelines on dairy remain largely based on theoretical considerations about isolated nutrients (e.g., theorized benefits of calcium or vitamin D; theorized harms of total fat or saturated fat) or short-term dietary pattern studies of surrogate markers, rather than on the mounting evidence on how milk, cheese, yogurt, butter, and other dairy foods relate to major clinical endpoints. Such evidence on health outcomes is crucial, because dairy products appear to be a heterogeneous class with complex effects dependent upon the interplay of diverse nutrients and processing characteristics (e.g. probiotics, fermentation, milk fat globule membrane, and more).

In this issue of the Journal, 3 new publications report on dairy consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes or mortality. Ardisson Korat et al. evaluated estimated dairy fat consumption and onset of diabetes in 3 cohorts of US health professionals. After adjustment for other risk factors, higher dairy fat intake, in comparison with carbohydrate, was associated with lower diabetes risk in 1 cohort of middle-aged women, and was not significantly associated with diabetes in the other 2 cohorts or among all 3 cohorts combined. In subgroup analyses, dairy fat intake was associated with lower risk of diabetes at younger ages (<65 y) and in women, the 2 subgroups among whom 70–80% of diabetes cases occurred—although these interactions by age and sex did not achieve statistical significance. When dairy fat was statistically compared with carbohydrate from whole grains, the latter was associated with lower risk of diabetes (per 5% energy, 7% lower risk), whereas, compared with other animal fats (largely form red meat and poultry) or with carbohydrate from refined grains, dairy fat consumption was associated with lower risk of diabetes (per 5% energy, 4–17% lower risk). Dairy fat consumption was not associated with incident diabetes when compared with vegetable fat, polyunsaturated fat (total, ω-6, or ω-3), or monounsaturated fat from plant sources. Because dairy fat in these cohorts was associated with several unhealthy lifestyle factors, including higher BMI, more current smoking, less physical activity, fewer fruits and vegetables, and a less healthy overall dietary pattern, this suggests that residual confounding, if present—the major limitation of observational cohorts such as this one—would tend to cause bias toward dairy fat appearing more harmful (less beneficial) than it actually may be.

These findings add to a growing body of literature which call into question the soundness of conventional dietary recommendations to avoid dairy fat. As noted by Ardisson Korat et al., dairy fat contains a complex mix of different SFAs, other unsaturated and conjugated fatty acids, and other constituents, each with varying biological effects. Physiologic effects of dairy fat further vary according to content of milk fat globule membrane, which alters cholesterol absorption and perhaps skeletal muscle responses to exercise. Also, cheese, the major source of dairy fat in most diets, is a fermented food and a rich source of menaquinones which may improve insulin secretion and sensitivity through

osteocalcin-related pathways. In a recent pooling project of de novo individual-level analyses from 16 prospective cohort studies across 4 continents (including 2 of the 3 US cohorts evaluated by Ardisson Korat et al.), objective blood biomarkers of odd-chain saturated fats and trans-palmitoleic acid, each found in dairy fats, were associated with significantly lower risk of diabetes. Together with these prior findings, the new results by Ardisson Korat et al. provide little support for metabolic harms of dairy fat, and indeed suggest potential benefits among younger adults, among women, and as a replacement for other animal fats or refined carbohydrates.

A second report in this issue of the Journal assessed how changes in dairy foods, assessed using serial questionnaires, related to incident diabetes in the same 3 US cohorts of health professionals. After multivariable adjustment, participants who decreased their total dairy intake by >1 serving/d over a 4-year period experienced 11% higher incidence of diabetes, compared with stable intake. Among dairy subtypes, changes in low-fat milk, whole milk, and cream were not significantly associated with diabetes, whereas decreases in ice cream, increases in some types of cheese, and decrease in yogurt were each associated with higher risk. Several factors complicate the interpretation of this analysis. Foremost, none of these findings were symmetrical for increases compared with decreases in intake: i.e., when decreased consumption of total dairy or a dairy subtype was linked to diabetes risk, increased consumption was not linked in the opposing direction, and vice versa. This contrasts expected biology and the important Bradford Hill criterion of dose-response, which for example has been evidenced in these cohorts for dietary changes and long-term weight gain. In addition, results for each of the dairy subtypes appeared generally inconsistent across the 3 cohorts, with little uniformity (I^2 values were not reported). Some of the findings counter expected causal biology—e.g., that decreasing ice cream increases diabetes—raising concern for reverse causation. The dietary instrument was also variably reliable for assessing different dairy foods: for example, as compared with multiple dietary records, the FFQ reliably measured consumption of yogurt ($r = 0.97$), but not hard cheese ($r = 0.38$). In light of the 26 prior cohort studies which have reported on dairy consumption and incident diabetes, in sum suggesting lower risk from total dairy and especially yogurt consumption, the internal inconsistencies of the present findings for changes in dairy foods raise more questions than they answer.

In the third publication in this issue, Pala et al. investigated dairy consumption and death from cancer, cardiovascular disease, and all causes in a community-based Italian cohort. After adjustment for other risk factors, compared with no consumption, moderate milk intake (≤ 200 g or ~6.5 ounces per day) was associated with ~25% lower mortality, largely owing to ~50% lower cardiovascular mortality, but consumption at higher levels was not associated with lower risk. Findings were similar for low-fat compared with whole-fat milk. Intakes of yogurt, cheese, and butter were not significantly associated with mortality. As the authors concluded, the lack of linear dose-response for milk raises questions about the validity of the observed benefits, but none of the findings support the hypothesis that milk, yogurt, cheese, or butter consumption increases mortality.

The global pandemics of obesity and type 2 diabetes, together with high rates of cardiovascular disease and cancer, have stimulated a new popular frenzy around healthier eat-

ing. Although the resulting attention on diet-related health impacts, economic burdens, and corresponding policy solutions has been positive, the craze of competing popular diets and their proponents have simultaneously fueled confusion, controversy, and skepticism. For example, ignoring the preponderance of evidence, some popular books and social media headlines claim that dairy foods are toxic. At the same time, prevailing dietary guidelines exacerbate the confusion, remaining mired in outdated conceptual frameworks and hesitating to acknowledge new paradigms of complexity.

As is always true in science, these 3 new investigations cannot by themselves definitively eliminate confusion or answer all questions. Yet, these studies aimed to address crucial questions on dairy and health in large and well-designed prospective cohorts. Together, the findings provide little support that consumption of total dairy, dairy subtypes, or dairy fat is harmful, and they continue to build the case for possible benefits. As recently reviewed, the dizzyingly complex characteristics and molecular effects of different dairy foods belie any simplistic overall summary or synopsis. These 3 new studies highlight this complexity and the urgent need for additional long-term prospective studies, interventional trials, and mechanistic investigations of dairy foods and health.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, these studies show, among other things, that full-fat dairy foods have little to no association with high blood pressure, cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, obesity, blood pressure, or cholesterol.

In fact, several of these studies show that full-fat foods help improve or lower negative health outcomes for children who drink more full-fat dairy beverages.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FULCHER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, additionally, since whole milk was removed from school lunchrooms, the childhood obesity rate has increased, according to the CDC and several case studies. Whole milk is not the problem.

For our children to excel in the classroom and beyond, they must have access to more nutritious options, not fewer.

The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act will allow schools participating in the National School Lunch Program to serve all varieties of flavored and unflavored milk, including whole milk.

It is important to remember that this legislation does not require any student to drink, or any school to serve, whole milk. Rather, this legislation simply gives schools the flexibility to serve a broader variety of milk in the school lunchroom.

Additionally, if students have a documented medical condition or disability that prohibits them from safely or comfortably consuming milk, schools are required to offer them an alternative beverage. This legislation would not change that standard.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to have 134 bipartisan cosponsors from 44 States.

The bottom line is the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act is about ensuring students have the necessary nutrients to learn and grow.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 13½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have enjoyed working together on many different bills, but on this bill, we happen to disagree. He has presented evidence on the floor that, instead of being considered by Members of Congress, really ought to be considered by the experts in the normal scientific process.

□ 1430

If the schoolchildren get the benefit of his studies, then tell it to the experts and not the politicians. I would hope that we would stick with the scientific process, as we are doing. Let's stick with the DGAs and not the political process in changing the process by trying to convince Members of Congress who are subject to political pressures on one side or another. So I would hope that we would stick to that process and not the political process.

If we have studies, then show it to the experts and not the politicians.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), who is the vice chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I thank Ms. FOXX for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman THOMPSON and Chairwoman FOXX for sponsoring this important legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 1147, the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act. This crucial legislation recognizes the nutritional benefits of whole milk for our children.

As a result of the radical Obama Administration policies led by Michelle Obama, only fat-free and low-fat milks can be served in school meals.

H.R. 1147 would end this practice and allow schools to serve whole milk. Whole milk is a rich source of essential nutrients, including calcium and vitamin D, which are vital for developing strong bones and a healthy immune system.

Studies have also shown that whole milk can contribute to healthier weight in children. I raised my seven children on whole-fat milk, and they are all within normal weights. I also have recognized that children who have high-fat diets stay full longer.

I am proud to support this bill on behalf of parents, and I want to thank America's dairy farmers for producing milk for our families.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD two scientific articles.

[From the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy]

DAIRY FOODS, OBESITY, AND METABOLIC HEALTH: THE ROLE OF THE FOOD MATRIX COMPARED WITH SINGLE NUTRIENTS

(BY DARIUSH MOZAFFARIAN)

INTRODUCTION

Conventional dietary guidelines from around the globe have focused on individual nutrients to maintain and improve health and prevent disease. This is due to the historical focus, developed in the last century, on single nutrients in relation to clinical nutrient deficiency diseases. However, this reductionist approach is inappropriate for translation to chronic diseases.

A look back at the history of modern nutrition science provides important perspectives on the origins of the reductionist approach to nutrition. In 1747, the British sailor and physician James Lind tested whether citrus fruits prevented scurvy, but it was not until 1932 that vitamin C was actually isolated, synthesized, and proven to be the relevant ingredient. The period of the 1930s to 1950s was a golden era of vitamin discovery, when all the major vitamins were identified, isolated, and synthesized, and shown to be the active constituents of foods relevant for nutrient deficiency diseases such as pellagra (niacin), beriberi (thiamine), rickets (vitamin D), and night blindness (vitamin A). This scientific focus on nutrient deficiencies coincided with global geopolitics, in particular the Great Depression and World War II, which accentuated concerns about insufficient food and nutrients. For example, the birth of RDAs was at the National Nutrition Conference on Defense in 1941, which focused on identifying the individual nutrients needed to prevent nutrient deficiencies in order to have a population ready for war. Together, these scientific and historical events led to the concept of food as a delivery system for calories and specific isolated nutrients.

It was not until the 1980s that modern nutrition science began to meaningfully consider nutrition in association with chronic diseases, such as obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease (CVD), and cancer. Intuitively, the reductionist paradigm that had been so successful in reducing the prevalence of nutrient deficiency diseases was extended to chronic diseases. Thus, saturated fat became "the" cause of heart disease, whereas now, excess calories and fat are "the" causes of obesity.

What recent advances in nutrition science have demonstrated, however, is that although a single-nutrient focus works well for prevention of deficiency diseases, such as scurvy or beriberi, this approach generally fails for chronic diseases such as coronary artery disease (CAD), stroke, type 2 diabetes, or obesity. For such complex conditions, the focus should be on foods.

CALORIES IN/CALORIES OUT

The US obesity epidemic is a recent phenomenon, starting in the mid-1980s, and the rise of obesity globally is even more recent. The strategies to address this epidemic have not yet caught up with advances in nutrition science. Most current dietary recommendations and policies across the globe remain calorie and fat focused, recommending foods based on these reductionist metrics rather than their complex, empirically determined effects on health. For example, nearly all guidelines recommend low-fat or nonfat dairy foods to reduce calories, total fat, and saturated fat in the diet, based on the theory that this will help maintain a healthy weight and reduce the risk of CVD. This is

seen, for example, in the 2015–2020 US Dietary Guidelines; National School Lunch Program, NIH Dietary Guidelines for Kids; and CDC Diabetes Prevention Program.

However, foods are not simply a collection of individual components, such as fat and calories, but complex matrices that have correspondingly complex effects on health and disease. Recommendations based on calorie or fat contents fail to consider the complex effects of different foods, independent of their calories, on the body's multiple, redundant mechanisms for weight control, from the brain to the liver, the microbiome, and hormonal and metabolic responses. This growing evidence indicates that different foods, calorie-for-calorie, have different effects on the risk of long-term weight gain and success of weight maintenance.

DAIRY FOODS AND WEIGHT

Although dairy products contribute ~10 percent of all calories in the US diet, until recently, little direct research had evaluated the health effects of different dairy foods. The complex ingredients and matrices of different dairy foods, from milk to yogurt to cheese, appear to have varying effects on weight.

Although considerable research has focused on optimal diets for weight loss among obese individuals (secondary prevention), fewer studies have evaluated determinants of gradual weight gain (primary prevention). Among nonobese US adults, the average weight gain is ~1 lb (0.45 kg) per year. This represents a very slow, modest increment, but when sustained over many years, this small annual weight gain drives the obesity epidemic. This gradual pace also makes it difficult, if not impossible, for individuals to identify specific causes or remedies.

To identify specific dietary factors associated with long-term weight gain, we performed prospective investigations among 3 separate cohorts that included 120,877 US men and women who were free of chronic disease and not obese at baseline. We examined weight gain every 4 y, for up to 24 y of follow-up, and its association with the increased intake of individual foods. Within each 4-y period, participants gained an average of 3.35 lb. On the basis of increased daily servings of different foods, those strongly linked to weight gain were generally carbohydrate-rich, including potato chips (per daily serving, 1.69 lb greater weight gain every 4 y), other potatoes/fries (1.28 lb), sugar-sweetened beverages (1.00 lb), sweets (0.65 lb), and refined grains (0.56 lb). Other foods were not linked to weight gain, even when then intake was increased, including cheese, low-fat milk, and whole milk. Other foods were actually related to less weight gain: the more they were consumed, the less weight was gained. This included vegetables (–0.22 lb), whole grains (–0.37 lb), fruits (–0.49 lb), nuts (–0.57 lb), and yogurt (–0.82 lb) When sweetened vs. plain yogurt were evaluated, each was associated with relative weight loss, although when sweetened, about half the benefit was lost.

What could explain these findings? We hypothesize that different foods have varying effects on multiple redundant mechanisms for weight gain, including effects on hunger and fullness, glucose, insulin and other hormonal responses, de novo fat synthesis by the liver, gut microbiome responses; and the body's metabolic rate.

Based on these findings, certain foods, when consumed over the long term can have relatively neutral effects on weight, others promote weight gain, whereas still others promote weight loss.

Interestingly, although we found that cheese, low-fat milk, and whole-fat milk were each unassociated with weight change,

there is evidence that dairy foods may promote healthier body composition. Consistent with our findings, a systematic review and meta-analysis of 37 randomized clinical trials with 184,802 participants, which assessed the effect of dairy consumption on weight and body composition, found that overall, dairy consumption had little effect on BMI. Body composition, however, changed significantly. Dairy consumption led to a reduction in fat mass (0.23 kg) and an increase in lean body mass (0.37 kg). Overall, high-dairy intervention increased body weight (0.01, 95 percent CI: -0.25, 0.26), and lean mass (0.37, 95 percent CI: 0.11, 0.62); decreased body fat (-0.23, 95 percent CI: -0.48, 0.02) and waist circumference (-1.37 95 percent CI: -2.28, -0.46).

In subgroup analyses, such effects appeared larger in trials also having energy restriction, but such subgroup findings should be interpreted cautiously. The types and frequency of dairy products consumed varied among these trials, making it difficult to make distinctions in this meta-analysis about the effects of different types of dairy products such as low-fat or whole fat, or milk, yogurt, or cheese. When viewed in combination with our long-term observational findings, the joint results suggest that dairy foods do not promote weight gain, that dairy consumption may reduce body fat and augment muscle mass, and that the type of dairy product (milk compared with cheese compared with yogurt) may be more important for preventing long-term weight gain than the dairy fat content.

DAIRY FOODS, PROBIOTICS, AND THE MICROBIOME

Many pathways appear relevant to the concept that foods cannot be judged on calorie content alone for risk of obesity. Among these, the gut microbiome is particularly interesting. Substantial evidence demonstrates that the quality of the diet strongly influences the gut microbiome. Among different factors, probiotics have been studied for their effect on the microbiome; as well as potential benefits of fermented foods, which may be greater than the sum of their individual microbial, nutritive, or bioactive components.

For example, in an experimental model, mice genetically predisposed to obesity were provided control diets or a “fast-food” chow with and without probiotic-containing yogurt or a single probiotic (*Lactobacillus reuteri*) in water. Without probiotics, mice on the fast-food chow gained significant weight. However, the addition of either probiotic-containing yogurt or water prevented this weight gain. Crucially, the probiotics did not appear to reduce the amount of calories consumed; rather, the benefits appeared related to changes in microbiome function and inflammatory pathways. The results support weight benefits of probiotics and, more importantly, provide empiric evidence that challenges the widely accepted conventional wisdom that the effects of different foods on obesity depend largely on their calories.

Consistent with this animal experiment, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis of 15 randomized controlled trials examined the effects of probiotics, either in foods or as supplements, on body weight and composition in overweight and obese subjects. Administration of probiotics significantly reduced body weight percent (-0.60 kg), BMI (-0.27 kg/m²), and fat percentage (0.60 percent), compared with placebo. A separate meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials demonstrated that consumption of probiotics in foods or supplements significantly improves blood glucose, insulin, and insulin resistance. The trials in these two meta-anal-

yses were neither long-term nor large—in all, a total of about 1,000 subjects were included in each meta-analysis, with trial durations ranging from 3 to 24 wk and with varying designs in terms of controls, disease conditions, and composition of probiotic preparations evaluated. Nonetheless, together with observational and experimental evidence, these studies provide compelling evidence to support weight and metabolic benefits of foods rich in probiotics.

DAIRY FOODS, CVD, AND DIABETES

Although an important risk factor for type 2 diabetes and CVD, growing research suggests that specific foods may also directly alter disease risk. In a meta-analysis of 29 prospective cohort studies including 938,465 participants who experienced 93,158 deaths, 28,419 incident CAD events, and 25,416 incident CVD events, neither total dairy nor milk consumption was significantly associated with total mortality, CAD, or CVD. Notably, findings were similar when total whole-fat dairy, or low-fat dairy were separately evaluated. In contrast, the intake of fermented dairy products (predominantly cheese, plus yogurt and fermented milk) was associated with modestly lower risk of total mortality and CVD, with about 5 percent lower risk of each per 50 g daily serving. In addition, the consumption of cheese alone, the dairy product with the highest amount of dairy fat, was associated with a significantly lower risk of both CAD and stroke.

In the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis cohort, including 5209US adults with Caucasian, Asian, black, and Hispanic backgrounds, different food sources of saturated fat were analyzed for their relation with subsequent CVD risk, adjusted for sociodemographics, medical history, and other dietary and lifestyle factors. A higher intake of saturated fat from dairy sources was associated with significantly lower CVD risk (per each 5 g/d, RR = 0.79, 95 percent CI = 0.68, 0.92), whereas a higher intake of saturated fat from meat sources was associated with higher CVD risk (per each 5 g/d, RR = 1.26, 95 percent CI = 1.02, 1.54). Intakes of saturated fat from other sources, such as butter and plant oils/foods, were too low to identify any associations.

These findings suggest that saturated fat from different food sources may have varying effects on CVD risk. This may partly relate, for example, to differences in the types of saturated fatty acids in meat compared with dairy. Compared with meat, dairy has a greater proportion of short-chain and medium-chain saturated fatty acids, with correspondingly less palmitic and stearic acids. Compared with their longer chain fatty acids, growing evidence suggests that shorter and medium-chain triglycerides have different physiology, including potential benefits on metabolic risk, weight gain, obesity, and the gut microbiome.

In addition, cardiometabolic effects of different dairy foods appear to vary depending on other characteristics, such as fermentation or the presence of probiotics. The large European Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) cohort across 8 European countries evaluated the consumption of different dairy foods and risk of diabetes among 340,234 participants with 12,403 new cases of diabetes during follow-up. In the fully adjusted model including adjustment for estimated dietary calcium, magnesium, and vitamin D, the consumption of milk (low-fat and whole-fat) was not significantly associated with type 2 diabetes. Individuals who consumed more yogurt or thick fermented milk experienced a nonsignificant trend toward lower risk (across quintiles: RR = 0.89, 95 percent CI = 0.77, 1.03; *P*-trend = 0.11), whereas individuals who consumed more

cheese had significantly lower risk of diabetes (RR = 0.83, 95 percent CI = 0.70, 0.98, *P*-trend = 0.003). A higher combined intake of fermented dairy products (cheese, yogurt, and thick fermented milk) was also associated with a lower risk of diabetes (RR = 0.85, 95 percent CI = 0.73, 0.99, *P*-trend = 0.02).

Similarly, in the Malmö Diet and Cancer Cohort following 26,930 participants over 14 y, different food sources of fat and saturated fat had very different associations with incidence of diabetes. Overall, low-fat dairy consumption was associated with a higher risk of diabetes (across quintiles: RR = 1.14, 95 percent CI = 1.01, 1.28; *P*-trend = 0.01), whereas whole-fat dairy consumption was associated with a substantially lower risk RR = 0.77, 95 percent CI = 0.68, 0.87, *P*-trend < 0.001). However, relations varied further by subtype. For example, nonfermented, low-fat milk was associated with higher risk; nonfermented, whole-fat milk was not associated with risk; and fermented, whole-fat milk was associated with lower risk. Cheese intake showed a nonsignificant trend toward lower risk (RR = 0.92, 95 percent CI = 0.81, 1.04; *P*-trend = 0.21), whereas red meat intake was associated with significantly higher risk (RR = 1.36, 95 percent CI = 1.20, 1.55; *P*-trend < 0.001). When estimated intakes of individual fatty acids were evaluated, intakes of saturated fatty acids with 4–10 carbons, lauric acid (12:0), and myristic acid (14:0) were associated with decreased risk (*P*-trend = 0.01).

In addition to the consumption of whole foods such as milk, cheese, or yogurt, significant amounts of dairy fat can be consumed as relatively “hidden” ingredients in creams, sauces, cooking fats, bakery desserts, and mixed dishes such as casseroles containing butter, milk, or cheese. Self-reported questionnaires may miss many of these sources, leading to inaccurate measurement of true dairy fat consumption in individuals. Biomarkers can partly reduce this mismeasurement. In a global consortium combining de novo individual-level analyses across 63,602 participants in 16 separate cohort studies, higher blood concentrations of odd-chain saturated fatty acids (15:0, 17:0) and a natural ruminant *trans* fatty acid (*trans*-16:1n-7), objective circulating biomarkers of dairy fat consumption, were evaluated in relation to onset of diabetes. Each fatty acid was associated with lower incidence of diabetes, with ~20–35% lower risk across the interquartile range of blood concentrations. It is unclear whether such lower risk is related to direct health benefits of specific dairy fatty acids, or to other aspects of foods rich in dairy fat. For example, the major source of dairy fat in most diets is cheese, a fermented food rich in vitamin K2 (menaquinone) which is converted from vitamin K by the action of bacteria. Menaquinone, which cannot be separately synthesized by humans, is linked to lower risk of type 2 diabetes in prospective observational studies, with supportive experimental evidence for potential benefits on glucose control and insulin sensitivity. The biologic mechanisms that could explain metabolic and diabetes benefits of dairy foods and dairy fat have been recently reviewed.

Based on all the evidence, the relation of dairy foods to obesity, CVD, and diabetes does not consistently differ by fat content, but rather appears to be more specific to food type. In particular, neither low-fat nor whole milk appear strongly related to either risks or benefits, whereas cheese and yogurt (as well as other fermented dairy such as fermented milk) may each be beneficial. These findings suggest that health effects of dairy may depend on multiple complex characteristics, such as probiotics, fermentation, and processing, including homogenization and the presence or absence of milk fat globule membrane.

HOLISTIC DIETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Conventional dietary guidelines generally recommend 2-3 daily servings of low-fat or nonfat dairy foods, without regard of type (yogurt, cheese, milk); largely based on theorized benefits of isolated nutrients for bone health (e.g., calcium, vitamin D) and theorized harms of isolated nutrients for obesity and CAD (e.g., total fat, saturated fat, total calories). Advances in science indicate that updated dietary guidelines must incorporate the empirical evidence on health effects of different dairy products on weight, body composition, CVDs, and diabetes. These findings suggest that recommendations for milk, cheese, and yogurt should be considered separately, based on their differing relations with clinical outcomes. These findings further suggest that whole-fat dairy foods do not cause weight gain; that overall dairy consumption increases lean body mass and reduces body fat; that yogurt consumption and probiotics reduce weight gain; that fermented dairy consumption including cheese is linked to lower CVD risk; and that yogurt, cheese, and even dairy fat may protect against type 2 diabetes.

Based on the current science, dairy consumption is part of a healthy diet, and intakes of probiotic-containing yogurt and fermented dairy products such as cheese should be especially encouraged. Based on little empirical evidence that low-fat dairy products are better for health, and at least emerging research suggesting potential benefits of foods rich in dairy fat, the choice between low-fat compared with whole-fat dairy should be left to personal preference, pending further research. Such recommendations are consistent with a growing focus on and understanding of the importance of foods and overall diet patterns, rather than single isolated nutrients.

[From the European Journal of Clinical Nutrition, Dec. 11, 2017]

EFFECT OF WHOLE MILK COMPARED WITH SKIMMED MILK ON FASTING BLOOD LIPIDS IN HEALTHY ADULTS: A 3-WEEK RANDOMIZED CROSSOVER STUDY

(By Sara Engel, Mie Elhauge, and Tine Tholstrup)

INTRODUCTION

Dairy is a source of saturated fat (SFA) and dietary recommendations for choosing low-fat dairy products are mainly based on predicted effects of macronutrients, such as SFA, which are known to increase LDL cholesterol concentration in the blood. However, there is disagreement between dietary guidelines and results from meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies reporting no association between dairy and risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD) and an inverse association with type 2 diabetes (T2D). A meta-analysis including studies comparing diets of equal SFA content from cheese and butter reported a beneficial effect of cheese on LDL cholesterol. Moreover, a comparison between regular and reduced fat cheese found no difference in effect on LDL cholesterol and risk markers of the metabolic syndrome, although a significantly higher SFA content in the regular fat cheese diet. This could suggest that the expected effect on LDL cholesterol was mediated by a combination of nutrients or bioactive components in the cheese matrix. Every day, people make a choice between whole milk and skimmed milk in the super market. Thus, a comparison between these high and low-fat dairy products is a real-life practical issue for the consumer that makes it possible to further examine the effect of milk fat on health. Two studies compared milk with different fat content and found no difference in

changes in LDL and HDL cholesterol; one between two control diets with semi-skimmed and skimmed milk (1.9 vs. 0.3%) and another between whole milk and skimmed milk (3.4 vs. 0.2%) but with only eight participants and therefore underpowered. Current evidence from randomized controlled trials (RCTs) indicate that milk consumption has no effect on risk of T2D in terms of fasting insulin and glucose concentrations, although not consistently. The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of whole milk compared with skimmed milk on serum total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol, and triacylglycerol concentration and secondarily on glucose and insulin concentrations in healthy subjects. We hypothesized that whole milk would increase fasting blood cholesterol concentration moderately compared to skimmed milk.

METHODS

Subjects

Subjects were recruited through postings on the Internet and around university campus area in Copenhagen. A total of 25 subjects were screened through telephone calls, 19 were assessed for eligibility, 18 were enrolled in the study, and 1 subject dropped out after randomization. Exclusion criteria were: previous or current CVD, diabetes, or other severe chronic disease; BMI (in kg/m²) <18.5 and >30; age <20 years and >70 years; pregnancy or planning of pregnancy during study period; excessive physical activity (>10 h/wk); milk allergy or lactose intolerance; blood donation <1 mo prior to and during study period; use of supplements, lipid-lowering medication, as well as medicine that might affect study outcomes; known or suspected abuse of alcohol, medication, or drugs; blood pressure >140/90 mmHg; and inability to follow study protocol. After receiving oral and written information about the study all subjects gave their informed consent in writing and completed a lifestyle questionnaire including questions about current and previous disease.

STUDY DESIGN

The study was a crossover RCT. The two intervention periods of whole milk and skimmed milk (in random order) were 3 weeks long with no wash-out period, as the lipids in the blood are known to adjust after 2 weeks. The study was not blinded as the appearance of the test beverages could not be concealed. However, analyses of blood samples as well as statistics were done blinded. Sample size was based on a previous study on dairy fat in which butter significantly increased LDL cholesterol compared with olive oil (control) (difference in concentration 0.17 mmol/L). Thus with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.19 mmol/L, a total of 12 subjects had to be included in order to detect a similar difference (assuming a significance level of 5 and 80% power). The study was carried out at the Department of Nutrition, Exercise, and Sports, Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg, Denmark from 3 October to 17 December 2015. The study was approved by the Municipal Ethical Committee of Copenhagen (Report H-15011908) and conducted according to the Helsinki Declaration.

INTERVENTION

The test foods were provided to the study subjects, consisting of 0.5 L conventional skimmed milk (0.1%, Arla Foods, Denmark) and whole milk (3.5%, Arla Foods, Denmark) from cows and from the same season. The energy content and macronutrient composition of the milks are shown in Table 1. Subjects were instructed not to consume yogurt, ice-cream, or milk besides the test milk. For other dairy products such as cheese and butter and for cooking oils subjects were in-

structed to keep the same dietary pattern throughout the intervention. Apart from the test foods and restrictions in dairy intake the remaining diet was self-selected and study subjects were asked to maintain their usual diets and their regular level of physical activity throughout the intervention periods. Subjects were instructed in how to substitute the test foods for food items from their habitual diets (usually the milk they normally drank). Weekly subjects visited the department to collect the milk and for weighing and follow-up making sure they adhered to the test diet and kept a stable body weight during intervention periods. Compliance was measured as a percentage of milk consumed according to a diary kept throughout the intervention compared with the milk handed out. Subjects completed 3-d dietary records the last week of each period and were instructed to include 1 weekend day and 2 weekdays to take account of differences in nutrient intake. Dietary intake was assessed using Dankost Pro dietary assessment software (Dankost).

CLINICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Fasting blood samples were taken at baseline, after 3 weeks and after 6 weeks. Prior to the blood sampling subjects fasted (12 h) and were asked to refrain from smoking (12 h), extreme sports (36 h), alcohol or medicine (24 h). Blood samples were drawn for assessment of following: serum lipids (total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol and triacylglycerol), insulin, and plasma glucose. Samples for assessment of blood lipids and insulin were collected into dry tubes, and samples for glucose were collected into tubes with a 1 × 3 mL-fluoride citrate mixture. To coagulate blood samples were stored at room temperature for 30 min. Further, blood samples for assessment of blood lipid and insulin concentrations were centrifuged at 2754 × g for 10 min at 4°C and stored at -80°C until the concentration was analyzed. For glucose, samples were centrifuged at 2754 × g for 10 min at 20°C and stored at -80°C until the concentration was analyzed. LDL and HDL cholesterol concentrations were assessed by enzymatic colorimetric procedure (ABX Pentra LDL Direct CP and ABX Pentra HDL Direct CP, respectively; Horiba ABX). Concentration of total cholesterol was assessed by enzymatic photometric test (CHOD-PAP from ABX Pentra Cholesterol CP). Triacylglycerol and glucose concentrations were assessed by enzymatic colorimetric procedure (ABX Pentra Triglycerides CP and ABX Pentra Glucose HK CP; Horiba ABX, respectively). Blood lipid concentration was analyzed on an ABX Pentra 400 Chemistry Analyzer (Horiba ABX). Interassay CVs for total, LDL and HDL cholesterol, triacylglycerol, and glucose were 2.2, 2.7, 2.0, 2.6, and 2.5%, respectively. Intra-assay CVs for total, LDL and HDL cholesterol, triacylglycerol, and glucose were 0.9, 0.7, 1.2, 3.8, and 1.1%, respectively. Insulin concentrations were assessed by the solid-phase enzyme-labeled chemiluminescent immunometric assay with an Immulite 2000 XPI (Siemens Medical Solutions Diagnostics). Interassay and intra-assay CVs for insulin were 3.5 and 4.2%, respectively.

Insulin resistance was evaluated by using homeostasis model assessment—insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) with the following formula: HOMA-IR = Fasting serum insulin (μU/mL) × fasting plasma glucose (mmol/L)/22.5.

Fasting body weight was measured at baseline, 3 and 6 weeks to the nearest 0.1 kg wearing light clothing and having emptied their bladder in advance. Height, body weight for BMI calculation, and waist circumference were also measured at screening. Height was measured without shoes to the nearest 0.5 cm with a wall-mounted

stadiometer (Seca) and waist circumference was measured horizontally at the midpoint between the bottom rib and the top of the hip bone.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistical differences for outcome measures were analyzed with linear mixed models that incorporated systematic effects of period and treatment and their interaction. Approximate F-tests were used to evaluate the interaction between time and treatment and if non-significant to evaluate a time-independent treatment effect. Baseline values and relevant covariates: sex, age, waist circumference, and baseline-BMI were included. Subject-specific random effects were included to account for inter-subject variability and to adjust for non-specific differences that could not be explained by the explanatory variables included. For dietary records statistical differences were based on paired t-test or Wilcoxon Signed Rank test for non-parametric variables. Treatment differences were reported in terms of unadjusted mean levels with corresponding standard errors. All models were validated by graphical assessment of normal quantile plots and residual vs. fitted plots. When departure was detected logarithmic transformation of the variables were made. Variance homogeneity was visually inspected and showed similar variance. Concentration of glucose and insulin were correlated to blood lipid responses using Pearson correlation test or Spearman correlation test for non-parametric variables. A two-tailed P-value < 0.05 was considered significant. The statistical software R version 3.1.3 2015 was used for all statistical evaluations.

RESULTS

Subjects

Of the 18 recruited subjects, 1 dropped out in the first period because of inability to follow study protocol. Baseline characteristics of the 17 subjects who completed the study are outlined in Table 2. No difference was observed in body weight during the intervention between whole milk and skimmed milk periods ($P = 0.59$). The compliance for intake of milk during the first and second period was 99.7 and 98.5%, respectively.

BLOOD LIPIDS

Results from fasting blood lipid measurements at the end of each period are listed in Table 3. HDL cholesterol was significantly higher with whole milk than with skimmed milk ($P < 0.05$). There were no significant differences between the periods for any of the other blood lipids. For total cholesterol there was a tendency for a higher concentration with whole milk than with skimmed milk ($P = 0.06$).

INSULIN AND GLUCOSE

Results of glucose and insulin concentrations measured at the end of each period as well as calculated HOMA values are listed in Table 3. There were no significant differences between the periods for any of these outcomes. However, correlation analysis with skimmed milk showed that insulin and LDL cholesterol were moderately positively correlated ($r = 0.54$, $P < 0.05$) and with whole milk that glucose and HDL cholesterol were moderately negatively correlated ($r = 0.52$, $P < 0.05$).

DIETARY INTAKE

Total energy intake was significantly higher with whole milk than with skimmed milk ($P < 0.05$). Fat intake (in grams and percentage of energy) was significantly higher with whole milk than with skimmed milk ($P < 0.001$). Also, the intake of saturated, monounsaturated, and polyunsaturated fat was significantly higher with whole milk than with skimmed milk ($P < 0.001$, $P < 0.05$,

and $P < 0.05$, respectively). Intake of carbohydrate was significantly higher with skimmed milk than with whole milk ($P < 0.01$). There were no differences between the periods for intake of protein, calcium, alcohol, and dietary fiber.

