



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2024

No. 9

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 17, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RON ESTES 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, 2024, 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.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHEAST IOWA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission. Since 1973, the commission has transformed from merely a planning agency to a dynamic force in grant writing and program management.

Through these initiatives, they have facilitated the investment of over \$300

million in outside funds into our southeastern Iowa communities, influencing infrastructure, tourism, redevelopment, and housing initiatives.

I congratulate the Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission's chair, Brent Schleisman, and executive director, Mike Norris, on their continuous work to adapt the organization's original priorities to today's challenges.

I congratulate you on your work, and I wish you 50 more years of success for southeast Iowa.

CONGRATULATING THE CLINTON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clinton Municipal Airport on their Distinguished General Aviation Award by the FAA. This prestigious award is quite significant, and this year marks the first time that this award has been given to an airport without commercial airline service.

The FAA Central Region selected Clinton Municipal Airport for its active community involvement, successful project submissions, and contributions to the local economy.

Jim Johnson, the FAA Central Region Director, also commended the airport's active local role, safety achievements, and modernized facilities.

I congratulate the entire team at the Clinton Municipal Airport for receiving this award and for their dedication to excellence and community service.

CONGRATULATING HNI CORPORATION

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate HNI Corporation for being recognized among America's Most Responsible Companies.

Under the leadership of CEO Jeff Lorenger, HNI's commitment to corporate social responsibility shines through, securing its place on Newsweek's list for its fifth consecutive year.

The company's focus on environmental sustainability and corporate

governance is showcased by its impressive achievements, including a 64 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and zero waste to landfills at multiple facilities.

I congratulate them on this achievement and thank them for their dedication to creating a more sustainable future.

CONGRATULATING PHIL PARKER

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Iowa's defensive coordinator, Phil Parker, who has been awarded the coveted Broyles Award. This accolade is presented each year to the top assistant coach in college football, and it recognizes Parker's 25 years of dedication and leadership on the Hawkeye's coaching staff.

This season, the team had an impressive defensive record, ranking fifth nationally in total defense, and they played 27 consecutive games where they allowed 400 yards or less. Coach Parker has been instrumental in their success, which is reflected in their lowest defensive average since 2008.

As the third Iowa assistant coach to receive this award, I congratulate Coach Parker and the rest of the coaching staff on this impressive testament to the excellence of the University of Iowa.

Go Hawkeyes.

UNLV STUDENTS AND FACULTY RETURN TO CAMPUS

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

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, this is the first week of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas' spring semester, a time when students should be excited to see their friends after winter break and faculty begin to review the syllabus with an eager class.

Sadly, this won't be a typical week back for the students of UNLV. That is

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.

H149

because this week is the first week that students will be returning to in-person classes since last month's horrifying shooting in which a gunman took the lives of three professors and critically wounded a fourth.

Thousands of students and faculty members were forced to huddle in classrooms behind locked and barricaded doors, waiting for hours to find out whether their campus was safe or not.

Immediately after the shooting, I, and many of my colleagues, demanded once again that Congress do something, just anything, to curb our Nation's gun violence epidemic.

Since then, our country has witnessed another 70 school shootings. That is in just 6 weeks. How many pieces of legislation to address gun violence have been brought to the floor in that time? Zero. It is shameful.

Instead, our far right has played partisan games to score cheap political points, threatening a government shutdown, and completely dismissing the very real fear that students and educators at UNLV and across the country feel each and every day.

That fear should not be normal. Nevadans are tired of it and so am I. I want my colleagues to work together to end this sick cycle of gun violence. Let's honor these victims with action.

HONORING PETER RICHARD SGRO

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to honor the life and legacy of the late Peter Richard Sgro, who sadly left this world on January 9. Peter was iconic on so many levels that his outside-the-box vision and drive to effectuate change will be deeply missed.

As an attorney, Peter always believed in seeking justice for his clients. He never walked away from a fight if he knew that virtue needed to prevail, and in his case, virtue certainly always prevailed.

As the chairman of the board of the Guam Chamber of Commerce, Peter evidenced that he was an advocate for small businesses, particularly the little guy. He stood with them to challenge policies that would raise the cost of doing business, and his relentlessness ensured that he wouldn't sit down until compromises were made.

As a businessman, Peter was a visionary, and this was clear when he worked aggressively to bring a private hospital to open its doors in Guam. Peter understood the necessities to improve and expand healthcare for families, and whenever we drive by the Guam Regional Medical City in the northern part of Guam, we can evidently see Peter's legacy on display.

For all the roles Peter embraced to help Guam prosper over the decades, there was none that he enjoyed more than being a father to Christopher,

Matthew, Katarina, and Maria, and a grandfather to Ricardo, Natalia, and Mila. They were his foundation, his purpose, and his pride. My heart and my deepest condolences go out to them in this trying time.

In 2022, as a Guam senator, I had the honor of recognizing Peter and his legacy as his company, International Group, Inc., was celebrating an anniversary. I am saddened that in such a short period of less than 2 years, I am recognizing him under a different set of circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, of behalf of a thankful Nation and an appreciative island of Guam, I honor the life and legacy of Peter Richard Sgro and thank him for his many contributions to our island community. He will be dearly missed. Adios to my friend, until we meet again.

A CALL FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF MIGRANTS

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud daughter of Guatemalan immigrants, the wife of a Dreamer, and the Representative of Illinois 3, a district proud of the contributions of the migrants who call it home, and a member of the Humboldt Park United Methodist Church, a church that is formed by immigrants, a church that has been serving the community for decades, and a church that built me and taught me to put my faith into action and to advocate for our shared humanity.

As a Methodist, I would like to share a call for prayer and action from "Metodistas Asociados Representando la Causa Hispano Americana," "Methodists Associated Representing the Cause of Hispanic/Latinx American," the National Plan for Hispanic/Latino Ministry of the United Methodist Church, and the General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church.

As we just celebrated the season of Epiphany, we are reminded again of the story of those three wise travelers who journeyed through many lands and over borders in search of a newborn king.

We are reminded that after they found the infant Jesus, his mother, and Joseph, the true peril of their mission began.

Herod's anxiety and paranoia led to one of the worst infant massacres recorded in the Gospel text, and their earnest pilgrims' story transformed the Holy Family's existence into a family like so many today seeking asylum in other lands and, in particular, at our southern border.

Therefore, we join in a call for the humane and sacred treatment of migrants, refugees, and those who seek asylum at our borders as a recognition that the same Jesus who traveled with his family on that fateful night, can

still be found in the faces of all of the families we see on our TV screens and our social media spaces.

Along with this, we stand in opposition to the State of Texas SB 4 law, signed by Governor Greg Abbott, which allows police officials to arrest and charge migrants with misdemeanors or more serious offenses if they do not agree to leave by order of a State judge.

This law incentivizes racial profiling and further limits the rights of due process for migrants fleeing unthinkable violence, poverty, and death.

Furthermore, we oppose the inhumane treatment of migrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers by Governor Abbott in transporting migrants to other States without their knowledge or consent, only to abandon them on cold streets without concern about the extreme cold weather and safety issues they would face.

We call on this administration to honor the principles of so many of the world religions that call us to mercy, to compassion, and to welcome and hold sacred lives of immigrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers when engaging in budget negotiations and stricter border security measures.

We urge the administration to consider prayerfully those measures that will lead to a safe and just resolution with a path toward effective immigration solutions, funding to be able to process asylum and refugee claims faster and more effectively, and intentional steps to work with countries of origin to understand and combat the reasons for this mass migration.

We call on our colleagues, Members of the House and Senate, to negotiate in good faith with this administration, not in the hopes of gaining political points, as we have seen, but in the spirit of their shared citizenship in the world and with a deep conviction of what it means to be a beloved community.

The Gospel of Matthew tells us that Herod tempted the wise men to carry out his evil intentions toward the Christ child and his family. However, in a dream, an angel warns them not to return to Herod. Instead, they chose to return by another route.

Their courage and conviction should inspire all of us to choose another route, one filled with compassion, with justice, with mercy, and the belief that we are all made in the image of our creator and endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We call on all Methodists and all humans everywhere to join us in the call of action for prayer.

May we lead differently. May we recognize our shared humanity. May our faith lead us to action. May we be reminded that we, in fact, have a shared humanity and a responsibility to act justly and mercifully.

□ 1015

MAYOR JOSH MOENNING RETIRING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sincere gratitude to my hometown mayor, Josh Moenning, of Norfolk, Nebraska. After almost 12 years as mayor, he has decided to retire at the end of his term.

During his tenure, Mayor Moenning saw Norfolk through dozens of projects that made our city a more desirable place for families and young people. Mayor Moenning said his time as mayor centered around three things: enhanced quality of life, improved infrastructure and city services, and economic growth.

He accomplished those three objectives and more by renovating Johnson Park, revitalizing a wide variety of businesses and housing developments, and expanding infrastructure. Mayor Moenning took the city's ideas and needs, and he put them into action.

Because of his service to our community, Norfolk is an even better place to live, work, and raise a family than it was 12 years ago.

On behalf of the city of Norfolk in the First Congressional District, I extend our appreciation to Mayor Moenning for his leadership over the past 12 years.

IN HONOR OF ANGIE MUHLEISEN

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Angie Muhleisen.

For the better part of three decades, Angie has led Union Bank & Trust of Lincoln. She has recently announced she is stepping down as CEO.

When Angie started at Union Bank, it was a \$50 million financial institution. Through the years, she has helped grow it into an \$8 billion organization with over 1,000 teammates.

From Lincoln's Inspire Woman of the Year to the Chamber's Burnham Yates Citizenship Award, Angie's leadership has earned significant recognition from community organizations.

Even as she steps away from her role as CEO, her heart for service isn't slowing down. She recently became the board chair for the University of Nebraska Foundation. She also serves on the board of Assurity and is involved in numerous other organizations.

Angie's greatest legacy is her family. Her son Jason is stepping into the role as CEO and will do an outstanding job building on her work.

Best wishes to Angie on this next chapter.

SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight National School Choice Week.

School choice allows parents and children to choose the school that best fits their needs. Whether it is a public school, a private school, a home school, or a hybrid of these options, parents have a right to direct the upbringing and education of their kids.

Last year, Nebraska passed its first school choice law, helping more families and kids to pick a school that best

fits their needs, but there is still more we can do.

Here at the Federal level, I am a proud cosponsor of Congressman ADRIAN SMITH's Educational Choice for Children Act, which would bolster school choice across the Nation. This legislation would help more kids from low-income households access the education of their choice. I urge my colleagues to pass this.

Back home in Nebraska, our legislature has been working to fund students, not systems. I am excited to see how they build on their school choice success. Keep up the great work.

HOUSING WEEK

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight housing week, as declared by me, in Nebraska.

A recent survey by Lending Tree found that 94 percent of Americans identified owning a house as part of the American Dream, but just over half of those "... who don't own a home say they're worried they never will."