DISCUSSION

In the present study we showed that a daily intake of 0.5 L whole milk for 3 weeks did not increase LDL cholesterol compared to an equal intake of skimmed milk in healthy subjects. Moreover, although small, a significant increase in HDL cholesterol concentration was shown with whole milk compared to skimmed milk, which was significantly, moderately, and negatively correlated with glucose concentration. None of the other outcome measurements showed a difference between the periods. The increase in HDL cholesterol following intake of whole milk was expected due to the higher content of SFAs known to increase HDL and LDL cholesterol concentrations. The Nordic Nutrition Recommendations as well as the American Dietary Guidelines advice that SFA should be limited to less than 10E%, due to the predicted effect on LDL cholesterol. In comparison, the amount of SFAs in the whole milk diet was almost 5 E% above and in the skimmed milk diet close to recommendation (14.4 and 11.3 E%, respectively), according to the dietary records. Thus, the result of no difference in LDL cholesterol was unexpected and opposite to the dietary guidelines and our hypothesis, despite of the dominating macronutrient content of SFA with whole milk. Studies of the association between HDL cholesterol concentration and CVD has shown that HDL is protective. However, it is necessary to be cautious when interpreting low concentration of HDL cholesterol as a CVD risk factor. Mendelian randomization studies have shown that genetically decreased HDL cholesterol was not associated with increased risk of myocardial infarction, questioning the causality of an association between low HDL concentration and CVD. Still, HDL cholesterol concentration, as a marker of cardiovascular health, should be taken into consideration when interpreting the effect of dairy or SFAs in the diet.

Our results are in line with two previous intervention studies from 2009 and 1994 comparing milk of different fat content that also showed no effect on total and LDL cholesterol concentration after 12 months and 6 weeks with similar milk intake (500 and 660 ml/d, respectively); however, contrary to our results also no effect on HDL cholesterol. Fonolla et al. compared semi-skimmed milk and skimmed milk and therefore a smaller difference in milk fat (1.9 vs. 0.3%), which could explain the lack of difference in HDL cholesterol compared to the present study. Steinmetz et al., the more comparable study and of good quality, also compared skimmed milk with whole milk in a crossover design, but in a background diet designed to meet the AHA recommendations. Steinmetz et al. reported a significantly higher concentration of total and LDL cholesterol with whole milk compared to skimmed milk. However, the statistical analysis was not adjusted for baseline measurements, and thus not adjusted for differences between periods, and in addition the sample size was small ($n = 8$). Still, the analysis of difference in change from baseline between the two diets was also reported which showed no difference between total and LDL cholesterol, in line with our results. Nevertheless, the study reported higher Apolipoprotein B concentrations with whole milk compared to skimmed milk known to be a predictor of cardio metabolic risk.

Although the dietary records showed a significantly higher energy intake with whole

milk compared to skimmed milk, it seems that the study subjects compensated for the extra energy with whole milk by lowering their intake of carbohydrate which was significantly lower compared to skimmed milk. The content of calcium and protein were similar in the two milk types, but whole milk has a higher content of milk fat globule membranes (MFGM), which encloses the fat. A possible matrix effect of MFGMs was suggested in a recent study showing an impaired lipoprotein profile after a butter oil diet, low in MFGMs, compared with a whipping cream diet, high in MFGMs. One proposed mechanism, based on a mice study, is through lowering of cholesterol absorption by inhibition of cholesterol micellar solubility possibly due to presence of sphingomyelin in MFGM fragments. Thus, one could speculate that an expected higher LDL cholesterol concentration after whole milk may be modified by a dairy matrix effect of MFGM.

The strength of the present RCT was the imitation of real-life settings by not matching the diets for energy content or macronutrient composition, which made it possible to directly compare whole milk and skimmed milk as whole foods. The free-living design of the study was a limitation, thus allowing the presence of potential confounding by other lifestyle and dietary factors. However, the crossover design minimizes this potential confounding as study subjects were their own control.

In conclusion, the results indicate that intake of 0.5 L/d of whole milk does not adversely affect fasting blood lipids, glucose, or insulin compared to skimmed milk in healthy adults. Moreover, intake of whole milk increased HDL cholesterol concentration compared to skimmed milk. These findings suggest that if the higher energy content is taken into account, whole milk can be considered as part of a healthy diet among the normocholesterolemic population.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act which will allow schools to offer both unflavored and flavored whole milk for students.

Whole milk provides children with 13 essential nutrients for growth, development, immunity, and brain function. Whole milk also serves as the top source of protein, calcium, potassium, and vitamin D for children.

I am a proud cosponsor of this vital legislation, and I thank my good friend, Chairman THOMPSON, for introducing this commonsense bill.

For too long, poor Federal policy has kept whole milk out of our school cafeterias. This commonsense legislation puts the health and well-being of our children first. As the father of two young sons myself, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Also as a father, I would note that I see every day the illustration of how my children react to whole milk versus skim milk. I would just give that firsthand impression.

I also would say the science supports it.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD these scientific studies, as well.

COMPARISON OF THE DASH (DIETARY APPROACHES TO STOP HYPERTENSION) DIET AND A HIGHER-FAT DASH DIET ON BLOOD PRESSURE AND LIPIDS AND LIPOPROTEINS: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

The Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) dietary eating pattern, which emphasizes fruit and vegetables, low-fat dairy foods, and whole grains, is one of the most widely prescribed dietary modifications for reducing blood pressure (BP) and cardiovascular disease risk. Notably, in the Nurses' Health Study, self-reported greater adherence to a DASH-style diet was associated with a lower risk of coronary artery disease and stroke. Because LDL cholesterol is lower with the consumption of the DASH diet than with a typical Western diet due in part to its limitation of saturated fatty acids, it is believed that its lower saturated fat content may contribute to reduced risk of cardiovascular disease.

The degree of dietary adherence strongly determines the efficacy of dietary interventions. A recent review of 9 trials of the DASH diet with objective measures of compliance reported poorer adherence when dietary advice rather than foods was provided. A common reason for low adherence or high attrition is the difficulty of following prescribed diets. In the original DASH trial, lack of menu variety was a primary reason for lapses in dietary adherence. This suggests the potential value of providing options for the DASH diet that permit variation in macronutrient composition while preserving benefits on BP and lipid risk factors.

One such variation is the substitution of fat for carbohydrate. Appel et al. reported that the replacement of 10% of energy from carbohydrate with unsaturated fat (primarily monounsaturated) in a DASH-like diet resulted in a reduction in triglycerides and an increase in HDL cholesterol, with no change in LDL cholesterol, and a further reduction in the Framingham risk score. There is evidence that long-term compliance to diets with reduced saturated fat is poor, even with intensive counseling, and that moderate-fat diets may yield better dietary adherence than low-fat diets. Furthermore, the mean intake of individuals who consumed the DASH diet in the ENCORE (Exercise and Nutrition Interventions for Cardiovascular Health) study failed to meet the low total fat and saturated fat targets.

The effects on lipids and BP of replacing carbohydrates with saturated fats within a DASH-like diet have not been reported, to our knowledge. In the present study we tested the effects of substituting full-fat dairy products for nonfat and low-fat dairy foods (thereby increasing saturated fat from 8% to 14% of energy) in conjunction with a reduction of 12% of energy in carbohydrate, primarily from sugars.

METHODS

Study design and diets

A 3-period randomized crossover study in free-living participants was conducted between August 2011 and December 2013 at our clinical research center in Berkeley, California. The participants consumed a 1-wk run-in diet, consisting of a mixture of 2 or 3 d of each experimental diet, and then consumed in random order a control diet, a standard DASH diet, and a higher-fat, lower-carbohydrate modification of the DASH diet (HF-DASH diet) for 3 wk each. Each experimental diet was separated by a 2-wk washout period, during which participants ate their own foods but continued to abstain from alcohol. Participants were assigned their diet sequence in randomly determined blocks of 3, 6, 9, or 12 individuals by using a uniform

random-number generator. Diet sequences were kept in sealed envelopes and assigned to the participant by the study nutritionist 1-2 d before starting the first experimental diet. Participants were blinded to diet order, but because of the nature of the diets they were likely able to identify each diet. Clinic personnel were not blinded to diet order. Laboratory personnel and investigators were blinded to diet order, and unblinding was performed after data collection before analysis. Participants met with study staff weekly for counseling, to receive study foods, and to be weighed. At the end of each experimental diet, participants visited the clinic on 2 consecutive days for clinical and laboratory measurements. In addition, a fasting blood sample was taken after each washout period to document a return to baseline for standard lipid and BP measurements.

Study population

Participants included generally healthy men and women >21 y of age with an average diastolic BP between 80 and 95 mm Hg and systolic BP <160 mm Hg for 2 screening visits. Exclusion criteria included the following: use of nicotine products or recreational drugs, history of coronary artery disease, diabetes, or other chronic disease, use of hormones or medications known to affect lipid metabolism or BP; use of dietary supplements within the past 3 mo; unwillingness to refrain from alcoholic beverages during the study; BMI (in kg/m²) ≥35; total and LDL cholesterol >95th percentile for sex and age; fasting triglycerides >500 mg/dL; fasting glucose ≥126 mg/dL; and abnormal thyroid-stimulating hormone concentration. Participants were recruited primarily through our database of previous study participants, Internet advertisements, and community health events. The protocol was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Children's Hospital and Research Center Oakland. All participants provided written informed consent.

Dietary provision

The Bionutrition Core of the University of California, San Francisco, Clinical and Translational Science Institute developed and prepared diets for a 3-d cycle menu at 5 levels of energy intake (1800, 2100, 2600, 3100, and 3600 kcal). Participants whose energy needs were between main-menu calorie levels received unit foods (100 kcal) that matched the macronutrient and mineral content of the experimental diets. The control and DASH diets were designed to match the characteristics of the diets used in the original DASH trial. The higher-fat and lower-carbohydrate content of the HF-DASH diet was achieved by replacing nonfat and low-fat dairy with full-fat dairy products, mostly in the form of whole milk, cheese, and yogurt, and by reducing sugars, mostly from fruit juices, which constituted 59% of total fruit intake in the DASH diet. The DASH and HF-DASH patterns were otherwise developed by using similar recipes and foods, provided in different amounts to meet each diet specification. As in the original trial design, emphasis was placed on an abundance of fruit and vegetables, increased whole grains and dairy products; limited servings of meat, poultry, and fish, and inclusion of nuts, seeds, and legumes several times weekly. The nutrient composition of the diets was initially assessed by using Nutrition Data System for Research Software (NDSR 2010; Nutrition Coordinating Center, University of Minnesota) and validated by compositional analysis of g the 3-d cycle menus (Covance Laboratories). The sodium, potassium, magnesium, calcium, and fiber contents of the DASH and HF-DASH patterns were similar; the diets differed only in the amount of total fat, saturated fat, cholesterol, and carbohydrate they provided.

Dietary control was achieved by providing participants with 2 standardized entrees and accompanying side dishes daily (lunch, dinner, and some snacks), representing ~50% of total energy. Detailed menus, shopping lists, and food preparation instructions were provided for the remaining food items (mostly dairy, produce, and cereal products) to be purchased and prepared at home. Participants were required to come to the clinic weekly to pick up study foods, submit receipts documenting study food purchases, and to meet with the nutritionist to assess compliance with the dietary protocol and adjust energy intake to maintain a stable weight (within 3% of baseline, at ±10 pounds maximum). They were also required to maintain their usual physical activity levels during the study and to monitor daily steps by pedometer. Compliance was assessed by measuring 24-h urinary potassium at the end of the second week of each experimental diet. Twenty-four-hour urinary sodium was measured as an indicator of sodium intake.

Experimental measurements

After each 3-wk dietary period, body weight and waist and hip circumference were measured and the percentage of body fat was assessed by bioimpedance (TBF 551 body-weight scale; Tanita). BP was measured at the clinic by using a Dinamap monitor (GE Pro 100 or Critikon Pro 300) after the second week of each diet and on 2 consecutive days at the end of each experimental diet, and the 3 values were averaged. At each instance, BP was measured in a sitting position after 5 min rest 3 times, and the last 2 measurements were averaged. Participants were also provided with a portable BP cuff (Model BP791IT, Omron Healthcare, Inc) and were instructed to self-measure BP twice in the morning and twice in the evening for the last 7 d of each experimental dietary period. Data were automatically recorded on the BP instrument and downloaded for analyses. Urinary potassium and sodium were measured in 24-h urine collections by an outside clinical laboratory (Quest Diagnostics).

Fasting plasma samples collected on 2 consecutive days at the end of each experimental dietary period were analyzed for plasma lipids and lipoproteins, glucose, and insulin. Total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, and glucose were measured by enzymatic end-point measurements with the use of enzyme reagent kits (Ciba-Corning Diagnostics Corporation) on an AMS Liasys 330 Clinical Chemistry Analyzer. LDL cholesterol was calculated by using the Friedewald equation. Total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and triglyceride concentrations were monitored throughout by the CDC-National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Lipid Standardization Program. Apolipoprotein B (apoB) and apolipoprotein A-I (apo A-I) were measured by immunoturbidimetric assays (Battion Assay Systems; AMS Liasys 330 analyzer).

Lipoprotein particle concentrations and LDL peak diameter were measured by gas-phase electrophoresis (ion mobility), as previously described, with a modified procedure for initially separating the lipoproteins from other plasma proteins. Lipoprotein intervals were defined as previously described.

Statistical analysis

The primary objective was to compare the DASH and HF-DASH diets for lipid and lipoprotein measurements. At 80% power, an n of 36 would yield a minimum detectable difference between diets of 0.14 mmol/L for LDL cholesterol (SD of response = 0.30 mmol/L), 0.04 g/L for apoB (SD of response = 0.09 g/L), 0.03 mmol/L for HDL cholesterol (SD of response = 0.07 mmol/L), 4.1 mm Hg for systolic BP (SD of response = 8.6 mm Hg), and 2.2 mm Hg for diastolic BP (SD of response =

5.3 mm Hg). The detectable changes in BP were sufficient to confirm the differences observed in the original DASH trial. Treatment differences were determined by ANOVA for a 3-treatment crossover design. Pairwise comparisons between diets were adjusted by the Bonferroni method for 3 group comparisons (HF-DASH diet compared with control diet, HF-DASH diet compared with DASH diet, and DASH diet compared with control diet), and $P < 0.017$ corresponding to an overall 2-tailed $P < 0.05$ was considered significant. ANOVA and paired t tests were used to compare triglycerides and total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol after each of the 2 washout periods with baseline to test for the effectiveness of the washout period for normalizing plasma lipids. The analyses were restricted to those subjects who completed all 3 diets.

RESULTS

Study participants

Thirty-six participants completed all 3 experimental diets and are included in analyses. Fasting plasma triglycerides and total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol measured after each of the 2 washout periods showed no significant differences between screening values and their values after the first or second washout period (analyses not shown), indicative of their return to baseline concentrations.

As expected, 24-h urinary potassium excretion was significantly higher with the DASH and HF-DASH diets than with the control diet ($P < 0.0001$ for both, adjusted for period) and did not differ between the DASH and HF-DASH diets (mean \pm SE: HF-DASH diet, 81.5 ± 3.5 ; DASH diet, 83.5 ± 3.5 ; and control diet, 50.5 ± 3.5 mmol), consistent with good dietary compliance. Urinary sodium excretion did not differ between diets (mean \pm SE: HF-DASH diet, 116.6 ± 7.8 ; DASH diet, 119.3 ± 7.8 ; and control diet, 129.0 ± 7.8 mmol; $P = 0.49$, adjusted for period). Body weight remained stable throughout the study and there were no differences by diet (mean \pm SE: HF-DASH diet, 79.7 ± 0.1 ; DASH diet, 79.6 ± 0.1 ; and control diet, 79.8 ± 0.1 kg; P -treatment = 0.62).

Effects of diets on BP

Table 3 presents the statistical evaluation of the crossover design's treatment, period, and sequence effects along with the adjusted treatment means and their SEs. Significant treatment effects were observed for systolic and diastolic BP, such that the DASH and HF-DASH diets produced significant and comparable reductions relative to the control diet, with no differences between the DASH and HF-DASH diets.

There were no significant sequence effects, but there were significant carry-forward effects for both systolic and diastolic BP and a significant period effect for systolic BP. The carry-forward effect appeared to be due to lower systolic and diastolic BP after the HF-DASH diet compared with the DASH, control, or no previous diet. Mean BPs were, in fact, lower at the end of the washout period after the HF-DASH diet than after the other diets for systolic (mean \pm SE: -4.1 ± 1.7 mm Hg; $P = 0.02$) and diastolic (-0.9 ± 1.1 mm Hg; $P = 0.40$) BPs. The carry-forward effect did not appear to be the result of any individual participant.

Both morning and evening systolic and diastolic BPs measured by the participants at home were similarly reduced with the DASH and HF-DASH diets compared with the control diet, confirming the treatment effect of the DASH and HF-DASH diets on BP. There were no significant sequence, period, or carry-forward effects for home BP measurements.

Effects of diets on plasma lipids and lipoproteins

Significant treatment effects were observed for plasma concentrations of

triglycerides, total cholesterol, LDL cholesterol, and HDL cholesterol, apo A-I, LDL peak diameter, large and medium VLDL, intermediate-density lipoprotein (IDL), and large LDL concentrations.

For the primary comparison of the DASH and HF-DASH diets, the latter resulted in significantly lower plasma triglycerides, large and medium VLDL concentrations, and significantly higher LDL peak particle diameter. There were no significant differences between the DASH and HF-DASH diets for any other lipid or lipoprotein measurement after Bonferroni correction.

Both the DASH and the HF-DASH diets significantly reduced total cholesterol compared with the control diet. The DASH diet also significantly decreased LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, apo A-I, IDL concentrations, large LDL concentrations, and LDL peak diameter compared with the control diet. Except for lower total cholesterol, none of the lipid and lipoprotein measurements differed significantly between the HF-DASH and control diets after Bonferroni correction.

There were no significant sequence effects for any of the lipid and lipoprotein variables examined. None of the variables that showed a significant treatment effect exhibited significant carry-forward or period effects.

DISCUSSION

The DASH diet, which was developed and validated as a means for lowering BP, was formulated to include low-fat and nonfat dairy foods. In this study, we tested whether the BP benefit, as well as a favorable lipid and lipoprotein profile, could be maintained by the HF-DASH diet that includes full-fat dairy foods, with a corresponding increase in total and saturated fat, and a reduction in carbohydrate achieved primarily by reducing fruit juices and sugars, because sugar intake is associated with detrimental effects on cardiovascular disease risk factors. The HF-DASH diet lowered both systolic and diastolic BP to an extent similar to the DASH diet, indicating that the diet components responsible for the BP reduction were retained in the HF-DASH diet. Although the sodium content of the control diet was slightly higher than that of the 2 experimental diets, this difference was similar to that observed in the original DASH trial. Furthermore, 24-h urine sodium measurements were similar on all 3 diets, indicating that the BP reductions with the DASH and HF-DASH diets were not attributable to lower sodium intake.

When substituted for carbohydrates or unsaturated fats, saturated fats have been consistently shown to increase LDL cholesterol. We previously showed that with limitation of carbohydrate intake, the increase in LDL cholesterol induced by saturated fat is due primarily to large, cholesterol-rich LDL particles and not small, dense LDL particles. Indeed, in the present study, we found that the reduction in LDL cholesterol with the DASH diet compared with the control diet occurred in conjunction with lower concentrations of large LDL particles as well as of IDL particles, which both contribute cholesterol content to the standard LDL-cholesterol measurement. However, despite a 6% of energy higher saturated fat content to the HF-DASH diet compared with the DASH diet, there were no significant differences in LDL cholesterol or any of the LDL subclasses between these diets. There may be features of the DASH diet that mitigate the increase in LDL cholesterol that is typically observed with higher saturated fat intake.

It is of interest that there was a significantly higher LDL peak particle diameter with the HF-DASH diet compared with the DASH diet. Although this difference was of relatively small magnitude, it corresponded

to a trend, albeit nonsignificant, for relatively higher concentrations of larger LDL particles and lower concentrations of smaller LDL particles with the HF-DASH diet with no net difference in total LDL particle concentrations. This change in the distribution of LDL particles may be more easily detected by the peak diameter than the individual subtractions. The shift toward larger LDL particles with the HF-DASH diet may be attributed at least in part to the lower carbohydrate content of this diet compared with the DASH diet, because a shift from smaller to larger LDL particles was previously shown to correlate with reductions in plasma triglyceride and VLDL concentrations resulting from reduced carbohydrate or sugar intake. The reductions in triglycerides and VLDL particle concentrations with the HF-DASH diet compared with the DASH diet observed in the present study were relatively modest as might be expected from the moderate difference in carbohydrate content between the diets (43% compared with 55% of energy). It is possible that these differences were not of sufficient magnitude to elicit the significant reductions in small, dense LDL particles as well as in apoB (an index of LDL particle number) that have been observed previously with more substantial reductions in carbohydrate intake.

The present study confirmed previous observations that the DASH diet lowers HDL cholesterol, which is consistent with a significant reduction in apo A-I compared with the control diet. These changes were not observed with the HF-DASH diet, although the differences between the effects of the HF-DASH and DASH diets did not reach significance. The basis for the reduction in HDL cholesterol with the DASH diet is not known, although it is noteworthy that this effect was not associated with a change in HDL particle concentrations, suggesting that it may represent a change in HDL composition.

Other investigators have also tested modifications of the DASH diet on BP or lipid risk factors. The OmniHeart trial tested the replacement of 10% of energy from carbohydrate in a DASH diet with 10% of energy from unsaturated, primarily monounsaturated, fat or 10% of energy from protein. The protein and monounsaturated fat diets yielded similar or greater reductions in BP compared with the standard, high-carbohydrate DASH diet. Replacing carbohydrate with monounsaturated fat reduced total cholesterol and triglycerides and increased HDL cholesterol with affecting LDL cholesterol. Replacing carbohydrate with protein reduced total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol and triglycerides. The Beef in an Optimal Lean Diet Study found that the inclusion of lean beef in a low-saturated-fat DASH-like diet resulted in comparable effects on lipid and lipoprotein measures compared with a standard DASH diet. Sayer et al. recently showed that a DASH-style diet containing either lean pork or chicken and fish similarly reduced BP. Together with results from the present study, the above findings provide evidence that aspects of the DASH diet can be modified without compromising its benefits on BP or LDL-cholesterol lowering, offering flexibility in food choices for individuals following the DASH diet.

The crossover design of this trial was largely successful in that lipids and lipoprotein returned to baseline concentrations and there were no significant sequence effects and no carry-forward effects for most of the variables. The exceptions were the clinic measurements of systolic and diastolic BPs, whose reductions showed significant carry-forward on the HF-DASH diet, an unexpected and unexplained effect because there was no such carry-forward effect for the home BP measurements.

Strengths of our study include high dietary compliance as measured by urinary biomarkers and lack of weight change as a potential confounder. Limitations include a relatively small sample size and a short intervention duration.

In conclusion, the results of this study indicate that modification of the DASH diet to allow for more liberal total and saturated fat intake in conjunction with moderate limitation of carbohydrate intake, primarily from fruit juices and sugars, results in lower concentrations of triglycerides and VLDL particles, with no increases in total or LDL cholesterol and no attenuation of the favorable BP response to the standard DASH diet. Therefore the modified HF-DASH diet studied here presents an effective alternative to this widely recommended dietary pattern, with less-stringent dietary fat constraints, which may promote even broader implementation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank Dr. FOXX for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act. As a doctor, I know the benefits of whole milk, and I know that whole milk can have benefits for Americans of all ages.

Whole milk is 96½ percent fat-free. According to a study that was conducted that lasted for more than 15 years and was published in *The Lancet* journal of medicine, individuals who consume more than two dairy products each day have a lower risk of cardiovascular disease. There is lower morbidity associated with those who have whole milk and whole milk products in their diet.

The 13 essential nutrients that are found in milk are vital to the development of bones, muscles, and even brain tissue in our Nation's children.

By banning healthy milk products from our schools, misguided policies that were crafted and implemented by the Obama administration, that has led students to turn away from milk and dairy products and turn to highly caffeinated and sugary drinks. Those drinks have very little nutritional value.

Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District is home to the most number of dairy cows in our Commonwealth. Recently, I had the chance to visit Galliker's Dairy Company in Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

For the past four generations, Galliker's has processed milk from 46 regional family dairy farms for retailers, grocery stores and schools across the Northeast.

The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act will ensure that the whole and 2 percent milk processed at facilities like Galliker's will make its way into school lunchrooms across the country.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for nutrition by supporting this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for painting a vivid and completely disingenuous picture of junior high school students being held down and having milk forced down their throats in a school cafeteria.

I will also take the opportunity—I can't believe I am doing this—the milk fat content of whole milk is actually 3.25 percent making it 96.7 percent fat-free.

So when we look at the science, we read this definition: Milk means the lacteal secretion practically free from colostrum obtained by the complete milking of one or more healthy cows.

The reason soy milk is not in there is because it is not milk. Neither is almond milk. Milk comes from a mammal.

Mr. Chair, I strongly support this bill, and I am looking forward to having our children have healthy and nutritious choices in their schools.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to cosponsor the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

After over 10 years of schools having to comply with a nonsensical ban, I am excited to work on this bill to provide full-favor, nutrient-dense milk to kids once again. Parents and physicians have known the benefits of milk for generations. Nearly 70 percent of milk consumed at home is whole or 2 percent because it actually tastes good. It is packed with vitamins, and, most importantly, kids actually love it. I know my four do.

Full-fat milk gives parents alternatives to soda that their kids actually want to drink, but kids have been barred—strangely barred—from having their favorite milk choices in schools.

The result has been a decline in milk consumption in schools, and when kids are drinking less milk, they are losing out on nutrients that are critical for their healthy development.

Milk is the top source of protein, calcium, phosphorus, and vitamin D for kids. It provides seven of the 14 nutrients the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends for brain development.

The bottom line is that limiting milk in schools reduces consumption of essential nutrients, pushes kids towards sugary alternatives, and has led to less healthy kids.

As the Representative for hundreds of family-owned dairy farms in New York, and as a parent to four kids, I have one special interest: the health standard of the kids growing up in our communities.

I am excited to take this long overdue action to repeal a ridiculous ban. I am grateful to Chairman THOMPSON for his leadership to get the full-fat milk back in schools.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), who is my classmate.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman and my classmate for yielding.

Mr. Chair, let me speak in favor of this important bipartisan legislation. The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act is an investment, I believe, in our children's health and future.

This proposed legislation, let's be clear, does not change the underlying law. For the 19 years that I have been on the House Agriculture Committee, the school lunch and breakfast program has been and should be a focus of attention by the House of Representatives and the Congress.

Why?

It is because we provide the support for the school lunch and breakfast programs.

And why else?

It is because we want our children to have the most nutrition possible from lunch and breakfast.

In addition, we want to deal with issues of obesity and issues of allergies. It is important for a healthy future.

Now, let me say that I know a little bit about this. My family and I have been involved in the dairy business in California for three generations, since the early 1920s. Dairy plays a critical role in the nutritional diet of children as a leading food source for nutrients that are critical for development and growth. We must provide healthy nutrient-packed options that children will actually choose to consume, ranging from nonfat to whole.

Milk provides 13 essential nutrients, as has been mentioned, including three of the four nutrients of public health concern that involve calcium, potassium, and vitamin D.

A few months ago I visited the Fresno Unified Nutrition Center. Fresno Unified is the third largest school district in California with 73,000 students. They prepare 45,000 lunches a day and 15,000 breakfasts at 85 school centers. It is a big undertaking for this nutritional program.

What we know is that for many of the kids, the breakfast or the lunch they get is sometimes the best meal they get in a day, so, therefore, we need to be focused on this. Our schools must be equipped with nutritional school milk options. We must be available and flexible to new scientific developments that are made.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, our schools must be equipped with nutritional school milk options, and this is what this legislation attempts to try to do.

When kids like their school milk options that are flavorful and tasty, they

consume them in the levels that they should. When kids, I think, like their choices for lunch or breakfast, America succeeds.

Let me close by saying that every body needs milk.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, we are waiting for one more speaker to come, so I will yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate some points that were made before. We are not being driven by any special interest group lobby. We are being driven by the special interest group of children. We want children in school to have access to whole milk, which, as my colleagues have pointed out, is 96.75 percent fat-free, but it provides one of the most nutritious meals that children can have.

We are seeing tremendous waste in the schools. We are not excluding soy drink. The policy that we are trying to overcome here by providing whole milk to children was a policy passed under the Obama administration. We are not trying to harm minorities in any way whatsoever. We want everybody to have the choice to drink a soy drink, whole milk, skim milk, 1 percent milk, whatever.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to myself.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been terribly mischaracterized by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is about healthy choices for children.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 3¼ minutes remaining.

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

□ 1445

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX very much for her leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Chair, kids love milk, but our schools have been prohibited from providing children whole milk since 2010 and, frankly, it was based upon false science.

Milk is a healthy choice for our children. It has 13 essential nutrients that kids need—calcium, protein, iron, vitamin D, potassium, and more. Compared to soda or iced tea, which kids will turn to without a healthy alternative, a carton of milk has only one-third of the sugar as a can of Coca-Cola.

We, as adults and Representatives, need to give our children and grand-

children the options to make healthy choices. We need this legislation to put whole milk back in our schools.

Mr. Chair, would you be surprised to know that whole milk is 96.75 percent fat free? To say whole milk is unhealthy for kids is, if you will, “udderly” ridiculous.

Let’s do the right thing by our children, families, and dairy farmers by passing the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act. It is time to ask American schoolchildren if they, once again, “Got Milk?”

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues are attempting to make school meals less healthy by ignoring the latest science and undermining President Biden’s work to strengthen school meal nutrition.

The latest DGAs have already made clear that fat-free milk and low-fat milk are the healthiest options for children. If anybody has studies or research to the contrary, they should submit it to the experts in the normal process rather than politicians.

This bill goes against the dairy industry’s recent commitment to ensuring students have access to the healthiest dairy options consistent with the DGAs.

Mr. Chairman, we should be committed to ensuring that students have access to the healthiest dairy options in accordance with science-based guidelines, but H.R. 1147 contradicts this commitment by interfering with the independent process that aligns child nutrition standards with the latest science.

I am also disappointed that we are considering a bill that does nothing to meaningfully address child nutrition or hunger. This is in stark contrast to the comprehensive science-based reauthorization of the Federal child nutrition programs that committee Democrats advanced last Congress to, among other things, strengthen evidence-based nutrition standards for school meals beyond just milk.

The bottom line is that Congress should not inject politics into child nutrition standards at the expense of nutritious meals that our children need to grow healthy.

Mr. Chair, I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1147, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I have seen a lot of bills mischaracterized on this floor in my time here, but I think this is one of the worst.

Passing the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act would be a critical step toward empowering parents and securing our children’s well-being. Whole milk isn’t just a beverage; it is a vital source of nutrients essential for children’s growth. Denying access to its calcium, vitamin D, and protein threatens to inhibit their development.

To the anti-milk advocates, I have one thing to ask of you: What do you have against milk?

If you scrutinize them closely, you might be convinced that Democrats are waging a war on dairy. The Democrat administration has presided over a 15 percent milk price increase in the grocery store.

A Democrat proposal, the Green New Deal, calls for the elimination of cows for their so-called greenhouse gas emissions.

A Democrat policy is slashing the milk available to newborns through the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for women, infants, and children by four quarts.

A Democrat interest group, PETA, has called milk a so-called white supremacist symbol. How patently absurd.

Let’s end the war on milk and pass the bill.

Together, we can ensure that our children have access to the nutritional foundation they need to thrive and become the healthy, vibrant leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Chair, I urge all my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOOLENAAR). 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 as read.

H.R. 1147

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 “Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. WHOLE MILK PERMISSIBLE.

Section 9(a)(2) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Lunches served by schools participating in the school lunch program under this Act—

“(i) shall offer students a variety of fluid milk;

“(ii) may offer students flavored and unflavored whole, reduced-fat, low-fat and fat-free fluid milk and lactose-free fluid milk; and

“(iii) shall provide a substitute for fluid milk for students whose disability restricts their diet, on receipt of a written statement from a licensed physician that identifies the disability that restricts the student’s diet and that specifies the substitute for fluid milk.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) SATURATED FAT.—Milk fat included in any fluid milk provided under subparagraph (A) shall not be considered saturated fat for purposes of measuring compliance with the allowable average saturated fat content of a meal under section 210.10 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).”.

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed

in House Report 118-308. 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 MRS. LUNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-308.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 6, insert “**ORGANIC OR NON-ORGANIC**” before “**WHOLE MILK**”.

Page 3, line 17, insert “organic or non-organic” after “unflavored”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chair, I am happy to be here today to draw attention to something that is important to our children’s health, parental choice, and the many farmers across our Nation.

For years, America’s school lunches have lagged behind other countries’ programs in terms of health and nutrition. European and Asian students often have access to fresher and healthier meals than students in the United States.

This problem has been worsened by the Federal Government’s overregulating what schools are allowed to serve our children, in particular, preventing schools from offering whole milk to students. The Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act would allow students who participate in the National School Lunch program to serve their students whole milk, but my amendment goes a step further by ensuring schools may also offer their students to use organic milk as well.

The food we give our children and where it comes from is incredibly important. My amendment empowers parents and the ability that they have to decide what is healthiest for their children.

As many parents know, high-quality nutrition is closely related to better academic and behavioral outcomes in children. Allowing parents to choose organic milk is a step in the right direction.

Studies have also found that organic milk contains more omega-3 fatty acids and antioxidants than nonorganic milk, which helps with brain function, heart health, and fighting disease, respectively.

Of course, it is vital that we also know where this milk comes from, or-

ganic or not. Far too often, Congress listens to special interest and big ag lobbyists and ignores the countless family farmers who are the backbone of our country.

Our organic family farmers and the countless unseen families who feed our Nation are invaluable to our country. These farmers work many long, thankless hours to bring us nutrient-rich, high-quality milk.

Mr. Chair, on behalf of my family and I, I thank them. I am thankful to be able to be here today to continue to empower and fight for our children, and I thank those that are helping to bring organic milk to our country.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chair, nothing in this bill prevents schools from offering organic milk under current law. As the main barrier for schools offering organic milk is cost, nothing in this amendment provides additional funding or support to help schools offer organic milk, if they prefer.

Fundamentally, this amendment does not fix the flaws of the underlying bill. It invites Congress to legislate on specific foods served in school meals at the expense of evidence-based recommendations from experts.

According to those experts, milk is the top source of saturated fat in American diets. Whole and 2 percent milk can raise bad cholesterol, the cause of heart disease, and contains more fat, saturated fat, cholesterol, and calories than 1 percent and fat-free milk.

This has led to organizations such as the CDC to recommend nutrient-rich 1 percent or fat-free milk instead of 2 percent or whole milk.

For children aged 2 and up, the inclusion of whole milk in the bill disregards the healthy dietary patterns backed by the dietary guidelines for Americans, the scientific, evidence-based comprehensive set of nutrition recommendations.

Over 60 organizations have expressed concerns over attempts to bring whole milk back into school meal programs. Regardless of whether milk is organic, inclusion of whole milk in this bill is detrimental to American youths’ health and well-being, and the amendment fails to alter that fact.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the underlying bill and oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I hear a lot from my colleagues across the aisle on the experts,

but I also wonder how many people in Congress have had to use National School Lunch programs; and, frankly, I have been one of those people.

When I hear people speak in opposition to this saying that it is going to hurt minorities, it is going to hurt those of us who have actually had to use the program, I find it ironic. Frankly, I think that we need more people in office that have had rougher upbringings to bring a different lens and perspective.

To hear that whole milk is bad for children, to hear the arguments against organic milk, and to hear the arguments that are coming from across the aisle, I don’t know that it represents, necessarily, the best interests of the American people other than political spite.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. LUNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 118-308.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 10, strike the period and quotation mark at the end and insert the following:

“(E) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN PURCHASES.—The Secretary shall prohibit schools participating in the school lunch program under this Act from purchasing or offering milk produced by China state-owned enterprises.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits schools from participating in the school lunch program under the act from purchasing or offering milk produced by Chinese state-owned enterprises that may be operating here within the United States or elsewhere.

As many of us know, in 2008, the melamine scandal exposed systemic corruption and disregard for the safety standards within China’s own dairy industry. This scandal resulted in the death of six infants and sickened thousands more, highlighting the devastating consequences of lax regulations and unethical practices.

The evidence is clear: These enterprises pose a serious threat to our consumers’ health, our economic security, and our national interests. We can’t allow CCP enterprises to export their dangerous practices to our school lunches.

This is an issue of maintaining American control of critical supply chains. Chinese state-owned enterprises have no business being in our schools.

Florida is one of the largest cattle producers in America, and there is no way I will allow producers in my State to be compromised by the CCP or the PRC. If we fail to act, we risk losing our family farms and jeopardizing the livelihoods of thousands of Americans.

This is not about trade isolationism; it is about protecting our children in schools from unsafe products, ensuring fair competition for American producers, and safeguarding our national security.

The potential consequences of inaction are simply too great for me to ignore. The quality and safety of food that we provide to our children is paramount, and we cannot compromise on these standards. We must be vigilant about our source and production practices of the products that are present in our educational institutions and safeguard them from adversaries that do not share our same interests.

□ 1500

By prohibiting schools from purchasing or offering milk produced by China's state-owned enterprises operating in the United States and elsewhere, we aim to send a clear message about our commitment to health and the safety of our children.

Last year, over 30 million schoolchildren relied on school lunches for their nutrition. We have seen how the CCP has approached other industries, and we cannot allow such an important sector to become vulnerable in a time of crisis.

Therefore, I urge you to join me in preventing the CCP-supported entities from infiltrating school lunches and a key American supply chain. This is a necessary step to protect the health and well-being of our citizens, safeguard our economy, and defend our national interests. Let us send a clear message that we will prioritize the safety and security of our Nation's schoolchildren above all else.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, nobody disputes that the dairy industry is a crucial part of domestic supply chains and provides an important economic benefit to the tune of over \$753 billion to the U.S. economy.

In 2022, just five States—California, Wisconsin, Idaho, Texas, and New York—collectively produced more than 50 percent of the U.S. annual milk supply.

School breakfast and school lunch programs are already required to purchase domestic agricultural commod-

ities and food products. Although exemptions exist, milk is produced in sufficient quantities in the U.S. and at competitive prices to severely restrict the ability of any school to purchase foreign-produced milk.

To this end, the amendment does not fix the flaws in the underlying bill and makes no meaningful improvements to buy-American policies.

We can make sure that Chinese milk is not breaching our supply chain with continued monitoring and enforcement of present law. A recent report found that Chinese seafood has been served in schools, highlighting the need for additional diligence in enforcing present law.

I do not support the underlying legislation, and I oppose the amendment as being unnecessary.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, and I understand that facts, for whatever reason, seem to sink in a lot slower on the left than they do in America's party, so I will say this once more.

In 2008, the melamine scandal exposed systemic corruption and disregard for our complete safety in milk and other dairy products produced by China, so it is interesting that the gentleman says they are not actually weakening anything when they had infants and children by the thousands who died or were sickened by their actual production capacity capabilities or incapacities.

Again, facts are a very finicky thing. They oftentimes slowly leak in on the left, but you can't dispute that China's production of dairy has been less safe and less put under the regulations of rigorous streams than they do in American production with the FDA.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I just reiterate that present law requires domestic purchase, and so this is unnecessary. If Chinese milk has gotten into the supply, we need to monitor that. It violates present law. To suggest that we are ignoring science, the underlying bill ignores science. That is the purpose of the underlying bill.

I hope that we reject this amendment and reject the underlying bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TIFFANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-308.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 10, strike the period and quotation mark at the end and insert the following:

“(E) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may not prohibit any school participating in the school lunch program under this Act from offering students the milk described in subparagraph (A)(ii).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 922, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chair, first of all, merry Christmas.

My bipartisan amendment prevents the USDA from issuing any rule that bans any of the milk covered in this bill, including chocolate milk. This would ensure that all types and flavors of milk are available to schoolchildren and not subject to bureaucratic rule-making.

Some may ask why are we focusing on this issue. Unfortunately, it is because the USDA has set its sights on getting rid of chocolate milk in schools. It is now up to us to act.

This summer, it was reported that the Department of Agriculture is considering a ban on chocolate milk in elementary and middle schools. USDA issued a proposed rule that would set a new nutrition standard for school meals. These new standards could limit the availability of flavored milk, like chocolate and strawberry, in high schools while children in elementary and middle schools would have no access at all.

For those of you with young children or grandchildren, go and ask them what they think about USDA's new rule. I think I can speak for most folks when saying that when I was young, chocolate milk was usually the highlight of having lunch at school, but this new rule would mean that roughly 30 million students who participate in the USDA's school meal programs would no longer be able to have chocolate milk, or any flavored milk for that matter.

According to the Journal of the American Dietetic Association, removing flavored milk from schools resulted in a 62 to 63 percent reduction in milk consumption by kids in kindergarten through fifth grade, including a 50 percent reduction in sixth through eighth grades.

Milk is full of rich nutrients that support bone growth and development, and millions of children enjoy drinking it. We should not allow rules that would limit our children's access to delicious and nutritious products like milk and its varieties covered in this great bill.

Mr. Chair, I say to the USDA, come and take it.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, current law requires that school meals and beverages offered under the school meal programs be consistent with the dietary guidelines for Americans, the DGAs, which are drafted by an advisory committee of experts. These are evidence-based recommendations set to provide nutritional guidance to ensure children receive the most nutritious meals possible.

This amendment would effectively undermine the unbiased evidence-based guidelines of DGAs by prohibiting USDA from doing its work and replacing that process with a process where evidence will be presented to politicians and we get to decide the science. It is critical that actual scientists and experts make the recommendations and guide the process in determining options in schools and that regulations are updated to align with current DGAs.

Experts, not Members of Congress, should be the ones determining the nutrition standards to ensure that our children get the healthiest meals possible.

This amendment, like the underlying bill, reinforces the precedent for Congress to legislate on specific foods, at the behest of one industry or another, that would be served in schools.

There is a reason that the school lunch program does not contain specific nutrition standards for foods and beverages, and that is to ensure that nutrition standards can adapt to the latest science and expert recommendations. Both this amendment and the underlying bill upset this policy and open the program to politicization in favor of district interests and single-food lobbies over the health and well-being of our children.

Dozens of organizations, including the Academy of Nutrition & Dietetics, the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Heart Association, and a lot of others have urged Congress not to interfere with that process and to respect the science-based process.

For these reasons, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chairman, oh, those experts, those experts have done us so well in the United States of America. Why are we \$33 trillion in debt? Why do we have childhood obesity that is off the charts at this point?

Oh, those experts serve us so well, those experts that told us that butter is not good for us. Remember that a number of decades ago? Growing up on a dairy farm in western Wisconsin, I couldn't believe the experts were telling us that butter is not good for us. Well, all of a sudden, they are changing their tune on that.

They told us that we shouldn't possibly drink whole milk. They are beginning to turn on that also and saying maybe that is good for our children.

Yeah, the experts, they have done us so well.

The reason I bring this before the House of Representatives is I did listen to experts, those people who run the school lunch programs.

I will never forget a day about a decade ago when I stopped at a local gas station in northern Wisconsin, and a school lunch director came up to me—I didn't even know her—she said, at that time, Senator TIFFANY, would you tell the Federal Government to get out of our school lunch program? We are throwing away so much food.

Remember Michelle Obama's school lunch dictates that she put in place? The school lunch director said, Don't do that to us. I had multiple school lunch directors across northern Wisconsin, in my district, asking the Federal Government to stay out of their school lunch programs: We know what we are doing, we are trained in what we are doing, and we see what happens in our schools.

Mr. Chair, I urge 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 yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I include in the RECORD a letter signed by dozens of organizations opposing this changing the science and the process.

MARCH 20, 2023.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Chair, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. MARTIN HEINRICH,
Chair, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
Ranking, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN HOEVEN,
Ranking, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. KAY GRANGER,
Chair, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ANDY HARRIS,
Chair, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
Ranking, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. SANFORD BISHOP Jr.,
Ranking, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRS MURRAY, HEINRICH, GRANGER, AND HARRIS, AND RANKING MEMBERS COLLINS, HOEVEN, DELAURO, AND BISHOP: As you craft the fiscal year (FY) 2024 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies spending bill, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose any policy riders blocking implementation of stronger nutrition standards in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs.

We strongly support the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s proposed rule to strengthen nutrition standards consistent with the 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (“Child Nutrition Programs: Revisions to Meal Patterns Consistent With the 2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans”). We must preserve and build on the progress schools and the food industry have made over the past decade to meet science-based nutrition standards. These improvements are an amazing success story and one of the most important public health achievements in a generation. For children in poverty, the risk of obesity declined substantially each year after implementation of stronger nutrition standards in 2012 such that obesity prevalence would have been 47 percent higher in 2018 if the nutrition standards had not been updated. Additionally, a 2021 study found that school meals are the single most healthy source of nutrition for children—more nutritious than grocery stores, restaurants, worksites, and others. Research shows that children like the healthier school meals and while food waste remains a problem in this country, the amount of food wasted in schools has not changed since the standards were updated in 2012, according to the USDA's largest and nationally representative study of school meals. For many children participating in the program, school breakfast and lunch are the only meals they receive that day.

Despite the overwhelming success of the nutrition standards, improvements are still needed to align school meals with the Dietary Guidelines, which the current proposed rule aims to do. The USDA issued a proposal that is pragmatic, flexible, gradual, and most important—achievable. The rule proposes, for the first time, to reduce added sugars, with product-based limits for the top sources of added sugars beginning School Year 2025–2026, and to phase into a limit of added sugars averaged over the week beginning School Year 2027–2028. These standards are critical: among children, excessive intake of added sugars has been associated with poor diet quality, cavities, and increased risk of cardiovascular disease, yet more than 92 percent of schools exceed the Dietary Guidelines limit for added sugars for breakfast and 69 percent exceed it for lunch.

Further, sodium reduction is paramount to protect children's health; nine out of ten children consume too much sodium, putting them at risk of hypertension and cardiovascular disease into adulthood. The USDA proposes new, gradual 10-percent sodium reduction levels every two school years for breakfast (through School Year 2027–2028) and lunch (through School Year 2029–2030). The USDA also maintains at least 80 percent of the weekly grains offered are whole grain-rich.

The rule aims to align dietary patterns for sodium and whole grains with the recommendations of the Dietary Guidelines, but the USDA recognized that a gradual, incremental approach to meeting those recommendations is more feasible for schools and the food industry to implement. For instance, children up to age 8 would still consume close to their day's worth of sodium (83 percent) from just breakfast and lunch combined. Sodium and whole grain-rich standards have been the subject of many riders over the past decade, causing confusion and stymying industry innovation and improvements to children's health. The USDA has listened to Congress; the proposals in this rule on sodium and whole grains are within the spirit of those previous riders.

This gradual, incremental approach was crafted by the USDA to be feasible for schools and the food industry. And these standards are feasible. The largest food companies have many K–12 products that meet

the USDA's proposed added sugars, sodium, and whole grain-rich standards. Further, schools have been able to meet, and in some cases, exceed the current nutrition standards during the pandemic. In the first-of-its-kind study, a nationally representative study of elementary schools found that meals were meeting existing nutrition standards in 2022, and for sodium, average sodium decreased and the vast majority of schools were close to or already meeting future sodium-reduction levels on par with this rule. There are plenty of examples where schools have reduced sodium beyond the USDA's requirements or provided more whole grains and still been able to serve healthy, delicious, and culturally-relevant foods to their students.

Opponents of the rule claim that the meal nutrition standards cannot be strengthened due to labor shortages, supply chain disruptions, and other issues facing school food service programs. These are real challenges but require different solutions than stalling progress for healthier school meals. Over the past decade, the USDA and Congress have learned that schools need the additional assistance to meet stronger standards and they have also recognized current pandemic-related constraints, and therefore have committed millions of dollars to helping schools provide healthier meals while weathering these challenges. In September 2022, the USDA launched its \$100 million Healthy Meals Incentive Initiative with the stated goal of improving the nutritional quality of school meals. Of that, \$30 million is available for small and rural schools and \$50 million will go toward working with food manufacturers on innovative solutions to increase the availability of nutritious school foods. Congress has also increased technical assistance funding each year for the past three fiscal years (FY) (\$1 million in FY 2021; \$2 million in FY 2022 and 2023), with \$1 million of that funding being directed to assist with sodium reduction efforts in FY 2022–2023. These investments will be transformational, but the impact of inflation on school nutrition programs means schools still struggle to make ends meet. Therefore, increased meal reimbursement rates will be critical to the future success of school meals programs.

Beyond riders blocking implementation of the new proposed standards, there are other ongoing attempts to undermine evidence-based nutrition standards. For instance, the proposed rule allows for potatoes to be served in breakfast up to four out of the five school days, if a school chose to serve vegetables in place of fruit in breakfast. Therefore the existing breakfast potato rider—which allows schools to serve potatoes before other vegetables at breakfast—does not need to be included in the spending bill. Further, we are similarly concerned about attempts to bring whole milk into the school meals program. The Dietary Guidelines is explicit in its recommendation that everyone 2 years and older should limit their intake of saturated fat and choose fat-free or 1-percent low-fat milk instead of 2-percent reduced-fat or whole milk. The proposed rule reiterates this, while providing flexibilities for flavored 1-percent milk. Yet continued industry attempts to circumvent the science persist.

Finally, there are evidence-based strategies to increase school meal consumption that do not involve weakening nutrition standards, for instance, enabling students to have sufficient time to eat (at least 20 minutes of seat time) with longer lunch periods, having recess before lunch, serving lunch at an appropriate time of day, presenting food in an appetizing and easily eaten way, making the cafeteria inviting, and limiting competitive foods (snacks and beverages sold in vending machines and a la carte) during the

school day. While some of these strategies cannot be addressed at the federal level, we encourage you to support these efforts.

In conclusion we urge you to oppose any riders that block or weaken stronger nutrition standards for children.

Sincerely,

Academy of Nutrition & Dietetics; Advocates for Better Children's Diets; Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, Inc.; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network; American Heart Association; American Institute for Cancer Research; American Public Health Association; Ann and Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago; Association of State Public Health Nutritionists; Balanced; California Association of Food Banks; Center for Digital Democracy; Center for Science in the Public Interest; Chef Ann Foundation; Chilis on Wheels; Coalition for Healthy School Food; Colorado Children's Campaign; Community Food Advocates; Council on Black Health, Inc.; Cultiva la Salud; DC Greens.

Dolores Huerta Foundation; Environmental Working Group; FARE (Food Allergy Research and Education); Farm to Table-New Mexico; Food Research & Action Center (FRAC); FoodCorps; Friends of the Earth; From Now On Fund; Healthy Food America; Healthy School Food Maryland; Healthy Schools Campaign; Hope Community Services Youngstown; Illinois Public Health Institute; Independent Restaurant Coalition; Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR); Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future; Latino Farmers of the Southeast; National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; National Association of School Nurses; National Education Association; National Farm to School Network; National League for Nursing; National PTA; National WIC Association.

Nebraska Appleseed; North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition; Northeast Ohio Black Health Coalition; Northwest Coalition for Responsible Investment; Office of Kat Taylor; Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project, Inc.; Public Health Advocates; Public Health Institute; Redstone Global Center for Prevention and Wellness; Roots of Change; Rural Advancement Fund of the National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc; Rural Coalition; Seventh Generation Interfaith Coalition; Sisters of Charity of Saint Elizabeth; Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia; Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior; Society of Behavioral Medicine; Springfield Food Policy Council; Stanford Medicine Children's Health; The Laurie M. Tisch Center for Food, Education and Policy, Teachers College, Columbia University; The Praxis Project; Trust for America's Health; UnidosUS; Union of Concerned Scientists; Urban School Food Alliance.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this amendment would make it impossible to update the science based on new evidence. We should be basing our decisions on science, not what somebody tells us at the gas station. I hope that we defeat the amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

KILEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOOLENAAR, 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. 1147) to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to allow schools that participate in the school lunch program under such Act to serve whole milk, and, pursuant to House Resolution 922, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry further 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 will be postponed.

□ 1515

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

CONDEMNING ANTISEMITISM ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND THE TESTIMONY OF UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS IN THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 927) condemning anti-semitism on University campuses and the testimony of University Presidents in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 927

Whereas, on October 7, 2023, the world witnessed Hamas terrorists perpetrate the deadliest attack against the Jewish people since the Holocaust;

Whereas, in the months since, the Anti-Defamation League has recorded 2,031 antisemitic incidents, 400 of which occurred on college campuses, a more than 330-percent increase from the year prior;

Whereas Jewish and Israeli students have faced physical violence, hate-filled disruptions in the classroom, calls from students and faculty advocating for the elimination and destruction of Israel, and other forms of persistent harassment;

Whereas, according to a recent study from the Anti-Defamation League and Hillel International, 73 percent of Jewish college students surveyed have experienced or witnessed some form of antisemitism on campus since the beginning of the school year, up from 32 percent the prior year;

Whereas many university administrations have failed to address the rise of antisemitism;

Whereas to hold universities accountable, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce held a hearing on December 5, 2023;

Whereas, when the Presidents of the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology were asked if calling for the genocide of Jews violates university policies on bullying and harassment, Presidents Elizabeth Magill, Claudine Gay, and Sally Kornbluth were evasive and dismissive, failing to simply condemn such action;

Whereas President Magill stated, "It is a context-dependent decision";

Whereas President Gay insisted that it "depends on the context";

Whereas President Kornbluth responded it would only constitute harassment if it were "targeted at individuals";

Whereas President Magill has resigned, and the other Presidents should follow suit; and

Whereas acts of hate, intimidation, discrimination, and violence-based on ethnicity or religion have no place in our country or in the global community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly condemns the rise of antisemitism on university campuses around the country; and

(2) strongly condemns the testimony of University of Pennsylvania President Elizabeth Magill, Harvard University President Claudine Gay, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology President Sally Kornbluth and their failure to clearly state that calls for the genocide of Jews constitute harassment and violate their institutions' codes of conduct in front of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce on December 5, 2023.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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. Res. 927.

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

There was no objection.

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

"It depends on the context." This was the testimony delivered by so-

called prestigious university presidents when presented with the question: Does calling for the genocide of Jews violate your campus bullying and harassment policies?

The context. What a disgraceful, legalistic answer from academia's supposed top minds.

As chairwoman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I will tell you what never depends on the context: defending the rights of Jewish students to feel safe on campus.

Condemning calls to incite violence against the world's most persecuted ethnic group is always appropriate and never depends on the context. Holding smug university elites accountable never depends on the context.

That is why I rise today in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I condemn anti-Semitism in all forms. Moreover, calls for genocide of the Jewish people have no place in reasonable discourse, and I condemn that, too. I did not think such a statement would be necessary, but in today's context, it is necessary.

These sentiments were shared repeatedly by Claudine Gay of Harvard, Sally Kornbluth of MIT, and Elizabeth Magill of the University of Pennsylvania during their testimony last week.

Unfortunately, because of a 5-minute exchange toward the end of the hearing that was clipped and shared online without full context during the hours-long hearing, these university presidents' commitment to fighting anti-Semitism has been called into question.

This is because, during the clip, they answered the question asked. They made the mistake of believing the hearing was a serious attempt to ascertain what could be done to promote student safety on campus in light of the tension between the First Amendment protections of freedom of speech on the one hand and the criminal code, title VI, and campus code of conduct on the other.

Some speech, such as threats, can be so severe as to be criminal. Other speech could establish a hostile environment on campus in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Universities can establish codes of conduct prohibiting some speech while respecting the First Amendment, but any speech involved in a First Amendment analysis is likely to be reprehensible. The fact that it might be protected does not make the speech any less reprehensible and does not suggest that you even agree with it.

A call for genocide of Jewish people is obviously reprehensible in all contexts, but whether or not it is constitutionally protected depends on context.

Don't take my word for it. Read the article published recently in The Har-

vard Crimson authored by Harvard law professor Charles Fried, formerly the Solicitor General during the Reagan administration.

In the article, Professor Fried states: "When asked whether they would discipline students (or, I suppose, faculty) if they called for genocide of Jews, each president responded that the answer depends on the context of the utterances."

He goes on by saying: "I have taught at Harvard Law School since 1961 and began practicing before the Supreme Court in 1985—for 4 years as Solicitor General of the United States—and I would have felt professionally obligated to answer as the presidents did. It does depend on context."

"In the 1969 case *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that 'constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press do not permit a State to forbid or prescribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action.'"

He continues: "Speech itself is, indeed, well protected."

The three university presidents head private institutions that are not bound in every aspect by Federal constitutional restraints, but each institution, in various ways, has declared itself committed to protecting First Amendment values over the years.

It is not surprising that their presidents would have answered that whether they would discipline or expel students for advocating genocide depends on the context. If one seeks to follow constitutional principles, answering this question certainly does depend on the context.

That is what Professor Fried said. That is the kind of analysis applied to any freedom of speech question. It is even being applied to former President Trump today. Was his speech on January 6, 2021, a crime of inciting violence or was it protected speech?

Incredibly, the university presidents were directed to give a one-word answer, yes or no, and they responded as Professor Fried said he would have been professionally obligated to do: It depends on context.

Regrettably, they took the question as an opportunity to seriously discuss the constitutional implications of a complex question. That was a big mistake. For that mistake, we are considering a resolution to condemn them and ask them to resign.

I also think it is important to put this resolution in context because, in 2017, after white supremacists walked through the campus of the University of Virginia shouting, "Jews will not replace us," Democrats on the committee requested a hearing on that incident and nothing happened. Meanwhile, the one who declared there were "good people on both sides" has been enthusiastically endorsed.

We need to do everything the law allows to address anti-Semitism,

Islamophobia, racism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination on college campuses. This resolution is not a serious effort to advance that cause. I, therefore, oppose this resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the Conference chairwoman.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman FOXX for chairing last week's important hearing.

There is a reason that last week's hearing with the university presidents of Harvard, Penn, and MIT made history as the most watched congressional testimony in history with over 1 billion views. That is because their testimony was the most morally bankrupt testimony in the history of the United States Congress.

When asked the very specific question, "Does calling for the genocide of Jews violate [your] code of conduct when it comes to bullying and harassment?" the world watched and the world heard their answers in horror as the president of Harvard, the now-former president of Penn, and the president of MIT equivocated, dehumanized, and failed to answer yes. Anyone with a sliver of decency, humanity, and morality knows that the answer to that question is yes.

President Kornbluth of MIT said that such depravity would only be considered harassment depending on the "context."

When pressed during her questioning, Penn's now-former President Magill's response was shocking to the extreme: "If the speech becomes conduct, it can be harassment."

Finally, Harvard President Gay's answer was the same: "It depends on the context."

It was pathetic, amoral, and inhumane, and by God, the world heard it. As I said in the hearing, it does not depend on the context.

As attacks against Jewish students have skyrocketed on campuses across America, we clearly have tremendous work ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, to address this rot of anti-Semitism that is now rooted in our once-premier higher education institutions, and we will not be deterred by this important work.

This is why I rise today in support of my bipartisan resolution condemning the rise of anti-Semitism on university campuses around the country and the morally bankrupt testimony of those university presidents.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is only a first step, but it is an important step. I commend my colleagues, Congressman MOSKOWITZ, Majority Leader SCALISE, and Congressman GOTTHEIMER, for joining to lead this

historically important, bipartisan effort to stand for moral truth.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, Ranking Member SCOTT, for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who has dedicated most of her career to combating anti-Semitism and as the co-chair of the House Bipartisan Task Force for Combating Antisemitism, I know well that anti-Semitism has been on the rise in our country for years.

It was a growing problem before the October 7 Hamas terrorist attack, and sadly, immediately after that savage attack, anti-Semitism has skyrocketed, particularly on college campuses.

What we have seen happening on college campuses is outrageous, and too many college and university leaders have totally failed in their moral responsibility to condemn anti-Semitism. They have failed to keep Jewish students and faculty members safe. That is shameful.

I was appalled by the failure of the three college presidents to simply say yes. A call for the genocide of Jews is wrong, period, but I have no interest in meaningless resolutions that do nothing to address the underlying issue of anti-Semitism.

That is why my colleagues should join us in crafting serious bipartisan legislation that will make a real difference. We don't need throwaway resolutions. We need effective solutions.

If we are serious about fighting anti-Semitism, we need legislation to implement and codify the United States' National Strategy to Counter Anti-Semitism. We need to pass the President's request for \$200 million in emergency supplemental funding for the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. We need to fully fund the Office of Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Education, not cut that funding. We need to strengthen our Federal civil rights laws to punish all universities that fail to protect Jewish students.

□ 1530

Until we do that, nonbinding politically motivated resolutions are not worth the paper they are written on. When anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, it harms us all and it eats at the foundations of our democracy.

I have always called out anti-Semitism on the left and on the right, and I will continue to do so, but I don't want just words. I want this Congress to take action and pass implementing legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX for yielding, a former college

president herself, who understands these issues. I am very grateful for Republican Conference Chairwoman ELISE STEFANIK, who is courageously leading this resolution that condemns anti-Semitism on university campuses.

Most Americans are shocked at the insane campus anti-Semitism that has developed. I reviewed this in a lead Op Ed in the Washington Times on December 7.

My analysis was:

Sadly, college campuses have descended from coveted citadels of intellectual freedom to illiberal sewers of intolerance and bigotry. Diversity and inclusion are a George Orwell 1984 implementation excluding conservative thought.

Over the years, as infantile leftists hire only other infantile leftists, the most extreme hire even more extreme, as each tries to outdo the other in leftism. This leads to today's suicidal derangement, even as the regime in Tehran, coordinating with war criminal Putin, develops missiles for a nuclear attack on the big Satan America, which would vaporize college campuses.

The solution for close-minded intolerance on campuses is obvious. To liberate academia from denial of free speech, there should be the inclusion and diversity of more conservative academics overcoming today's blatant discrimination. All Americans in good faith want college education to be uplifting for students to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleague, Congresswoman MANNING. This should be bipartisan.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I happened to be in the room because I am on the committee and was a little bit startled and stunned by the lack of concern for rampant anti-Semitism in the most prominent universities in this country—the leaders who were chosen to lead those universities.

We have to ask ourselves why is it happening on our premier campuses?

I can go out in Wisconsin, all the hard workers in the factories, all the hard workers on the farms, all the people working in retail, I don't see any evidence of this. As a matter of fact, I don't think there is anywhere in the State of Wisconsin I would go and find this sort of thing.

Nevertheless, we seem to be fighting it in our universities.

The question is: Why is that so? Is there anything out there that would give an indication that you have a possibility of anti-Semitism?

Part of it, I think, is coming from recent immigrants who are carrying grievances from long ago to the United States, but the more concerning one is the spoiled, upper-middle classes that make up so many of the college students and professors.

I think what we are coming out of is what I will call the bored upper-middle classes looking for something to do and the unhappiness out of that boredom that leads them to anti-American, but also anti-Semitic and anti-Israel. Because when they see Gaza and Israel, they see one successful Western country and they see an unsuccessful crooked country, and it leads them to be so mentally muddled up that they can't see what is wrong with the horrific murders that took place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, for nearly four centuries Harvard has been known for many great things: as America's first college, as the alma mater of eight Presidents, as the most fertile of ground for new ideas and cutting-edge research.

Yet now, in this moment, Harvard has become known for a truly terrible thing—for anti-Semitism, for leading a 21st century American resurgence of one of the world's most ancient and retrograde prejudices. This is in large part because of the words and action, as well as the silence and inaction of President Claudine Gay.

We have all now seen the shocking testimony from last week, but to borrow a phrase from Dr. Gay, we need to also look at the context, the context of Harvard having the very worst ranking in the entire country for protecting free speech; the context of President Gay initially refusing to condemn the Hamas terrorist attack and then refusing to condemn the student groups that blamed Israel; the context of Harvard's woefully inadequate measures to protect Jewish students both before October 7 but especially after, to the point that at the hearing, President Gay refused to even answer the question as to whether a Jewish student can feel safe and welcome on her campus.

That Harvard has declined to remove President Gay, even after Penn forced out its president, speaks volumes about the singular failures of that university.

Yet, Harvard also offers a broader window into what ails higher education in our country.

This is a moment of reckoning for American higher education. Our universities cost too much, deliver too little value to graduates, and have become the most intolerable places in American life.

Now is the time for fundamental change to reform the American university, and this resolution is a first step.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN), chairman of the Early

Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education Subcommittee.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the evil and hatred of anti-Semitism find its voice across American college and university campuses, and we have seen the full force of Jewish hatred grow as student organizations continue to celebrate the horrific October 7 terrorist attacks.

These institutions have become hate factories that are quick to allow the spread of anti-Semitism but slow to condemn it, if at all.

Harvard President, Claudine Gay, even said, calling for the genocide of Jewish students "depends on the context" when it comes to violating the university's code of conduct.

Let me be clear: Today, the faces of modern anti-Semitism in American education are Harvard, UPenn, MIT.

These institutions have gone from elite to elitist.

At Harvard, if you use the wrong pronouns, that is a violation of their code of conduct, but violently targeting Jewish students and calling for the genocide of the Jewish people, that is acceptable Harvard conduct.

The history of the Holocaust reminds us what will happen when hatred is met by silence. We cannot stand by while students feel threatened.

It is more than a discussion, Mr. Speaker. It is a call to action.

That is why I am proud to support Representative STEFANIK's resolution condemning anti-Semitism in institutions of higher learning and specifically condemning Presidents Magill, Gay, and Kornbluth for failing to denounce the calls for genocide on their campuses.

Mr. Speaker, 17 times it was asked; 17 times they failed the question.

Mr. Speaker, it bears repeating, anti-Semitism is not activism.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 927. Last week, Americans watched in bewilderment as the presidents of Harvard, MIT, and Penn were unable to say if calls for a genocide of Jews violated their harassment and bullying policy.

Let's not forget campus leaders go after microaggressions, but suddenly when it comes to anti-Semitism, they chose to remain silent.

At that same hearing, I asked Harvard's President how she could rectify cracking down on faculty for saying there are biologically two genders but maintain that calling for genocide is protected speech.

The reality is that at these universities, free speech only applies to cer-

tain people at certain times, which is why these schools rank at the bottom of scorecards that judge freedom of speech.

The inability of these presidents to condemn anti-Semitic rhetoric only encourages further harassment and jeopardizes the safety of Jewish students, and ultimately all.

Mr. Speaker, they need to be held to account. I encourage adoption of the resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, "Anti-Semitism on College Campuses: Incident Tracking from 2019 to 2023; 659 total reported anti-Semitic incidents on college campuses since October 7—a 700 percent increase compared to last year."

This was updated on December 13, 2023.

"Since the terrorist attack on Israel by Hamas on October 7, anti-Semitic incidents against Jewish students on college campuses have reached alarmingly high rates, increasing by 700 percent over the same period last year.

"Hillel International has been working around the clock with our partners to report and address these incidents, and to ensure that all Jewish students feel safe on campus."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this report from Hillel International.

ANTISEMITISM ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES:
INCIDENT TRACKING FROM 2019-2023

659: TOTAL REPORTED ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES SINCE OCTOBER 7—A 700% INCREASE COMPARED TO LAST YEAR

Since the terrorist attack on Israel by Hamas on October 7, antisemitic incidents against Jewish students on college campuses have reached alarmingly high rates, increasing by 700% over the same period last year.

Hillel International has been working around the clock with our partners to report and address these incidents, and to ensure that all Jewish students feel safe on campus. If you or a student you know experiences an antisemitic incident on campus, report it (anonymously) to receive 24/7 support at ReportCampusHate.org, or contact our free legal helpline, the Campus Antisemitism Legal Line (CALL) for pro bono legal support.

IN THE MONTH FOLLOWING THE OCTOBER 7 ATTACK ON ISRAEL, HILLEL INTERNATIONAL TRACKED A 700% INCREASE IN ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES COMPARED TO THE SAME PERIOD LAST YEAR

306: TOTAL REPORTED INCIDENTS OF ANTISEMITISM FROM OCTOBER 7-NOVEMBER 7, 2023 HILLEL HAS NEVER RECORDED MORE THAN 50 TOTAL INCIDENTS IN THIS SAME TIME PERIOD SINCE WE STARTED TRACKING IN 2019

129: UNIQUE CAMPUSES IMPACTED BY ANTISEMITIC INCIDENTS FROM OCTOBER 7-NOVEMBER 7, 2023

We have never recorded more than 40 campuses impacted by antisemitism in this same time period

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative STEFANIK, my colleague from New York, for introducing this much-needed legislation.

With issues as critical as mitigating anti-Semitism and protecting our Jewish community, it is vital that we speak today with moral clarity.

Just days ago, in a hearing in the House Education and the Workforce Committee, we heard shocking testimony from the presidents of what were once our most esteemed educational institutions.

Each one of these institutions has more than 100 years of history educating our youth.

One, Harvard University, is closing in on 400 years of history.

These schools have an embarrassment of riches: Billions of dollars in annual revenue, much of it from Federal funds, billions more in endowments—no, tens of billions of dollars in endowments—they have the resources to reach any educational goal.

When pressed on the solution to the problem of anti-Semitism, each of them testified that education was, in fact, the solution. Education is supposed to be the solution to anti-Semitism.

Yet, with all of that history, with all of those resources, with the esteem of our society and the world, these universities are ground zero for rampant, virulent, obscene, and inhuman anti-Semitism.

□ 1545

The hearings last week exposed not only the lack of moral leadership at these schools; it also exposed a sickness in the culture of our elite universities.

If calling for the murder and genocide of fellow students for the crime of being Jewish is not immediately and completely repugnant, then there is no moral compass at the heart of these institutions.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution which, to my knowledge, would mark the first time in American history that the House of Representatives would vote to tell private college and university presidents to resign. I want all of my colleagues to think very seriously about what this means for us today and in the future.

We are all profoundly disturbed by the resurgence of anti-Semitism and racism in campus towns, including death threats, serious death threats against Jewish students at Cornell, and

actual shootings and attempted murder of three Palestinian-American students in Burlington, Vermont.

We all want to express our outrage in House resolutions, which we have done more than 20 times as a House of Representatives, and numerous times even since October 7. For example, on November 2, we passed H. Res. 798, which condemned all forms of anti-Semitism on college campuses, denounced any support for terrorist groups on campus, reaffirmed the free speech rights of Jewish students and faculty, and urged enforcement of Federal civil rights laws to protect Jewish students against anti-Semitism.

Why do we need this resolution? The only thing new about it is it would have the U.S. House of Representatives call specifically for the resignation of two college presidents, a call that has been slipped in at the bottom of page 2 of the resolution.

This extraordinary passage comes close to being what the Constitution calls a bill of attainder, which is the unconstitutional imposition by Congress on a specific citizen or citizens of a criminal punishment or stigma by the Congress itself. Although this resolution is not a criminal punishment or stigma against specific citizens, it is undoubtedly a civil punishment and stigma against specific American citizens.

How many of you would like the president of the college where you went or where your children go to be walking around with a congressional resolution telling them to resign?

Everyone knows that this will be an academic scarlet letter and a professional death sentence for anyone carrying it around. Does anyone think that UPenn President Liz Magill, who has already resigned in the face of Ms. STEFANIK's ceaseless campaign to force her out, will ever be able to find another college presidency? Give me a break.