Next week, I will address a Workforce Housing Summit hosted by the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce. If we want to keep the American Dream alive, we must address the high cost of housing, help more Americans save for a downpayment, and break through other barriers. We must also take care of the housing stock in our communities.

Later next week, I will be hosting a housing improvement meeting in Clarkson. This meeting will help brief community members about programs that can help weatherize and improve existing homes. Next week will be full of small, but important, steps toward addressing this shortage. While there is no silver bullet, through the work of local, State, and Federal partners, we can help more Americans find the home of their dreams.

100-PLUS DAYS OF ISRAEL-HAMAS WAR

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 100 days since Hamas launched a vicious war against Israel, committing inhumane acts of violence.

Since October 7, Israel has worked to eliminate Hamas in response to their horrific killing and torture of over 1,000 innocent people. Right now, there are still more than 100 hostages being held by Hamas, including as many as six Americans.

Over the last few months, we have witnessed numerous protests across the country sympathizing with Hamas, which is nothing short of shocking. The messages of these protesters is often at odds with supporting the only democracy in the Middle East, and they do not reflect our Nation's values.

Let me be clear. America does not negotiate with terrorists, and we support the right of Israel to exist. America will continue to stand with Israel as they work to end Hamas and free every single hostage. We will not back down.

May God bless the continued friendship between Israel and America.

MATER DEI HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate Mater Dei High School's football team for earning their fourth California State championship. The Monarchs secured their final win of the season over an undefeated team with an impressive 35-0 victory.

Their success is a shining example of the dedication, hard work, and perseverance of the young players, the coaches, and the community.

Also with this win, the Monarchs claimed a top three position in national rankings and the number one spot in the media composite on the national level.

I congratulate the students, parents, coaches, and teachers that form the Monarch football team. You have made us proud. I am looking forward to next year.

NORTH ORANGE CONTINUING EDUCATION'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the North Orange County Continuing Education Program.

For half a century, North Orange County Continuing Education has offered programs that transform lives in Orange County.

Established in 1973, NOCE has grown to serve more than 29,000 students each and every year and offers over a thousand courses each semester to those of all ages.

The curriculum includes vocational, business, financial, and other skills that individuals need throughout their life. Also, beyond the classroom, NOCE has shown the real impact that they have on our community. In fact, they support over 3,000 jobs directly and indirectly and offer services to help everyday individuals succeed.

As we celebrate NOCE's 50th anniversary, we reflect back on their work and look forward to their future and their success in our community.

ANAHEIM PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anaheim Public Library's award-winning Foster Youth Initiative that has gained recognition for making resources available to kids in need.

The library's Foster Youth Initiative offers library cards to youth who are in the foster care system, who are homeless, or those that have been emancipated. This card is special. It removes address requirements and penalties and makes sure that those young people have access to our community's public library system.

Also, the initiative has been recognized by the Orange County Business Council's Public-Private Partnership and has received such an award. It is a testament to the hundreds of library cards that have been made available to

those students, those young individuals that would not otherwise receive a library card.

I congratulate the Anaheim Public Library for their commitment to support our youth in need.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF HOBART MANLY, JR.

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 life of Hobart Manly, Jr., a veteran of the National Guard and an avid golfer.

Hobart was raised in Savannah and excelled in multiple sports in high school before going on to attend the University of Georgia. He is perhaps best known for his career as an amateur golfer. He competed in three British amateurs, two French amateurs, and the Canadian Open. Hobart has also won the North-South Championship located in Pinehurst, North Carolina.

In 1969, Hobart was inducted into the Savannah Athletic Hall of Fame, and 22 years later, he was inducted into the Georgia Golf Hall of Fame.

Hobart lived on Isle of Hope outside of Savannah with his wife, Marilyn, of 67 years. Hobart's competitive spirit and love for sport is something I find incredibly admirable and strive to implement in my own life every day.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the entire Manly family during this difficult time.

RECOGNITION OF EMT ROSEMARY MITTS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Savannah EMT Rosemary Mitts.

Rosemary was raised in a military family, leading her to learn the importance of having a strong work ethic from a young age. She modeled her choice to work in healthcare after her grandfather, as he was a medic in the U.S. Army during the Vietnam war.

Rosemary began her work as an EMT at Chatham Emergency Services. She also earned her medic license through her time at paramedic school and soon after went on to teach others to become EMTs like herself.

Rosemary consistently strives to better herself and others in her work environment. She is always looking for ways to provide the best care possible for the people in her community.

Rosemary was recently chosen to be a member of the American Ambulance Association's 2023 Stars of Life Class, a program that celebrates the distributions of ambulance professionals who have gone above and beyond the call of duty in service to others.

We congratulate Rosemary. We can't think of anyone more deserving.

CONGRATULATING MAMIE BACON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Mamie Bacon, who recently celebrated a historic anniversary.

Last October, she was recognized for 50 years of work for King and Prince Seafood in Brunswick, Georgia. Mamie started working for King and Prince Seafood in 1973 and has not looked back since.

She originally planned to retire 7 years ago but chose to continue working her job in quality assurance. She is quoted in the Brunswick News saying: "I love my job and I love the people."

For her service to King and Prince, the company plans on building a new pavilion and dedicating it in her honor. Mamie is simply one of the many examples of the First District of Georgia's rich and selfless sense of community. We wish Mamie the best of luck.

SAVANNAH AIRPORT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Savannah/Hilton Head International Airport for being nominated as one of the Best Airports in the U.S. by Conde Nast Traveler.

The Savannah Airport has been voted the number one airport in the Nation for the fourth consecutive year by the Conde Nast Traveler 2023 Readers' Choice Awards. This achievement is the result of several key factors, such as the airport's beautiful town square-inspired layout and great amenities. The charming visitor center has a historic southern street style that makes visitors feel right at home.

The airport also features great food and great shops to keep travelers fed and entertained. This Georgia airport was also once named "the happiest airport in the country."

We congratulate, again, Savannah's airport for continuing to hold its first-place designation and congratulate the staff that made that happen.

HONORING EDDIE HARMS

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Nebraska Third District pilot, farmer, soil conservationist, and now centenarian, Eddie Harms.

An extraordinary pillar of consistency in his southeast Nebraska community, Eddie turned 100 years of age on December 22, 2023.

□ 1030

Eddie and his wife, Millie, raised two children. He worked as a farmer and soil conservationist for more than 80 years, only recently selling his long-used Caterpillar bulldozer. He is known by neighbors for his dogged Nebraska work ethic, willingness to lend a hand, and deep sense of personal responsibility.

Growing up with his 12 siblings on the family farm near Adams, Nebraska, Eddie said from an early age: "We learned what we needed to do."

Demonstrating love for family, community, and the land throughout his life, Eddie exemplifies Nebraska values

of stewardship, neighborliness, and conservation.

Today, he lives in Syracuse, Nebraska, and continues to visit family and friends around the community. His daughter, Tanya, attests that he loves taking care of the land and being busy doing things.

Eddie's character and contributions to his community are outstanding and highlight all that is great about small towns all across America.

RECOGNIZING NEBRASKA AGRICULTURE ACADEMY AND FFA

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Third District agriculture educators and the record-breaking number of FFA members in Nebraska and across the Nation.

As the sixth State chartered by the National FFA Organization upon its founding in 1928, Nebraska FFA provides outstanding career growth opportunities, which build character and develop competence in our next generation of ag industry leaders who will feed and fuel the world.

In public, private, and homeschooling settings, student interest and participation in FFA is at an all-time high. According to the Nebraska FFA Foundation, there were 10,454 student FFA members in Nebraska during the 2021–2022 school year.

Despite a shortage of agriculture educators, the Nebraska Agriculture Academy is providing opportunities to students who are homeschooled and in remote communities where an FFA chapter may not be operating. Through supervised agricultural experience projects, these students are gaining hands-on experience to help our communities thrive, such as raising their own cattle herds.

Through career connections and preparation to excel, FFA continues to be an outstanding opportunity for students. With 945,988 student members nationally, which is an increase of 11 percent from last year, the number of FFA student members and chapters across the United States continues to grow.

The future of American agriculture is bright because our future farmers, ranchers, food scientists, veterinarians, product merchandisers, ag teachers, and others are eager to learn and grow.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

You, O Lord, have been our God forever, and have delivered us from peril and menace time and again. We acknowledge no other God but You. Not our power or might, but only You can uphold us. We confess no other savior but You—neither our wit, nor our own wisdom, but Yours alone can redeem us.

For You have cared for us in our wilderness. You have provided shelter for us in the scorching heat of anxiety and the raging storms that threaten our well-being.

Deliver, then, Your people from the relentless power of devastation and desolation. After almost 2 years of fighting for their country and its citizens, redeem the people of Ukraine. As we mark the 100th day of ostensibly intractable conflict in Israel and Gaza, bring Your peace and justice to this region.

May those who are persecuted be rescued from death's sting. May those who have sacrificed so much be spared from the grave's victory. Do not hide Your compassion from them, but speak into the chaos and confusion of this horrific strife and once again grant Your deliverance and then govern us with Your peace.

In the light of Your love, we pray in the strength of Your name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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
PRO TEMPORE

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

U.S.-U.K. SOLIDARITY FOR PEACE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was grateful to participate this weekend in the legislative exchange program of the Association of Marshall Scholars to Oxford and London, led by co-chairs, MARK GREEN and JIM HIMES; with emeritus co-chairs, LINDA SANCHEZ and MIKE TURNER.

It was historic as the alliance was fulfilled as real with actions.

Prime Minister Rishi Sunak met in Kyiv on Friday with President Volodymyr Zelenskyy to announce billions more aid for Ukraine. We observed Parliament on Monday where he provided details warmly welcomed by all political parties.

Simultaneously, Britain and America launched air strikes in self-defense against Tehran regime Houthi puppets.

Yesterday, at Chatham House in London, we met with Defence Secretary Grant Shapps, who warned Iran: "We see you, we see through what you're doing."

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, as warned by the FBI.

IN HONOR OF LIAM LYNCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 10-year-old Liam Lynch of western New York.

Liam was first diagnosed with lymphoma in 2019 and, thanks to the expert care through Roswell Park/Oishei Children's Hospital partnership, he went into remission.

Unfortunately, Liam relapsed, but he is a tough, determined kid, and we support his efforts to succeed.

With the support of Liam's family and his community, he has donated more than 2,300 pairs of pajamas to other patients at the hospital where he is seeking care.

Liam's enduring positivity through chemotherapy, radiation, and months

in the hospital has been recognized by the Buffalo Bills, including its star quarterback Josh Allen, along with the many people across the western New York community.

Liam Lynch truly embodies the spirit of the City of Good Neighbors.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Liam Lynch and his family as he bravely continues his battle to beat lymphoma for good.

HONORING THE SEVEN FAMILIES
OF VICTIMS OF PERRY HIGH
SCHOOL ATTACK

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

Mr. NUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the families who are grieving following an attack on Perry High School in Iowa.