Now, I hold no brief for the college presidents' overly legalistic, ethically tone-deaf answers awkwardly advanced in response to Ms. STEFANIK's rapid-fire, yes-no questions. It should not be difficult for anybody to say in an age of rampant gun violence and lax Republican gun laws, which have put tens of millions of AR-15s in circulation in our society, anyone calling for genocide of the Jews, or anyone else, should be sent immediately a campus security detail to see if they pose the risk of harm to other people or if they need an immediate mental health exam. If there is not an imminent threat, surely the call for genocide of the Jews by definition constitutes a hostile learning environment and should occasion aggressive disciplinary action. Where is the common sense on the part of the college presidents?

Where is the common sense in the Congress of the United States of America?

Calling for the resignation of private individuals at private universities

would be a dramatic and unprecedented departure for the U.S. Congress, which has never before voted to tell a college president to resign.

Before we affix this lifelong stigma, reproach, and dishonor on a private citizen, do you think perhaps we should offer them some kind of due process, the kind of due process that even George Santos got and that Donald Trump is getting all over America right now for his 91 Federal and State felony charges?

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, should Harvard President Claudine Gay, who is the first Haitian American ever to serve in that position, and Sally Kornbluth, who is Jewish, get the chance to explain what they are actually doing to combat racism and anti-Semitism at their schools and what they have done in their lives and in their careers to oppose anti-Semitism and racism, which are the gateways to destruction of liberal democracy? Do we care about that, or is this just a bunch of drive-by talking points?

Is it relevant that the Harvard and MIT boards have made unanimous statements affirming the leadership of their two college presidents? Are we saying that their boards don't matter or they are indifferent to anti-Semitism and the leaders of the Freedom Caucus know better than the Jewish president of MIT what anti-Semitism is?

Now, I know these two were the presidents testifying before Ms. STEFANIK, but are we sure that these two are even the worst in the country when it comes to bias and discrimination? Is this a one-shot deal, or, as Ms. STEFANIK promises, is this just the beginning? Are we going to go through all of the college and university presidents in America? What about the CEOs of the businesses? Maybe they are not performing to her satisfaction either.

Indeed, maybe there are college presidents who have looked the other way in not hypothetical cases of anti-Semitism and racism but real cases of anti-Semitism and racism. What about them? Are we going to let them go, or are we going to go after them? Maybe we should determine who the worst are before we start using the resources of the House of Representatives to call for people to resign.

Are there college presidents, by the way, who looked the other way when there was sexual abuse of college male wrestling team members, rape of students, or female gymnasts or female soccer players? Are we interested in that now that we are superintending higher education in America, now that we are the appellate review board for the colleges?

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, are we prepared to become the national academic appeals panel for college presidents, coaches, and professors, or is that perhaps best left to the universities themselves?

Maybe it is that we just don't have a positive legislative agenda of our own to lower drug prices in America, to get aid to our democratic allies in Ukraine against the fascist imperialist thug Vladimir Putin. Maybe we don't have anything real to do, so we decide instead to go around and start lecturing the college presidents and the college boards all over America.

In the absence of a real program for America, the majority is filling our hours with censures, expulsions, motions to vacate the speakership, overthrow their own leaders, and, of course, impeachment of President Biden for what? For doing nothing wrong. That is all that they give us. This cannibalistic instinct they have unleashed now turns on private citizens, academic leaders who will wear the scarlet letter "A" so they can have some more press conferences.

Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a December 8 statement from the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, a group invited by the majority in 2018 to testify at a hearing examining the First Amendment rights on campus and a group that authors the free speech ranking the majority cited several times at the committee hearing, titled, "University Presidents Were Right to Condemn Hate Speech and Defend Free Speech."

[From FIRE, Dec. 8, 2023]

SPECIAL POST: STEPHEN ROHDE, 'UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS WERE RIGHT TO CONDEMN HATE SPEECH AND DEFEND FREE SPEECH'—FIRST AMENDMENT NEWS 403.1

(by Ronald K. L. Collins)

When it comes to speech on college campuses, the problem is one with a vintage flavor. Simply recall (if you can) what Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote in his 1957 opinion in *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (a case successfully argued by professor Thomas Emerson): "The essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities is almost self-evident."

Note that it was a plurality opinion—and note also his use of the word "almost." In other words, doubts lingered.

Four decades later, in a book way ahead of its time, the late Robert M. O'Neil awakened our world to free speech issues that would define the world in decades to come. The book was "Free Speech in the College Com-

munity." In it, Bob (a free speech champion and friend) wrote:

When the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching surveyed university presidents for a study in the late 1980s entitled campus tensions, more than half the respondents noted that racial intimidation or harassment was a serious problem on their campuses. The National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence, which has the most detailed database, cited at least 250 campuses at which acts of racial hatred occurred in the period 1986–89. The institute has elsewhere reported that one in five minority students encounters some form of physical or psychological racial harassment at least once a year.

And so the same problem resurfaces, but now in a new context, growing out of the Israel-Hamas War and the free expression issues raised by it: those of antisemitism and hate speech. In a recent *Politico Magazine* interview, professor Eugene Volokh said:

I'm worried that there is pro-Palestinian speech being suppressed. I'm worried that there's some pro-Israeli speech being suppressed . . . I also think that there are some things that are being too much tolerated.

Mindful of all of the above and much more, what follows is an op-ed by Stephen Rohde, author of "American Words of Freedom: The Words That Define Our Nation" and "Freedom of Assembly," regarding the recent hearings on campus antisemitism and the reactions to statements by the university presidents on the matter.

At a contentious congressional hearing on December 5, the presidents of three major universities unequivocally condemned antisemitism and hate speech while standing firm in defense of free speech. In a furious backlash, elected officials, alumni, students and donors have unleashed scathing criticism, going so far as to open a congressional investigation and demand that all three resign.

The three presidents, Elizabeth Magill of the University of Pennsylvania, Claudine Gay of Harvard, and Sally Kornbluth of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, testified before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce at a hearing entitled "Holding Campus Leaders Accountable and Confronting Antisemitism."

The episode reveals not only how little our elected officials and the American people understand about the concept of protected free speech at our colleges and universities; it shows how, in a free society, confidence in the value of protecting all ideas and viewpoints—even those we despise—is eroding.

NADINE STROSSEN'S 'NON-EMERGENCY SPEECH'

Public colleges and universities are bound by the First Amendment. Private colleges and universities, in their written policies and handbooks (and in some states by legislation), generally guarantee students and faculty members the right to academic freedom and freedom of speech comparable to the First Amendment.

In her new book "Free Speech: What Everyone Needs to Know," Nadine Strossen, who served for 17 years as national president of the ACLU, provides a useful summary of current First Amendment law:

The First Amendment permits government to outlaw the speech that is the most dangerous, consistent with the "emergency" principle: speech that, considered in its overall context, directly, imminently causes or threatens specific serious harm . . . [on the other hand, the] First Amendment outlaws the censorship that is the most dangerous: restrictions based solely on disfavor of the speaker's ideas, or on generalized, speculative fear that the speech might indirectly contribute to some future harm.

Strossen calls the latter "non-emergency speech."

While non-emergency speech may potentially cause harm, Strossen explains that "it is dangerous to grant government the added latitude to punish speech with a less direct, imminent connection to potential harm" because "predictably, government (which is accountable to majoritarian and other powerful interest groups) disproportionately exercises any such discretion to suppress minority voices and views."

Strossen's warning applies equally to public universities (which are an arm of the government) as well as to private universities, which rely on the support of the federal and state governments as well as donors and alumni, and who may be inclined to suppress unpopular views in order to protect their funding.

Consequently, whether students should be expelled or disciplined for expressing their views goes far beyond simply looking at the words they speak. It requires a serious examination of the context and circumstances surrounding the speech. The chants of protesters at a large rally screaming "Kill all the Jews," while unspeakably vile and contemptible, would not "directly and imminently" cause or threaten specific serious harm when considered in their overall context.

Yet the same words spoken by someone holding a gun on the steps of a Jewish student center do pose a "direct and imminent threat" and should be stopped and punished by campus authorities and/or the government. What students say in the classroom should be treated differently than what they say at a campus rally or debate. Angry threats made to individual students should be treated differently than the same words written on a flyer or in an op-ed in the campus newspaper.

THE PLIGHT OF PENN'S PRESIDENT MAGILL

Members of Congress and other critics of the college presidents apparently couldn't be bothered with the nuances of these complex issues. In the midst of complaints that the presidents failed to adequately condemn antisemitism, scant attention has been paid to their opening remarks.

For example, Penn President Magill couldn't have been more forceful in her condemnation of antisemitism. Given the misleading and unfair criticism to which she was subjected and the immediate calls for her resignation, her balanced and comprehensive opening statement deserves to be considered in detail.

After summarizing her impressive credentials prior to becoming Penn's president (executive vice president and provost of the University of Virginia, dean of Stanford Law School, professor of law at the University of Virginia, law clerk for U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg), she immediately and forcefully stated that she and Penn:

. . . are horrified by and condemn Hamas's abhorrent terrorist attack on Israel on October 7th. There is no justification—none—for those heinous attacks. The loss of life and suffering that are occurring in Israel and Gaza during the ensuing war are heart-breaking. The pain extends to our campus. I know it from my daily conversations with our students, faculty, and staff, as well as parents and alumni.

Magill said she valued the opportunity to reaffirm her and Penn's "unyielding opposition to antisemitism, and to outline the urgent, university-wide actions we are taking to combat this centuries-old and resurgent threat." She also said her "first priority is to members of the Penn community and, above all, to their safety and support." She continued:

I must also ensure that our academic mission thrives; that academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas endure; and that we swiftly address any violation of the Law or our University's policies. These are the priorities Penn is seeking to achieve in the actions I will discuss today.

She noted that prior to October 7, "antisemitism"—a pernicious, viral evil—was already rising in our society, and global events have dramatically accelerated the surge. No place is immune, and campuses, including ours, have recently experienced an unacceptable number of antisemitic incidents. We are combating this evil head-on with immediate action." She described how she "condemned antisemitism publicly, regularly, and in the strongest terms possible," and wanted to:

reiterate my and Penn's commitment to combating it. For decades our Division of Public Safety has learned from and worked with the Anti-Defamation League office in Philadelphia, and we are working closely with them, as well as local, state, and federal law enforcement to promptly report and investigate antisemitic acts against any member of the Penn community. Where we have been able to identify individuals who committed these acts in violation of existing University policy or law, we have initiated disciplinary proceedings and referred these matters to law enforcement where appropriate.

President Magill went into detail about how Penn has "acted decisively to ensure safety throughout and near campus." Then she pointed out that like many communities around the world:

Penn has also experienced protests, rallies, and vigils related to the terrorist attack and the subsequent war. Protest—and all it entails—has long been a feature of university life. Penn's approach to protest is guided by the U.S. Constitution, outlined in decades-old open expression policies, and supported and upheld by trained Open Expression Observers. We recognize the right of peaceful protest and assembly, and we give broad protection to free expression—even expression that is offensive. At the same time, we have zero tolerance for violence or speech intended to incite it. Our public safety officers are present at every protest, rally, or vigil, trained in de-escalation techniques, and, if necessary, they are ready to act.

Magill also talked about "the challenges of fostering robust debate during difficult times," how "in addition to respecting the right of protest, Penn is offering many ways for students to come together in classrooms and in small groups to discuss these issues," how "educating citizens requires engagement with real-world challenges and hard topics—topics that often inspire passionate responses," and how "university leadership must provide guardrails that encourage free and open expression while also ensuring a secure environment."

She outlined Penn's new "Action Plan to Combat Antisemitism" and she announced that she had created a new student advisory group on the Jewish student experience.

Magill also noted the: "rising harassment, intimidation, doxing, and threats toward students, faculty, and staff based on their identity or perceived identity as Muslim, Palestinian, or Arab. Some have lost family members in this war, and many are worried about the safety of their loved ones in the region. Many are also afraid for their own safety, and the horrifying shooting of three Palestinian students in Vermont has only deepened their fears."

She said she was "appalled by and have publicly condemned these acts of harassment, threats, and intimidation. We are investigating all allegations, even when

threats have come from outside our campus. We are providing resources and advice to assist individuals with online doxing, harassment, and threats."

And she has created a Presidential Commission on Countering Hate and Building Community "to empower our campus leaders to address antisemitism, Islamophobia, and hate in all forms, and to lay the groundwork for a stronger, more connected community."

Magill ended her opening statements by reiterating that:

"[h]igher education institutions create knowledge, share it for good, and educate the next generation—missions that have never been more essential," and noting that on Penn's campus today many people are "engaged in serious and respectful conversation—despite disagreement—about difficult topics, including those related to the Israel-Hamas war."

REPRESENTATIVE ELISE STEFANIK: 'DOES CALLING FOR THE GENOCIDE OF JEWS VIOLATE PENN'S RULES OR CODE OF CONDUCT? YES OR NO?'

Most of the attacks on Magill focused on her exchange with Representative Elise Stefanik, Republican of New York. Stefanik noted that "there had been marches where students had chanted support for intifada, an Arabic word that means 'uprising' and that many Jews hear as a call for violence against them."

Stefanik asked Magill, "Does calling for the genocide of Jews violate Penn's rules or code of conduct? Yes or no?"

Magill replied, "If the speech turns into conduct, it can be harassment."

Stefanik pressed the issue: "I am asking, specifically: Calling for the genocide of Jews, does that constitute bullying or harassment?"

Magill, who joined Penn last year with a pledge to promote campus free speech, replied, "If it is directed and severe, pervasive, it is harassment."

Stefanik responded: "So the answer is yes."

Trying to give complete rather than glib answers, Magill said, "It is a context-dependent decision, congresswoman." Stefanik then exclaimed, "That's your testimony today? Calling for the genocide of Jews is depending upon the context?"

After some more back and forth, Magill said, "It can be harassment," to which Stefanik responded, "The answer is yes."

Given the totality of Magill's testimony, it is astonishing and disappointing that Gov. Josh Shapiro of Pennsylvania said he found her statements "unacceptable." According to *The New York Times*, he said:

"It should not be hard to condemn genocide, genocide against Jews, genocide against anyone else," and "I've said many times, leaders have a responsibility to speak and act with moral clarity, and Liz Magill failed to meet that simple test. . . . There should be no nuance to that—she needed to give a one-word answer."

Shapiro, who is a nonvoting member of Penn's board, urged the trustees to meet soon. CNN has reported that the board held an emergency meeting on Wednesday, December 6. No outcome has been announced.

"It's unbelievable that this needs to be said: Calls for genocide are monstrous and antithetical to everything we represent as a country," said White House spokesman Andrew Bates, according to *The New York Times*.

The Times also reported that Senator Bob Casey, Democrat of Pennsylvania, did not mince words. "President Magill's comments yesterday were offensive, but equally offensive was what she didn't say," he said in a statement. "The right to free speech is fun-

damental, but calling for the genocide of Jews is antisemitic and harassment, full stop."

Senator John Fetterman, a Pennsylvania Democrat, described the testimony as "a significant fail. . . . There is no 'both sides-ism' and it isn't 'free speech,' it's simply hate speech," he said in a statement. "It was embarrassing for a venerable Pennsylvania university, and it should be reflexive for leaders to condemn antisemitism and stand up for the Jewish community or any community facing this kind of invective."

DID MAGILL'S CRITICS ACTUALLY LISTEN TO HER TESTIMONY?

Did these officials actually listen to Magill's testimony or did they just rely on truncated news reports and angry social media posts? In fact, Magill repeatedly and unequivocally condemned antisemitism and the Hamas attacks, and she said that calling for the genocide of Jews could constitute harassment under Penn's policies.

The *Times* also reported that Marc Rowan, the chief of Apollo Group and the board chair at the Wharton School—Penn's business school—wrote to the university's board of trustees asking them to rescind their support for Magill. "How much damage to our reputation are we willing to accept?" he wrote. "The call for fundamental change at UPenn continues."

Within 24 hours, a petition demanding Magill's resignation had attracted more than 3,000 signatures. Did Rowan and the 3,000 who signed the petition actually listen to all of her testimony before taking the extraordinary step of calling for her resignation?

Now Congress is threatening all three universities with a full-fledged investigation reminiscent of the HUAC and McCarthy hearings of the 1940s and 1950s that looked into communists and their "sympathizers," questioning college professors under oath about their teaching, writing, and politics. Many were fired or forced to sign loyalty oaths.

On Thursday, Rep. Virginia Foxx, chair of the House Committee on Education & the Workforce, told *Fox News*:

"[T]he Committee is opening a formal investigation into the learning environments at Harvard, UPenn, and MIT and their policies and disciplinary procedures. This investigation will include substantial document requests, and the Committee will not hesitate to utilize compulsory measures including subpoenas if a full response is not immediately forthcoming."

Stefanik is quoted as saying that after "this week's pathetic and morally bankrupt testimony by university presidents when answering my questions, the Education and Workforce Committee is launching an official Congressional investigation with the full force of subpoena power into Penn, MIT, and Harvard and others."

Ominously, she did not specify what other colleges and universities would be targeted. "We will use our full Congressional authority to hold these schools accountable for their failure on the global stage," she added.

Facing this barrage of threats and criticism, with her job on the line, Magill relented and apologized for her testimony:

"In that moment, I was focused on our university's longstanding policies aligned with the U.S. Constitution, which say that speech alone is not punishable. . . . I was not focused on, but I should have been, the irrefutable fact that a call for genocide of Jewish people is a call for some of the most terrible violence human beings can perpetrate. It's evil—plain and simple. In my view, it would be harassment or intimidation."

ENTER HARVARD PRESIDENT CLAUDINE GAY

Harvard's president, Claudine Gay, has also come under fire from donors, students

and alumni over her statements about whether calls for genocide of Jews would be a breach of Harvard's code of conduct. Gay testified that this type of speech was "personally abhorrent to me" and "at odds with the values of Harvard." But she added that Harvard gives "a wide berth to free expression, even of views that are objectionable," and takes action "when speech crosses into conduct that violates our policies" governing bullying, harassment or intimidation.

The Times reports that Jacob Miller, the student president of Harvard Hillel, said that "the testimony yesterday was a slap in the face, because there was a very easy clear right answer and she opted not to say that." Bill Ackman, the billionaire hedge fund manager and Harvard alumnus, called on all three presidents to resign, citing the exchanges over genocide. "It depends on the context" and whether the speech turns into conduct, "that is, actually killing Jews," he wrote on X. "This could be the most extraordinary testimony ever elicited in the Congress. They must all resign in disgrace. If a CEO of one of our companies gave a similar answer, he or she would be toast within the hour."

The day after the hearing, Harvard released this statement from Gay:

"There are some who have confused a right to free expression with the idea that Harvard will condone calls for violence against Jewish students. Let me be clear: Calls for violence or genocide against the Jewish community, or any religious or ethnic group are vile, they have no place at Harvard, and those who threaten our Jewish students will be held to account."

Her statement did not say what would constitute a threat, or whether chants of "There is only one solution: intifada, revolution" would meet the definition, as Stefanik argued during the hearing.

ON FIRE

The Times quoted a spokesman for the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, a free speech advocacy group, who explained that whether speech rises to the level of harassment "is a complicated and fact-intensive issue" that stems from a pattern of targeted behavior. "For example, it's hard to see how the single utterance Representative Stefanik asked about during the hearing—no matter how offensive—would qualify given this requirement," the spokesman said.

FIRE is correct. Take, for example, Harvard's "University-Wide Statement on Rights and Responsibilities." It begins by declaring that the "central functions of an academic community are learning, teaching, research and scholarship" and that by "accepting membership in the University, an individual joins a community ideally characterized by free expression, free inquiry, intellectual honesty, respect for the dignity of others, and openness to constructive change. The rights and responsibilities exercised within the community must be compatible with these qualities."

THE HARVARD POLICY

The Harvard policy explains that the "rights of members of the University are not fundamentally different from those of other members of society," suggesting that First Amendment norms apply, while adding that the University "has a special autonomy and reasoned dissent plays a particularly vital part in its existence." All members of the University "have the right to press for action on matters of concern by any appropriate means" and the University "must affirm, assure and protect the rights of its members to organize and join political associations, convene and conduct public meetings, publicly demonstrate and picket in or-

derly fashion, advocate and publicize opinion by print, sign, and voice."

Furthermore, the University: places special emphasis, as well, upon certain values which are essential to its nature as an academic community. Among these are freedom of speech and academic freedom, freedom from personal force and violence, and freedom of movement. Interference with any of these freedoms must be regarded as a serious violation of the personal rights upon which the community is based.

Finally, the policy makes clear "that intense personal harassment of such a character as to amount to grave disrespect for the dignity of others be regarded as an unacceptable violation of the personal rights on which the University is based."

It is immediately apparent—and should have been apparent to the White House, members of Congress, Governor Shapiro, and the rest of the critics—that Magill and Gay were accurately reflecting the complex analysis required to determine when free speech crosses the line into prohibited harassment, threats, or violence.

Magill was indeed correct that "if the speech turns into conduct, it can be harassment," that "if it is directed and severe, pervasive, it is harassment," and therefore, calling for the genocide of Jews "can be harassment."

She had the audacity to explain that it would depend on all the facts and circumstances.

Gay was indeed correct that calls for the genocide of Jews are "personally abhorrent" and "at odds with the values of Harvard." And she was also correct that Harvard gives "a wide berth to free expression, even of views that are objectionable," and takes action "when speech crosses into conduct that violates our policies" governing bullying, harassment or intimidation.

Apparently, her sin was trying to explain freedom of speech to Congress and the American people.

The Supreme Court and federal law make clear that for speech in the educational setting to constitute "harassment" sufficient to result in expulsion or other discipline, it must be "so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars the victim's access . . . to an educational opportunity or benefit."

Had Stefanik and her colleagues taken the time to familiarize themselves with the current law on free speech and framed their questions in terms of the legal definition of "harassment," they would have found common agreement with all three presidents. Had all the critics done their homework instead of spreading misunderstanding about free speech on campus, they would have embraced and applauded how these university presidents skillfully condemned what they called the "pernicious, viral evil" of anti-semitism and the "abhorrent" calls for genocide of Jews, while upholding "academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas" which ensure "a wide berth to free expression, even of views that are objectionable."

ENTER THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

The American Association of University Professors' policy, On Freedom of Expression and Campus Speech Codes, adopted almost thirty years ago, reminds us that "[f]reedom of thought and expression is essential to any institution of higher learning" in order to inspire "vigorous debate on those social, economic, and political issues that arouse the strongest passions. In the process, views will be expressed that may seem to many wrong, distasteful, or offensive. Such is the nature of freedom to sift and winnow ideas."

On a campus "that is free and open, no idea can be banned or forbidden. No viewpoint or

message may be deemed so hateful or disturbing that it may not be expressed. Hostility or intolerance to persons who differ from the majority (especially if seemingly condoned by the institution) may undermine the confidence of new members of the community." The AAUP notes:

In response to verbal assaults and use of hateful language, some campuses have felt it necessary to forbid the expression of racist, sexist, homophobic, or ethnically demeaning speech, along with conduct or behavior that harasses. Several reasons are offered in support of banning such expression. Individuals and groups that have been victims of such expression feel an understandable outrage. They claim that the academic progress of minority and majority alike may suffer if fears, tensions, and conflicts spawned by slurs and insults create an environment inimical to learning.

And while these "arguments, grounded in the need to foster an atmosphere respectful of and welcoming to all persons, strike a deeply responsive chord in the academy," the AAUP acknowledges "both the weight of these concerns and the thoughtfulness of those persuaded of the need for regulation, rules that ban or punish speech based upon its content cannot be justified."

The AAUP continues, "An institution of higher learning fails to fulfill its mission if it asserts the power to proscribe ideas—and racial or ethnic slurs, sexist epithets, or homophobic insults almost always express ideas, however repugnant. Indeed, by proscribing any ideas, a university sets an example that profoundly disservices its academic mission."

The AAUP cites what the Supreme Court stated when it rejected criminal sanctions for offensive words:

[W]ords are often chosen as much for their emotive as their cognitive force. We cannot sanction the view that the Constitution, while solicitous of the cognitive content of individual speech, has little or no regard for that emotive function which, practically speaking, may often be the more important element of the overall message sought to be communicated.

The AAUP further warns that a college or university:

sets a perilous course if it seeks to differentiate between high-value and low-value speech, or to choose which groups are to be protected by curbing the speech of others. A speech code unavoidably implies an institutional competence to distinguish permissible expression of hateful thought from what is proscribed as thoughtless hate.

Moreover, the AAUP says, "banning speech often avoids consideration of means more compatible with the mission of an academic institution by which to deal with incivility, intolerance, offensive speech, and harassing behavior," such as adopting and invoking "a range of measures that penalize conduct and behavior, rather than speech—such as rules against defacing property, physical intimidation or harassment, or disruption of campus activities," the development of "courses and other curricular and co-curricular experiences designed to increase student understanding and to deter offensive or intolerant speech or conduct," and condemning "manifestations of intolerance and discrimination, whether physical or verbal."

The AAUP concluded by noting that:

[t]o some persons who support speech codes, measures like these—relying as they do on suasion rather than sanctions—may seem inadequate. But freedom of expression requires toleration of "ideas we hate," as Justice Holmes put it. The underlying principle does not change because the demand is to silence a hateful speaker, or because it comes from within the academy. Free speech

is not simply an aspect of the educational enterprise to be weighed against other desirable ends. It is the very precondition of the academic enterprise itself.

THE FREE SPEECH GOLDEN RULE

Aryeh Neier, former executive director of Human Rights Watch, was born in Nazi Germany and became a refugee at two years old when his family fled in 1939. He was national director of the ACLU at the time of the Skokie controversy when the ACLU defended the right of American Nazis to conduct a march in that predominantly Jewish community.

In his book "Defending My Enemy: American Nazis, the Skokie Case, and the Risks of Freedom," he explained why a Jew would defend the Nazis:

Because we Jews are uniquely vulnerable, I believe we can win only brief respite from persecution in a society in which encounters are settled by power. As a Jew, therefore, concerned with my own survival and the survival of the Jews—the two being inextricably linked—I want restraints placed on power. The restraints that matter most to me are those that ensure that I cannot be squashed by power, unnoticed by the rest of the world. If I am in danger, I want to cry out to my fellow Jews and to all those I may be able to enlist as my allies. I want to appeal to the world's sense of justice. I want restraints that prohibit those in power from interfering with my right to speak, my right to publish, or my right to gather with others who also feel threatened. Those in power must not be allowed to prevent us from assembling and joining our voices together so we can speak louder and make sure that we are heard. To defend myself, I must restrain power with freedom, even if the temporary beneficiaries are the enemies of freedom.

It is high time elected officials and other critics of free speech begin to embrace and defend the Free Speech Golden Rule: Protect the free speech of others as you would have them protect your free speech.

We are going down a very dangerous path if we set a precedent and empower government officials or college administrators to silence, expel, discipline, or criminally punish students for uttering hateful speech that most of us find vile and shameful but that falls short of legally proscribable incitement, true threats, or harassment. Armed with such awesome powers of censorship, there is no telling when different government officials or different college administrators with different political agendas will find what the rest of us say to be vile and shameful and silence and punish us.

To defend ourselves, we must restrain power with freedom, even if the temporary beneficiaries are the enemies of freedom.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the statement says that Gay was indeed correct on calls for genocide of Jews were personally abhorrent and at odds with the values at Harvard. She was also correct that Harvard gives wide berth to free expression, even to views that are objectionable and takes action when free speech crosses into conduct that violates our policies. Apparently, her sin was trying to explain freedom of speech to Congress and the American people.

The Supreme Court and Federal law makes clear that speech in educational settings constitutes harassment sufficient to result in expulsion or other discipline must be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars the victim's access to the educational opportunity.

Had STEFANIK and her colleagues taken time to familiarize themselves with the current law on free speech and frame their questions in terms of the legal definition of harassment, they would have found common agreement with all three presidents.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn anti-Semitism. I condemn calls for genocide of Jewish people. I guess in this context, that has to be repeated over and over again. I am also concerned about the polarization of college campuses and the disturbing rise of discrimination and incidents on college campuses.

As I have noted, I am skeptical of the majority's newfound concerns about anti-Semitism on college campuses because, as I said in 2017, after white supremacists marched through the University of Virginia grounds shouting, "Jews will not replace us," I do not recall the same level of outrage. In fact, I note the endorsement of the one who declared that there were good people on both sides. I wrote a letter to the majority requesting a congressional hearing at that time, and our calls went unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, I concede that the university presidents' testimony last week, when taken out of context, fell under the First Amendment trap that when you suggest that speech is protected, therefore, you must agree with it. No, you can believe that speech is protected but also believe that it is reprehensible. Calling for genocide of Jews is reprehensible in all contexts, but it could also be protected.

Mr. Speaker, they answered the question the way Professor Fried said that he would have been professionally obligated to respond, but answering the question as posed should not warrant calls for his resignation.

We need to do everything we can do under the law to address anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination. This resolution fails to do anything to establish standards that can address reprehensible divisions in our society and on college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article titled, "President Gay Was Right: Context Matters."

PRESIDENT GAY WAS RIGHT: CONTEXT MATTERS

(By Charles Fried)

Since their appearances before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, the presidents of Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, and MIT have been subject to a barrage of hostile criticism in the media, including from constitutional scholars known for their advocacy for free speech.

When asked whether they would discipline students (or, I suppose, faculty) if they called for the genocide of Jews, each president responded that the answer depends on the context of the utterances.

I have taught at Harvard Law School since 1961 and began practicing before the Supreme Court in 1985—for four years as Solicitor General of the United States—and I would have felt professionally obligated to answer as the presidents did. It does depend on the context.

In the 1969 case *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that

"constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press do not permit a State to forbid or prescribe advocacy of the use of force or of law violation except where such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing imminent lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action."

Now, many—perhaps most—constitutional democracies do not go this far, and courts in some nations, including Canada, France, Germany, and South Africa, have allowed criminal prosecution for what may compendiously be called hate speech. But our Supreme Court has never deviated from its principle of incitement.

Even in the case that strayed the furthest from this standard—the 2010 decision in *Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project*, which upheld the statute that makes it a federal crime to knowingly provide "material support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization"—Chief Justice John Roberts '76 was careful to carve out free speech from the ruling.

In that decision, he wrote that, under the statute, Americans "may say anything they wish on any topic" so long as they do not speak or write "to, under the direction of, or in coordination with foreign groups that the speaker knows to be terrorist organizations." The three dissenters would have gone further in protecting the organizations' speech.

To be clear, governments may withhold benefits from American members of foreign terrorist organizations under certain circumstances, and certainly governments may declare official positions condemning such organizations and their principles. But none of this includes criminal sanctions.

Speech itself is, indeed, well-protected.

The three university presidents head private institutions that are not bound in every respect by federal constitutional constraints. But each institution in various ways has declared itself committed to protecting First Amendment values over the years. So it is not surprising that their presidents would have answered that whether they would discipline or expel students for advocating genocide depends on the context.

If one seeks to follow constitutional principles, answering this question certainly does depend on the context.

In 1991, prompted by an incident in which Harvard students hung Confederate flags outside their dorm windows, University President Derek C. Bok penned an essay defending the rights of the students to display offensive messages.

He directly linked Harvard's free speech guidelines to First Amendment principles, writing that he had "difficulty understanding why a university such as Harvard should have less free speech than the surrounding society—or than a public university."

I must admit that I have never seen such flags in recent times. Yet, even today, under the circumstances Bok faced, if I were a university president pressed to answer yes or no whether the student speech in question would subject the students to discipline, I would have to reply that, yes, it depends on the context.

The lead questioner, Representative Elise M. Stefanik '06, sought to lay a rhetorical trap for the three university presidents. But I doubt Stefanik is as principled as she purports to be.

Were the facts of the event before President Bok 30 years ago to recur and the administration to fail to discipline the display of Confederate flags, would Representative Stefanik have had the same reaction? I doubt it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that Republicans need a lecture on free speech or freedom of religion. We do not need such a lecture on that. We understand those concepts. Those are our first freedoms, and we are very keenly aware of those.

Mr. Speaker, there are massive problems in postsecondary education in our country, and our committee is doing its best to address some of those problems and to do something about them.

What we knew before the hearing, and what we know even more strongly after the hearing that we held last week, is that Jewish students are facing a massive rise in violence on our college and university campuses.

According to the Anti-Defamation League and Hillel International, 73 percent of Jewish students surveyed said they experienced anti-Semitism on campus this year. That number is up from 32 percent in 2021. Yet, college administrators, like the ones who testified before the committee last week, are not acting to protect students.

Now is not the time for campus leaders to sit on their hands. The only way to salvage American academia and restore a safe learning environment for its students is by rooting out anti-Semitism and standing up against hate.

I thank God that the Committee on Education and the Workforce is up to the task.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise to oppose antisemitism as well as all forms of hate on college campuses and wherever else it may exist.

Today I address the Congress to associate myself with the comments made during debate on H. Res. 927 by the Honorable JAMIE RASKIN and the Honorable KATHY MANNING. Both of these esteemed leaders highlight the nuance necessary when discussing issues of campus speech and antisemitism. Representative RASKIN's and Representative MANNING's remarks are insightful, and I, generally speaking, endorse their sentiments as sufficient explanations for my vote against the resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I once again rise in strong support of any and all serious and meaningful efforts to combat antisemitism. Unfortunately, it's clear that the resolution on the floor today was drafted with the sole intention of scoring political points, not protecting Jewish students from antisemitism.

Last month, the House passed a resolution condemning antisemitism on college campuses and calling for campus administrators to ensure Jewish students and faculty are protected. Since then, I have urged the Majority to move past mere lip service and instead make meaningful contributions to the fight against antisemitism on college campuses.

If the Republican Majority truly cared about protecting Jewish students and faculty, they

would have spent the last month implementing the Biden Administration's National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism and providing robust funding for the federal office working to protect Jewish students—the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. Instead, they put a spending bill on the floor that cuts the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights' budget by 25 percent.

If the Majority truly cared about protecting Jewish students and faculty, they would pass a bill increasing funding for the Nonprofit Security Grant Program, which provides critical funding to safeguard our nation's synagogues and Jewish centers.

If the Majority truly cared about protecting Jewish students and faculty, they would stop echoing racist ‘great replacement theories’ and ignoring antisemitism emanating from the right—including antisemitic comments coming directly from the leader of their party. It's telling that the sponsor of this resolution has chosen to remain silent about former President Trump—whom she has endorsed—dining with a man who is calling for the genocide of “perfidious Jews” and other non-Christians.

Finally, if the Republican majority truly cared about protecting Jewish students and faculty, they would work with Democrats on this issue in a good-faith, bipartisan fashion instead of blatantly plagiarizing the work of a Jewish Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, the rise of antisemitism in the United States and across the world—particularly on college campuses—is a real and growing problem. I hope that someday, the Majority will use its power to actually do something about it instead of playing partisan political games. I continue to stand ready to work with the Majority if they are ever ready to address this issue in a serious, bipartisan fashion. However, I can not support this attempt to score political points masquerading as a resolution to protect Jewish students and faculty.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 927.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. FOXX. 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 motion will be postponed.

DR. EMMANUEL BILIRAKIS AND HONORABLE JENNIFER WEXTON NATIONAL PLAN TO END PARKINSON'S ACT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2365) to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2365

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 “Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable Jennifer Wexton National Plan to End Parkinson's Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKINSON'S PROJECT.

Title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end:

“PART W—PARKINSON'S AND RELATED DISORDERS

“SEC. 3990O. NATIONAL PARKINSON'S PROJECT.

“(a) DEFINITION OF PARKINSON'S.—In this section, the term ‘Parkinson's’ means—

“(1) Parkinson's disease; and

“(2) all other neurodegenerative Parkinsonisms, including multiple system atrophy, corticobasal degeneration, progressive supranuclear palsy, and Parkinson's-related dementia.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall carry out a national project, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project (referred to in this section as the ‘Project’), to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson's.

“(c) ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT THROUGH PROJECT.—In carrying out the Project, the Secretary shall—

“(1) create, maintain, and periodically update an integrated national plan to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson's, ameliorate symptoms, and slow or stop progression;

“(2) carry out the annual assessment under subsection (d);

“(3) provide information, including—

“(A) an estimate of the level of current Federal investment in preventing, diagnosing, treating, and curing Parkinson's, ameliorating symptoms, and slowing or stopping progression; and

“(B) if applicable, an estimate of the investment necessary to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson's, ameliorate symptoms, and slow or stop progression;

“(4) coordinate research and services across all Federal agencies related to Parkinson's;

“(5) encourage the development of safe and effective treatments, strategies, and other approaches to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson's, ameliorate symptoms, and slow or stop progression;

“(6) improve the—

“(A) early diagnosis of Parkinson's; and

“(B) coordination of the care and treatment of individuals with Parkinson's;

“(7) review the impact of Parkinson's on the physical, mental, and social health of individuals living with Parkinson's and their caregivers and families;

“(8) coordinate with international bodies, to the extent possible, to integrate and inform the mission to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson's, ameliorate symptoms, and slow or stop progression globally; and

“(9) to the extent practicable, collaborate with other entities to prevent duplication of existing research activities for related disorders.

“(d) ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall carry out an assessment of the Nation's progress in preparing for, and responding to, the escalating burden of Parkinson's, including—

“(1) recommendations for priority actions based on the assessment;

“(2) a description of any steps that are planned or have already been taken to implement such recommendations, including

whether such recommendations can be implemented under existing law; and

“(3) such other items as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(e) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain an Advisory Council on Parkinson’s Research, Care, and Services (referred to in this section as the ‘Advisory Council’) to advise the Secretary on Parkinson’s-related issues.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(A) FEDERAL MEMBERS.—The Advisory Council shall be comprised of experts, to be appointed by the Secretary, who collectively are from various backgrounds and perspectives, including at least one member from each of—

“(i) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

“(ii) the Administration on Community Living;

“(iii) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

“(iv) the National Institutes of Health;

“(v) the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality;

“(vi) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

“(vii) the Food and Drug Administration;

“(viii) the National Science Foundation;

“(ix) the Department of Defense;

“(x) the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(xi) the Office of Minority Health;

“(xii) the Indian Health Service;

“(xiii) the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and

“(xiv) other relevant Federal departments and agencies as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—In addition to the members listed in subparagraph (A), the Advisory Council shall include 10 expert members, to be appointed by the Secretary, who shall include representatives of minority communities, communities disproportionately affected by Parkinson’s, and communities underrepresented in Parkinson’s research, who shall each be from outside the Federal Government, and who shall include—

“(i) 2 Parkinson’s patient advocates, at least 1 of whom is living with young-onset Parkinson’s;

“(ii) 1 Parkinson’s family caregiver;

“(iii) 1 health care provider;

“(iv) 2 biomedical researchers with Parkinson’s-related expertise in basic, translational, clinical, or drug development science;

“(v) 1 movement disorder specialist who treats Parkinson’s patients;

“(vi) 1 dementia specialist who treats Parkinson’s patients; and

“(vii) 2 representatives from nonprofit organizations that have demonstrated experience in Parkinson’s-related research or Parkinson’s-related patient care and other services.

“(C) REPRESENTATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the members of the Advisory Council are collectively representative of agencies, professions, individuals, and entities concerned with, or affected by, activities under this section.

“(3) MEETINGS.—

“(A) FREQUENCY.—The Advisory Council shall meet—

“(i) at least once each quarter during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the Advisory Council is established; and

“(ii) at the Secretary’s discretion after such period.

“(B) ANNUAL RESEARCH MEETING.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this section, and every year thereafter, the Advisory Council shall convene a meeting of Federal and non-Federal organizations to discuss Parkinson’s research.

“(C) OPEN MEETINGS.—The meetings under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be open to the public.

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, and every year thereafter, the Advisory Council shall provide to the Secretary and Congress a report containing—

“(A) a list of all federally-funded efforts in Parkinson’s research, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, clinical care, and institutional-, home-, and community-based programs and the outcomes of such efforts;

“(B) recommendations for priority actions to expand, eliminate, coordinate, refocus, streamline, or condense Federal programs based on each program’s performance, mission, scope, and purpose;

“(C) recommendations to—

“(i) reduce the financial impact of Parkinson’s on families living with Parkinson’s;

“(ii) improve health outcomes for, and the quality of life of, individuals living with Parkinson’s;

“(iii) prevent Parkinson’s, ameliorate symptoms, and slow or stop progression;

“(iv) improve the quality of care provided to beneficiaries with Parkinson’s who receive coverage through a federally-funded health care program, such as the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act or the Medicaid program under title XIX of such Act;

“(v) research the association between environmental triggers and Parkinson’s to help reduce exposure to potential triggers; and

“(vi) research and better understand the underlying factors contributing to Parkinson’s;

“(D) priority actions to improve all federally-funded efforts in Parkinson’s research, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, clinical care, and institutional-, home-, and community-based programs;

“(E) an evaluation of the implementation, including outcomes, of the national plan under subsection (c)(1); and

“(F) implementation steps to address the recommendations and priority actions under subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), based in part on the evaluation under subparagraph (E).

“(5) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Council shall terminate at the end of calendar year 2035.

“(f) INFORMATION SHARING.—Each Federal department and agency that has information relating to Parkinson’s shall share such information with the Secretary consistent with the statutory obligations of such department or agency regarding disclosure of information, as necessary to enable the Secretary to complete a report under subsection (e)(4).

“(g) SUNSET.—The section shall cease to be effective at the end of calendar year 2035.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 2365, the newly titled Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable Jennifer Wexton National Plan to End Parkinson’s Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

First, I thank Chair RODGERS for her support of this bill and passing it out of markup last week unanimously by a vote of 47-0. I am also grateful to my good friend and co-lead on this bill, Representative PAUL TONKO, for his support and for working with me on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. TONKO has been a true partner in this effort to provide hope for patients living with Parkinson’s disease, and I commend him for his advocacy on behalf of the community.

Mr. Speaker, in that spirit, The Michael J. Fox Foundation has been a champion for this mission to fund research for better treatments and cures for over 23 years. Michael J. Fox has been able to use his own diagnosis and celebrity status to channel over \$1 billion to translational research.

We have a letter of endorsement from his foundation and 30 other Parkinson’s and neurological advocacy groups and organizations. I truly could not thank them enough for their support and grassroots efforts on this particular bill.

H.R. 2365 is no-cost legislation—I want to repeat, no-cost legislation—that will unite experts from government and the private sector to develop a national Parkinson’s project with the goal of preventing, treating, and ultimately curing Parkinson’s disease.

Parkinson’s affects almost 1 million Americans nationwide, and it is the fastest growing neurological disease with no cure available, unfortunately.

It costs our healthcare system over \$52 billion annually, and that number is projected to increase over the next decade to \$80 billion. We must do all we can to change that trajectory.

Sadly, many of my close family members are among those who have been diagnosed with this horrific disease. This year, in particular, has been very difficult for my family. I lost my brother, Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis, to Parkinson’s disease in May. As a primary care physician, my brother cared for his community and his family. He really did.

I am so thankful that my friend and colleague, ANNA ESHOO—she is a godsend—suggested we rename the title of the bill after him in his honor. I thank her for her strong support on this bill.

My brother was an outstanding individual. In my opinion, he was a saint. May his memory be eternal.

Further, my mother-in-law, Theodora Lialios, also passed away just this past October after her yearslong battle with the disease. She was a strong and wonderful woman.

My uncle also had a diagnosis and passed away a few years ago.

My father, Congressman Mike Bilirakis, who was chairman of the Health Subcommittee under the Energy and

Commerce Committee—Peter worked with him—was diagnosed just recently. This is for my dad and all of my constituents.

Given these personal connections, I have made it a mission to enact legislation that will help Parkinson's patients around the country. H.R. 2365 is the first step in that direction.

Thankfully, we have been able to come together in a bipartisan fashion to move this bill forward. I am hopeful we will get broad, bipartisan support in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, this could also not come at a more critical time. Earlier this year, researchers were able to newly discover a Parkinson's biomarker that will help reveal pathologies and provide better understanding in research and development efforts.

I truly believe we are on the brink of new breakthroughs for treatments and cures and that one day we will completely eradicate this dreadful disease.

We must be proactive. We cannot afford to wait any longer. This national Parkinson's project will provide an integrated strategy to support and coordinate research efforts, collaborate to prevent duplication, encourage development of safe and effective treatments, and review the impact on patients and their caregivers and families.

Mr. Speaker, with passage of this bill, HHS will be tasked with the creation of a new advisory council comprising of experts in the field across the Federal Government in every related agency, combined with non-Federal members. This is how you do it, a public and private partnership. There will be non-Federal appointed members represented by the patient advocates, specialist providers, clinicians, and researchers working in the Parkinson's space.

This advisory council will focus its efforts on an annual report to the Secretary and to Congress with an evaluation of the current efforts to prevent, treat, and cure Parkinson's once and for all.

It will also provide recommendations for ways to reduce the escalating burden of this disease on patients, families, and caregivers. It will provide recommendations on ways to reduce costs and improve health outcomes and quality of care for Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and our Nation's true American heroes, our veterans, and better research the underlying causes of this terrible disease.

Lastly, H.R. 2365 will incorporate other neurodegenerative Parkinson's-related diseases, including the rare disease, progressive supranuclear palsy, PSP. PSP is an extremely aggressive disease that progresses rapidly, with life expectancy of 6 to 9 years after diagnosis. It has no known cure or cause. Like Parkinson's, we can change that if we act now.

Mr. Speaker, I was so saddened to learn that our friend and House col-

league, JENNIFER WEXTON, was diagnosed with PSP. Our thoughts and prayers are with her and her family. Her bravery is to be commended for continuing in Congress on behalf of her constituents while battling this horrific disease.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative WEXTON for her bipartisan support. She did so much. I couldn't do this without her. We are absolutely honored to be able to add her name to the title of this legislation, as well.

In the end, there has never been a better time to move forward with H.R. 2365, the Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable Jennifer Wexton National Plan to End Parkinson's Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Majority Leader STEVE SCALISE, for helping put this bill on the suspension calendar this week. We really appreciate accelerating the process.

It is a no-brainer. We have to cure this disease as soon as possible. We need to save lives, and quality of life is so very important, as well.

Let's do the right thing for the Parkinson's community by getting this bill through the House floor to the Senate and enacted into law as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2365, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable Jennifer Wexton National Plan to End Parkinson's Act.

These past few years, I have been honored to champion this legislation on behalf of the more than 1 million Americans living with Parkinson's.

I first learned more in-depth about Parkinson's from a friend who suffered with the disease. When the opportunity arose to partner with Congressman BILIRAKIS on this meaningful effort, I jumped right in and made it my personal mission to get this done on behalf of the millions of people living with Parkinson's.

Mr. Speaker, currently, there are no treatments to cure, prevent, or significantly slow down its progression. Parkinson's is the second most common neurological disease and is, unfortunately, growing and growing fast.

Mr. Speaker, I will highlight that there is hope on the horizon. Earlier this year, researchers discovered a new biomarker for Parkinson's disease. This is an exciting step forward, but much more research and coordination is needed.

Our bipartisan, no-cost legislation will, for the first time, unite our Federal Government in a mission to cure and prevent Parkinson's, alleviate financial and health burdens on American families, and reduce government spending over time.

This pioneering legislation is greatly needed. This bill will bring Federal stakeholders and non-Federal experts together to implement a national plan

to prevent and cure the disease, improve diagnosis and treatment options, and lessen the burden for caregivers and their families.

□ 1615

The bill's text is modeled off the successful National Alzheimer's Project model which brought together many parts of our Federal Government to improve the Federal response.

Once signed into law, this bill will do for Parkinson's what the national plan did for Alzheimer's and bring together coordination, care, and research all to help those with Parkinson's, as well their loved ones.

This will help bring a strong focus on a cure, a treatment, and also prevention. It will shine a needed light on the suffering related to Parkinson's.

Sadly, we recognize that environmental triggers are likely a part of Parkinson's, but so much is still unknown. More research and more coordination are critical to getting answers to these questions.

I thank The Michael J. Fox Foundation for everything that it does, but especially all of the work that they provided on behalf of this bill.

I thank the New York-based groups and advocates who stood by my side demanding action on this bill and giving a face to Parkinson's. That mission and their journey was over a series of years.

Together with patients, with families, and with medical professionals we learned about the challenges of Parkinson's and why this bill is so desperately and urgently needed.

I thank my good friend, GUS BILIRAKIS, for working on the National Plan to End Parkinson's Act with me. It is an honor to work with the gentleman on this, and I know how much this means to him personally. I thank him for his relentless work to push this forward. The loss of his brother and mother-in-law in this last year, indeed, has been a devastating blow for their family. I admire how my friend has channeled that pain and committed to making a difference so that we can bring hope to those with Parkinson's.

I thank Chair RODGERS and Representative PALLONE for staying with us and finding the resolution to move this meaningful bill forward. I thank Congressman GUTHRIE and Congresswoman ESHOO for their support, as well.

Additionally, I thank our committee staff for their hard work on bringing this together. Special thanks go to Tiffany Guarascio, Una Lee, Waverly Gordon, Shana Beavin, and Jacquelyn Bolen for all of their efforts.

From my personal office, I thank Emily Silverberg, our legislative director, for the resolve to continue until we pass that finish line.

I thank Congressman BILIRAKIS' team, especially Chris Jones, for her hard work on this effort.

I also thank our good friend, Congresswoman JENNIFER WEXTON. We love

JENNIFER. She has been there. She has faced a devastating diagnosis, and she not only joined this fight but became one of the most vocal advocates fighting for the Parkinson's community.

Mr. Speaker, as many of us know, Congresswoman WEXTON was first diagnosed with PSP this year which she describes as a kind of Parkinson's on steroids.

Today and every day, JENNIFER gives a face to Parkinson's, and she is changing the future for those who have not yet received the diagnosis and those who will benefit from the National Plan to End Parkinson's. I thank my friend for her advocacy and for bravely sharing publicly about her journey. I value her friendship and am in awe of her determination and her journey. I understand that receiving a Parkinson's diagnosis has got to be truly devastating for individuals and their loved ones.

It is, indeed, incumbent upon Congress to ensure Americans know they will be supported during this frightening and life-altering time. Our legislation does just that and offers a dose of hope.

This is a commonsense, compassionate bill that will establish a robust response to address Parkinson's and ensure that patients and their families receive the care that they need and deserve. By moving this forward, we will make a positive difference, improve lives, and even save lives.

For the millions of Americans living with Parkinson's, as well as their loved ones, I hope this brings much-needed hope. Hope has finally arrived. Hope is on the way, and that has been the message of this whole effort.

To all my colleagues, I thank them for their strong support and commitment to the Parkinson's community. I urge my colleagues to support this meaningful bill. It will make a difference totally to those who are impacted and to the Nation.

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2365, the Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable JENNIFER WEXTON National Plan to End Parkinson's Act.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my dear friend from Florida, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS, for his leadership and his excellent work on this bipartisan piece of legislation. We all admire my friend, and we thank him for his courage.

This is the first-ever legislation in Congress focusing on curing and preventing Parkinson's disease and ensuring quality care for those living with the disease.

More than 1 million people in the U.S. live with Parkinson's disease, and there are no treatments to cure, pre-

vent, or significantly slow down the progression.

Mr. Speaker, whether you are living with the disease or caring for someone, Parkinson's takes a terrible toll on everyone involved.

This issue is also very important to me. As a pharmacist, I have, through my career, experienced this with many patients. I also watched my dear friend, Senator Johnny Isakson, courageously battle Parkinson's disease for over 6 years.

Fortunately, we have an opportunity here today to pass one of the single largest congressional efforts to address Parkinson's disease.

The National Plan to End Parkinson's Act will build on the great work being done at places like the Isakson Center, named after Senator Isakson, to end Parkinson's once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for patients and for the Parkinson's community by getting this bill passed.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), who is an active member on our Energy and Commerce Committee and a very strong supporter of this legislation.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative TONKO for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dr. Emmanuel Bilirakis and Honorable Jennifer Wexton National Plan to End Parkinson's Act.

More than 1 million people in the U.S. live with Parkinson's disease. Without a cure, this number will only continue to grow. Every 6 minutes, someone is diagnosed with Parkinson's, and their life changes forever.

This diagnosis is devastating to patients and their loved ones who deal with the physical, emotional, and financial toll of this disease. I know this and its impacts firsthand. As a teenager, I watched my father battle Parkinson's for the last 10 years of his life.

I also recognize and thank our colleague, JENNIFER WEXTON, who earlier this year shared that she was diagnosed with a form of atypical parkinsonism, PSP, and she has shared her story and has been an advocate to make sure that the bill got to where it is today.

The National Plan to End Parkinson's Act, the first-ever legislation solely dedicated to ending Parkinson's disease, is sorely needed.

This bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to lead a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's. Our fight against this heartbreaking disease is nowhere near done, but we have the tools to start.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and to support this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to express my support for the

National Plan to End Parkinson's Act, which addresses one of the most pressing health challenges of our time, Parkinson's disease. It is a debilitating brain disorder that disrupts the lives and families across our Nation, including those in my immediate family, as well.

H.R. 2365 puts forth a much-needed proactive approach, mandating Health and Human Services to formulate and regularly update a national plan coordinating efforts to not only prevent and slow the progression of Parkinson's but to ultimately find a cure.

This bill will help lift up hope for loved ones and caregivers impacted by the disease by enhancing the diagnosis, treatment, and care provided to those affected by Parkinson's.

As previously mentioned, this includes supporting research for a new biomarker researchers recently discovered that can provide intelligence on the presence of an abnormal protein in the brain and body that is a known indicator of Parkinson's disease.

If researchers can find these types of biomarkers in the brain and body, then doctors can better detect who has the disease or may be at a high risk of developing it, and that can lead to an earlier diagnosis and more effective treatment.

Many people across the Nation have had to deal with the emotional and financial challenges that come with taking care of a loved one stricken with this cruel disease.

This legislation comes at an imperative time. According to the Parkinson's Foundation, nearly 90,000 people in the U.S. are diagnosed with Parkinson's disease every year. That is nearly a 50 percent increase over previous years. Today, nearly 1 million people in the U.S. are living with the dreaded disease, and that is projected to grow to 1.2 million by the end of this decade.

The cost to families is devastating when it comes to medications, surgeries, and other treatments. There are nearly \$52 billion per year in costs and lost income in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, this is a cruel disease. My grandfather, Finley; my father, Gale; and my brother, Scott, have fallen prey to this disease, but there is hope.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join forces in passing this bill. Together, we can pave the way for a future where Parkinson's disease is not a sentence but a condition we have conquered through our shared dedication to the health and well-being of the American people.

This bill would not be possible without Representative WEXTON. So I will close by saying to my friend and colleague: There is hope. This disease may touch my friend physically, but it can never touch her soul. May God bless my friend.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, we will find a cure.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Commonwealth of Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), who is a great supporter of this legislation.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my friend and colleague, Congresswoman JENNIFER WEXTON, to share her strong support and statement regarding this important legislation.

These are her words:

"I rise today in strong support of the National Plan to End Parkinson's Act.

"As many of you know, earlier this year, I shared that I have been diagnosed with progressive supranuclear palsy, or PSP for short, which is an atypical Parkinson's, a kind of Parkinson's on steroids.

"Even those of you with whom I have never interacted one on one have witnessed my physical deterioration, from my striding confidently through the Chamber earlier this year to walking more haltingly and dependent on my walking sticks this summer, to leaning heavily on my walker now. In all likelihood, some time in 2024, I will come to the floor in a wheelchair.

"Eventually, those of us who have these diseases will be unable to walk, talk, or even feed ourselves. We will require extensive and expensive institutional or in-home care, the cost of which will likely be borne primarily by U.S. taxpayers.

"Since my diagnosis, I have seen firsthand how Parkinson's disease or atypical Parkinson's can change everything, not only for those of us who suffer from the disease itself, but for all of the many people in our lives who love us and want us to be well again.

"The physical challenges are tough. In just 2016, I ran the Marine Corps Olympic-distance triathlon and as recently as last year got up every morning during session to go to the gym with Chair RODGERS and a small group of dedicated women Members.

"My family has felt the impacts, as well. My husband, Andrew, and I were supposed to be getting to the good part and were looking forward to enjoying our empty nest as our younger son went off to join his brother in college.

"Instead, he will be a caregiver, and we are looking for ways to convert the first floor study and half bath to a bedroom and en suite so that I will be able to remain in our home when I am no longer able to make it up or down stairs.

"Instead of scuba diving together in the morning and sitting under a palm tree and playing Scrabble in the afternoon, we will not enjoy a leisurely retirement a decade plus from now."

□ 1630

"I know it has been difficult for my sons to watch as their vivacious, cool—for a mom—confident Congresswoman mom goes through these changes and challenges as well.

"This is my family's story, but we, unfortunately, are not alone. There are

over 1 million people in the United States who have these diseases, and countless loved ones surrounding them.

"We did not expect this to happen to us, and it could happen to anyone. That is why this legislation is so critical. Today marks a historic step forward toward a world where no family has to endure what ours has.

"To my colleagues, friends, and those from across the country from whom I have heard an outpouring of support, I have been touched by your kindness and the desire for action from both sides of the aisle.

"If there is one thing we can all agree on, it is that we can and must do better to fight these terrible diseases.

"The past year has been a difficult road and an emotional journey for me, not only facing the great health challenges that come with this diagnosis, but also coming to terms with the fact that I have to give up doing what I love.

"I have spent my career uplifting the stories of those in need and fighting to serve my community, and I am proud to continue that fight on behalf of the broader Parkinson's community for as long as I am able.

"I am grateful to have a platform to be a voice for those struggling with this disease and to fight and help bring greater resources to the search for a cure. The National Plan to End Parkinson's Act will do just that.

"This is not the end of the road, but a vital and necessary first step on a journey that will lead to a cure or, even better, eradicate Parkinson's and atypical Parkinson's altogether.

"I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and reaffirm Congress' commitment to finding treatments and cures for millions of families across the country."

Mr. Speaker, I would only add to the words of Congresswoman JENNIFER WEXTON that she is a fighter.

Having served with her in the Virginia General Assembly, I saw her fight on behalf of others and turn their pain into progress, and now I am honored to serve with her as she does that with her own pain, turns it into progress to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves. I join her in supporting this bill and asking our colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Dr. EMMANUEL BILIRAKIS and Honorable JENNIFER WEXTON National Plan to End Parkinson's Act, H.R. 2365.

This bill takes a major step toward preventing and curing Parkinson's and diseases like it, diseases that impact millions of Americans, including more than 67,000 people in my home State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman TONKO and Congressman BILIRAKIS for

introducing this transformative legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor. I also thank the Houston Area Parkinson Society for the advocacy and the important and meaningful work that they do for those living with Parkinson's in Texas' Seventh Congressional District and throughout the greater Houston area.

I thank my friend and colleague, Congresswoman JENNIFER WEXTON of Virginia, for her leadership, for her grace, and for her inspiring example. As her classmate in the Congress in the class of 2018 and fellow William and Mary Law School alum, I have admired JENNIFER since the day that I met her.

Today, we honor her by naming this legislation for her in recognition of the work that she has done to advance this landmark legislation that will change the lives of millions of individuals and families affected by Parkinson's and diseases like it for decades to come, but it is JENNIFER who honors all of us, who honors our Constitution and our country and our fellow citizens by her service and by her example of courage and commitment and citizenship.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this is a very emotional journey, and in the words of JENNIFER WEXTON, this could happen to anyone, so any one of us could be touched by the impact of this legislation that will deliver efforts to search for better diagnoses, sounder treatment, and ultimately find a cure, but it is also about hope, and hope rings eternally here with this effort so that folks like JENNIFER will know and folks from GUS BILIRAKIS' family will know that America cares, that she cares deeply.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the reason the Lord brought us here today was to do good things, and that is why our constituents elect us—to do good things and work together for our constituents and, of course, for our wonderful country.

I thank JENNIFER WEXTON, my colleague, for really helping me with this. We could not have done this without our bipartisan support, and I appreciate the gentlewoman (Ms. WEXTON) so very much.

I want to thank my staff and the committee staff for not giving up and being resilient in getting this done in a timely fashion. We urge the Senate to do the same.

I want to also salute some family members: my sister-in-law, Maria, who took care of my brother Emmanuel for so many years. He took care of everyone in our community really as an old-fashioned family doctor and called patients every night to make sure that they were okay. He worried about us on a regular basis, the family, and never really cared about himself. God bless

him for what he has done for our community and, again, for this bill.

I also thank my nieces, Evelyn and Stella; and my lovely, wonderful wife for taking care of my mother-in-law for so many years.

This is quite an accomplishment. Again, we couldn't do it without Representative TONKO, Representative ANNA ESHOO, Ranking Member PAL-LONE and, of course, Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, who has been wonderful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous support for this wonderful bill that will do so much. I thank Michael J. Fox for his help. He has done so much. We will find a cure. I encourage a "yes" vote on this particular vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2365, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 motion will be postponed.

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 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 1147;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 918;

Adoption of H. Res. 918; and

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 927.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

WHOLE MILK FOR HEALTHY KIDS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unin-

ished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1147) to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to allow schools that participate in the school lunch program under such Act to serve whole milk, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 99, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 718]

YEAS—330

Aderholt	Duncan	Kelly (MS)
Alford	Dunn (FL)	Kelly (PA)
Allen	Edwards	Kiggans (VA)
Allred	Ellzey	Kildee
Amo	Emmer	Kiley
Amodei	Eshoo	Kilmer
Armstrong	Estes	Kim (CA)
Arrington	Ezell	Kuster
Auchincloss	Fallon	Kustoff
Babin	Feenstra	LaHood
Bacon	Ferguson	LaLota
Baird	Finstad	LaMalfa
Balderson	Fischbach	Lamborn
Balint	Fitzgerald	Landsman
Banks	Fitzpatrick	Langworthy
Barr	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)
Bean (FL)	Fletcher	Latta
Beatty	Flood	LaTurner
Bentz	Foster	Lawler
Bera	Foxx	Lee (FL)
Bergman	Franklin, Scott	Leger Fernandez
Bice	Fry	Lesko
Biggs	Fulcher	Letlow
Bilirakis	Gallagher	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Lofgren
Bishop (NC)	Garamendi	Loudermilk
Boebert	Garbarino	Lucas
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Luetkemeyer
Brecheen	Gimenez	Luna
Brown	Golden (ME)	Luttrell
Buchanan	Gomez	Lynch
Buck	Gonzales, Tony	Mace
Bucshon	Gonzalez,	Magaziner
Budzinski	Vicente	Malliotakis
Burchett	Good (VA)	Maloy
Burgess	Gooden (TX)	Mann
Burlison	Gosar	Massie
Calvert	Gottheimer	Mast
Cammack	Granger	Matsui
Caraveo	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Carbajal	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Carey	Green (TN)	McClain
Carl	Greene (GA)	McClellan
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McClintock
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McCollum
Cartwright	Guest	McCormick
Chavez-DeRemer	Guthrie	McGovern
Ciscomani	Hageman	McHenry
Cline	Harder (CA)	Meng
Cloud	Harris	Meuser
Clyburn	Harshbarger	Miller (IL)
Clyde	Hayes	Miller (OH)
Cohen	Hern	Miller (WV)
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Miller-Meeks
Collins	Hill	Mills
Comer	Hinson	Molinaro
Correa	Horsford	Moolenaar
Costa	Houchin	Mooney
Courtney	Houlahan	Moore (AL)
Craig	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (UT)
Crane	Hudson	Moran
Crawford	Huffman	Moskowitz
Crenshaw	Huizenga	Moulton
Crow	Hunt	Mrvan
Cuellar	Issa	Murphy
Curtis	Jackson (IL)	Neal
D'Esposito	Jackson (NC)	Neguse
Dauids (KS)	Jackson (TX)	Nehls
Davidson	Jackson Lee	Newhouse
Davis (NC)	James	Norcross
De La Cruz	Johnson (OH)	Norman
Dean (PA)	Johnson (SD)	Nunn (IA)
DeGette	Jordan	Obernolte
DelBene	Joyce (OH)	Ogles
Deluzio	Joyce (PA)	Owens
DesJarlais	Kaptur	Palmer
Diaz-Balart	Kean (NJ)	Panetta
Donalds	Keating	Pappas
Duarte	Kelly (IL)	Payne

Peltola	Self	Titus
Pence	Sessions	Tokuda
Perez	Sewell	Tonko
Perry	Sherman	Torres (CA)
Peters	Sherrill	Trahan
Pettersen	Simpson	Trone
Pfluger	Slotkin	Turner
Phillips	Smith (MO)	Valadao
Pingree	Smith (NE)	Van Deyn
Pocan	Smith (NJ)	Van Orden
Posey	Smith (WA)	Van Orden
Reschenthaler	Smucker	Vasquez
Rodgers (WA)	Sorensen	Veasey
Rogers (AL)	Soto	Wagner
Rogers (KY)	Spanberger	Walberg
Rose	Spartz	Waltz
Rosendale	Stansbury	Weber (TX)
Rouzer	Stanton	Webster (FL)
Roy	Stauber	Wenstrup
Ruiz	Steel	Westerman
Ruppersberger	Stefanik	Wexton
Rutherford	Steil	Wild
Ryan	Steube	Williams (GA)
Salazar	Strong	Williams (NY)
Salinas	Sykes	Williams (TX)
Schakowsky	Tenney	Wilson (SC)
Schiff	Thanedar	Wittman
Scholten	Thompson (CA)	Womack
Schrier	Thompson (MS)	Yakym
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)	Zinke
Scott, Austin	Tiffany	
Scott, David	Timmons	

NAYS—99

Adams	Evans	Morelle
Aguilar	Foushee	Mullin
Barragan	Frost	Nadler
Beyer	Gaetz	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	Nickel
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Bonamici	Garcia, Robert	Omar
Bowman	Goldman (NY)	Pallone
Boyle (PA)	Green, Al (TX)	Pascrell
Brownley	Grijalva	Porter
Bush	Higgins (NY)	Pressley
Cárdenas	Himes	Quigley
Carson	Hoyer	Ramirez
Carter (LA)	Ivey	Raskin
Casar	Jacobs	Ross
Case	Jayapal	Sánchez
Casten	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kamlager-Dove	Scott (VA)
Cerfilus-	Khanna	Stevens
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Strickland
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Swalwell
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Takano
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Tlaib
Cleaver	Lee (NV)	Torres (NY)
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Underwood
Crockett	Lieu	Vargas
Davis (IL)	Manning	Velázquez
DeLauro	McBath	Wasserman
DeSaulnier	McGarvey	Schultz
Dingell	Meeks	Waters
Doggett	Menendez	Watson Coleman
Escobar	Mfume	Wilson (FL)
Espaillet	Moore (WI)	

NOT VOTING—4

Frankel, Lois	Scalise
Pelosi	Schneider

□ 1731

Messrs. KRISHNAMOORTHY and PALLONE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SEWELL, Messrs. TONKO and THANEDAR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO CONTINUE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF JOSEPH BIDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 918) directing certain committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Joseph Biden, President of the United States of America, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 212, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 719]

YEAS—220

Aderholt Ellzey Kelly (PA)
 Alford Emmer Kiggans (VA)
 Allen Estes Kiley
 Amodei Ezell Kim (CA)
 Armstrong Fallon Kustoff
 Arrington Feenstra LaHood
 Babin Ferguson LaLota
 Bacon Finstad LaMalfa
 Baird Fischbach Lamborn
 Balderson Fitzgerald Langworthy
 Banks Fitzpatrick Latta
 Barr Fleischmann LaTurner
 Bean (FL) Flood Lawler
 Bentz Foxx Lee (FL)
 Bergman Franklin, Scott Lesko
 Bice Fry Letlow
 Biggs Fulcher Loudermilk
 Bilirakis Gaetz Lucas
 Bishop (NC) Gallagher Luetkemeyer
 Boebert Garbarino Luna
 Bost Garcia, Mike Luttrell
 Brecheen Gimenez Mace
 Buchanan Gonzales, Tony Malliotakis
 Buck Good (VA) Maloy
 Bueshon Gooden (TX) Mann
 Burchett Gosar Massie
 Burgess Granger Mast
 Burlison Graves (LA) McCarthy
 Calvert Graves (MO) McCaul
 Cammack Green (TN) McClain
 Carey Greene (GA) McClintock
 Carl Griffith McHenry
 Carter (GA) Grothman McCormick
 Carter (TX) Guest Meuser
 Chavez-DeRemer Guthrie Miller (IL)
 Ciscomani Hageman Miller (OH)
 Cline Harris Miller (WV)
 Cloud Harshbarger Miller-Meeks
 Clyde Hern Mills
 Cole Higgins (LA) Molinaro
 Collins Hill Moolenaar
 Comer Hinson Mooney
 Crane Houchin Moore (AL)
 Crawford Hudson Moore (UT)
 Crenshaw Huizenga Moran
 Curtis Hunt Murphy
 D'Esposito Issa Nehls
 Davidson Jackson (TX) Newhouse
 De La Cruz James Norman
 DesJarlais Johnson (OH) Nunn (IA)
 Diaz-Balart Johnson (SD) Obernolte
 Donalds Jordan Owens
 Duarte Joyce (OH) Palmer
 Duncan Joyce (PA) Pence
 Dunn (FL) Kean (NJ) Perry
 Edwards Kelly (MS)

Pfluger
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Rosendale
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Salazar
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Self
 Sessions
 Simpson

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

NOT VOTING—1

Schneider

□ 1739

So the previous question was ordered.