On January 4, 11-year-old Ahmir Jolliff, a sixth grader in our community, died during an attack on his school. Ahmir's wonderful mother, Erica, said her son, known as Smiley because of the dimples that always lit up his face with a grin, believed in making every day count, and we should all take this burden on seriously as we march forward.

During this attack, Principal Dan Marburger heroically put himself in harm's way to create an opportunity for students to run to safety, and, in those few moments while he tried to talk down an active shooter, he undoubtedly saved the lives of many in our community. However, for his selfless actions, standing in harm's way, this week it is sad to report that he has passed away.

As his daughter Claire said: Dad taught us and inspired us to be better people every day. He passed many lessons and things on to us as kids.

Undoubtedly, there are families in Perry who are still living the life lessons that Dan Marburger taught. There is no doubt this impact will live on in heavy, but also inspiring, ways as a mentor and an educator in our community.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers are with the Marburger family and the people of Perry.

THREAT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the world has not been in such an unstable nuclear situation since the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

The web of nuclear arms control agreements is being dismantled and weakened. Russia and North Korea constantly threaten to use nuclear weapons. Iran is increasing its capacity to build a nuclear weapon, and the nuclear powers, including in the United States, plan to modernize and increase their nuclear arsenals.

This should scare every single Member of this House. Ninety-three nations have signed the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which entered into force 3 years ago on January 22, 2021. In my opinion, it is disappointing that the United States has not yet signed. The world is calling on us to end the threat of nuclear war, not enable it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reverse direction, get back to the negotiating table, and move toward agreements to end the threat of nuclear weapons once and for all.

TEAM ALABAMA WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it often takes tragic events to bring us all together.

Last week, a tornado ripped through Cottonwood, Alabama, and it basically destroyed the entire town of about 1,200 people. This weekend, I had the opportunity to visit with the folks in Cottonwood and to see how I could help.

Small communities like this don't have the resources that other big cities have to recover from a storm. The community has to come together to rebuild their homes and their community, and that is exactly what Cottonwood is doing. It is very moving to see everyone come together and to help each other. This is what the Alabama family is truly all about.

I am grateful today and every day to be part of Team Alabama working together at the local, State, and Federal level to rebuild our storm-damaged communities and begin to return to normalcy.

KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OPEN

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress to focus on lowering costs and growing the middle class, but extreme MAGA Republicans continue to create one crisis after the next.

The bare minimum is for Congress to keep the government open, yet Republicans have repeatedly threatened government shutdowns. Republicans want a shutdown unless they get harsh and ineffective border policy changes.

They are willing to hold hostage pay for our troops. At the same time, Republicans have rejected billions in funding from President Biden to help secure the border and to create a more orderly process. Republicans prefer to play politics rather than solve problems.

This week, Democrats will once again provide the majority of votes to

keep the government open. Democrats are here to do our job and put people over politics. We need to keep the government open so that American families are not hurt by Republicans' failure to govern.

RECOGNIZING ROGER BAKER

(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 today to recognize Roger Baker for his many years of service to the Ohio Farm Bureau.

This tireless advocate served 12 years as the District 8 State trustee on the Ohio Farm Bureau, representing the counties of Wayne, Medina, Ashland, and Summit.

Mr. Baker is a wealth of knowledge and a champion for agriculture. I can personally attest that he has been invaluable as I carry out my role on the House Agriculture Committee to reflect challenges of Ohio agriculture. Those lucky enough to know him can attest to his passion and dedication to his field.

Even though Mr. Baker's tenure on the Ohio Farm Bureau Board of Trustees has come to an end, I do not doubt that he will continue advocating for Ohio agriculture, and I am thankful for his service on our Ohio 7 agricultural advisory council.

There is no question that the farm community in Ohio has benefited from the farm efforts of Roger Baker.

Mr. Baker's years of dedicated work have helped Ohio's farmers feed the world. I thank Mr. Baker for his dedication to our community.

ALBERTSONS-KROGER MERGER

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

Mrs. PELTOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend Alaska's rights to affordable groceries, which are under threat from a corporate mega-merger.

The Albertsons-Kroger merger would combine Alaska's two largest grocery stores. Many of our communities just have two grocers, a Carrs-Safeway and a Fred Meyer, often across the street, whether it is Airport Way in Fairbanks or the Sterling Highway in Soldotna.

If they merge, 14 of these stores will be sold to a company that has never operated in Alaska. That matters.

Alaska is a remote State with one-of-a-kind logistical challenges. We know what happened in the 1999 Carrs-Safeway merger, when a new operator had to close its stores after barely a year. Alaskans got higher prices and fewer choices.

We won't be ignored this time. We are asking the Federal Trade Commission to listen to our voices, stop this merger, and protect our access to food and jobs.

As the FTC meets this week, Alaskans will be speaking up, asking them to do the right thing and listen to those who have the most to lose.

□ 1215

MAUI COUNTY HOUSING PLAN

(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 so many of our Maui "'ohana," "family," stable housing for their families and the ability to manage mortgages for lost homes keep them up at night.

Earlier this month, the State of Hawaii, Maui County, FEMA, and various philanthropic organizations announced a \$500 million interim housing plan to move thousands of families still living in hotels into stable, long-term housing by July 1 of this year. \$250 million of this critical funding is coming directly from FEMA.

Of all the ways that this plan will seek to provide some stability for "keikis," "children," and "kupuna," "elders," who lost everything, the most critical and urgent are the investments that will be made in more permanent developments.

We need shovels in the ground now, and I strongly encourage FEMA to lean into their plans to build modular homes that will house up to 500 households.

In talking with constituents and Maui Mayor Bissen, we must also focus immediately on identifying options to help survivors with their mortgages. Absent options, our people will feel they have no choice but to leave Lahaina. As I have said before, Lahaina is not Lahaina without her people.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6914, PREGNANT STUDENTS' RIGHTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6918, SUPPORTING PREGNANT AND PARENTING WOMEN AND FAMILIES ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 957, DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES, CONDEMNING THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CRISIS ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER, AND URGING PRESIDENT BIDEN TO END HIS ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 969 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 969

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6914) to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students,

and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6918) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-20 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H.Res. 957) denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), 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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6914 and H.R.

6918, which provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Ways and Means, respectively, and provides each one motion to recommit. The rule further provides for consideration of H. Res. 957 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, citizens across this country, and even Members on both sides of the aisle, have been imploring this administration to end its open-border policies, yet these cries have fallen on deaf ears. The President has failed to maintain operational control of this Nation's borders, causing the worst border crisis in American history.

Of course, this crisis extends way beyond the border. Every community in the country is facing the consequences of this administration's failure, from the strain on schools to the horrifying fentanyl epidemic being worsened by the astonishing amount of narcotics coming across the border.

In short, the policies of this administration have created a border crisis, a national security crisis, and a humanitarian crisis. It is so irresponsible and embarrassing that I almost understand why the Biden administration refuses to take responsibility for it.

Be that as it may, the fact is the responsibility lies with Secretary Mayorkas; the appointed border czar, Vice President HARRIS; and President Joe Biden.

H. Res. 957 condemns the national security and public safety crises these actors and other Biden administration officials have created, denounces the Biden administration's open-border policies, and urges the President to end said policies.

We are also here to discuss two pieces of legislation to support expectant mothers. H.R. 6914, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act, requires institutions of higher education to provide information on the rights of and accommodation and resources for pregnant students. According to the CDC, nearly one-third of all abortions performed in America are for women aged 20 to 24, college-aged students. While most colleges are required to accommodate pregnant students under Title IX, many women are unaware of those requirements and the resources available to them and feel that they have to have an abortion or give up their educational goals.

This bill simply requires these institutions to share information about resources and accommodations they already provide.

H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, a bill I introduced with Representative TENNEY from New York and Representative CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from keeping TANF dollars from being used to sup-

port pregnancy centers. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families provides \$16.5 billion annually to support assistance activities for needy families.

Certainly, pregnancy centers, which provide a wide variety of resources to pregnant women, from treatments to diapers to counseling, qualify for this kind of funding. Unfortunately, the Biden administration has shown their antiwomen, pro-abortion hand again, proposing a rule to modify allowable uses of TANF that singles out pregnancy centers in a way that could prevent States from using these funds for these vital care centers.

Make no mistake, conservatives are here for unborn babies and their mothers, and we want to ensure these moms are supported throughout their pregnancies and empowered to raise their families. These bills do just that.

Each of these bills delivers on the commitment House Republicans have made to the American people. We are here to protect the rights of Americans; we are here to hold the government accountable; and we are here to secure this country and its borders, all of which this administration has failed to accomplish.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, a little more than 48 hours from a devastating government shutdown. The deadline to pass a Federal budget is already 3 months overdue, and the clock keeps ticking.

Unable to get control of their majority and act responsibly, Republicans keep kicking the can down the road. They have struggled to pass any legislation because they choose again and again to appease an extremist minority rather than to advance policies supported by the majority of Americans and their Representatives here in the House.

Moreover, now, as we face pressing challenges at home and around the world, they have brought us to the brink of disaster once more, all because they chose to renege on a bipartisan deal to fund the government.

So, with these serious problems we are facing, what are House Republicans' priorities for today? They are to attack the President and pass more anti-abortion bills. It is a new year, but for House Republicans, it is the same old story.

Distracted by their own chaos and infighting, they have repeatedly failed to deliver for the American people. They have wasted time and tax dollars on baseless investigations and divisive culture wars, dragging the American people with them down rabbit holes of conspiracies and untruths.

They throw tantrums when they can't get their way, ousting their last Speaker and, just last week, bringing all work in the House to a halt because their new Speaker had dared to try to

strike a deal to keep the government open.

They put on dramatic acts of political theater, hoping to hide the fact that they are unable to complete the most basic tasks of governing. In 2023, they led the least productive session of Congress since the Great Depression.

We think the American people deserve better.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the three bills that the House leadership has chosen to spend Congress' time on this week, and it is more of the same.

The first bill in this rule is the grotesquely misleading H. Res. 957, a resolution that repeats lies and distortions about the migration challenges at our southern border, starting with the title of the resolution and its false claim that this administration is promoting an open border. This is MAGA fiction, and it is an effort to keep campaigning on the fear of immigrants rather than any serious attempt to address the complex issues created by global migration forces and decades of congressional inaction.

It has become obvious that our Republican colleagues don't really want to fix our broken immigration system. They just want to campaign on it.

They have rejected—before even reading—the bipartisan solutions proposed by Senate Republicans, Democrats, and the administration.

They have refused to consider supplemental border funding requests from the President because the truth is they don't want solutions. They want political stunts. They want to rant, complain, blame, and campaign.

Immigration and border issues are complex. That is why they have remained on the table for so many years. They require comprehensive and nuanced policies, not acts of cruelty and dehumanization marked by barbed wire, family separation, or needless tragedies.

As we have seen over and over again, our Republican colleagues would rather use this issue to sow anger, division, and fear. They will use meaningless resolutions that do nothing to change the status quo, like this one, to distract from their failed Congress and their do-nothing agenda.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to see just how House Republicans view immigration and the border as a purely political issue, look no further than House leadership. After saying for months that border security is a crisis and just last month taking a field trip with over 60 House Republicans to the border, this week House leadership refused to even consider a bipartisan deal negotiated by the Senate before they have read it.

Mr. Speaker, you can't say that the border is in a state of emergency yet reject a bipartisan deal to address the crisis.

We can and must do better than this. Moreover, we owe it to our constituents and our country to work toward

real, thoughtful solutions rather than partisan talking points like H. Res. 957.

Now, let's turn to H.R. 6914 and H.R. 6918. Supporting the health and well-being of mothers and babies should be something we can all agree upon, and we would welcome some real collaboration in that area.

Nonetheless, that is not what the majority has brought to the floor today. The fact is that both of these bills are designed to advance an extremist agenda to limit Americans' fundamental freedoms, particularly with respect to reproductive healthcare.

It is nothing but a political exercise that our Republican colleagues undertake every year on the anniversary of Roe v. Wade. It is designed to cater to the most extreme supporters as they descend on Washington, D.C., for an anti-abortion rally.

The fact is that the MAGA majority's anti-abortion agenda is wildly unpopular in this country. The vast majority of Americans do not support it, and they have proven that at the polls repeatedly in the last couple of years.

Americans do not want politicians and rightwing extremists undermining their freedom to make their own medical and reproductive healthcare choices based on their own individual circumstances.

In the face of the overwhelming and repeated rejection of these extremist attempts to interfere in private medical decisions, Republicans are now cloaking their efforts in family-friendly rhetoric and misleading talking points. So, it is important to dig a little deeper and see what these bills are and are not.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really wanted to support pregnant women, children, and families, then they would work with us to address the shameful fact that maternal mortality in our country far exceeds that of our peers. Childbirth is dangerous here in the United States, particularly for Black women and their babies, not because we don't know how to support healthy outcomes but because of a lack of will or interest from Congress.

It is a full-blown crisis, but it doesn't have to be. When it comes to giving our kids brighter futures, we should be talking about powerful tools like the expanded child tax credit, which lifted millions of children out of poverty. We should be strengthening WIC and SNAP, nutrition programs that serve as lifelines for pregnant women, mothers, infants, and families. Instead, this MAGA majority has proposed deep cuts to these nutrition programs.

We should pass policies to improve access to high-quality childcare and early education services, nutritious food, comprehensive maternal and infant healthcare, stable housing, and family-sustaining jobs because those are the things that would really help our kids and families.

□ 1230

The policies that our Republican colleagues have brought before us today in these two bills do none of that.

In fact, they would actually divert money away from vulnerable families and ultimately endanger women's lives.

H.R. 6914 purports to be concerned with providing information to pregnant college students.

Of course, there are obvious and unique challenges to balancing school and parenting, although students and their families can thrive with the right support. Unfortunately, this bill doesn't actually provide such support.

Instead, it requires that colleges inform students only about the rights and resources for carrying a pregnancy to term—resources, I will add, for which this House majority has sought to dramatically slash funding.

The bill purposely leaves out any requirement for schools to distribute medically accurate information regarding all of the healthcare options available to pregnant women. If this bill were truly about ensuring that pregnant college students have the necessary information to make informed decisions to meet their unique reproductive healthcare needs, it would include information about contraception, abortion, miscarriages, and the services that might be available to them during their pregnancy and after.

If the underlying intent of this bill were not clear enough in its one-sided substance, we need only look to the alleged funding section of the bill, which would write into law completely unproven and even false anti-abortion talking points.

These are findings that the bill's author could provide no evidence to support when it was marked up in committee. However, don't take my word for it. Advocates dedicated to advancing civil rights and resources for pregnant and parenting students have expressed deep concerns about this bill, including groups that are experts on this issue like The Coalition For Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy.

It is obvious that this MAGA majority doesn't really care about educating and supporting pregnant and parenting students. Instead, they would rather leave them in the dark and attempt to deny women the freedom to make informed decisions about their own bodies and futures.

Lastly, I will talk about H.R. 6918, which is another example of House Republicans doubling down on an extreme and unpopular agenda to try to ban abortion care nationwide. This bill is cloaked in a title that most Americans would agree with, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

In fact, Congress has passed bipartisan legislation to do just that, including through TANF funding, the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families.

However, in recent years, there has been growing evidence and a raft of studies showing that critical TANF aid for families is being diverted to purposes not authorized by Congress.

One of the greatest causes of concern is the siphoning of Federal TANF taxpayer dollars to support so-called crisis pregnancy centers, most of which are part of a well-funded arm of the global anti-abortion movement.

There is a growing body of evidence that these crisis pregnancy centers use deceptive and coercive tactics to target vulnerable people facing unplanned pregnancies, and they often prevent them from accessing a full range of appropriate reproductive healthcare, including safe abortion care and contraceptives.

Just as this bill is cloaked in benign pro-family rhetoric, these pregnancy centers distribute diapers and formula in order to disguise their underlying anti-abortion mission.

One of the great dangers of these crisis pregnancy centers is that they present themselves as legitimate healthcare facilities, but the reality is that most are unlicensed, understaffed by medical professionals, and unbound by the privacy laws that govern medical providers.

This has led to women being misled and given inaccurate or even dangerous information about their pregnancies and the options for care that are available to them, including women who have suffered life-threatening undiagnosed complications in their pregnancies, women who have been denied the information and opportunity to access appropriate reproductive healthcare for them, and women who have been encouraged to undertake dangerous and medically contraindicated procedures.

There is strong evidence that many pregnancy centers are using the public money that States allocate to them through TANF for purposes that are not authorized by Congress. That is why last year, the Department of Health and Human Services issued a proposed regulation to better guide the States in what services were eligible for TANF funding, and that is why this bill, H.R. 6918, is so dangerous and dishonest.

When we have a growing mountain of evidence of misuse and even fraudulent use of TANF dollars by crisis pregnancy centers, this bill by its term would prevent the Department of Health and Human Services from any regulation of pregnancy crisis centers.

House Republicans would green light the unregulated use of public money to fund these anti-abortion facilities, many of which have been proven to promote false medical claims and misinformation; misrepresent their services as providing a full range of reproductive healthcare, despite having only anti-abortion services and usually lacking any medical personnel. Horrifyingly, they are unbound by HIPAA privacy restrictions, and some

of these centers collect and distribute women's sensitive personal information to organizations within the larger anti-abortion movement.

This is what Republicans are trying to push upon American women with these bills, and I wholeheartedly disagree.

Thus, here we are. It is another week, and the House GOP still can't get their act together. Their majority is on track to become one of the most ineffective in modern history.

Again, we are just hours from a government shutdown, but instead of dealing with that or any of the real problems Americans are facing today, this House majority is desperately trying to mask its own failure with misleading rhetoric and bills that will never become law. It would be a joke if it weren't so serious.

Led by their most extreme Members, it is clear our Republican colleagues don't want to make Congress work better for the American people. They want to break it, and they want to campaign on it. They want to bring chaos to this Chamber and pass legislation that feeds the flames of their desperate culture wars.

It is irresponsible, it is reckless, and it is not what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding time to me now, but I am very disappointed to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle stand up and defend President Biden's plan to restrict resources through TANF that, for many years, have provided help for expecting mothers and families who are facing uncertainty and hardship.

The legislation under the rule today, the Support Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act, introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative FISCHBACH, will protect access to these critical resources through pregnancy centers across the country that give vulnerable mothers a hand up when they need it the very most.

Yet the Biden administration is working to exclude these pregnancy centers from the TANF program and thereby restrict access for expecting mothers who need things like vitamins, diapers, classes, and transportation.

Pregnancy centers do so much to invest in our community. They are often the first stop for a mother who is dealing with an unplanned pregnancy and will help her assess her options, provide healthcare services, and support her after her child is born.

For those who choose life, pregnancy centers are a lifeline. The bottom line is this: Expectant mothers who qualify and need this hand up under TANF deserve any and all options and resources

available to them, including the option to choose life and to pursue motherhood.

My colleagues keep saying that they want to support all women and their choices, but their support clearly wavers when it comes to mothers who have chosen life for their unborn child. I question the morality of an administration that seeks to restrict these resources in favor of pushing options that are more about promoting abortion services and less about simply helping families who are expecting.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, my colleague Representative MICHELLE FISCHBACH for her leadership on this important legislation, which I am a proud cosponsor.

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

We have heard from our colleagues over the course of debate on this bill that they think that they need more discretion to spend TANF dollars, but if this bill were to pass, a pregnancy center would be unregulated. That is what the bill literally says, We cannot regulate pregnancy crisis centers. So if they wanted to use TANF dollars to stage a Taylor Swift concert, they could because there is to be no regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the executive summary of a report titled, "Designed to Deceive: A Study of the Crisis Pregnancy Center Industry in Nine States," written by the Alliance: State Advocates for Women's Rights and Gender Equity.

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

There was no objection.

Executive Summary:

CRISIS PREGNANCY CENTERS (CPCS) ARE ANTI-ABORTION ORGANIZATIONS THAT SEEK TO REACH LOW-INCOME PEOPLE FACING UNINTENDED PREGNANCIES TO PREVENT THEM FROM ACCESSING ABORTION AND CONTRACEPTION.

CPCs, advance, this mission by using deceptive and coercive tactics and medical disinformation, and misleadingly presenting themselves as medical facilities. The modern CPC industry, a well-resourced arm of the global anti-abortion movement, is rapidly expanding while evading public accountability, despite increasing reliance on public funds.

CONTEXT FOR THIS STUDY

We live in the most hostile era for reproductive freedom in decades. The anti-abortion movement's two primary strategies—passing abortion bans and contraception restrictions and expanding crisis pregnancy center networks with taxpayer money—are simultaneously reaching peak, unprecedented levels. As of this writing, the U.S. Supreme Court has allowed Texas Senate Bill 8 to become law in Texas, effectively undermining *Roe* by establishing a vigilante system wherein private individuals are deputized, and financially incentivized, to enforce the law by suing friends, neighbors, and strangers. This radical law positions Texas CPCs—supported by state funding that has increased twentyfold since 2006—to play a central role in the surveillance of pregnant people.

While severe legislative restrictions such as Senate Bill 8 make headlines, the modernized, proliferating, and mostly evangelical CPC industry's critical role in the anti-abortion, anti-LGBTQ+ movement—and effect on the health of pregnant people—is relatively obscured from public view. Modern CPCs are plugged into the global anti-abortion movement's sophisticated digital infrastructure, which facilitates expansion, client surveillance, and systemic, coordinated promotion of anti-abortion disinformation.

Investment of public money in CPCs is escalating, especially in the states, with virtually no government oversight, accountability, or transparency. Investigations into publicly-funded CPCs by advocates and watchdog groups have found evidence of misuse, waste, and potential skimming of funds in multiple states, including Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Yet CPCs continue to secure state contracts while the nature and quality of their services remains largely unexamined and unregulated by policymakers.