Van Duyne
 Van Orden
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Waltz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (NY)
 Williams (TX)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yakym
 Zinke

Pallone
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peltola
 Perez
 Peters
 Pettersen
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Quigley
 Ramirez
 Raskin
 Ross
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan
 Salinas
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 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
 Velazquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 212, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 720]

AYES—221

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

NOES—212

Adams	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Allred	Gomez	Pappas
Amo	Gonzalez,	Pascrell
Auchincloss	Vicente	Payne
Balint	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Beatty	Grijalva	Perez
Bera	Harder (CA)	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Pettersen
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blumenauer	Himes	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Pocan
Bonamici	Houlihan	Porter
Bowman	Hoyer	Pressley
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Brown	Huffman	Ramirez
Brownley	Ivey	Raskin
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Bush	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Caraveo	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carbajal	Jacobs	Ryan
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Salinas
Carson	Jeffries	Sánchez
Carter (LA)	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Cartwright	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Casar	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Case	Keating	Schiff
Casten	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Schrier
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Cherfilus-	Kilmer	Scott, David
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Sewell
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Slotkin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sorensen
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Soto
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Correa	Lee (PA)	Stansbury
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Stanton
Courtney	Levin	Stevens
Craig	Lieu	Strickland
Crockett	Lofgren	Swalwell
Crow	Lynch	Sykes
Cuellar	Magaziner	Takano
Davids (KS)	Manning	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McClellan	Titus
DeGette	McCollum	Tlaib
DeLauro	McGarvey	Tokuda
DelBene	McGovern	Tonko
Deluzio	Meeks	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Menendez	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Meng	Trahan
Doggett	Mfume	Trone
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Eshoo	Morelle	Vargas
Españlat	Moskowitz	Vasquez
Evans	Moulton	Veasey
Fletcher	Mrvan	Velázquez
Foster	Mullin	Wasserman
Foushee	Nadler	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Waters
Frost	Neal	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Neguse	Wexton
Garamendi	Nickel	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Garcia, Robert	Omar	

NOT VOTING—1
Schneider

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1746

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING ANTISEMITISM ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES AND THE TESTIMONY OF UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS IN THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 927) condemning antisemitism on University campuses and the testimony of University Presidents in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 126, answered “present” 3, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 721]
YEAS—303

Aderholt	De La Cruz	Higgins (NY)
Alford	Deluzio	Hill
Allen	DesJarlais	Hinson
Allred	Diaz-Balart	Horsford
Amodei	Donalds	Houchin
Armstrong	Duarte	Hoyer
Arrington	Duncan	Hudson
Babin	Dunn (FL)	Huizenga
Bacon	Edwards	Hunt
Baird	Ellzey	Issa
Balderson	Emmer	Ivey
Banks	Españlat	Jackson (NC)
Barr	Estes	Jackson (TX)
Bean (FL)	Ezell	James
Bentz	Fallon	Jeffries
Bergman	Feenstra	Johnson (LA)
Bice	Ferguson	Johnson (OH)
Biggs	Finstad	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Jordan
Bishop (NC)	Fitzgerald	Joyce (OH)
Boebert	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (PA)
Bost	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Brechean	Fletcher	Kean (NJ)
Buchanan	Flood	Keating
Buck	Foxx	Kelly (MS)
Bucshon	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (PA)
Budzinski	Franklin, Scott	Kiggans (VA)
Burchett	Fry	Kiley
Burgess	Fulcher	Kim (CA)
Burlison	Gaetz	Kim (NJ)
Calvert	Gallagher	Kuster
Cammack	Galleo	Kustoff
Caraveo	Garamendi	LaHood
Carr	Garbarino	LaLota
Carter (GA)	Garcia, Mike	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Garcia, Robert	Lamborn
Cartwright	Gimenez	Landsman
Chavez-DeRemer	Golden (ME)	Langworthy
Ciscomani	Goldman (NY)	Latta
Cleaver	Gonzales, Tony	LaTurner
Cline	Gonzalez,	Lawler
Cloud	Vicente	Lee (FL)
Clyde	Good (VA)	Lee (NV)
Cohen	Gooden (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Cole	Gosar	Lesko
Collins	Gottheimer	Letlow
Comer	Granger	Levin
Connolly	Graves (LA)	Lieu
Costa	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Courtney	Green (TN)	Lucas
Craig	Greene (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Crane	Griffith	Luna
Crawford	Grothman	Luttrell
Cuellar	Guest	Lynch
Curtis	Guthrie	Mace
D'Esposito	Hageman	Malliotakis
Davids (KS)	Harris	Maloy
Davidson	Harshbarger	Mann
Davis (NC)	Hern	Manning
	Higgins (LA)	Mast

McBath	Pettersen	Stanton
McCarthy	Pfluger	Staubert
McCaul	Phillips	Steel
McClain	Posey	Stefanik
McClintock	Reschenthaler	Steil
McCormick	Rodgers (WA)	Steube
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Stevens
Meng	Rogers (KY)	Strong
Meuser	Rose	Swalwell
Miller (IL)	Rosendale	Tenney
Miller (OH)	Rouzer	Thanedar
Miller (WV)	Roy	Thompson (PA)
Miller-Meeks	Ruiz	Tiffany
Mills	Ruppersberger	Timmons
Molinaro	Rutherford	Titus
Moolenaar	Ryan	Torres (CA)
Mooney	Salazar	Torres (NY)
Moore (AL)	Salinas	Trone
Moore (UT)	Sarbanes	Turner
Moran	Scalise	Valadao
Morelle	Schiff	Van Drew
Moskowitz	Scholten	Van Dyne
Moulton	Schrier	Van Orden
Mrvan	Schweikert	Vasquez
Murphy	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Nehls	Scott, David	Walberg
Newhouse	Self	Waltz
Nickel	Sessions	Wasserman
Norcross	Sherman	Schultz
Norman	Sherrill	Weber (TX)
Nunn (IA)	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Obernolte	Slotkin	Wenstrup
Ogles	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Owens	Smith (NE)	Wild
Pallone	Smith (NJ)	Williams (NY)
Palmer	Smith (WA)	Williams (TX)
Pappas	Smucker	Wilson (SC)
Peltola	Sorensen	Wittman
Pence	Soto	Womack
Perez	Spanberger	Yakym
Perry	Spartz	Zinke
Peters	Stansbury	

NAYS—126

Adams	Escobar	Nadler
Aguilar	Eshoo	Napolitano
Amo	Evans	Neal
Auchincloss	Foster	Neguse
Balint	Foushee	Ocasio-Cortez
Balint	Frost	Omar
Barragán	Garcia (IL)	Panetta
Beatty	Garcia (TX)	Pascrell
Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Blumenauer	Hayes	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Porter
Bonamici	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Bowman	Huffman	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ramirez
Brown	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Bush	Jacobs	Ross
Carbajal	Jayapal	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Scanlon
Carson	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Carter (LA)	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
Casar	Khanna	Sewell
Case	Kildee	Strickland
Casten	Kilmer	Sykes
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Takano
Castro (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Thompson (CA)
Cherfilus-	Larson (CT)	Thompson (MS)
McCormick	Lee (CA)	Tlaib
Chu	Lee (PA)	Tokuda
Clark (MA)	Lofgren	Tonko
Clarke (NY)	Magaziner	Underwood
Clyburn	Masie	Vargas
Correa	Matsui	Veasey
Crockett	McClellan	Velázquez
Crow	McCollum	Waters
Davis (IL)	McGarvey	Watson Coleman
Dean (PA)	McGovern	Wexton
DeGette	Meeks	Williams (GA)
DeLauro	Menendez	Wilson (FL)
DelBene	Mfume	
DeSaulnier	Moore (WI)	
Dingell	Mullin	
Doggett		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Brownley	Gomez	Houlihan
----------	-------	----------

NOT VOTING—2

Crenshaw	Schneider
----------	-----------

□ 1754

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE ENFORCEMENT OF SUBPOENAS ISSUED BY THE CHAIRS OF THE COMMITTEES ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY, WAYS AND MEANS, OR THE JUDICIARY AS PART OF THE INQUIRY INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO EXERCISE ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO IMPEACH JOSEPH BIDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 6 of H. Res. 918, H. Res. 917 is considered as adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 917

Resolved, That the chairs of each of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary are authorized, with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to initiate or intervene in certain judicial proceedings before a Federal court for the purpose of advancing the ongoing investigations into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Joseph Biden, President of the United States of America, including as set forth in the memorandum issued by the Chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary of the House of Representatives, entitled "Impeachment Inquiry", dated September 27, 2023, and that the Chair of each such Committee has had and continues to have the authority to issue subpoenas to further this impeachment inquiry.

SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

SEC. 2.

The authority provided by clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the Chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary included, from the beginning of the existing House of Representatives impeachment inquiry described in the first section of this resolution, and continues to include, so long as the impeachment inquiry is ongoing, the authority to issue subpoenas on behalf of such Committees for the purpose of furthering the impeachment inquiry.

RATIFYING AND AFFIRMING SUBPOENAS

SEC. 3.

The House of Representatives ratifies and affirms any subpoenas previously issued, pursuant to the authority established by the Constitution of the United States and clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, by the Chairs of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, or the Judiciary as part of the impeachment inquiry described in the first section of this resolution.

INITIATION AND INTERVENTION IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 4.

(a) The chairs of each of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary are authorized, on

behalf of such Committees, and with the approval of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to initiate or intervene in any judicial proceeding before a Federal court—

(1) to seek declaratory judgments and any and all ancillary relief, including injunctive relief, affirming the duty of any recipient of a subpoena authorized, described, ratified or affirmed by the second or third section of this resolution to comply with that subpoena, including the subpoenas issued to—

(A) Jack Morgan, U.S. Department of Justice; and

(B) Mark F. Daly, Senior Litigation Counsel, Tax Division, U.S. Department of Justice; and

(2) to petition for disclosure of—

(A) information relevant to the impeachment inquiry, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e), including Rule 6(e)(3)(E) (providing that the court may authorize disclosure of a grand-jury matter "preliminarily to a * * * judicial proceeding"); and

(B) materials relevant to the impeachment inquiry currently held by the National Archives and Records Administration, including those to which access may be provided pursuant to section 2205 of title 44, United States Code.

(b) The chair of each of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary exercising authority described in subsection (a) shall notify the House of Representatives, with respect to the commencement of any judicial proceeding thereunder.

(c) The Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives shall, with the authorization of the Speaker, represent any of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in the subsection (a).

(d) The Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives is authorized to retain private counsel, either for pay or pro bono, to assist in the representation of any of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in subsection (a).

(e) In connection with any judicial proceeding brought under subsection (a), the chair of each of the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and Judiciary exercising authority thereunder has any and all necessary authority under Article I of the Constitution.

□ 1800

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3721

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 3721.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LUNA). The gentleman's request is granted.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ZINKE. Madam 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

BROCHU'S FAMILY TRADITION

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the hard workers of a Georgia establishment that was named among the best new restaurants of 2023.

Food magazine Bon Appetit released its picks for the best new restaurants of 2023, forming the list from various places around the country that they state represent the very best of dining. Brochu's Family Tradition in Savannah is a part of this list.

Chef Andrew Brochu spent years in Chicago fine dining, ultimately deciding to open his first restaurant in Savannah, the hometown of his business partner and wife, Sophie Brochu.

Madam Speaker, the restaurant is situated in a former 1930s grocery store and is full of charming details that will remind you of the South almost as much as the food will. With innovative takes on East Coast favorites, the food is reminiscent of the backyard gatherings and family dinner parties of Andrew's youth.

I, again, congratulate Brochu's Family Tradition, and wish them the best of luck going forward.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Gun Violence Prevention and Community Safety Act.

This bill would take important steps towards ending the epidemic of gun violence in our country.

It would create a license gun owners would need to get before the purchase of a firearm. It would require universal background checks and close loopholes to avoid them. It would ban individuals who present a safety risk from owning a gun. It would raise the minimum age for buying a gun and establish a 7-day waiting period before a gun purchase could be made. It would ban military-style assault weapons and ghost guns. It would hold the gun industry accountable for the harm their products cause to society, and it would provide funding for Federal research into gun violence.

We must do something to stop this country's epidemic of gun violence. The longer we wait, the more lives we lose.

HONORING YEOMAN 3RD CLASS WILLIAM OSBORNE

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Yeoman 3rd Class William

Osborne. Yeoman Osborne went to Maryville College where he majored in psychology and played for the football team all 4 years and served as co-captain during his senior year.

After graduating, he joined the Naval Reserve and went to boot camp, then served 1 year in the Reserves and 2 years on Active Duty.

In September 1970, he got a job as a probation and parole officer trainee in Virginia, then worked at the Virginia State Penitentiary, and after that he drilled on a World War II destroyer.

Around this time, the Navy was under pressure to do something about troops returning from Vietnam with substance abuse issues.

Since Yeoman Osborne had a degree in psychology and experience working with people with drug addictions, he was selected as part of a team who received training as substance abuse counselors.

He went on to get his master's degree in education and his Ph.D. in public policy and administration, and he had a great career as a criminal justice educator.

He is currently enjoying retirement with his wife, Maureen; and living in Knoxville close to his son Patrick, and his wife, Jessica, and their two children. He also has another son Ryan, who lives in North Carolina.

It is my honor to recognize Yeoman William Osborne as the Tennessee Second District's 2023 Veteran of the Month.

RECOGNIZING CALIFORNIA DIVISION 4-AA FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS, THE SOQUEL HIGH KNIGHTS

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

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the new California Division 4-AA football champions, the Soquel High Knights. This is the first team from Santa Cruz County to win a State football title.

Head Coach Dwight Lowery, a former defensive back for the San Diego Chargers, took the team over 6 years ago, and ever since he has been working with these young men day in and day out to get them better and better in order to dominate the Pacific Coast Athletic League.

This season, though, Soquel only lost two games with their last defeat on September 22. Since then they went undefeated, extending their five-game winning streak into the postseason and ultimately into the championship title at Pasadena City College defeating Jurupa Hills High School 28-7.

The Knights' superior defense was on full display as well as the passing game, and all the while 1,000 fans cheered them on.

We on the Central Coast are very proud of the Soquel Knights. As the

United States Representative for California's 19th Congressional District and as someone who played high school football against Soquel, I am proud to celebrate the school's victory.

Congratulations. Go Knights.

NO ENDGAME FOR THE WAR IN UKRAINE

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, over the next month, there is going to be more discussion with regard to what is going on in Ukraine and whether we should have more Ukraine aid. I will emphasize, again, there is not enough discussion about how this war is going to end because eventually all wars end.

Madam Speaker, I think if you talk to the Biden administration, they have no plan nor vision as to what that war is going to look like a month or a year from now. One thing I will point out is that you are dealing with two countries who already have a shortage of young people and who should want this war to end. Ukraine has the second-lowest birth rate in the world. There is also a low birth rate in Russia, and a lot of people are moving to the United States.

During the Korean war, a bloodier war than this, President Eisenhower had a negotiation with the North Koreans and Red China, arguably the two most evil regimes in the last century. Nevertheless, he didn't say: Oh, we can't negotiate with Putin.

He negotiated with completely evil people, and tens of thousands of Koreans are probably alive today because of what President Eisenhower did.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition and join with the opposition to H. Res. 918 directing certain committees to proceed with an impeachment inquiry of President Biden.

As we all know how serious this is, Madam Speaker, let me remind you that Article II of the Constitution says that a President shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. Article II says it also requires that the President take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

There is no charge or challenge of facts that the President has not executed his job carefully, that he has committed high crimes, misdemeanors and treason. In fact, out of 35,000 pages of financial records, 2,000 pages of Treasury records, 36 hours of testimony, and a number of witnesses, tens of thousands of VP area emails, there is nothing.

This is extreme, a political stunt, and there is no evidence worthy of putting forward this impeachment.

In the words of an outstanding scholar, Professor Michael Gerhardt, in other words, an impeachment proceeding, including the initiation of an impeachment inquiry must rise above petty partisanship.

We cannot do this under the circumstances of petty partisanship. Mr. Biden should not be impeached.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MR. LLOYD KENNETH ROGERS OF ALEXANDRIA, KENTUCKY

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

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Lloyd Kenneth Rogers of Alexandria, Kentucky, who passed away on December 8, 2022, at 90 years of age.

Lloyd Rogers rose from adversity to live a life of notable achievement and civil service. Lloyd was raised in an orphanage in Kentucky, the same orphanage where he met his wife Blanche whom he was married to for 65 years.

Lloyd served 9 years in the U.S. Navy during the Korean war. Then he came back to Kentucky, and he ran and won a seat as judge-executive of Campbell County where he served in a civilian capacity. Then later, he worked as my director of Veterans Affairs in my congressional office where he was committed to helping other former servicemembers.

Lloyd also aided in crafting legislation that most of my House colleagues are familiar with. That is right. Lloyd Rogers wrote the first draft of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, otherwise known as the REINS Act.

I saw the first draft of this bill in his basement on his personal computer. He wrote it himself because he was concerned about overreach of the executive—having served his country in the military and having served as an executive himself. He gave it to the Congressman before me who introduced the bill.

I pay tribute today to a mentor and a friend, and I send his family, especially his son, Dennis, my deepest condolences. I commend Lloyd for his unwavering commitment to his country and to his community.

CONSUMER-DRIVEN ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, I am incredibly proud today to introduce the Clean Electricity and Transmission Acceleration Act with my friend, Congressman MIKE LEVIN, to remove the financial and regulatory barriers that are delaying the clean and cheap energy transition.

For too long, U.S. energy policy has been focused on putting the interests of

energy producers and exporters first, which is good for a small minority of Americans, but is actually opposed to the interests of a majority of us who are energy consumers.

Here is the thing: every new wind turbine, every solar panel, every geothermal plant, and every hydro plant is a threat to oil, gas, and coal producers who cannot compete against free. Every EV charger, every heat pump, and every LED light is a threat to people who make money off inefficiency. However, for consumers to realize those benefits and entrepreneurs to access those markets, we need wires to connect new generations to new loads.

So over the last year, Congressman LEVIN and I have worked with our colleagues across the Democratic Caucus to develop a consumer-focused energy policy that makes that possible, to accelerate the deployment of clean energy, to accelerate Americans' access to cheap energy, and to refocus U.S. energy policy on the interests of energy consumers where it belongs.

RECOGNIZING ANTONIO BAEZ'S SERVICE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Antonio Baez, who is a member of our district congressional staff and who has answered yet another call to serve. Antonio came to our office through the Wounded Warrior program, later moving to our official staff.

A family man and proud Marine Corps veteran who later served in Afghanistan as a member of the Army Reserve, Antonio adeptly attended to his duties with skill, knowledge, and compassion.

He was president of his police academy class at Lorain County Community College and served as a sworn officer and deputy sheriff, nobly serving his community.

Antonio exhibited exemplary public service to the people of Ohio's Ninth District. I deeply appreciate his service as do the hundreds of constituents for whom he was a dutiful listening ear and a guiding heart.

This past weekend, Antonio raised his right hand again, taking the oath of office as a newly elected member of the Lorain City Council. He is a son of Lorain and has never forgotten his roots.

Bravo. His call to serve runs deep, and I know he will serve his beloved community well.

Godspeed, and I thank Antonio for his service to the American people. Onward.

What Lorain makes and grows makes and grows Lorain.

□ 1815

CLEANING UP CORRUPTION IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, all I want for Christmas is to clean up the corruption in Congress.

That is why tomorrow morning I will be introducing my political reform and anticorruption resolution, supported by Unusual Whales, Capitol Trades, and Quiver Quantitative. CREW has also done important work on these issues.

It calls for five things: First, a ban on all PAC and lobbyist money; second, a ban on Members of Congress trading stock; third, a ban on Members ever becoming lobbyists; fourth, term limits for Members of Congress and Supreme Court Justices; and, fifth, a binding Code of Ethics for the Supreme Court.

The American people on both sides are frustrated by the corruption in Washington. We need real change. I hope Members on both sides will support this resolution that we introduce tomorrow.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF AIR FORCE MAJOR LUKE UNRATH

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the memory of Air Force Major Luke Unrath. Just days ago, Major Unrath lost his life when the CV-22B Osprey he piloted crashed during a training exercise off the coast of Japan. He was just 34 years old.

Major Unrath's journey of service began in Riverside in my district where he graduated from Martin Luther King High School. His commitment to a life of purpose and selflessness was evident early.

Described by his comrades as a natural leader, Major Unrath's cool demeanor, high standards, and quick wit left a mark on all who had the privilege of serving alongside him.

Today, we remember and honor a beloved husband, brother, and son. Major Unrath's legacy is one of sacrifice, dedication, and exemplary service to our great Nation.

Madam Speaker, may Major Luke Unrath rest in peace and may his memory inspire future generations to uphold the values of service, integrity, and courage that he so nobly embodied. I extend my deepest condolences to the Unrath family.

Madam Speaker, today, along with my Riverside County colleague Representative KEN CALVERT, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the memory of a true American hero, Air Force Major Luke Unrath. Just days ago, on November 29, Maj. Unrath lost his life in service to our nation when the CV-22B Osprey he piloted crashed during a training exercise off the coast of Japan. He was just 34 years old.

Maj. Unrath's journey of service began in Riverside, where he graduated from Martin Luther King High School, embodying the spirit of his alma mater. His commitment to a life of purpose and selflessness was evident from the beginning of his life.

Born and raised in Riverside, Maj. Unrath's family, including parents Gregg and Nora, and siblings Ashley, Scott, and Carly witnessed his unwavering dedication to making a positive impact on the world.

Commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Cal Poly Pomona, Maj. Unrath earned a bachelor's degree in aerospace engineering in 2013. Embarking on his Air Force career on January 31, 2014, he initially served as a developmental and aeronautical engineer at Vandenberg Air Force Base. In 2019, he transitioned to become a pilot, showcasing his commitment to continuous learning and growth.

Maj. Unrath's leadership, intelligence, and work ethic did not go unnoticed. He played a pivotal role as an officer in charge for squadron communications and later as a flight commander. His impact extended far beyond the borders of our nation, as he coordinated and executed numerous operations in the Indo-Pacific area of responsibility.

Described by his comrades as a natural leader, Maj. Unrath's cool demeanor, high standards, and quick wit left an indelible mark on all who had the privilege of serving alongside him. He loved to fly, and his steady hands and quick thinking earned him the trust and respect of his peers.

Today, we remember and honor a beloved husband, brother, son, and an incredible leader. Maj. Unrath's legacy is one of sacrifice, dedication, and exemplary service to our great nation. We extend our deepest condolences to his family, and we express our gratitude for the profound impact he had on the lives of those he touched.

May Major Luke Unrath rest in peace, and may his memory inspire future generations to uphold the values of service, integrity, and courage that he so nobly embodied.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE GLOBAL ILLICIT DRUG TRADE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-89)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to global illicit drug trafficking declared in

Executive Order 14059 of December 15, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond December 15, 2023.

The trafficking into the United States of illicit drugs, including fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, is causing the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans annually, as well as countless more non-fatal overdoses with their own tragic human toll. Drug cartels, transnational criminal organizations, and their facilitators are the primary sources of illicit drugs and precursor chemicals that fuel the current opioid epidemic, as well as drug-related violence that harms our communities. International drug trafficking—including the illicit production, global sale, and widespread distribution of illegal drugs; the rise of extremely potent drugs such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids; as well as the growing role of Internet-based drug sales—continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14059 with respect to global illicit drug trafficking.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, December 13, 2023.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS' ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2023

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to host this last Special Order of 2023, and to allow my colleagues to speak on House Republicans' legislative efforts this week and achievements on behalf of Americans this whole entire year as we have taken over the majority at the start of 2023 and share a little bit about what we have accomplished.

This week we passed legislation to lower healthcare costs, increase price transparency regarding healthcare, allow schools to make their own choices on nutritional aspects, such as the type of milk that they provide to their students, and ensure Americans receive the answers they deserve regarding the inquiry into the Biden family's peddling schemes and nefarious business dealings.

Tomorrow, we will vote on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2024, a comprehensive and robust bill that will provide for the needs of our servicemembers and enhance our national security efforts, while keeping liberal ideology out of our military.

I am pleased to have some of my colleagues here to speak on these bills and the ways that they have delivered for their constituents throughout the year.

No one has done that more than the Representative that will address this next, particularly on her strong focus with respect to defense. I have an Air Force Base that is part of who I am, part of where I grew up, so close to the community that I get to represent. She is in a very similar situation and has an intense focus on providing for her district and the needs of making sure that our men and women have what they need to secure our Nation and take the fight to our adversaries.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. KIGGANS).

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have had the honor of working on this important legislation for months and am proud of the final bipartisan bill we produced to strengthen our national security.

One of the main reasons I came to Congress was to restore America's military strength and improve the quality of life for our servicemen and -women. This bill takes several critical steps to help us achieve that goal.

In total, this year's NDAA authorizes \$886 billion in national defense discretionary programs with the focus on improving our readiness and recruitment, supporting our servicemembers and their families, strengthening partnerships with our allies, increasing the lethality of our Joint Force, equipping our warfighters to successfully complete their mission, and ensuring vigorous oversight of taxpayer dollars at the Pentagon.

I wanted to speak specifically to a few components of the NDAA, why it is a great bill, why I am excited to support it and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

First of all, a large component of the NDAA is about supporting our servicemembers and their families. It secures the largest pay raise in 20 years for our servicemembers at 5.2 percent. We continue to see our servicemembers struggling with the economy. They are unable to afford things, not just gas and groceries, but things like buying a new home, buying a new car. We have servicemembers that still qualify for things like SNAP benefits and WIC benefits. We still see food pantries that exist on our bases. Providing that important pay raise, again the largest in over 20 years, was a very important component of taking care of our men and women.

This NDAA also authorizes \$356 million over the President's budget request to renovate and build new barracks. We had a GAO report come out recently that really highlighted some of our insufficiencies when it comes to housing, especially unaccompanied housing—the mold issues, the pest issues, and the out-of-date infrastructure that is old and dilapidated. We can do better for our servicemen and -women. This bill provides just that.

It is a starting point. There is a lot to do, but I am excited to support it for that reason. The NDAA also includes a parents bill of rights at DOD schools.

I represent Virginia's Second Congressional District, so it is kind of the birthplace of the parents' rights matter movement. We were able to incorporate why it is important to have parents involved in their children's school into this NDAA piece so that it applies to DOD schools as well.

The bill also authorizes DOD to reduce the out-of-pocket childcare expenses for military families and provides \$153 million over the President's budget request for the construction of new childcare centers. In my district, I have Naval Air Station Oceana. Our base has over 1,600 people on the waiting list. That is not acceptable, and my base is not alone.

If you were to look at other bases, they have the same amount on their waiting lists. We can do better than this. It is an important way to support our servicemembers and their families.

This bill also authorizes an additional berthing barge to provide a safe and healthy housing alternative for Navy servicemembers during dry-dock availabilities. We just had an article come out about the USS *Stennis* in Newport News, which is where the shipyard is. It will be the first to have off-ship housing, free WiFi, and better parking. We have to take care of our servicemen and -women who are in these extended port periods, especially when their ships are being repaired. This bill does just that.

This NDAA also provides oversight for taxpayer dollars. It cuts \$37 billion in inefficient weapons systems, Defense programs, and Pentagon bureaucracy. It requires mandatory DOD audits, and it also establishes a special inspector general to oversee and monitor security assistance going to Ukraine.

I have been a supporter of Ukraine. I think we need to continue to support that fight in Ukraine; however, it cannot be a blank check. There has to be some accountability, and this inspector general will do just that.

This NDAA also improves readiness and recruitment, and this is something I have been focused on. We have a recruitment, retention, quality of life task force that has been part of our Armed Services Committee. We have been focusing on that for several months now. This NDAA is a good place to start.

It creates a grant program to expand the capacity of our shipyards. We see

that we are behind in our shipbuilding capacity. We know that China is outpacing us. China is rapidly approaching 400 ships, while we are hovering at just under 300. It is so important that we invest in that shipbuilding piece and, additionally, supporting our ship repair industry.

This bill also increases the number of Junior ROTC programs and instructors at U.S. high schools. That is such an important part of our recruiting for our Armed Forces. I want people to be in our great Navy and Army and Air Force and to join our great military. It is a great way for people to have jobs and education benefits and healthcare. Plus, there is no better place to advertise for our military than starting with our young people. Putting that investment in the JROTC programs is so important, and this NDAA does that.

This bill also extends military recruitment and retention bonuses and special pay authorizations. We have got to stay competitive with civilian jobs that are out there. I know there is a lot of competition in workplaces, and this NDAA will help the military to stay competitive.

It also rejects the Biden administration's efforts to reduce the size of our Navy by protecting four battle force ships with years of service life remaining. The President had asked to decommission eight ships, and we reduced that number to four. We really can't afford to decommission any ships, in my opinion, but we cut it to four. We have to make sure that we are providing oversight of the money and investment that we are putting in ship repair. We need to watch that our ships are getting repaired and they are getting repaired on schedule because we need every single one of them.

This bill also establishes enlisted training pilot programs at community colleges offering more educational opportunities for our enlisted servicemen and -women. It prohibits DOD from contracting with any CCP or Chinese-owned or controlled company operating in the U.S., which is such an important piece of national security.

This NDAA also strengthens partnerships with our allies. We need our friends now more than ever. This bill fully funds our Pacific Deterrence Initiative. It provides for the implementation of the AUKUS agreement with Australia, unlocking over \$3 billion in Australian investments in the U.S. submarine industrial base.

It authorizes over \$987 million in INDOPACOM Commander priorities, which were left unfunded in the Biden budget. It strengthens training and advising for the military forces of Taiwan and extends authority for the transfer of weapons systems, as well as precision-guided munitions to Israel.

This NDAA also protects our own national security. We do have some border wins that we were able to get and secure in this NDAA. It fully funds the deployment of National Guardsmen in support of Border Patrol activities. It

extends the Pacific Deterrence Initiative to enhance U.S. deterrence and defense posture in the Indo-Pacific region. It funds initiative of \$14.7 billion, an increase of \$5.6 billion over the budget request. It prohibits the DOD from reducing the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles below 400 or reducing the responsiveness or alert status of the arsenal.

I am also proud that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle supported my effort to include critical provisions from my Sailor Standard of Care Act in our Nation's most important Defense bill. These provisions will directly benefit servicemembers and their families in Hampton Roads and throughout the country by improving our servicemembers' quality of life by increasing access to mental health care.

As a nurse practitioner, focusing on mental health care, especially for our military members and especially for our veterans, has been something that I fight for every single day. We had provisions of the Sailor Standard of Care Act get into the NDAA and into the Conference version, which we will be voting on tomorrow.

□ 1830

Some of those provisions are that it examines reimbursement rates for mental health care providers under TRICARE.

When I meet with mental health care providers in my district, and throughout the country really, they have that same concern, they want to be reimbursed. There are not enough of them.

We want them to be partners in care for our military members and our veterans, so we need to make sure we are providing that reimbursement, and we are providing it in a timely manner.

This bill also directs the Navy to look into constructing and managing a dashboard to track quality-of-life programs and their utilization rate. So we are looking at things like healthcare, childcare, spouse employment, housing, and we are making sure we are providing the best services we can, again, for our military.

This bill requires a report on the feasibility of expanding TRICARE for life to include a benefit for the SilverSneakers program, mimicking the existing benefit that is included under some of our Medicare Advantage programs.

We had constituents that asked for this program. They want to utilize public gyms and recreation facilities, and so we would like the TRICARE program to cover it for our older adults who would love nothing more than to go exercise.

This bill also assesses the feasibility of providing additional mental health resources to limited-duty sailors. In Hampton Roads, we saw an increase in the suicide rates for sailors that we took out of the workplace, that we took out of the mission, and we kind of had them in a waiting area.

In this bill, we are looking at how long is that taking to medically process people out?

Are we providing those mandatory mental health screenings?

Are we taking care of them? Who is providing that care?

This bill is going to look at expanding that care so that chaplains can do it and corpsmen can do it. There is a shortage of mental health care providers. So really looking holistically at how we are providing the mental health services to our servicemen and -women and providing them with the best mental health services that we can.

The harsh reality is that the world is a dangerous place. The United States and its allies are facing unprecedented and rapidly evolving threats across the globe. China is outpacing us in warship production. China has 350 ships and is quickly moving to 400 ships compared with our 293.

Iranian proxies have attacked American bases and troops stationed overseas over 46 times since October 17. Israel is countering the most horrific attack on the Jewish people since the Holocaust.

North Korea launched its first military reconnaissance satellite into orbit last month with the help of Russia. Russian aggression continues in Ukraine, with Putin threatening to go after NATO member countries next.

Now more than ever, we must prioritize and project American strength across the globe. This legislation goes a long way in achieving that goal. The goal of this legislation is deterrence, it is all about peace through strength. America leads the world in peacekeeping forces, and it is so important. I can think of no other country that I would want to have this role than our great Nation, the United States.

In closing, Madam Speaker, the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act ensures our military can remain the best in the world. It refocuses our Nation's efforts on advancing military readiness and quality of life to make sure our men and women in uniform are ready to fight tonight.

As a former Navy helicopter pilot, as a third-generation veteran, military spouse, and mother to children who serve, I will always be the loudest voice for our military men and women in Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Passing this year's NDAA by a wide bipartisan margin would send an important signal to the men and women defending our freedom that those of us in Congress will rise above our differences to prioritize their needs and our national security above all else.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comprehensive view of the defense bill that we are going to be finalizing tomorrow. The Senate is currently voting on it right now actually.

This is one of those amazing things that Congress finds a way to get something done for our servicemen and -women. You talk about TRICARE, not

only talk about TRICARE, but about the housing and the healthcare issues that our servicemen and -women face with rampant inflation going on. They get squeezed more than anybody.

They don't exist in the private sector. They can't go to their boss and ask for a raise. They are serving our Nation, and they are getting squeezed by the same type of fiscal policy that has created this type of inflation.

Our bill addresses so much of that, but it also goes to the lethal aid that we need to defend our Nation, the deterrence that you talk about. Particularly in my district, the F-35 program is so key and important, and the naval shipyards in Mrs. KIGGANS' district, so I thank her for the work that she does.

I am thrilled to be a part of something at this time of Christmas to show our servicemen and -women that their Representatives care about them and want them to be successful. We look forward to finishing up that process this week.

I am going to spend some time tonight talking a little bit about the always fun question that we get to talk about. I remember lobbying this question over to the Democrats when they were in the majority quite often: What have you accomplished? You do a bunch of messaging bills, and none of them get passed in the Senate.

Now that we have had the opportunity to be in the majority for just less than a year, as it comes up on the end of the year here, it is good to take a moment to think about what we have accomplished. Can we answer that question?

What do we need to do to address any criticism that may be out there? Have you accomplished enough? Washington is a tough place.

I look forward to having a chance to look back on the year and share a few wins. I will try to articulate it here a little bit, but there is always a unique context.

The part I keep reflecting on is, I came to Congress in January 2021, and I have been here almost 3 years. What is important to look at is juxtapose 2023 with 2021. President Biden was in the White House. The Senate for the last 3 years has been controlled by a Democrat majority.

For the first 2 years of my time here, we had what I will call a triple majority, when you have the White House, Senate, and the House in one-party control.

2023 versus 2021. Immediately, as we entered into the 117th Congress, the Georgia Senate flipped, which I think was a surprise to the Democrats. It was a surprise to the Republicans, but we will work to rectify that.

However, within a month and a half, with budget reconciliation—where it does not have to go through the Senate filibuster because we didn't have the majority in the House—there was a \$2 trillion bill passed immediately, a \$2 trillion bill that was masquerading as a COVID relief bill. We had addressed the

COVID relief bills in a bipartisan approach prior to that. There was a \$2 trillion bill that got passed with no offset spending, completely additive to the national debt.

Within months after that, we saw the fastest increase in inflation that we have seen in 40 years to the point where you basically wipe out an entire family's salary for a month of each year with the amount of inflation that happened so quickly.

That doesn't just happen. That happens because of monetary policy. When you add and you load the system with that type of spending, you immediately get inflation. That is not just a Republican saying that; it is not just a Democrat saying that. That is the way economics works. When you load monetary policy and you have so much money chasing so few goods, prices for Americans skyrocket, particularly middle-class and lower-income Americans.

Just being in the majority, what has taken place in 2023? We curbed trillions of dollars of spending. When the majority at that time, the Democratic Party, had the White House, House, and Senate, they could virtually pass any type of fiscally related, budget-related bill that they wanted without having to go through the Senate filibuster to reach compromise.

In those circumstances, they can pass a bill on party lines. They chose within the first month and a half to pass a \$2 trillion bill that led to the most rapid increase in inflation that most Americans have seen in their lifetime. You are seeing inflation still high. We are still reeling with the effects of that, but it has leveled off because Republicans are in control of the House of Representatives.

Just by being in control of the House of Representatives, and the hard work that it took to win back the majority, we immediately curbed all of that spending. It wasn't just the \$2 trillion bill. They passed an Inflation Reduction Act, the IRA, that had nothing to do with inflation, but that was nearly a trillion-dollar bill. They thought maybe it was going to be \$400- to \$600 billion. It is now estimated to be well over that.

What that bill was was a failed Solyndra-type policy. It is broadly accepted among Republicans and Democrats that the Obama-era kind of mini Green New Deal with Solyndra and this tax break that was given to them was a massive failure. This isn't just, again, a Republican saying that. That is largely accepted that a \$500 million bill was largely a failure. That is a lot of money, and that is a big failure for the type of policy you are trying to create. That was \$500 million.

The Inflation Reduction Act, which basically mimics what took place with Solyndra, where you are trying to pick winners and losers in the energy world, was in the range of \$400 billion, which is far more expensive than what it was even billed to be.