States are also enabling CPCs to siphon public funds from safety-net programs for low-income pregnant people and children. In so doing, CPCs exacerbate the very economic scarcity they use to justify their encroachment into under-resourced neighborhoods and communities of color: the modern CPC industry has revitalized strategies to target Black women, who are more likely than white women to face barriers to medical care and pregnancy resources.

Today, crisis pregnancy centers outnumber abortion clinics nationwide by an average of 3 to 1. The disparities are higher in states that fund CPCs: in Pennsylvania, the ratio of CPCs to abortion clinics is 9 to 1; in Minnesota, it is 11 to 1. The maternal and public health consequences of this seismic shift in the reproductive health care landscape in the states are unknown.

MAJOR STUDY FINDINGS AT A GLANCE

CPCs Provided Virtually No Medical Care.

Many CPC websites used language and imagery signifying they were providers of medical services but the services most commonly offered were not medical.

The most common CPC service was a pregnancy test—usually a self-administered urine-stick test.

The second most common CPC offering was “free” goods, which pregnant people typically had to earn.

More than 1/2 of CPC's offered “non-diagnostic” ultrasound as a tool to signal medical legitimacy and persuade people to carry their pregnancies to term.

Many CPCs offered sexuality “education” as a vehicle for medical disinformation and ideological messaging.

Almost none of the CPC provided prenatal care.

Only 1 of the 607 CPCs provided contraception care.

State-Funded CPCs are More Harmful Than Privately Funded Centers.

CPCs Routinely Promoted False Medical Claims and Used Deceptive Practices.

Almost 2/3 of CPCs promoted patently false and/or biased medical claims about pregnancy, abortion, contraception, and reproductive health care providers.

“Abortion Pill Reversal”—an unethical practice and non-scientific claim—is a CPC priority. More than 1/3 of CPCs promoted APR; in some states more than 1/2 promoted APR.

Fewer than 1/2, of CPCs indicated they had a licensed medical professional. None indicated whether medical professionals were employed or volunteers, or full- or part-time.

Many CPCs deceptively claimed on their website to have no agenda and to provide full and unbiased information.

CPCs seek to intercept people seeking health care—10% operated mobile units that can locate near abortion clinics to confuse their patients. Online, CPCs employ digital tactics to intercept people searching for abortion care.

CPCs Appear to be Local but are Part of a Global Anti-Abortion Network.

THE ALLIANCE CRISIS PREGNANCY CENTER STUDY

Measuring the proliferating CPC industry's impact on public health must begin with a thorough assessment of the services CPC offer pregnant people—and the services they do not. In the absence of government oversight, the Alliance conducted this Study to document and evaluate CPC services and practices in nine states in which we operate and partner with allies: Alaska, California, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington. We investigated 607 CPCs between March 2020 and February 2021 and collected over 50 categories of publicly available data through systematic review of CPC websites and social media. In addition, we conducted public records investigations and research into CPC operations in six states (AK, CA, MN, NM, PA, and WA) that further informed the Study. Our findings shine renewed light on the modern CPC industry and expose the particular harms of state-funded CPCs.

CPCs Provided Virtually No Medical Care.

The three most common CPC Services were pregnancy test (88.5%), “free” material goods (88.1%), and “counseling” (78.6%). The fourth most common service was “non-diagnostic” ultrasound. While approximately one-quarter (28.4%) offered STI testing, most did not provide or refer for STI treatment and none offered barrier-method contraception, a standard of care for STI prevention. Only one CPC offered contraception.

The most common CPC service was a pregnancy test. Of the CPC specifying type of test, 96% offered a urine test, the self-administered stick tests available at drugstores. Some CPCs claimed to provide “lab-quality” drug tests.

Almost none of the CPCs in the Study provided prenatal care. While most CPCs offered pregnancy tests, the majority (95%) offered no prenatal care and fewer than half made prenatal care referrals. CPCs affiliated with big anti-abortion networks (almost half of the CPCs in this Study) provided prenatal care less often than unaffiliated centers. Significantly, state-funded CPCs were less likely to offer or refer for prenatal care than CPCs without state funding.

The second most common CPC offering was “free” goods, which pregnant people actually had to earn. Most CPCs (88.1%) advertised free material goods, including maternity and baby supplies, but noted that provision of these goods was contingent on the pregnant person's participation in “earn while you learn” classes or counseling, Bible studies, abstinence seminars, video screenings, or other ideological CPC programming. While CPCs target people considering abortion, research shows most pregnant people who seek out a CPC do so because they cannot afford diapers and other infant and maternity goods CPCs claim to offer for free.

More than half of CPCs offered “non-diagnostic” ultrasound. The fourth most common CPC service, offered by 56% of CPCs, was “non-diagnostic” ultrasound, which cannot study placenta or amniotic fluid, or detect fetal abnormality or fetal distress. Anti-abortion organizations steering the CPC movement promote the use of ultrasound technology as a tool to persuade clients to carry their pregnancies to term and falsely signal medical legitimacy. The American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine condemns

the use of ultrasounds for any non-medical purpose: “The use of ultrasound without a medical indication to view the fetus, obtain images of the fetus, or identify the fetal external genitalia is inappropriate and contrary to responsible medical practice.”

CPCs offered sexuality “education” as a vehicle for medical disinformation and ideological messaging. Almost 17% of CPCs claimed to offer sexuality-related programming, which typically focused on abstinence and also featured religious and shame-based messages and harmful stereotypes about LGBTQ+ youth and non-traditional families. Approximately 8% of CPCs overall indicated that they offer these services off-site, including in public schools; a full 20% of CPCs in Washington offered these programs off-site.

CPCs Routinely Promoted False Medical Claims and Used Deceptive Practices.

Almost two-thirds (63%) of CPCs promoted patently false and/or biased medical claims, mostly centered on pregnancy, contraception, and abortion, especially medication abortion. False claims typically included patently untrue information about reproductive health care and providers, false and misleading information regarding risks of abortion and contraception, and deceptive citing to make it seem such claims were supported by legitimate medical sources when they are not. Many CPC sites claimed people who have had abortions suffer from “post-abortion syndrome,” a non-existent diagnosis that has been debunked by medical professionals.

While many CPCs claimed to be medical clinics, fewer than half (47%) indicated whether they had a licensed medical professional on staff. Only 16% indicated a physician and 25% indicated a registered nurse was affiliated with their staff; none indicated whether licensed medical professionals were employees or volunteers, nor whether they were engaged full- or part-time. Many CPCs falsely claimed to have no agenda and to provide full and unbiased information to support a pregnant person's choice. Many disguised the fact that they do not provide or refer for abortion. Among CPCs in this Study, 10% operated mobile units that can locate near abortion clinics to confuse and intercept their patients.

Abortion Pill Reversal—an unethical practice and non-scientific claim—is a CPC priority. “Abortion pill reversal” is an anti-abortion marketing term that refers to the experimental administration of high doses of progesterone to pregnant people who have taken the first, but not the second, of two medicines for a medication abortion. Anti-abortion advertising claims this can “reverse” an abortion, but medical experts say such claims “are not based on science and do not meet clinical standards.” Its health effects are unknown; the only credible clinical study was stopped after one-quarter of the participants went to the hospital with severe bleeding.

More than one-third (35%) of CPCs in the Study promoted APR, with significant variation across states: More than half the CPCs in Idaho (57.1%) and Washington (50.9%) promoted APR. Overall, some 5% of CPCs said they provided APR, but none indicated who administered it, whether it was administered vaginally, orally, or by injection, or whether follow-up care was provided.

State-Funded CPCs are More Harmful Than Privately Funded Centers.

The Alliance Study found that taxpayers are unknowingly funding the most problematic practices of the CPC industry. State-funded CPCs promoted abortion pill reversal at significantly higher rates and offered prenatal care and referral less often than CPCs without state funding.

CPCs Appear to be Local but are Part of a Global Anti-Abortion Network.

Almost half (45.8%) of the CPCs in this Study were affiliated with one or more of the international, national, and regional right-wing organizations that steer the CPC industry, including Heartbeat International, Care Net, and National Institute of Family and Life Advocates. These groups provide digital strategy, infrastructure, and marketing tactics to help CPCs intercept people searching online for abortion care, signal that they are trusted sources of health care, and secure public funding. At least one of these groups collects and stores sensitive client data such as sexual history in “digital dossiers.”

CONCLUSIONS

While CPCs misleadingly present themselves as medical facilities to draw low-income people experiencing an unplanned pregnancy, the four services most often provided by CPCs served no medical purpose. Most CPCs disseminate medical disinformation focused on stigmatizing abortion and contraception and promote made-up, abortion-related mental health conditions not recognized by medical experts. The promotion of “abortion pill reversal,” an unethical, non-scientific practice based on a fraudulent claim, is currently a top CPC priority.

While people considering abortion are main targets of CPC marketing efforts, research shows that, in fact, the majority of people who go to CPCs intend to carry their pregnancies to term and are primarily seeking the pregnancy tests and infant supplies, especially diapers. CPCs claim to offer for free.

In short, it is widespread financial insecurity and inadequate support for pregnant people that makes people vulnerable to CPCs. CPCs use deceptive and misleading practices to exploit economic insecurity and gaps in access to health care to advance their anti-abortion, anti-contraception agenda. Robust research documents that being denied abortion care exposes both the pregnant person and their family to a range of potential harms. But we do not know the health consequences visiting a CPC has on the typical CPC client; a pregnant person needing prenatal care and parenting resources.

With CPCs outnumbering abortion clinics in almost every state, this unregulated network of ideological, deceptive, and manipulative providers of mostly non-medical services is increasingly more likely to be the most logistically accessible facility in the landscape of services for pregnant people with limited resources. The disparities detected in services between state-funded and other CPCs within the same state underscores the need for a coherent analysis of state-funded CPCs, and the consequences of government investment in CPCs on maternal and public health.

CALL TO ACTION: HOLD CPCs ACCOUNTABLE TO PROTECT REPRODUCTIVE & MATERNAL HEALTH

The Alliance Study findings make clear that a thorough data-driven assessment of CPC services, funding streams, and accountability measures is needed in states across the country.

It is our hope that this Study spurs stakeholders to assess how CPCs are targeting and treating low-income pregnant people and how the seismic shift in the reproductive landscape—wherein CPCs have proliferated as access to evidence-based reproductive healthcare and abortion has diminished—affects maternal and public health. We already know delaying access to abortion care poses a range of potential harm to pregnant people; we call for future research to specifically investigate the impact of visiting a CPC on maternal health and birth outcomes.

The United States is in the throes of a maternal mortality and morbidity crisis

marked by severe racial disparities, with Black, Latino and Indigenous people and infants suffering disproportionate harms. And we are still in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, an unprecedented public health crisis that is exacerbating pregnancy-related mortality and racial disparities, especially worsening Black maternal health. And, despite these interrelated public health crises, anti-abortion policymakers and bureaucrats are aggressively advancing an ideological agenda that further undermines maternal health and specifically targets Black women.

In this context, we urgently call on state lawmakers to stop funding CPCs and to dramatically increase investment in equitable access to evidence-based reproductive health care, especially in under-resourced communities.

We call on state policymakers nationwide to act on the detailed and state-specific policy recommendations in this report to: protect CPC clients and pregnant people seeking health care; promote transparency and best practices in publicly funded programs; address significant and deepening gaps in maternal and reproductive health care; and eliminate mounting obstacles to health care experienced by low-income pregnant and parenting people.

These findings reaffirm that the Alliance mission as state-based advocates is more pressing than ever: The fight for reproductive freedom is in the states.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, this report studies crisis pregnancy centers in Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota. Overall, its findings show that crisis pregnancy centers provided virtually no medical care, promoted false medical claims, and used deceptive practices; State-funded crisis pregnancy centers are more harmful than privately-funded centers; and crisis pregnancy centers appear to be local, but are actually part of a global anti-abortion network.

It is clear that these sorts of manipulative and unregulated centers are not what is best for women and children's health, and actually have been proven to misuse Federal taxpayer dollars. We absolutely shouldn't be allowing Federal dollars to flow to them without any scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a serious question for my Republican colleagues: Did the Trump campaign write these bills for you? They seem right out of his political playbook—cruel, uninformed, nasty bills. You are turning the House of Representatives into the committee to re-elect Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Minnesota can claim whatever she wants about these bills, but I wish the other side would just be clear. I wish they would just come clean with the American people. What they want is to ban abortion, a total ban. That is what these bills are about.

Don't believe their spin. This debate isn't about giving students more information or helping provide resources to families or whatever other misleading junk you hear from the other side.

That is all a bunch of baloney, a bunch of BS.

Read their bills. Read the bills, and you will see what they do.

The Pregnant Students' Rights Act doesn't give anybody any new rights. It contains a bunch of completely made-up claims meant to stigmatize abortion. It lets schools not inform students of their actual rights with regard to contraception or abortion care. That is the truth.

Republicans can name the bill whatever they want. The problem is, when you read the bill, people actually see that the title is misleading.

I read the bill. The title is misleading. Their other bill is about crisis pregnancy centers, and I know a little bit about crisis pregnancy centers. I have one in my district that almost killed somebody because they told her that everything was fine when she had an ectopic pregnancy, and she almost died.

These centers are about pushing a political agenda, about deceiving women—some who are actually trying to seek access to abortion care.

Republicans say that Federal funding can't go to Planned Parenthood for political reasons, then why the hell is it going to these dangerous political pregnancy centers that push their own agenda? I mean, give me a break.

Now, look, just to be honest about it, the Republican position is to ban abortion nationwide. We know overturning Roe was just the start. Now they want to criminalize abortion, too, and throw women in jail for making decisions about their own bodies. Texas, Kentucky, South Carolina, they are all trying to lock women up if they get an abortion.

Every single week, Republicans are here on the House floor pushing for more extremist culture war nonsense like this.

Maybe that is why they keep losing elections because every time they put their anti-abortion agenda on the ballot, they lose. You would think that they would take the hint. Maybe that is why there are so few speakers on the other side talking about these bills today.

The sickest part of it all, the most disgusting thing is, they do not have one shred of compassion or care about the baby after it is born. They talk about the sanctity of life this and the sanctity of life that, and then they underfund and cut WIC and take food away from postpartum moms and babies. They cut programs that support maternal health. They block the expanded child tax credit, which kept millions of young children and babies out of poverty, and they don't even want to talk about the Black maternal health crisis in this country.

□ 1245

Forgive us if we think it is a little hypocritical to come down here and get lectured about life from a Republican Party that apparently thinks life begins at conception but ends at birth.

These are awful, awful, awful bills. We are here because the Republican Party is incompetent. They have no vision, no agenda, no way of making life better for people. They are the party of abortion bans, insurrections, and illegitimate investigations, and they will pay for it at the ballot box.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. Helping women and their babies and providing information is now an extreme agenda according to my colleagues across the aisle.

Supporting and promoting unrestricted abortion up until the time of birth is an extreme agenda.

The majority of pregnancy resource centers are affiliated with a national organization and have voluntarily signed on to an industry standard called Commitment of Care and Competence created by Heartbeat International that set an ethical code where they agree to adopt a transparent and honest service model.

Pregnancy resource centers provide honest information about services they offer, including ultrasounds and pregnancy testing. They do not hold themselves out to provide all forms of healthcare.

According to a recent report surveying 2,750 pregnancy care centers in 2022, there were 4,779 licensed medical staff, 5,396 licensed medical volunteers, over 500,000 hours of ultrasounds performed, and over 100,000 hours of RNs meeting with STD and STI tests for clients.

If my colleagues really believed in giving pregnant women every option, like they claim, they would have no problem with this bill. We are talking about information and care.

However, the fact that they are pushing against it so passionately just proves what my colleagues and the pro-life community have been saying all along, the left is antiwoman and will find any avenue they can to encourage women to have abortions. There are so many resources that exist that would actually empower them during their pregnancy and raising their families.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the Coalition for Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy and other organizations dedicated to advancing civil rights protections and resources for pregnant and parenting students in opposition to H.R. 6914.

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

There was no objection.

JANUARY 10, 2024.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Chair, House Education and Workforce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT “BOBBY” SCOTT,
Ranking Member, House Education and Workforce Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN FOXX AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: We are a diverse group of advocates and experts dedicated to advancing civil rights protections and institutional resources for pregnant and parenting students. Students who are pregnant and/or parents deserve the opportunity to complete their education free from bias and harassment, in environments that support them on their educational journeys. Unfortunately, pregnant and parenting students are routinely stigmatized, discriminated against, and denied the resources, accommodations, and support they need to thrive in their educational institutions.

More than 5.4 million college students in the United States are parents, which is nearly one quarter of undergraduate students and nearly one third of graduate students. Despite earning higher GPAs than non-parenting students, parenting college students are less likely to graduate. This is not due to personal failing, but rather a lack of institutional support and recognition of the unique barriers to college completion for parenting students. Pregnant and parenting students often experience feeling disconnected from the larger education community and are not aware of who they can speak to when they experience discrimination because of their pregnancy or parenting status.

This latest bill to “protect the rights of pregnant students” falls far short of the protections that are actually necessary for pregnant and parenting students and their children. The Pregnant Students’ Rights Act is a thinly veiled anti-abortion law which would not address the key barriers to pregnant students’ educational attainment, and instead would further shame and stigmatize people for their pregnancy outcomes.

The proposed bill relies on anti-abortion language and seeks to limit students’ reproductive healthcare decisions. This type of language is part of a deliberate strategy by the anti-abortion movement to further legal grounds for a national abortion ban now that the Supreme Court has overturned the constitutional right to abortion care as established in *Roe v. Wade*. Furthermore, the bill language contrasts with existing legal protections for pregnant students experiencing a range of outcomes related to their pregnancies.

Our belief in personal autonomy and respect for every person’s capacity to make their own decisions—including whether to continue their pregnancy or not—is at the core of our work to support pregnant and parenting students. This bill does not contain any meaningful supports that would actually help pregnant and parenting students be able to remain enrolled and meet their educational goals.

Such supports are critically needed, and include:

- Strengthened Title IX protections
- Nondiscrimination protections at the state and local level
- Accessible and affordable child care, and increased funding for on-campus child care
- Access to early education and pre-kindergarten services
- Transportation access
- Basic needs security (including food, housing, clothing, etc.)
- Flexible school attendance policies
- Lactation accommodations
- Less stigma and shame around young parenthood

Increased accountability measures for institutions who fail to protect pregnant and parenting students

Federal funding to support campus Title IX offices’ work to prevent and investigate discrimination against pregnant students

Mandatory data collection on students’ parenting statuses

Strides toward these meaningful supports are in progress. We applaud, for example, Representatives LUCY MCBATH and DEBORAH ROSS’s recent introduction of the Understanding Student Parent Outcomes Act of 2023, which would allow essential data collection on the barriers to college graduation for pregnant and parenting students. But sweeping legislation is necessary to ensure that pregnant and parenting students and their families are protected.

Although pregnant and parenting students face many roadblocks, they can thrive when their educational institutions listen to them, support them, and prevent discrimination against them. While balancing their health, caregiving responsibilities, and educational goals is challenging, these added responsibilities often renew students’ dedication to their studies. While the decision to parent and/or continue pregnancy is a personal one, the barriers that pregnant and parenting students face are not. This proposed bill would reinforce structural and institutional bias and scrutiny of the decisions students make regarding their personal lives.

We welcome the opportunity to have an open dialogue with the sponsors of the “Pregnant Students’ Rights Act” and with any other members of Congress who are ready to step up as the champion that pregnant and parenting students in our nation need and deserve.

Sincerely,

The Coalition for Pregnant and Parenting Students Advocacy:

A Better Balance; Generation Hope; Healthy Teen Network; Institute for Women’s Policy Research; Justice and Joy National Collaborative; National Women’s Law Center; New America Higher Education Program; Pregnant Scholar Initiative at the Center for WorkLife Law.

Joined by:

Advocates for Youth; American Association of University Women; American Civil Liberties Union; American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; BreastfeedLA; California Women’s Law Center; Center for Freethought Equality.

Center for Reproductive Rights; Clearinghouse on Women’s Issues; Colorado Teen Parent Collaborative; End Rape On Campus; Family Equality; Feminist Majority Foundation; Guttmacher Institute; Harvard Law School; Ipas; League of Women Voters of the United States; Legal Momentum, The Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund; National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women’s Health; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy and Community Empowerment; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women’s Political Caucus; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Positive Women’s Network-USA; Power to Decide; Reproductive Freedom for All (formerly NARAL Pro-Choice America); Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; Stop Sexual Assault in Schools; The Hope Center at Temple University; Union for Reform Judaism; Women of Reform Judaism; Won’t She Do It.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, this letter expresses concern that this bill is

based upon unproven anti-abortion rhetoric and seeks to limit students' ability to make reproductive healthcare decisions with a full range of information.

It goes on to say that the bill does not contain any meaningful support to help pregnant and parenting students meet their educational goals, and it notes how the bill leaves out policies we know would actually make a difference, like strengthen Title IX protections, accessible childcare and early education, basic needs security, and accountability measures for institutions that fail to protect pregnant and parenting students.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today's Republican bills are part of their extreme agenda to create a Federal abortion ban.

The first bill, H.R. 6918, would divert Federal funding used to help feed and house poor families and give it to anti-abortion centers.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists warned that these centers often mislead women with false medical information and, in the process, endanger public health. It is really endangering women's health because across the country we are hearing stories of women who are dying or nearly dying because of these extreme restrictions on their healthcare.

The other bill, H.R. 6914, should be named the student anti-abortion bill and not the Pregnant Students Bill of Rights because the bill restricts pregnant students' rights when Republicans restrict access to information about the full range of healthcare available to pregnant students or the benefits that might help a pregnant woman and her child receive nutrition assistance or Medicaid benefits; benefits, I would point out, that Republicans oppose. They don't want our babies to be healthy.