By being in the majority, we keep all of this stuff at bay, and we keep that amount of monetary supply from ever even reaching the system. With the addition of having to raise interest rates as high as we did, that will curb inflation. If I say nothing else, that is an enormous win for what our Republican majority is doing.

President Biden had a \$5 trillion tax-and-spend plan—much of which he wasn't even able to accomplish because it wasn't popular enough even among Democrats to pass—that we were able to defeat over the last 3 years, but still that amount of spending got put through.

As I talk about some more things here, that is key. I hope that Americans can understand that by Republicans creating a split government, we make it so that we don't allow a Democrat agenda. That is, during the election, when it was former Vice President Biden and current Senator BERNIE SANDERS, they were going back and forth saying: Oh, I don't agree with your policies, you know, Senator SANDERS. I am the more moderate candidate. I will be smarter with fiscal responsibility. That was what the former Vice President, candidate at the time, Biden said.

As soon as he got the White House, House, and Senate under one-party control, they basically implemented a BERNIE SANDERS-type approach. He probably wanted several more trillion, but to put a \$5 trillion tax-and-spend policy together, it was catastrophic, and every single American felt it.

I could go on and on about the fiscal side of things. It is clear that in order to get inflation under control, Republicans in the majority are the best thing that we have going for us in the House. We level off that spending, and we try to curb that back down. I am hopeful that we can continue to be successful at that.

I am the father of four young boys. I am terrified of their future with the amount of money that we are borrowing for our national debt each year, what we are having to spend more and more to cover the debt servicing. It is really scary.

Let me take it out of the fiscal side. In January of 2023, Americans were done with COVID. We didn't need these COVID policies to still exist. We needed to move on. Republicans put a bill on the floor to end the COVID emergency that was still in place with President Biden after almost 3 years in the White House.

The very week we put that bill—we announced that bill was going to be voted on on Wednesday or Thursday. By Tuesday, the White House had announced, yeah, we are actually going to pull that back now. That type of stuff doesn't happen unless we are in the majority, and we force the White House to pull back. They recognize it is not popular. Even Democrats were going to support our resolution to end the COVID emergency, and the White

House responded. They respond when we push back on bad policy.

These things are simple examples, but as you can see, we are in a position to be able to force the Biden administration to accept commonsense policy.

Another one, Chairman COMER and the Representative from Georgia, ANDREW CLYDE, put together some very sensible, well-thought-out resolutions to push back on the direction that Washington, D.C., was approaching some of their crime legislation and how they were dealing with basic crime in the city.

□ 1845

All of a sudden, we didn't know how it was going to play out, but they put that up. Democrats recognized it. They actually read it and said: Do you know what? This actually makes a lot of sense. We can't be this soft on crime.

Just by us putting forth that legislation, the White House came out and said: You are right. We are going to sign that into law.

This doesn't happen that often. Usually, there is just kind of: If the Republicans suggested it in the House, we are just going to veto it.

We are putting forth commonsense policies that the American people broadly agree with. By doing so, we are forcing the Biden administration to come onboard.

How many times did President Biden say: We are doing a clean debt ceiling. We are not going to address anything in the debt ceiling.

The debt ceiling gives us an opportunity to address the fiscal state of our Nation. Republicans stood firm. We put together a really strong bill, sent it over to the Senate, and let the White House know that we are going to demand significant changes in our trajectory. That was met with months and months of inaction from the White House.

What took place after they started negotiations? They recognized that President Biden was not going to be able to continue to spend like he was. He was going to have to accept that Republicans are going to stand firm to lower discretionary spending.

For the first time in over a decade, maybe more, we are going to spend fewer dollars in our discretionary budget than we did the year before. Usually, these grow at a rate of 1 to 5 percent. This is a time where we are actually going to reduce it, saving over \$2 trillion in a 10-year span, cutting out that much from the budget, putting caps on it.

We got that accomplished, and we are working through that process right now. I look forward to finalizing that in the first part of the year and realizing those true cuts.

Are there bills that we force President Biden to sign? Yes. I am really proud of the work that we have done.

Are there things that we have accomplished here in the House that are historic? Look at H.R. 1 and H.R. 2. They

are the two best energy and border immigration bills that you have ever seen come out of this place.

If we adhere to it, we would be living in true prosperity with respect to how we approach our energy. We would be doing it cleaner, safer, and with better standards than anywhere in the world.

We would be trusting our industry instead of outsourcing and sort of outsourcing that guilt. "I am okay with Iranian oil. I am okay if Russia continues to do that." We don't sanction the Nord Stream pipeline, but we sanction and get rid of our own pipelines. It does not make sense. The energy policies of the Biden administration do not make sense.

What are we doing as a majority to push back? We stood firm on the debt ceiling to make sure that we got portions of H.R. 1. We would love for that whole bill to be passed. It is apparently not going to, but we took portions of that.

Some of the worst going on in our economy right now is this horrible permitting process through these archaic NEPA standards. We stood firm and said this doesn't go through unless you give us this type of permitting reform.

We are doing the exact same thing right now, using our majority. For the first time that I have been here in 3 years, Democrats in the House and the Senate are saying: If we are going to move forward on Ukraine, I get that Republicans are going to stand firm on the border.

We were having 1,000 to 2,000 encounters from the last three Presidents, Republican and Democratic Presidents, mind you. We are over 10,000. We have had millions and millions of encounters. We do not have control of our southern border, and Republicans are saying, with our majority, we are going to stand firm.

That is going on right now, similar to how we used the debt ceiling leverage to be able to accomplish some very good policy changes.

It is not easy to be in split government. It is a lot of back and forth and a lot of, "This is your fault. It is not our fault," a lot of name-calling, a lot of back and forth on this.

We are standing firm on the key things that matter to our Nation—energy and immigration and border policies that make sense and are humane.

We cannot have the cartels running the border. They are making billions and billions of dollars by taking advantage of policy. It is so simple. It would actually improve President Biden's approval rating if he would recognize that the Migrant Protection Protocols that were in the previous administration were actually quite positive. They saved lives. They saved our National Guardsmen and -women's lives. They saved immigrants' lives.

It is nonsensical that we can't do it. We are going to use any opportunity we can to do that. That is how we are using our majority.

I have talked about H.R. 1 and H.R. 2. Those bills should be passed. If they

truly went on policy, the Senate would recognize that, and we would have a much better outlook for some of the key things that we are doing.

It is not a reality, I get that, but what from those bills can we make sure that we get done? That is the stuff that we are working on. That is where we are pushing our majority.

Another one that I have been heavily involved with—and I think back 3 years ago. It was considered a conspiracy theory that there were any nefarious business dealings going on with Hunter Biden. The media wasn't reporting it. Social media entities were kind of squashing it. They were suppressing this information. This was all during an election year.

Fast-forward 3 years. You have now Hunter Biden not willing to show up to a deposition, but he is here saying he did a lot of wrong things, admitting fully.

Another nine indictments have just come out. It would have been more if the investigation wouldn't have been slow-played so that the 2014 and 2015 tax crimes weren't covered under a statute of limitations or limited from that statute of limitations. There would be significantly more to be able to prosecute Hunter Biden on.

The American people 3 years ago thought that that was just a hoax. If we are not in the majority—if Republicans are not in the majority, there is no admission that what Hunter Biden had done with his business dealings was illegal. There would have been no subpoena power to be able to share that.

In the Ways and Means Committee, we have jurisdiction over the IRS. Some very brave IRS whistleblowers came forward and provided some testimony.

We have to keep that completely quiet. We are not publicizing this. These are private meetings. We are not trying to get clicks because of this. We got ahold of this testimony, and we had to be mum about it. We couldn't say a word. From Thursday the week before all the way until Thursday the next week, I wasn't allowed to say a word about it.

We knew on that Thursday we were going to be releasing the whistleblower testimony that basically claims that there was an investigation into Hunter Biden and that the Department of Justice was slow-playing it, was giving preferential treatment. There were inconsistencies on how they were prosecuting or moving forward with this investigation.

That was to take place on Thursday. We were going to release all this information. For the last 3 years, there could have been a plea deal announced with Hunter Biden.

It was Tuesday morning. This was to be released on Thursday, but Tuesday morning, all of our phones blew up with a notification that said Hunter Biden just went into a plea deal.

I called our committee and asked if we knew about that. I mean, we are set

to release this information, the whistleblower's testimony, on Thursday. Did we know about this? No, we didn't. This just came out.

It immediately reminded me of why it is important for Republicans to be in the majority and what we are doing in this majority.

We said: We have to end the COVID emergencies. We are going to put a bill on the floor.

Within a day of when the White House realized we were going to put a bill on the floor, they decided to end the COVID emergency measures.

Fast forward to June when this whistleblower information was going to be released. There was, all of a sudden, a plea deal on Tuesday before we were going to release it on Thursday.

What has happened since? We released this information. It is very credible information. They have been vetted over and over again.

The information they provided is disturbing. It shows illegality. It shows a connection from Hunter Biden to what extent President Biden—maybe Vice President at the time, from 2016 to 2020, before he ran—is involved.

There are alias emails. There are WhatsApp messages. This reeks. The American people recognize that. The vast majority of people say: Okay, there really was corruption going on here.

That was to be released on Thursday. We released it on Thursday. That plea deal has fallen through. There have been significantly more allegations and indictments that are going to be posed to Hunter Biden.

It was clearly a plea deal that was not sound. Now that the whistleblower information is out there that we used our Republican majority to release to the public, to let them make the decision, we all of a sudden are changing the way that Americans know what is going on with their government.

I get a little frustrated when I hear, "What are you doing with your majority?" We are creating government accountability.

Go look at the Commitment to America that we started off with, that Speaker MCCARTHY pushed hard to get ready to go for when we took back the majority. You can go down the list, from energy, pro-growth tax policy, immigration and border, and government accountability.

We created, in the first of this term, a competitiveness against China. It was very bipartisan, very sincere, no messaging along with it. They just put out a report on how to go about doing it.

Our Ways and Means Committee is working with GSP to incentivize closer allied countries, to bolster them up, get them involved in our trade agreements so we can move some of our manufacturing from China.

These are the ways that we are creating a productive way forward on how we are leveraging our majority to deliver for the American people.

The last 3 years have been tough to watch on an international stage. National security and foreign policy is something that I get heavily involved in. I have a background in it. I love seeing our Nation work to solve some of these problems.

Our allies in Israel know that they have our support. This has largely been bipartisan, and I have appreciated the dialogue that it has created with our colleagues.

Ukraine is in a tumultuous place with the regime, with President Putin and what he has done. They have been able to fight back with our assistance.

We need to make sure that we don't let—the reality is that we have a major border problem. The fixes are actually quite simple.

I still remember talking to Vice President Pence and the process they went through to create a simple policy that said: Make your asylum claims, but you have to remain in Mexico during that process.

That alleviates the pressure at the border, and that disincentivizes the cartel activity so they have no real leverage down there.

Now, they are lying to people, saying as soon as you get across the border, you get lost in the system, but you will be in America, and all will be well. That is a lie to those immigrants who are coming here, hoping for a better future.

It is a simple fix. That is all we are asking for, and we are going to require it as we move forward on supporting our friend and ally Ukraine.

We are taking control. We are making sure our government works, and we are using our majority to solve problems.

There are a whole bunch of additional things on this chart. As I look back, I am extremely proud of the work that we have done over the last year.

I will end with the National Defense Authorization Act. It has authorized \$886 billion for critical national defense priorities. That is an increase of \$28 billion over the fiscal year.

While we are still finding wasteful cuts within the entire discretionary budget, this bill sets the standard for the readiness and modernization improvements that Congress needs to make sure that our defense has what they need to excel.

This includes a 5.2 percent increase in servicemember basic pay to account for inflation. It can't account for all the inflation, but like I started with, we try to level that off using our Republican majority to squash massive funding measures that go out from the Biden administration.

We are also trying to increase what we can provide to our servicemen and -women. It commits \$360 million to bolster housing assistance and childcare support for military families and funds crucial military construction improvements across the country.

It accelerates advanced radar and technology development to address

emerging threats to our homeland, provides DOD with a multiyear procurement certainty to increase stockpiles of critical minerals and rare earth elements, and funds the ground-based strategic deterrent.

The bill also prevents land purchases by Chinese-backed entities and prevents DOD research grants from going to universities that partner with Chinese entities.

The NDAA for fiscal year 2024 also includes several conservative wins, such as banning the teaching of CRT in the military, ending the bureaucratic DEI overreach, establishing a parents bill of rights for military schools, and preventing the military Green New Deal.

It is not where we need to be establishing energy policy. You can just grab H.R. 1 if you want to establish a real energy policy.

□ 1900

All these wins are with a Democrat-controlled White House and Senate. These are significant wins.

When you really think about it, I didn't expect to have so many under a split government. It goes back to what Leader STEVE SCALISE said, that these are commonsense policies. When you cut through the politics of it and you can build better relationships with our partners on the Democratic side of the aisle, you can really look through and see that, yes, this makes sense.

I was kind of told by my media network that this is bad. Some voices back in my primary would say that I can't support anything that a Republican does. But this is actually quite reasonable. We need more of that.

We are sincerely trying to push more of that, and that is why we have been able to accomplish so much with opposition of the party in the White House and the Senate.

This is just the first 11 months of work, but my colleagues and I look forward to—first, a merry Christmas and a happy new year; I hope that we get back to be with our families—coming back ready to build on these wins and finish a lot of what we started: to get our fiscal house in order, ensure we have a strong defense, and deliver for the American people.

That is something that every single one of us, regardless of party, wants. We differ on the approach many times, but we want the same end goals.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to recognize that the stuff we are putting forward is truly common sense, and not to let politics continue to get in the way. As we approach how to navigate and get that done in the crazy political system like we have, common sense will win out.

My colleagues and I are really just thrilled and proud to be able to emphasize and show what we have done, and I look forward to building on these.

As we wrap up the NDAA this week and look to finalize the funding for much of this, let's continue to keep the American people as the guide on what

we want to accomplish, not our own personal political endeavors, but to truly know what is best for the American people and do a better job of that.

We as a Republican majority will continue to deliver with those types of commonsense policies.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: DELIVERING IN THE FACE OF REPUBLICAN CHAOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, we are here talking about the work that we have done, or tried to do, in this past year. This week is the last week Members of this body will gather to work on legislative business for 2023.

The last time I convened the Special Order hour, my colleagues and I came to the floor to discuss the impact that the debt ceiling would have on everyday, working people. We said over and over that a debt ceiling agreement that shortchanged funding for vital programs shortchanges everyday people.

I find that, much like in May, we are in the same place fighting to protect and to preserve the programs our communities need. Just like in May, I am here to remind this body why we were sent here and who sent us here: Our constituents.

Let me be clear. Who sent us here are our constituents, not MAGA extremists, not lobbyists, and definitely not Donald Trump.

This year, my colleagues and I on the Congressional Progressive Caucus have been fighting like hell for policies that protect people, including expanding healthcare for DACA recipients; addressing gun violence; securing protections for the workforce; and centering our policies around equity and justice.

I am proud to say that we have been able to deliver for our communities, yes, even in the midst of chaos. While we were able to accomplish so little—although I know that my colleague tried to talk a little bit about what the GOP tried to do—I am convening this Special Order hour to speak truth to power.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear and say that Republicans have held progress hostage. It has been a year, and we have spent more time on speakership elections—19 to be exact—point-

less censures, and political theater, jeopardizing the safety and the well-being of people, instead of moving policy that improves their lives.

We have spent countless hours subjected to words that dehumanize and devalue Brown and Black people, and I have witnessed firsthand as Members across the aisle call immigrants vile names like infestations over and over again, not just here but during my committee hearings; denying their humanity.

I have spent more time attending vigils than celebrating life because Republicans are intent on holding up bills that would address gun violence.

I have spent more time voting “no” to protect my constituents from harmful cuts and reckless policies than I have had the opportunity to vote “yes” to legislation that prioritizes working people and families.

I have spent more time on picket lines affirming that workers deserve living wages, protection from retaliation, and the right to collectively bargain than actually passing policies that ensure that all workers are compensated well, respected, and valued.

When I was elected to Congress, I told my community that I was committed to delivering results. I am here today to say that in the face of everyday Republican-manufactured obstacles to progress, their political games, their disorganization, and their opposition to honoring our shared humanity, I remained true to my commitments and my values as a Member of Congress.

I have remained focused on delivering results for Illinois' Third Congressional District and honoring our diverse multicultural, multigenerational community.

I am not alone.

My colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus have also remained true to their commitment and their values and focused on delivering for their districts. I am grateful to be flanked by such dedicated, persevering, and courageous leaders.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to welcome one of my colleagues to share some of the progress that she has made and what Congress must still continue to do to accomplish and deliver for the people.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I stand here today because we are just 1 month from another government shutdown, and Congressional Republicans have demonstrated once again that they are more concerned about satisfying their culture warrior base than actually addressing any of the problems their constituents face.

Madam Speaker, that hasn't stopped us from delivering for our districts. I am here because the everyday working-class people of Allegheny and Westmoreland Counties came together to say, everybody should have a livable

wage, clean air and water, affordable housing, decent transportation, and healthcare.

The people I represent resoundingly rejected the status quo and decades of corporations leaving us behind and polluting our communities without accountability. They demanded political representation that will actually try to solve the problems they face and not play political games with their lives.

Our movement's detractors, including those in Congress, many of them, will try to make you believe that people from working-class backgrounds representing working-class districts are too consumed by fighting national political battles and don't do enough to deliver for our districts.

Let me be clear. Key priorities of the Biden administration, like the Inflation Reduction Act, would not have happened without progressives here fighting tooth and nail to ensure that our communities had what they needed to thrive. Despite Republicans' dysfunction, we haven't stopped fighting even for one second.

We are proud to have delivered in my district nearly \$1 billion in Federal investments for infrastructure, affordable housing, STEM innovation, clean air, and good-paying jobs because the people of Western Pennsylvania and across the country deserve leaders in Congress who have lived their struggles and work as hard as they do.

Whether it was delivering \$400 million from the Department of Energy's clean financing program to fund EOS, a battery storage manufacturer that will employ thousands of workers in PA-12's Mon Valley, in particular, or the over \$150 million to improve transit in Pittsburgh, or helping to deliver \$50 million for affordable housing in the historically divested Hill District of Pittsburgh.

Our movement in Pennsylvania is delivering on priorities that won't just improve our communities but the lives of people across the country. We are demonstrating the power we can recognize when communities that have been left behind elect leaders that have actually gone through what they have.

Throughout history, and particularly over the past four decades, working-class people, disproportionately Black and Brown, have been told our priorities are too radical, our needs are too unrealistic, and that our lives are expendable. Our movement stands in direct contrast to that, standing up to monied interests and fighting for our communities to be healthier, stronger, and more resilient.

The wins we have secured that I have talked about today represent just a small part of what our movement has done while in elected office, and you can be sure we are not done yet.

On the other side, Republicans are demonstrating that they are fundamentally unserious when it comes to addressing the problems that their constituents face, and all of our constituents.

Now Republicans are fighting battles so they can reconcile their internal struggle between satisfying their right-wing cable-news culture warriors and their ultra-wealthy corporate donors.

They are an embarrassment, and their constituents and our country will remember.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Madam Speaker, as the gentlewoman was talking, I started asking myself that if our colleagues that are in the majority were actually serious about delivering for their constituents, then perhaps we would spend less time in censures; perhaps we would spend less time fighting each other, doing whatever kidney-elbow situation; arguing with each other on the corners, and all the games and all the other things they do, and actually pass legislation that helps people's experiences improve, like legislation around housing, making it more affordable so that no one has to live in a tent.

It is interesting because Republicans seem to really care about homelessness when it is someone that is undocumented, that is an immigrant or asylum seeker, but they have had the opportunity in leadership in these past 12 months to pass legislation to address housing, and instead, they are cutting funds for housing.

They say they care about families and women and their wives and their children, but they refuse to pass paid leave.

They say they care and are worried about healthcare, but are they really? Because if they were worried about healthcare, we would be doing less of the crazy theater here—19 elections for a darn Speaker—and actually pass quality healthcare.

Let's talk a little bit more about what they haven't done and what we should be focusing on.

I know that the gentleman from Utah attempted to talk about the GOP accomplishments, but I couldn't figure out which one accomplishment he was able to actually tangibly prove.

Let's talk about housing. It is no secret that housing prices are skyrocketing.

In Chicago, for example, we have seen a 5.7 increase in the cost of rent in 1 year. In some communities, it is as high as a 20 percent increase.

As temperatures plummet, more people find themselves in tents suffering cold nights in unsafe conditions, or they are just one paycheck away from homelessness.

You would think that our colleagues would be concerned about government shutdowns since so many people are just one paycheck away from homelessness. While working families are struggling to pay rent, we faced not one, but two threats of a Republican national shutdown.

I have to say it over and over. This is what my constituents ask me about every time I go back home, or message me: We didn't elect you all to spend your time fighting each other because you don't like each other, or because

one person said this thing that this other person didn't like. All this time you spend censoring each other and fighting instead of negotiating appropriation bills that would fully fund our communities.

Yet, that is what 12 months in Congress have looked like. The Republicans are leaving everyday American families literally out in the cold.

In spite of Republican chaos, I, along with Representatives RASHIDA TLAIB from Michigan-12, AYANNA PRESSLEY from Massachusetts-07, JIMMY GOMEZ from California-34, and GREG CASAR from Texas-35 are delivering when it comes to housing.

We introduced H.R. 5827, the Tenants' Right to Organize Act, legislation that will protect the power of tenants with Federal vouchers to organize.

□ 1915

We know that throughout our Nation, from big cities, like Chicago, to smaller cities, tenants have recognized that when we fight, when we come together and claim our power, we win.

Tenant organizing is not only winning battles against unfair housing practices, unjustified evictions, housing discrimination, and uncontrolled price hikes; it is also changing housing public policy.

The Tenants' Right to Organize Act, my bill, aims to amplify their efforts by protecting the organizing rights of tenants with housing choice vouchers and tenants living in low-income housing tax credit properties. It also expands protections for mixed-status families and those who may not be eligible for tenant-based rental assistance.

Currently, only public housing tenants have legally recognized the right to organize. By extending this right to housing choice vouchers and low-income tax credit tenants, the bill acknowledges that all tenants deserve decent, safe, stable, and sanitary housing.

The fight for safe, stable, equitable housing must also include tenants, and as we are encountering a worsening housing affordability crisis, we understand that now, more than ever, all tenants must have the right to organize.

Now, let's talk about immigration. This is a place where I find the most dissonance. The same people that love to quote Scripture—God has called me to love him above all things—and then they seem to forget the second commandment: Love your neighbor as you love yourself—it couldn't be more clear as it comes to immigration.

I cannot count the number of times the same people who quote Scripture come to this podium to respond while scapegoating immigrant communities, demonizing them, and then saying that they care about them, "poor immigrants."

Well, if you cared about them and if you cared about humanity, and certainly if we were living our Christian

values, then we would be looking for legal pathways so no one would have to endure what so many people seeking asylum have to do every single day.

Republicans have repeatedly tried to introduce legislation and resolutions that deport unaccompanied children. These are the same people that say that they are the ones of family values, they are the ones protecting life and children. They want to end asylum, and they want to jail families.

They are trying again right now. They are seeking to extort immoral and deplorable border provisions in exchange for aid for Ukraine. I have said it before and I will say it again and again and again: It is hypocritical, cynical, to target immigrants when many of the people who serve in this Chamber, some of them with me right now, have reaped the benefits of immigrant labor and become wealthy on the backs of immigrant sacrifice.

It takes courage to cross the border, to seek a job, to pursue an opportunity to raise your children in safety. The courage of our people stands in stark contrast with the cowardice of my colleagues.

There is nothing people-centered, nothing noble, nothing redeeming about their extremist approach to border immigration policy. Let's just be clear. They are scapegoating immigrants right now so they can say to their voters that they are doing something about the border, but they are not going to want to do enough, because they want to take the border conversation and issue to the polls in November.

Their unwillingness to negotiate, to actually get to the root cause of migration, is mind-boggling. They don't want solutions. Because if they wanted solutions, they would understand that actually addressing immigration, passing comprehensive immigration reform, would actually prioritize our economy. It would actually address the root causes of migration in Central and South America by creating legal pathways, by working with these countries, by ensuring that we help strengthen their democracies.

Yet, in spite of all the Republican chaos, a number of us have reintroduced the Dream and Promise Act, and we will work and work until we deliver it.

In spite of my Republican colleagues' inability to act beyond the border, we are here taking that first step in the right direction to give Dreamers and immigrants in America an earned pathway to citizenship that reflects our values as a Nation, a multicultural democracy of diversity and inclusion. We are here moving the needle to a real comprehensive immigration reform package that embraces our values as a nation.

Now, let me talk a little bit more about that. There are 9.8 million job openings right now. You can go to your local grocery store, go to Aldi, because some of us shop there still, very proudly, or you can go to absolutely any

other store. You talk about supply chain, and you realize that we don't have the workforce we need in order to address the issues of economy of the moment.

Now, just imagine, if the people that are here already, of the 11 million people living in the shadows, some of them for the last 30 years, if they were able to get a work permit, they would pay taxes, generate revenue for the Federal Government, helping address our issues of budget. They would address supply chain issues, our manufacturing, hospitality, agriculture, and the list goes on in terms of the different trades that are desperately needing workers that would get the workers they need. They would actually extend Social Security by decades if we passed comprehensive immigration policy, but that is not what we want to do.

We are so insecure perhaps about ourselves that we are unable to see the bigger picture of the economy for our country. Comprehensive immigration reform is a solution to the economy. Comprehensive immigration reform is the American way. This country was founded by immigrants, and every single person in this Chamber right now comes from a family who also migrated to this country, unless you are from the original indigenous communities.

Let me say this. As the only Member of Congress married to a Dreamer, this issue is extremely personal to me. I am committed to fighting this fight until we have a humane immigration policy that doesn't question the validity of people's lives and claims, that doesn't impose hurtful limitations on our communities, or doesn't leave anyone behind. No bans. No walls. No raids. Punto.

I want to talk to you a little bit about education and veterans. While extreme Republicans have served up hate and fear from every direction with no regard for the harm it causes our communities, I have been focused on addressing the real issues everyday people face—people like Army veteran Christopher Brown from Des Plaines, Illinois, who was promised by IIT Tech that his GI benefits would cover his tuition, only to be left with \$95,000 in student loans, or Navy veteran Bryan Tario from Lisle, Illinois, who was left with a significant debt after DeVry failed to be clear about the amount of money needed to complete his education.

Constituents in our districts have real problems that require real policy solutions. There are bad actors who should be held accountable and whose impact on our constituents can be minimized through prevention and redress.

These are the problems we should be addressing. If we spent the actual time addressing these issues, we would see the American people feel the improvement in their day-to-day lives.

Too many veterans are defrauded by predatory, often for-profit institutions that see the GI Bill education benefits and only see a profitable exploit.

In spite of the Republican chaos, I, along with Representative MIKE LEVIN from California, have introduced the Student Veteran Benefit Restoration Act, my very first piece of legislation in United States Congress.

H.R. 1767 establishes an across-the-board process for student veterans to have their GI Bill education benefits restored in qualifying instances, such as when a student veteran has been defrauded by an educational institution.

While Republicans waste our time doling out impeachments and censures, they deny veterans who have been defrauded justice, leaving them without recourse or the ability to start again in a reputable institution using the benefits they earned while serving our Nation.

It is time to bring H.R. 1767 to the floor, and I know that our veterans are watching closely and deserve it.

Now, I want to talk about health. Every person in Illinois' Third Congressional District has a right to achieve their dreams. As Members of Congress, our policy choices should enable them to realize their full potential.

Access to healthcare and healthcare services are critical supports to that end. That is why, while Republicans have made it their mission to cut funding for hospitals, healthcare providers, on-the-ground organizations that support health equity efforts, and programs that enable the healthcare ecosystem to function, my colleagues and I have made expanding access to healthcare services a priority.

Republicans proposed a Labor-HHS appropriation bill that cuts vital programs and services by 28 percent, equivalent to \$64 billion. Democrats held the line, and this bill did not pass. However, my colleagues, of course, did not stop there.

In spite of their chaos, I, along with so many of my colleagues, continue to deliver for our communities. Our fearless chair, Representative JAYAPAL, also introduced the Medicare for All Act, which would expand healthcare coverage to everyone, and I am a proud cosponsor of it.

We advocated for and we are proud to see the proposed rule from the Department of Health and Human Services that would grant eligibility for healthcare coverage to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, recipients.

I introduced an amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriation bill that affirmed how critical it is for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to maintain its independence from congressional meddling so that it can continue to address practices that harm consumers, especially predatory lending that leads to medical debt.

Medical debt puts people in an impossible position, having to choose between seeking necessary healthcare services and paying for their basic needs, like housing, food, and heat.

We didn't do that work alone. Achieving health equity requires col-

lective action, which is why I am proud to highlight the work of the AIDS Foundation of Chicago. In partnership with over 200 organizations and with funding support from the Ryan White program, the AIDS Foundation of Chicago served over 8,000 individuals last year through case management, housing, emergency financial assistance, and food support. Services include, but are not limited to, connections to housing, medical care, transportation, and behavioral health support.

The last thing I want to talk about is appropriations, something that this leadership doesn't seem to figure out. We are on our second continuing resolution, and the way things are going, we might have to go to a third one in January.

Let's not forget that Democrats have effectively kept the government open amid Republican infighting and, goodness, so much disorganization.

If we remember their first attempt at a continuing resolution, it included terrible anti-immigrant provisions and about a 30 percent cut to government services, which would have meant that in Illinois' Third District, 10,901 women and children would have gone hungry, 28,187 active and reserve servicemembers would have gone without payment in Illinois, and 5,000 residents in Illinois' Third District would have lost access to Federal help and vouchers.

These are not the goals of people who care about working families. How can you say that you are the party of family and then do everything you can to slash resources for them? To me, on the contrary, it is a vicious attack on working families.

At that time we said that if the Republicans were serious about averting a shutdown, they would bring a clean CR to the floor to keep our government running and to continue bipartisan conversations about funding priorities.

With less than 24 hours to avoid a shutdown, Republicans presented another CR. In spite of the Republican chaos, I, along with so many of my colleagues, delivered.

□ 1930

We defeated the extremist CR, and that victory made the clean CR that averted a shutdown possible.

We forced them to, at least momentarily, back down from their anti-immigrant demands and their cold disregard for working families. Let's remember that fight is not over.

You just heard a number of my colleagues, particularly the last one, talk about H.R. 2. H.R. 2 is the most anti-immigrant bill we have ever seen pass the Homeland Security Committee. We call it the child deportation act.

They want to bring back draconian Trump-era border policy. In the same sentence, they talk about how they are concerned about the women and children crossing the border. If that is not dissonance and hypocrisy, I don't know what is.

Let me say this loud and clear. It is our responsibility to deliver for the

people who sent us here. We are looking like chaos under Republican leadership. We must continue to double down, push back, and fight for working families.

I am committed to continuing the fight for an appropriations package that protects essential safety net programs and vital services, brings Federal resources back to my district and the State of Illinois, and prevents further cuts that threaten the well-being of our communities.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SUMMER LEE for joining me today as we talked about the Progressive Caucus' Special Order hour, the things that we continue to work on, and the victories in the midst of the chaos.

Here is what I want to say as I wrap up. Two days ago, I got back from Guatemala and Honduras. I went on my first committee delegation trip. As I visited Guatemala as a United States Congressperson, I couldn't stop thinking about my mother and how she has reminded me over the years of the 1,800-mile journey she took, walking and suffering as she was pregnant with me. She left poverty. She left a place she loved to have a better opportunity for me, her daughter.

I think about the moment that we are in today. I am very proud that I am the daughter of Guatemalan immigrants. I am very proud that I am the very first Latina of many to come from the Midwest. But I am more proud and honored to be able to be in this place, in this Chamber, fighting every single day for working families.

I am fighting for women who deserve paid leave and for constituents across the country who deserve quality healthcare.

I am fighting for clean water, clean energy, affordable housing, and the ability of the American people not to have to worry about living paycheck to paycheck.

I am fighting for that senior in my district who calls me crying: "If the government shuts down and I don't get my Social Security check, at 74 years of age, I am out in the street." These are the people who send us to Congress.

Madam Speaker, most of my colleagues, while celebrating and partying at holiday celebrations, perhaps having many spirits, should be reminded why they were sent to this Chamber. They were sent to represent the people who see them as their voice.

I will say to women, women of color, immigrants, the working class, children and our youth, Brown and Black people, the LGBTQ community, advocates and activists, on-the-ground organizations providing critical services, and anyone who feels afraid or invisible right now, to friends and allies of the progressive movement, and to my constituents in Illinois: I see you. I am fighting for you every single day.

There have been hard days in Washington, D.C., when I have been the only woman, the only Latina, the only

elected official with a mixed-status family where people are making decisions that will impact my life and your life, things that will impact the people I care about and the people you care about.

If there is ever a moment I falter, I think about my roots. I think about who I was sent here to fight for, and I find my footing again. My community is with me wherever I go, no matter how far away from home I might be.

While Republicans and their destructive agenda seek to decay the trust we have with one another, and they seek to divide us by holding resources hostage, community holds us together.

I refuse to allow Republicans and their obstruction of justice stop my colleagues and I from achieving true progress. I believe that progress is possible and that we can build a country that honors and respects the humanity and dignity of all marginalized people.

I believe that seeking asylum is a human right. I believe housing is a human right. In a country as rich as ours, no one should ever go hungry. No one should be trapped by crippling debt, whether it be student loan debt or medical debt. Brown and Black people are not disposable.

I fiercely fight for a world in which no one has to make impossible choices between going hungry or keeping the lights on at home.

I fight for a world where my loved ones like my uncle, who has been waiting for so long, can finally feel like this country is his home; where the color of our skin isn't a death sentence; and where we don't have to protest to ensure that climate change is taken seriously and the land and the people who take care of it are respected.

I believe in a self-determined future where all Palestinians and Israelis are free and safe. Our futures are intersected, and that realization can provide a path to coexistence.

A more just and loving world is possible. Progress is possible. It is possible because of the collective movement we are building—a progressive movement that does not move in fear but moves in courage.

The work is nowhere near done. Whether Republicans like it or not, I am here to stay and do the work that secures the future for all people. May we be reminded in this new year why we are here, who sent us here, and the responsibility we have to represent our constituents.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, during the 118th Congress, Democrats have worked persistently to advance legislation and policies that support the American people.

This Congress, Democrats have been met with fighting and incompetency from Republicans, an unwillingness to work together, and one of the most unproductive sessions in the history of Congress.

Despite the chaos, we have kept the government from defaulting on its debts and made sure that the government stayed open to do the work of the people.

I have worked with my colleagues to fight for the 18th Congressional District of Texas and my constituents, ensuring that the work of the federal government continues despite the chaos from Republicans.

House Democrats stand firm in our commitments to protect essential safety net programs and vital services, deliver for our districts, and prevent further cuts that would threaten the wellbeing of our constituents.

Democrats are united in putting People Over Politics to lower costs and grow the middle class.

As we wrap up the 1st session of the 118th Congress and look forward to the 2nd session, it is the job of Congress to fund our government, pass legislation that betters the lives of the American people, and ensure that we advocate for our constituents.

Extreme MAGA Republicans have had a difficult time coming to a consensus on how to pass their wildly unpopular and harmful legislation.

Instead of working in a bipartisan matter, they are wasting time and taxpayer dollars by bringing legislation to the floor that has no chance of passing the Senate and being signed by President Biden.

Congress should be working to lower costs and protect of national security instead of focusing on partisan politics.

As we go home for the holidays to our constituents and families, we bring with us a looming government shutdown, a result of incompetency and disfunction from extreme MAGA Republicans.

When we come back in January we must get back to our work.

The American people deserve a Congress that is serious in manner and functions to the best of its ability.