Representative STEVENS submitted an amendment to H.R. 6914 that would provide pregnant students information about miscarriages, a devastating loss that affects 1 million women in the U.S. each year. Shockingly, not a single Republican voted for this amendment to give students health information about miscarriages. In fact, Republicans opposed every Democratic amendment intended to make this bill more scientific and objective.

Last night, the chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee claimed this bill says absolutely nothing about abortion and was just a students' rights bill. A strange statement, since abortion is mentioned nine times in the bill.

"Mujeres," "Women," don't let anyone fool you. Extreme Republicans want to keep us in the dark.

We need to keep Congress out of decisions that women deserve to make for

themselves in doctors' offices on campuses and everywhere else women have healthcare needs.

Finally, the last bill on today's rule is a useless resolution that does absolutely nothing to help the problems at the border.

Resolutions like H.R. 957 that distort a real problem we are facing at the border and statements like we hear from President Trump that immigrants are poisoning the blood of our Nation are dangerous. They demonize all immigrants and lead to a rise in white supremacy and hate crimes, and they do nothing to solve our problems at the border.

Let me be clear. I want a secure and humane border. Democrats have put forth specific policies that address the root causes of migration, because the best way to stop the surge of migrants is to help them stay in their own countries. We have proposed funding and policy fixes for our broken immigration system, solutions that Republicans keep rejecting.

Instead, they provide a resolution that offers no solutions.

We need vision, and Republicans are only giving us division. Vision, not division, is what Democrats are about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the bills.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to repeat it: Helping women and their babies and providing information is not an extreme agenda. We are talking about taking care of women and their babies.

Supporting and promoting unrestricted abortion up to the time of birth is an extreme agenda, and it is a real shame the Democrats and the Biden administration are purposefully targeting and misrepresenting pregnancy centers in the rule and seeking to intimidate States that fund them and denying college students information.

Pregnancy resource centers play a vital role to both mothers, fathers, and their families, empowering them in their decision to choose life for their baby by providing realistic alternatives. They are another option for women who choose to use their services who are looking for an alternative to abortion.

All pregnancy resource centers are open and receive clients on a voluntary basis, and it is disgraceful that Democrats misconstrue these organizations in an effort to limit a woman's choice to raise their child.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, could you please advise how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining.

Ms. SCANLON. 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 services, including abortion care.

Since the Dobbs decision, every State in the Union has taken action on abortion in some way. Many States have used it as an opportunity to enact laws that ban specific instances of abortion or abortion care entirely. Republicans have reiterated time and again that that is their goal, to ban abortion nationwide.

The abortion access landscape is deeply fractured, and Americans continue to face the devastating consequences of abortion bans and restrictions on both patients' health and the greater healthcare ecosystem.

H.R. 12 ensures every American has full access to vital reproductive healthcare and will stop the devastating health consequences for women when abortion access is banned or limited.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will bring up legislation to protect a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions, the Women's Health Protection Act.

This is necessary because Republican bills being brought to the floor share a common goal, to limit access to reproductive healthcare for those who need it most. Like so many of the bills this Republican majority has advanced, these bills are intentionally designed to mislead with biased and inaccurate information and to shame those who seek abortion care.

Republicans are continuing their politically violent, thinly veiled misinformation campaign to ultimately enact a national abortion ban, a forced birth mandate. Now, they are using our pregnant students as their pawns. The young woman in college making the life-changing decision on when and how to start a family deserves comprehensive and medically accurate information.

Do not fall for the okey-dokey. They are playing with people's lives instead of trying to save and change and improve them.

Republicans don't care about the people, certainly not pregnant students. They have consistently undermined access to contraception, defunded on-campus childcare, and excluded information on essential abortion care from the bill they want us to vote for.

In fact, Republicans do not care about any pregnant person when they

seek to expand crisis pregnancy centers. Since my days on the Boston City Council, I have fought to stop these sham clinics. They use coercion to prevent women from accessing essential abortion care and operate as anti-choice propaganda centers.

As the chair of the Abortion Rights and Access Task Force under our Pro-Choice Caucus, allow me to set the record straight: Abortion care is healthcare, and a fundamental human right.

When the Supreme Court overturned the right to an abortion with the support of Republicans nationwide, they created the most life-threatening conditions for pregnant women in America in over 50 years.

If Republicans truly cared about pregnant students or healthcare or personal autonomy or even the fundamental right, freedom, to make decisions about your own body, they would bring our bill, the Women's Health Protection Act, to the House floor to overturn the Dobbs decision and codify the right to an abortion. Anything less is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

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

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

This MAGA majority has a bleak and nihilistic vision of our government. It is a vision where congressional power is wielded to take down political rivals; to force extremist beliefs on every American, particularly women; and to shamelessly sow division and fear, not to actually serve all Americans.

It is a vision where the idea of working together across party lines on behalf of all Americans is so anathema to the Republican Party that it can cause a Speaker to lose his gavel or rank-and-file Members of Congress to lose their primaries. It is where standing up against lies and for the Constitution results in death threats and where the integrity and core values of our country's institutions are continually chipped away.

This is an unacceptable way to govern. It is not governance at all. Americans deserve so much better. Let's stop playing these ridiculous games and get to work on the work that the people sent us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

We certainly have covered a lot of topics here today, and House Republicans are working hard to keep our commitments to the American people: holding government accountable, securing our border, and protecting the rights of the unborn and their mothers.

Conservatives care deeply about defending the unborn and empowering

women to confidently choose life, whether it be on a college campus or by ensuring access to care at pregnancy centers.

As thousands march for life across the country in the coming days, now is the perfect time to raise awareness of all the wonderful options that exist for women.

For nearly 3 years, we have seen a failure to act by the executive branch of this government to secure our borders. Biden beat his own record, with the 2023 fiscal year beating 2022 as the worst year at the border.

Mr. Speaker, 169 individuals on the terror watch list were apprehended trying to cross the border illegally. That number includes only the ones that we know about.

I am thankful for the hard work and thankless work our Customs and Border Patrol agents are doing and do not want to diminish any of the work that they are doing, but the administration's negligence has damaged our national security. Whether it is done through incompetence or malice, those responsible must be held accountable for their inaction.

To be clear, I am not talking about those hardworking CBP agents. I am talking about DHS Secretary Mayorkas; the so-called border czar, Vice President HARRIS; and President Joe Biden.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and underlying legislation.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to comment on H.R. 3058, the Recruiting Families Using Data Act.

There is an undeniable shortage of foster care placements in America, and an even more drastic lack of foster families with individual foster parents that can care for our Foster Youth. Furthermore, it is imperative that Congress ensures that foster children receive the highest standards of care in all current and future placements. This includes ensuring the availability placements that can be respectful of all of the individualities that foster youth hold.

That is why, in my capacity as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has jurisdiction over this legislation, as well as the Chairwoman on the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth (otherwise referred to as CCFY) I am proud to support this bill. I will also point out that Congressman KILDEE is one of our strongest advocates on the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, and I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation alongside my fellow CCFY cochairs, Representatives BACON and SCANLON.

I often reflect on an instance that occurred when I was age 14, upon a visit to my aunt in my home town. I was awakened in the middle of the night with the police at the door. They ushered in a family of twelve children. My aunt was identified as an emergency placement for these foster youth out of a limited number of adults who had been previously vetted to be foster parents. At midnight, I suddenly worked with my aunt to gather the needed supplies for these children, including items like bedding.

While my aunt was an outstanding foster parent, moments like these occur frequently

and exemplify the phenomenon that many youth feel when they enter care. Placements too often feel to youth like they are thrown to a stranger who the state has hired at random who is suddenly an authority of a child's life.

Thankfully, the Recruiting Families Using Data Act takes several important steps that can ensure that a foster care placement feels less alien to a new foster youth and is a more comfortable place for foster children to land during a tumultuous time in their lives.

One provision in this legislation is its requirement that whenever possible, the existing family of youth who are entering foster care are consulted regarding the most appropriate placement for the youth. This serves to not only maintain family bonds, but also increases the possibility that a foster placement has cultural competency with respect to a youth's background.

This bill importantly also includes measures to improve cultural competency of foster placements. This is through its provision that states, "diligently recruit potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of the children in foster care". For example, we know that African American youth are disproportionately overrepresented in the foster care system however, there is not a like amount of African American Foster Parents.

Another anecdote that often comes to mind is a little girl of mixed heritage who I knew that ran away from her foster home and chose to come to my own home. It came to light that her reasoning for these actions was because she was in a foster home with white parents, and she knew that my own daughter would actually be able to handle her African American hair in a way that her white foster parents were not able to. After working with these foster parents to improve their ability to help the girl with her hair, we were able to make a successful reunification. It is that simple. We can fix this.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that with the shortage of foster placements, it is all the more difficult to place foster youth with special needs in homes that are prepared to meet their needs. One such example of special needs is sibling groups. It is certainly a tragedy that upon enduring the trauma of being brought into the foster care system, children often also face the trauma for being indefinitely separated from their known biological siblings. Another example is that foster youth who are part of the LGBTQ+ community need special considerations to secure a safe and accepting placement while in foster care. This is all the more challenging as we are seeing vitriol toward this community nationwide. Youth also can have particular dietary needs either pertaining to health matters or cultural identity that should be catered to in a foster placement.

I am so glad that the House of Representatives is choosing to address all of these issues through the passage of the Recruiting Families Using Data Act. I am looking forward to continuing to work on behalf of foster youth with my colleagues in this constructive manner as we move forward.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 969—the rule providing for consideration of the following:

H.R. 6914—to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the

rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students, and for other purposes; H.R. 6918—to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers; and

H. Res. 957—denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies.

This resolution, providing for debate on these highly politicized and dangerous bills, is yet another shameful effort to erode and dismantle the rights and protections of Americans across the country, and to distract the American people with unviable solutions for immigration and border control—all in the face of inaction to prevent our government from shutting down once again.

H. Res. 969 is a measure that must be opposed for the reasons stated below.

As it pertains to H.R. 6914, this bill requires higher education institutions that participate in federal education programs to disseminate information on the rights and resources afforded to prospective, full- and part-time students who are pregnant or may become pregnant to encourage them to carry their pregnancy to term.

These institutions would be required to share this information by email at the start of each academic year, in student handbooks, at each orientation for enrolled students, at student health and counseling centers, and on the school's website.

A list of anti-abortion "findings" in the bill insinuate that women who have an abortion are at risk of developing mental health issues, abusing drugs and alcohol, and becoming suicidal.

Amendments in committee offered to make it clear that schools are still allowed to disseminate information on access to sexual and reproductive health services and the rights, protections, and accommodation afforded to students under Title IX were voted down by Republicans on the Committee.

As it pertains to H.R. 6918, this bill prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from restricting funding to pregnancy centers, which are defined as any organization that "supports protecting the life of the mother and unborn child" and "offers resources and services to mothers, fathers, and families."