My friends across the aisle have not been willing to compromise during any of the most time-sensitive and dire moments in the 118th Congress.

While they have been focused on division and fear, House Democrats have worked to advocate for their communities while simultaneously offering to collaborate on the most crucial legislation on a bipartisan basis.

In this Congress, I have worked tirelessly to improve the lives of my constituents in Houston.

I have worked to fight against sex trafficking and introduced legislation to stop human trafficking in school zones, introduced gun safety legislation as well as legislation to stop the trafficking of fentanyl, and have brought over \$200 million in grants to my district.

While I am proud of the work that I have done for the 18th congressional district of Texas, there is still much work that we need to do.

We have been kicking the can down the road for months, and rather than address the main duty as members of Congress—funding the government—House Republicans instead are launching baseless accusations against our President to score cheap political points.

Under Republican leadership we have just barely avoided two government shutdowns by the skin of our teeth and have been unable to pass meaningful legislation that would improve the lives of Americans.

This is not to say Democrats have not tried to reach across the aisle.

We indicated we would be open to negotiation to avert the first shutdown, and we were

rebuffed until the situation was at its most critical point.

We indicated we would be open to negotiation to avert the second shutdown, and our friends across the aisle took to the media to express countless times that they would refuse to work with Democrats to find a solution.

By trying to suppress Democratic voices, Republican leadership is silencing half of the country simply because they have a different worldview.

Moreover, by not passing serious legislation, Republicans are stifling the very constituents who put them in office.

To serve the people who elected us to Congress, we all must work together to enact positive change born from compromise and a combined desire to serve as a voice for our constituents.

The performance of Republican leadership in this Congress has been utterly disappointing, and I urge my colleagues across the aisle to remember that to serve the people, we must work together to provide comprehensive and meaningful legislation.

EVERY AMERICAN WANTS A STRONG MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, every American wants what every Republican wants, and that is a strong military. We realize that is our number one constitutional obligation.

We want the most capable, the most lethal military in the world. We need them to maintain peace and security. When we have to send them into harm's way, we want them to go with a clear mission and with every tool they need for victory. When they come home, we want to take care of the veterans and make sure they are welcomed and cared for. We want to make sure they have everything they need to succeed following their service in uniform to our country.

Unfortunately, what we have seen lately is our military has, in many ways, gone off its primary mission of protecting, securing, and preparing to continue to secure our Nation. They have gotten into social engineering, indeed, teaching CRT, DEI, and advancing things like gender ideology.

We have heard about drag shows at military bases, taxpayer-funded abortion travel, and taxpayer-funded transgender surgeries. It has certainly affected our recruiting. It has affected our capabilities. It has affected our readiness and ability to project power around the world.

I was happy to support the NDAA as it left the House and went to the Senate because it was focused on getting our military back to its focus, its purpose of protecting and securing our country; being that strong, lethal fighting force; and getting out of what we have known to become this woke move toward the military that has affected our capability.

Let's talk about the process it was supposed to go through. We understand that we send forth a good bill from the House, and then it goes to the Senate. There is supposed to be a conference on that. As a matter of fact, many Members worked to get on that conference committee. Many other Members worked to support people who would get on that conference committee in order to work and support different objectives that were in there.

A couple of things we were working on in our office was a bill that would let rank-and-file military be able to go into work in military contracting right after service. There has been a law that was meant to keep, for example, generals who were making big-time decisions about government, for example, from going to Raytheon and serving on a board because it wanted to make sure that their military decisions were not affected by future board positions. But the rank and file of our military kind of fell under that.

For example, we have an Army depot in our district. The rank and file cannot be employed there for 6 months after their retirement from military service. By then, they have often had to move on and find other careers.

We also had another provision that we were working on to make sure that the depots throughout our country that are tasked with the important duty of restoring and refurbishing our military hardware, supporting the warfighter and doing it in an efficient manner, that they continue to be able to thrive and survive. Those things fell off in what was our alleged conference.

This conference—instead of the Members that we elected to send there to represent this body—were instead four people who got together and the staffs probably of those four people made the decisions. Those two provisions were taken out of this bill, as well.

Let's talk about the House rules. All year, we talked about rewriting the muscle memory of Congress. We worked hard. I cannot tell you how many times we have heard the importance of single-subject bills and that we as Republicans were going to advocate for that. We were not going to marry things that were extraneous to each other. We were going to have bills that had to deal with germaneness. We added a germaneness rule in January that had never existed. We were going to say that any amendments to bills have to be germane. Anything we are going to add onto a bill has to be germane.

Come to find out that we now have the NDAA, which has come back from the Senate with a number of woke provisions in it, and added to that now is a FISA extension. In the Senate, the Parliamentarian says that is not germane to the NDAA. In the House, we actually have a tougher germaneness rule.

How are we getting around that? We are going to put it on the suspension calendar. We are just going to suspend

the rules and say the rules that we said we were going to operate by, we are not going to operate by when it comes to this bill. This is a tragedy.

Finally, when it comes to the Constitution, the Constitution is clear that Americans should not be warrantlessly surveilled. We know we have a DOJ that has been doing that. They have well extended their authorities.

We had so much FISA abuse. There were literally hundreds of thousands of instances of FISA abuse. Yet, we are asking for a clean extension of these provisions.

The Constitution was not written to be shredded in times of crisis or urgency. As a matter of fact, the Constitution was written specifically to place limits on our government in times of crisis and urgency.

It is not a time for us to look away and say that we will shred the Constitution a little bit here. The very purpose that the Constitution exists is to protect us in times like this and to make sure that we continue to protect the rights of the American people.

It is extremely important that we do everything we can to make sure that we do not pass a FISA out of this House that does not protect the American people. We cannot continue to allow them to spy on the American people, to surveil them without a warrant.

Let's get back to what we are here for. We want an NDAA that is going to focus on our military. We realize the importance of the first constitutional responsibility of this House, and that is to fund a military that will defend our Constitution and protect this land.

□ 1945

We are willing to do that.

Let's revisit this NDAA. Let's send this back to conference. Let's get us focused on what needs to be done, and for goodness' sake, let's not put a FISA extension that does not protect the rights of the American people.

I am happy to be joined by my good friend from the great State of Texas.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Texas yielding, and I appreciate his remarks because we share a committed interest to defending the United States, defending our military, and ensuring that our military is able to do its job.

Just in the last 24 hours, I saw that one of our generals put forward a report basically detailing the extent to which our recruiting levels and morale levels are low and that it is a particular time of difficulty for them in terms of recruiting.

I have been engaging with my colleagues, particularly on this side of the aisle, about the National Defense Authorization Act. It is, I believe, going to be on the floor tomorrow under a suspension of the rules. That means we are not going to go through regular

order, we are not going to be able to amend it, and we are not going to be able to have any real significant debate on it.

We are suspending the rules of the House, and we are going to try to jam this bill through by basically trying to get two-thirds of the Chamber to just say: Let's get this done, let's get out of town, and let's go home for Christmas, and send it to the Senate.

That is wrong.

That is a problem. To my colleagues who think we need to do this for our men and women in uniform, the truth is this is undermining our men and women in uniform. We are destroying the soul, we are destroying the culture, and we are destroying the morale of those men and women who signed up to serve and who are frustrated.

They are frustrated by being put in indoctrination classes on diversity, equity, and inclusion. They are frustrated by critical race theory being pushed. They are frustrated by abortion tourism being funded by taxpayer dollars and transgender surgery. They are frustrated by being fired from their job because they dared to say no to getting a COVID vaccine. They are frustrated about the state of affairs when our military is being turned into a social engineering experiment instead of being committed to its core function, which is to defend this country when called upon to do so.

That is the truth.

Our men and women in uniform want change. They want us to stand up and change it.

So what did Republicans do?

In one of the great demonstrations of what a body can do with a bare, thin, and razor-thin majority, we passed a National Defense Authorization Act in July that was a responsible bill and that would fundamentally make sure our military is focused on its core responsibilities and would ensure that our military is able to do its job without being focused on engineering.

I appreciate getting the message from those who delivered it. We have more people than just the two of us on the floor, I am pretty excited. It is a great night in the House Chamber. This is fantastic. We had a great audience. I am not just speaking to the echo chamber, as it were. We have a couple up in the bleachers up there.

Madam Speaker, here is the thing: Republicans passed a responsible National Defense Authorization Act that will make sure our military is focused on its mission.

Madam Speaker, you can see here the House GOP's bill. All of the green checkmarks are what we are talking about here. We ended President Biden's taxpayer-funded abortion travel fund which enables abortion tourism with taxpayer funded dollars. We ended taxpayer-funded gender transition surgery. We ended Biden's radical climate agenda in the carrying out of his executive order, which will promote and push his radical agenda into our mili-

tary so that we will have a forced migration to electric vehicles and all of the mandates of the Biden executive orders in the Pentagon.

It would protect servicemembers who were discharged for refusing the COVID-19 vaccine. It would ban the drag shows and drag queen story hour on DOD installations and prohibit critical race theory. It would create an inspector general for Ukraine aid. It would prohibit race-based admissions at our military academies, and it would eliminate the chief diversity officers and all these positions that are divvying us up by race.

Here is the thing: Senator SCHUMER and the Democrats created a bill that did none of those things because they want our military to be a social engineering experiment.

Now, to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have said: CHIP, you are just focusing on the social issues. That is not true. That is not true.

COVID vaccines that force some of our men and women in uniform off of their duty is not a social issue. That is their job. They have got shoved out of their job because they didn't want to have an experimental vaccine shoved in their arm.

It is also not true if you go look through all of the things, Madam Speaker, for example, the Inspector General with respect to Ukraine and other issues, none of the changes that we embraced to try to get our military focused where it needs to be were embraced by Democrats.

So then what happens?

At the end of the year when everybody is panicked, they go around this town, and all the defense lobbyists and all the people go around saying: Oh, my God, you have got to pass the National Defense Authorization Act, or the entire world is going to end, and we are not going to be able to defend the country.

That is not true. It is not true. We believe we should pass such a bill, but that is not true. That is legislating by fear.

Nevertheless, what you see here, Madam Speaker, is this NDAA compromise, National Defense Authorization Act compromise.

Now, Madam Speaker, you would think that we went through some regular process that we have been fighting for this year. Go to conference committee between the Senate and the House.

Wrong. That didn't happen.

There was a conference set up, but what happened is the leaders all got together, they decided what they wanted to jam through before Christmas, they went to the conference, and they said: Take it or leave it. Basically they said: Take it.

Then their conferees sent it back to us. Five of them didn't sign it. That is the truth.

So what do we get?

Madam Speaker, do you see the red Xs?

You see the one green check bans critical race theory which, by the way, is hard to enforce, but, okay, we got that. We have got some weak reforms here with respect to the vaccine issue with COVID-19, and we have got weak reforms with respect to the Inspector General of Ukraine.

In other words, we got one piece of it. We didn't get everything we had put in there, and that is it. We didn't get the other stuff. Nonetheless, that is not what they are telling you, Madam Speaker. They are going around telling you saying: Oh, yeah, we ended the drag queen story hour.

That is not true. What they did is they are accepting the Defense Department's characterization of the rules they are going to follow. They didn't actually include the language that restricts it.

So here is the way this town works, and then I am going to yield to my friend from Georgia because I just want everybody to understand, this is the way this town works: you govern by fear. You go up to a deadline, and you say: You must do this because I haven't got to the whipped cream with the cherry on top, which is this Defense bill watered down that not one Republican should support.

Let me be clear. There is no justification for supporting a bill that does not materially change the direction of our military away from being social engineering back toward its mission.

Nevertheless, what did they do?

They added the extension of surveillance, what we call FISA.

What does that mean?

Madam Speaker, you have read about all of the surveillance that has been carried out on American citizens. You know all about it through Carter Page. You know about the extent to which there has been rampant abuses by the FBI targeting American citizens and backdooring the ability to gather information on non-Americans and use that to target Americans. It happened.

They took January 6 names, they stuck them into the database, the query, the database that was collected on these non-American targets, and they have put the names of January 6 people into the database. Oh, the FBI says: Don't worry. We fixed it.

Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, can we really see what it was that they fixed?

Can we really look under the hood?

We are trying to pass reforms to what we call FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We should pass reforms right now before we leave town.

If we don't, then we should all be eating our Christmas dinner on the floor of this House, but, no, what are we going to do tomorrow?

We are going to take the National Defense Authorization Act with all of these red Xs—yes, it is true, all of you leadership hack staffers who are running around and saying that it is not true, come down and debate me on it

because it is true—they are going to add a FISA extension that will take it to April of this next year, and, worse yet, the procedures under that will extend all the way until April of 2025.

Then my colleagues get frustrated, and they say: Well, CHIP, why do you say things like name one thing we have done?

It is because of this. It is because we extend the same stuff and kick the can down the road. We do a National Defense Authorization Act which changes precious little, we jam it through, violating our own rules with respect to germaneness and single subject bills, we pile on FISA, we extend it to April of 2025, and then we go to the American people. We lie to them, and then we say that we did something great.

We should reject this. My colleagues should reject it tomorrow. We should stand up for the American people and do what we said we would do.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank both of my friends from Texas. What an incredible job they have done so far in communicating that the swamp's compromise NDAA is, indeed, woke, weaponized, and wrong for America.

Why, you may ask.

It is because during backroom negotiations, virtually all of the conservative wins that the House Republicans fought for were removed. This is a disaster for both our military and the American people.

Now, due to the so-called compromise, this year's NDAA green-lights the Biden administration's horrendous policies of treating our military like a social experiment.

For a long time, I have firmly believed that our Nation's incredible military will never be defeated by an outside force before we rot from the inside first, and that is exactly what these woke policies are doing. It is the real reason that recruiting is at rock-bottom levels for our military.

For example, the NDAA fails to eliminate the Pentagon's chief diversity officer, it fails to ban mask mandates on military installations, and it fails to prevent the Department of Defense education activity from teaching radical gender and racial ideologies.

Not to mention, the NDAA allows Joe Biden's Department of Defense to waste taxpayer dollars on transgender surgeries, drag queen shows, and abortion travel. Abortion travel, imagine that. The radical left will stop at nothing to advance the evils of abortion, even if their vile efforts violate Federal law.

Additionally, a vote for this year's NDAA is a vote to reauthorize warrantless surveillance on the American people. That is right. To make

matters worse, a clean reauthorization of FISA 702, which has been dangerously abused to illegally spy on Americans—literally, last year 278,000 times—was attached to this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

So let me be perfectly clear: the Fourth Amendment is not a suggestion, and I certainly will not be fearmongered by the intelligence community in order to allow this egregious and unconstitutional abuse to continue.

So either get a warrant or let FISA go dark, which means let FISA's authorization expire on 12/31.

Furthermore, FISA's reauthorization should never have been attached to the NDAA in the first place. An extension of FISA is not germane to the NDAA, meaning this legislation violates our January agreement of germane, single-subject bills.

Nevertheless, since leadership plans to pass the NDAA under suspension of the rules, Members will have no opportunity to raise the appropriate point of order against this nongermane matter.

Madam Speaker, this is not how Washington should operate. Members deserve the opportunity to debate legislation and vote on these matters separately. That is what we agreed to in January, and that is the standard we must now follow.

For all these reasons, I am a hard no on the fiscal year 2024 NDAA, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in taking a firm stand against this bad bill. As a 28-year Navy combat veteran, I am disgusted by the Biden administration's ongoing efforts to weaken our great military with woke and weaponized policies.

I am greatly disturbed by this body's blind acceptance of these nefarious efforts, so they can go home early for Christmas. Our military and our Nation deserve better.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. CLOUD from Texas, for holding this very important discussion here on the House floor because what we will be voting on tomorrow represents the very worst of Washington.

I was thankful that back in the summer, for the first time since I have been in Congress, I could vote for an NDAA after 2 years in the minority where the majority party under this President believes that the greatest threat to the military is climate and that the greatest threat to the military are conservative patriots, God forbid, Trump supporters in the military. That has been the focus of this administration as it relates to our military.

□ 2000

I voted four times against bad NDAs that were focused on climate extremism; that were focused on forcing our military to convert to electric vehicles; that were focused on diver-

sity, equity, and inclusion and CRT training in our academies; red flag for our military members; forcing our daughters to be drafted; focused on funding for abortion in the military; funding for transgender surgery.

This past summer, our Republican Conference passed a good NDAA that I was proud to vote for because it reversed those harmful policies. Then we were supposed to have a Conference Committee that would go and negotiate with the Senate. We are actually the stronger body with our majority than the Senate is because the Senate has to have 60 votes to pass legislation and, last time I checked, there is only 51 Democrats over there; however, in the House, we can pass whatever we want with a one-vote majority.

We should be the stronger party in negotiations, but that Conference Committee really never took place. Instead, a new NDAA was negotiated from what I call the four corners—the House Speaker, the House minority leader, the Senate majority leader, and the Senate minority leader. They came up with a new NDAA that takes out all of the good things that we fought for; the policy wins in the NDAA we voted for last summer.

To make it worse, we are going to combine that with an extension of FISA, surveillance on U.S. citizens, trampling on our most precious constitutional freedoms in this country with no reforms.

Our friend, ANDY BIGGS, authors the bill out of Judiciary with help from individuals like CHIP ROY, who is here with us tonight, and WARREN DAVIDSON. Instead of bringing that bill to the floor for a vote as an individual bill, instead we are going to take a FISA extension with no reforms—not fixing the constitutional issues, not protecting Americans from warrantless surveillance on them like they are foreign terrorists—and we are going to combine the two together in an effort to force passage on suspension of the rules, nonetheless, that some Members of this body might be afraid to vote against a bad FISA bill because they don't want to be accused of being against the military. The NDAA is a bad bill. Attaching it to FISA makes it that much worse. Every Republican should vote against it.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CLOUD for holding this time of discussion tonight.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLOUD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas. He is one of my best friends in the House, and one of the best Members we have in this body. His constituents are blessed to have him.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand here with these gentlemen here on the

floor. I will say in firm defense of our men and women in uniform and in firm defense of our appropriate use of intelligence surveillance on foreign subjects, on foreign targets, that is what we should be doing, but instead it has been abused by the FBI, abused by our intelligence apparatus to target Americans.

What are we going to do when we finally get the chance to deal with the reauthorization? We kick the can down the road, extend it to April, and that means extending it until April 2025; thus, the same procedures, the same abuses can continue with nothing but the promises of reforms within the FBI.

That is not good enough. This is the people's House. We are supposed to stand up and defend the people who sent us here.

I want to read something. In a Christmas Day 1944 letter to his mother and sister Rose, living in Washington, D.C., Sergeant David Warman, 1st Infantry Division, wrote: "This is Christmas morning, and I'm writing from a foxhole. The weather is very clear and sunny and there is slightly over two inches of snow which fell the other day. It is way below freezing, and I am wrapped in blankets as I write.

"As you know from the papers, the Germans have come out of their holes to put on a great drive to push us off their soil."

He later writes in that letter: "Let's hope the end is near and peace again comes to Earth quickly and this time permanently.

"How are you both? I hope you have a happy holiday season and don't have too many gloomy thoughts about me. True, my life is very uncomfortable and, I might say, uncertain, but I'm still around and who knows—I may get out without a scratch. So don't worry about me."

He and the men next to him in those foxholes knew why they were there. Those of us in this body need to pause and consider whether we know why we are here, whether we are doing our duty with the seriousness demanded by the sacrifices like theirs.

When we get on our planes and fly home for Christmas, rather than doing our job to protect the civil liberties of the American people by reforming FISA and doing our job here, we are doing a disservice to those men who sat in the foxholes on Christmas Day in 1944 and to the men and women in uniform we ask to go around the world defending us.

I get a little sick and tired of the preaching on the floor about what we need to do to defend our men and women in uniform by saying, you must pass the NDAA and you must do it now, but never mind the reforms you need to do to ensure we are doing it the right way; to make sure our military is focused on its mission rather than social engineering, so you can boost the morale, boost recruiting, boost the effectiveness, undo the damage being

done, and not layer on it a disastrous kicking the can down the road by putting more surveillance power still on the back of our men and women in uniform. That is not the way that we should be conducting business.

I implore my colleagues on this side of the aisle, don't do that. Don't use our men and women in uniform as an excuse to shirk our responsibility to actually reform the laws we were sent here to reform.

We have bipartisan legislation sitting right before us—Judiciary Committee, Intel Committee—that would reform these things. We should put them on the floor—or put one of them on the floor—we should amend them, and then we should send it to the Senate and tell them to do their job.

We should stop governing by fear and the false pressure of deadlines. Let's do our job for the American people. Let's send them a Christmas present that we are going to stand up and defend them and their civil liberties. That is what we should do tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues to oppose the NDAA with FISA added on it.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2670) "An Act 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."

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1734. An Act to require coordinated National Institute of Standards and Technology science and research activities regarding illicit drugs containing xylazine, novel synthetic opioids, and other substances of concern, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2747.—An Act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend the Administrative Fine Program for certain reporting violations.

S. 2787.—An Act to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to process applications for spectrum licenses from applicants who were successful bidders in an auction before the authority of the Commission to conduct auctions expired on March 9, 2023.

S.J. Res. 23—A Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 14, 2023, at 9 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5472. A bill to make improvements to the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5512. A bill to require United States financial institutions to ensure entities and persons owned or controlled by the institution comply with financial sanctions on the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus to the same extent as the institution itself, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-316 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5485. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide for greater transparency and protections with regard to Bank Secrecy Act reports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharge from further consideration. H.R. 5512 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BOST, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OGLES, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BURLISON, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs.

CAMMACK, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. BICE, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BACON, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. EZELL, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HERN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. LATTA, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SELF, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. CARL):

H.R. 6734. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to finalize, implement, or enforce proposed ATF Rule 2022R-17, entitled "Definition of 'Engaged in the Business' as a Dealer in Firearms"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6735. A bill to require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a long-term tactical fighter plan for the active and reserve components of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 6736. A bill to provide a retroactive effective date for the promotions of senior officers of the Armed Forces whose military promotions were delayed as a result of the suspension of Senate confirmation of such promotions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6737. A bill to require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a force design for the Air Force and the Space Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6738. A bill to provide for the appointment of fellows in the John S. McCain Strategic Defense Fellows Program to term expected service positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6739. A bill to modify and extend the temporary authority of the President to modify certain contracts and options based on the impacts of inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6740. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to amend the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to include consideration of past performance of affiliates of small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a limited number of cost-plus incentive-fee contracts for the Sentinel Intercontinental Ballistic Missile program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6742. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide an add-on payment to cer-

tain plans offering benefits designed to address the needs of dual-eligible individuals related to social determinants of health, and to provide administrative flexibility to improve integration for certain dual-eligible individuals; 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. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself and Mrs. HARSHBARGER):

H.R. 6743. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to include public awareness about menopause and related chronic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. SELF, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 6744. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from providing health care to, or engaging in claims processing for health care for, any individual unlawfully present in the United States who is not eligible for health care under the laws administered by the Secretary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURLISON (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 6745. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit certain employees to engage in independent negotiating; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CARAVEO (for herself, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois):

H.R. 6746. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public awareness campaign with respect to iron deficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. QUILLEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SORENSEN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 6747. A bill to speed up the deployment of electricity transmission and clean energy, with proper input from affected communities, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Agriculture, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Oversight and Accountability, and the Budget, 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. CHU (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of peer support services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mrs. LESKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAMMACK, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. POSEY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LAWLER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 6749. A bill to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to evaluate the results and status of completed and ongoing research related to menopause, perimenopause, or mid-life women's health, to conduct and support additional such research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. FOX, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 6750. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 Mercer Street Southwest in Wilson, North Carolina, as the "Milton F. Fitch, Sr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. DELUZZO, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 6751. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the life and legacy of Roberto Clemente; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 6752. A bill to require prompt reporting of any incident in which the Armed Forces are involved in an attack or hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAGEMAN (for herself, Mr. FRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 6753. A bill to amend the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act to provide for the removal and dismissal of qualified civil liability actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CROW, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BROWN):

H.R. 6754. A bill to authorize the establishment of a comprehensive school-based violence prevention program to assist youth at highest risk for involvement in gun violence in local communities and schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 6755. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to establish requirements for biological fathers to pay child support for medical expenses incurred during pregnancy and delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mrs. SYKES):

H.R. 6756. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish limits on certain toxic elements in infant and toddler food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.R. 6757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the rollover contributions from Roth IRAs to designated Roth accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BACON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 6758. A bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 6759. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. BURLISON, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 6760. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Green Climate Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGARVEY (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 6761. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to ease the benefits process for survivors of miners whose deaths were due to pneumoconiosis; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 6762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow companies associated with foreign adversaries from receiving the advanced manufacturing production credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLINARO (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 6763. A bill to establish a multi-stakeholder advisory committee tasked with providing detailed recommendations to address challenges to transmitting geolocation information with calls to the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6764. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to modify the

HIPAA privacy regulation with respect to the disclosure of certain protected health information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 6765. A bill to create a coordinated domestic wildlife disease surveillance framework for State, Tribal, and local governments to monitor and respond to wildlife disease outbreaks to prevent pandemics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and 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. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 6766. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 6767. A bill to require the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to submit to Congress an intelligence assessment on the Sinaloa Cartel and the Jalisco Cartel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mrs. RAMREZ, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. FROST, Ms. WATERS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CHU, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Mr. CASAR):

H.R. 6768. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out activities to establish, expand, and sustain a public health nursing workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 6769. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to provide for disclosure regarding foreign jurisdictions that hinder inspections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. SYKES (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 6770. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of infant and toddler food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SYKES (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 6771. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to provide for a NASA public-private talent program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 6772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the age for making catch-up contributions to retirement accounts to take into account time out of the workforce to provide dependent care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 6773. A bill to designate the Senator Dianne Feinstein Memorial Trail in Headwaters Forest Reserve, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 6774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish special rules relating to which professional sports leagues qualify to be exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 6775. A bill to provide for the Federal charter of certain public banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Ways and Means, and 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. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 6776. A bill to require a publicly traded company to disclose to the Securities and Exchange Commission if the company has a diversity, equity, and inclusion program to combat antisemitism; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 6777. A bill to prohibit covered entities from requiring consumers to solely use digital monthly statements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 6778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the treatment of moving expenses to employees and new appointees in the intelligence community who move pursuant to a change in assignment that requires relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIEU:

H. Res. 931. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 932. A resolution recognizing the 120th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States of America and the Republic of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. D'ESPOSITO (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. LANGWORTHY, and Mr. MOLINARO):

H. Res. 933. A resolution expressing opposition to New York's Clean Slate Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. OMAR):

H. Res. 934. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that regular journalistic activities are protected under the First Amendment, and that the United States ought to drop all charges against and attempts to extradite Julian Assange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. CLYDE:

H.R. 6734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have the power to “make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution that foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department . . .” Additionally under Section 5 of the XIV Amendment “The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation defunds and prevents the implementation of the proposed rule ATF Rule 2022R-17

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a long-term tactical fighter plan for the active and reserve components of the Air Force, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide a retroactive effective date for the promotions of senior officers of the Armed Forces whose military promotions were delayed as a result of the suspension of Senate confirmation of such promotions.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a force design for the Air Force and Space Force.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the appointment of fellows in the John S. McCain Strategic Defense Fellows Program to term excepted service positions, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: Congress shall have power . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces

The single subject of this legislation is:

Management of the Department of Defense

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: Congress shall have power . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces

The single subject of this legislation is:

Management of the Department of Defense

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14: Congress shall have power . . . to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces

The single subject of this legislation is:

Management of the Department of Defense

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6742.

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:

Dual-eligible Medicare plans

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 6743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health Care

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 6744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Department of Veterans Affairs health care and claims processing

By Mr. BURLISON:

H.R. 6745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill relates to federal labor laws.

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 6746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public awareness campaign with respect to iron deficiency among women and young children.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 6747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To accelerate the deployment of clean electricity generation and transmission, while engaging and empowering community stakeholders.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 6748.

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:

Mental Health

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 6749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is: Health care

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 6750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18,

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 Mercer Street Southwest in Wilson, North Carolina, as the “Milton F. Fitch, Sr. Post Office Building”

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 6751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the life and legacy of Roberto Clemente.

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 6752.

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:

Foreign Affairs

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.R. 6753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act to provide for the removal and dismissal of qualified civil liability actions.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 6754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the establishment of a comprehensive school-based violence prevention program to assist youth at highest risk for involvement in gun violence in local communities and schools, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 6755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Requires that non-custodial fathers cover half of a mother’s out-of-pocket health expenses incurred during pregnancy and delivery.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 6756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish limits on certain toxic elements in infant and toddler food, and for other purposes.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 6757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: “The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .”

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill amends the tax code to allow for the transfer of contributions from Roth IRA plans to a workplace designated Roth account (such as a Roth 401(k), Roth 403(b), and Roth 457(b) plans).

By Mr. LANGWORTHY:

H.R. 6758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Establish an opportunity for compensation for property owners when government action significantly impairs the value of ownership of their property.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 6759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

National Service

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 6760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Spending Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit United States contributions to the intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Green Climate Fund.

By Mr. MCGARVEY:

H.R. 6761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health

By Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 6762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Protect American tax credits from adversarial foreign entities

By Mr. MOLINARO:

H.R. 6763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Mental health care

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to modify the HIPAA privacy regulation with respect to the disclosure of certain protected health information.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 6765.

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:

To create a coordinated domestic wildlife disease surveillance framework for State, Tribal, and local governments to monitor and respond to wildlife disease outbreaks to prevent pandemics, and for other purposes.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 6766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to strengthen requirements related to nutrient information on food labels.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 6767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

A bill requiring an intelligence assessment of the Sinaloa Cartel and the Jalisco Cartel.

By Ms. STANSBURY:

H.R. 6768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out activities to establish, expand, and sustain a public health nursing workforce and for other purposes

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 6769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require all companies identified under the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act to retain independent auditors to ensure they are fully compliant with U.S. law.

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 6770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of infant and toddler food by requiring manufacturers or food processors to sample and test for contaminants in infant and toddler food.

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 6771.

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:

This legislation authorizes a public-private talent exchange program at NASA.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 6772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

It would allow individuals that took at least one year out of the workforce without receiving an earned income, for the purposes of caring for a family member, to make catch-up contributions in years prior to age 50 to their 401(k) plans, individual retirement accounts (IRAs), and other eligible retirement accounts.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 6773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

designating the Senator Diane Feinstein Memorial Trail in Headwaters Forest Reserve, California

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 6774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Limit the availability of 501(c)6 tax treatment in certain circumstances

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 6775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill provides for the Federal charter of certain public banks, and for other purposes.

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 6776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Securities disclosures

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 6777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit covered entities from requiring consumers to solely use digital monthly statements, and for other purposes.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 6778.

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:

Tax

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 40: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 234: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 521: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 537: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 619: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 807: Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 857: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 866: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 895: Mrs. HOUCHIN and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 898: Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California.
H.R. 907: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 953: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 972: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 987: Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1015: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1088: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1118: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1200: Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 1378: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1383: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1401: Mr. LUTTRELL and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1406: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1447: Mr. NADLER and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1503: Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 1521: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 1624: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1637: Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 1666: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1671: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1691: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CROW, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1755: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 1822: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 1823: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1826: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 2367: Mr. ALFORD.
H.R. 2375: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 2400: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 2412: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. PETERSEN, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2423: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2447: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 2501: Ms. WATERS.

- H.R. 2534: Ms. WATERS, Mr. SORENSEN, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2630: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2690: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2748: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2870: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2904: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 2918: Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 2923: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. GOMEZ.
 H.R. 3005: Mr. DUARTE.
 H.R. 3023: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 3039: Mr. ALFORD.
 H.R. 3074: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3090: Mr. HOYER.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. SCHOLTEN.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 3240: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 3269: Mr. MOLINARO and Mr. HERN.
 H.R. 3308: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 3325: Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 3418: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 3428: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 3433: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. DONALDS.
 H.R. 3435: Mr. LANGWORTHY, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 3475: Mr. AMO.
 H.R. 3507: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. MOLINARO and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3549: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 3577: Ms. CARAVEO.
 H.R. 3624: Mr. FEENSTRA.
 H.R. 3702: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CROW, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BUSH, and Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 3713: Mr. CAREY.
 H.R. 3738: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 3940: Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 3949: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 4034: Ms. TLAI.
 H.R. 4060: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4079: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4104: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 4153: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 4175: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 4190: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 4326: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 4362: Ms. LEE of Florida.
 H.R. 4475: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 4524: Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4561: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 4565: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4714: Mr. NADLER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Ms. PETTERSEN.
 H.R. 4723: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 4729: Mr. MOLINARO and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 4818: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COLE, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. HERN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YAKYM, Ms. WILD, and Ms. PETTERSEN.
 H.R. 4829: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4848: Mr. MASSIE.
 H.R. 4851: Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCLELLAN, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4867: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 4896: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 4897: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 4945: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4970: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 4974: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 5030: Mr. BACON and Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 5064: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 5084: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 5087: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
 H.R. 5198: Ms. PEREZ.
 H.R. 5221: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5266: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 5275: Mr. HERN and Ms. VAN DUYN.
 H.R. 5302: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 5399: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. HOYER.
 H.R. 5476: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5501: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 5530: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 5532: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 5533: Mr. MOYLAN.
 H.R. 5611: Ms. CARAVEO.
 H.R. 5624: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 5631: Mr. FRY.
 H.R. 5633: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 5685: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 5765: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 5820: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5877: Ms. CARAVEO.
 H.R. 5897: Ms. CHU and Mrs. TORRES of California.
 H.R. 5901: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 5934: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SORENSEN, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5938: Mr. MURPHY.
 H.R. 5956: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 5967: Mr. MORAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. EZELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CLINE, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, and Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 5975: Mr. MOLINARO.
 H.R. 5985: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 5987: Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 5995: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Ms. TENNEY.
 H.R. 6045: Mr. MOLINARO.
 H.R. 6049: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Ms. CRAIG.
 H.R. 6072: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 6127: Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 6129: Mr. MANN.
 H.R. 6156: Ms. PEREZ.
 H.R. 6160: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.
 H.R. 6161: Ms. CARAVEO.
 H.R. 6163: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 6212: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, and Mrs. LUNA.
 H.R. 6221: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 6227: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6244: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H.R. 6271: Mr. BOST and Mr. SORENSEN.
 H.R. 6311: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6319: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NORMAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 6416: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 6417: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 6455: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 6470: Ms. WATERS and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 6490: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 6504: Mrs. CAMMACK and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 6516: Ms. PEREZ, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
 H.R. 6524: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 6555: Mr. YAKYM, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 6567: Mr. MOYLAN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 6573: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 6585: Mr. BERGMAN and Ms. LETLOW.
 H.R. 6588: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
 H.R. 6592: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 6643: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 6645: Mr. MASSIE and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
 H.R. 6672: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 6674: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6683: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
 H.R. 6716: Ms. TLAI.
 H.R. 6731: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.J. Res. 13: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.J. Res. 92: Mr. ESTES and Mr. CLINE.
 H.J. Res. 98: Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H. Con. Res. 44: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 82: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H. Res. 566: Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIEU, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 585: Ms. TOKUDA.
 H. Res. 596: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H. Res. 767: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 837: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H. Res. 842: Mr. GIMENEZ.
 H. Res. 851: Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H. Res. 875: Mr. CLINE.
 H. Res. 881: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 882: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H. Res. 889: Mr. LANGWORTHY.
 H. Res. 895: Ms. MENG, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. BONAMICLI.
 H. Res. 901: Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. LEE of California, and Mrs. MCCLAIN.
 H. Res. 907: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCANLON, and Mrs. SYKES.
 H. Res. 915: Mr. BIGGS.
 H. Res. 920: Mr. BACON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. FINSTAD.
 H. Res. 927: Mr. TIMMONS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KILEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.
 H. Res. 929: Mrs. HAYES.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3721: Mr. ZINKE.