This legislation redirects critical funding to antiabortion facilities, which includes so-called "crisis pregnancy centers," that operate under the guise of legitimate health care providers.

At a time when women and girls' reproductive health care is already under attack from Republicans across the country, my colleagues across the aisle want to go even further by taking money from legitimate providers and redistributing it to these centers whose staff are not required to have any medical credentials.

Additionally, it must be noted that these harmful bills are futile attempts that will be vetoed by this Administration.

As we know, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 6914 and H.R. 6918.

As highlighted in the White House Statement of Administrative Policy (SAP), the Administration clearly stated its opposition to H.R. 6914 in its current form.

Existing federal civil rights laws have long prohibited discrimination against students on

the basis of pregnancy and related conditions, and institutions of higher education are already required to provide reasonable modifications to pregnant students—from modified class schedules to medical leave.

The Administration stated that it will continue taking action to ensure that students know their rights under federal law and have access to the comprehensive, evidence-based information and resources they need to make informed decisions about their health care.

And as highlighted by the White House in its SAP to H.R. 6918, contrary to the purported purpose of this bill, it would divert federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds from effective supports for pregnant and parenting women and families.

Indeed, the bill seeks to prevent the Department of Health and Human Services from even considering commonsense program integrity measures that ensure that the use of federal TANF funds is consistent with federal law and the long-standing purposes set by Congress.

Members of Congress from both parties have recognized the importance of ensuring that federal TANF funds serve their intended purposes, and the Department's proposal would merely ensure that federal TANF funds are used consistent with the statutory requirements.

I stand with the Administration in stating that we remain committed to supporting the economic security, health, and well-being of women and families across the country, and I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make this commitment as well.

As it pertains to H. Res. 957, this resolution does nothing to address legitimate issues at the southern border—instead, it repeats an old list of hyperbolic Republican talking points on immigration.

Rather than working constructively to address these issues, House Republicans continue to make the evidence-free argument that President Biden, Vice President Harris, and Secretary Mayorkas have intentionally created a "national security and public safety crisis" at the southern border.

This bill peddles the false narrative that President Biden has an open-borders policy and villainizes immigrants fleeing dangerous situations.

And it does nothing to advance common sense solutions to improve our immigration system like creating better legal pathways, increasing processing capacity at ports of entry, or funding more immigration judges to reduce the asylum backlog.

It is truly shameful that just days until a government shutdown, my Republican colleagues continue to waste time with a resolution that repeats the same, tired, inaccurate talking points on immigration and the border.

Once again, Republicans talk a big game when it comes to immigration and border security—but instead of trying to pass thoughtful and bipartisan legislation that might fix the problems in our immigration system, their resolution accomplishes nothing.

Let's look at the facts.

Today, there are approximately 38,000 people in immigration detention, which is 4,000 more than what DHS is funded for and roughly what the Trump administration averaged in Fiscal Year 2018.

The Biden administration has also significantly increased removals (in ways that many in our caucus worry violates due process).

Since the end of Title 42 last year, the Biden administration has removed or returned to Mexico over 470,000 individuals, including over 78,000 individual members of family units, including children.

The total is nearly equivalent to the number of people removed in all of fiscal year 2019 under the Trump administration.

This is hardly an open border.

Time and again, my colleagues across the aisle have refused to support additional resources and personnel for the border.

In 2021, all but six current House Republicans voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal, which provided additional funding to ports of entry to combat smuggling of people and drugs, and for modernization.

All but two current House Republicans voted against providing robust funding for Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and border security operations in the Fiscal Year 2023 appropriations omnibus legislation.

That bill provided more than \$17 billion to CBP, including funding for an additional 300 U.S. Border Patrol agents—the first increase since 2011.

The omnibus also included \$60 million to hire 125 CBP officers and \$70 million for non-intrusive inspection technology to detect narcotics and firearms at ports of entry.

In October of 2023, the Biden administration sent Congress a supplemental funding request, which included an additional \$13.6 billion for border security.

Yet House Republicans refuse to schedule a vote on this funding request, which would provide the Biden administration the resources it needs to secure the border and provide additional support for communities receiving migrants.

More specifically, this supplemental funding would pay for the following:

- an additional 1,300 Border Patrol agents;
- 375 immigration judges and 1,600 asylum officers to speed up processing of asylum claims;
- 1,000 CBP officers with a focus on countering fentanyl;
- new detection technology for ports of entry;
- additional investigative capabilities to combat fentanyl trafficking; and
- \$1.4 billion more in grants to help communities receiving migrants, among other investments.

Democrats have put forward good faith bipartisan solutions to actually secure the border by expanding lawful pathways to relieve pressure on the border and adequately fund government agencies.

By forcing a vote on a meaningless resolution filled with empty rhetoric, Republicans are showing they have no real solutions to address the border. Members should not take the bait.

In sum, H. Res. 969, the resolution providing for debate on these above stated bills (H.R. 6914, H.R. 6918, and H. Res. 957), is a pitiful attempt to continue the politicization of our government's ability to function and to dismantle rights and protections currently in place for the Americans across the country.

All a vote would do is put every Republican who supports it on record pushing this extreme agenda.

This is not what Congress should be focused on. Democrats and President Biden will stay focused on putting people over politics and keeping our government funded and functioning for the American people.

As such, I ask my colleagues to vote no on this shameful resolution providing for debate on these highly politicized and dangerous bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 969 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the 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 recommitt.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Ms. SCANLON. 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.

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 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of House Resolution 969; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant

to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6914, PREGNANT STUDENTS' RIGHTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6918, SUPPORTING PREGNANT AND PARENTING WOMEN AND FAMILIES ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 957, DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES, CONDEMNING THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CRISIS ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER, AND URGING PRESIDENT BIDEN TO END HIS ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 969) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6914) to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6918) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 957) denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 194, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—198

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Carey

Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad

Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin

Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost

Mast
McCaull
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar

NAYS—194
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tlaib	Trone	Wasserman
Tokuda	Underwood	Schultz
Tonko	Vargas	Watson Coleman
Torres (CA)	Vasquez	Wexton
Torres (NY)	Veasey	Williams (GA)
Trahan	Velázquez	

NOT VOTING—41

Bacon	Fulcher	Ogles
Blunt Rochester	Garcia, Mike	Phillips
Brownley	Gosar	Rogers (KY)
Cammack	Granger	Roy
Carter (LA)	Graves (MO)	Scalise
Cleaver	Hayes	Scholten
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Sessions
Costa	Kelly (MS)	Sewell
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Spanberger
Doggett	Lieu	Strong
Duarte	Massie	Waters
Emmer	Moore (WI)	Wild
Ezell	Nehls	Wilson (FL)
Fry	Norcross	

□ 1357

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.” 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.

Stated for:

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 11.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 11.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a rollcall vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 11.

Stated against:

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavailable to vote because of travel delays due to weather. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 11.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION’S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES, CONDEMNING THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CRISIS ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER, AND URGING PRESIDENT BIDEN TO END HIS ADMINISTRATION’S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 969, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 957) denouncing the Biden administration’s open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration’s open-borders policies, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 969, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 957

Whereas the United States is in the midst of the worst border security crisis in the Nation’s history;

Whereas, during every month of the Biden administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has encountered more than 100,000 illegal aliens along the southwest border;

Whereas the total number of illegal aliens encountered along the southwest border during the Biden administration exceeds 7 million;

Whereas the Biden administration has released at least 3.3 million of those illegal aliens into the interior of the United States;

Whereas, during the Biden administration, more than 1.7 million known illegal alien “gotaways” have successfully evaded U.S. Border Patrol along the southwest border;

Whereas, during the Biden administration, an untold number of unknown illegal alien “gotaways” have evaded detection along the southwest border;

Whereas the record 312 illegal aliens on the Terrorist Screening Dataset encountered by Border Patrol along the southwest border during the Biden administration represents a more than 2,700-percent increase when compared to the total number of such aliens encountered during all four years of the previous administration;

Whereas the Biden administration created the illegal alien crisis at the southwest border by terminating the Migrant Protection Protocols, halting border wall construction, abusing parole authority, mass releasing millions of illegal aliens into the country, and implementing policies that incentivize illegal immigration, among other actions;

Whereas the Biden administration systematically dismantled immigration enforcement and restricted the ability of immigration officials to deport aliens who violate United States law, ensuring relatively few aliens, including criminal aliens, are removed from the country;

Whereas the Biden administration’s lax immigration enforcement policies have resulted in numerous violent criminal aliens being released into United States communities;

Whereas the Biden administration’s lax border enforcement policies have allowedentanyl to saturate United States communities and kill Americans;

Whereas the Biden administration’s historic border crisis has made every State a border State;

Whereas the Biden administration refuses to use tools already at its disposal to end the border crisis; and

Whereas the Biden administration’s proposed solution to the historic border crisis—legislation to grant amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens—will do nothing but incentivize additional illegal immigration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) denounces the Biden administration’s open-borders policies;

(2) condemns the national security and public safety crisis that President Joe Biden, “Border Czar” Vice President Kamala Harris, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas, and other Biden administration officials have created along the southwest border; and

(3) urges President Biden to end his administration’s open-borders policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 957.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of H. Res. 957, denouncing the Biden administration’s open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwestern border, and urging President Biden to end his administration’s open-borders policies.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem at our southern border. I represent the First District of Texas, which is a rural district located in northeast Texas comprised of 17 counties. It borders Louisiana and Arkansas, and although it is not physically adjacent to the southern border, my district is directly impacted by the open-border policies of the Biden administration, as is every corner of America today.

The text of my proposed House resolution is simple, straightforward, and to the point. It denounces the Biden administration’s open-border policies, condemns the national security and public safety crisis caused by these policies, and urges President Biden to end them immediately.

Mr. Speaker, why do we need to actually have this resolution in the House today? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. It is for two primary reasons. One is because we need to admit that there is a problem. This House needs to admit that there is a problem on the border. Number two, we need to identify the source of the problem itself. Why do we have open borders? It is because of the policies of this administration.

Those two things today, to admit and to identify, will help lead us to a solution from this House body and across the three branches of government.

The border numbers do not lie. In fact, they tell a clear story about the depth of the crisis and the proximate cause rooted in the Biden administration policies.

Consider that the total number of illegal aliens encountered along the southern border since President Biden took office exceeds 7 million. At the same time, the Biden administration has released at least 3.3 million of those illegal aliens into the interior of the United States. This number is larger than the entire population of States like Nevada, Arkansas, and Kansas. In fact, it exceeds the combined populations of Wyoming, Vermont, Alaska, and North Dakota together.

Additionally, more than 1.7 million got-aways and an untold number of unknown illegal got-aways have successfully evaded capture by the U.S. Border Patrol along the southwestern border.

Mr. Speaker, 312 illegal aliens on the Terrorist Screening Dataset were encountered along the southwestern border since President Biden took office. By contrast, consider that during the 4 years of the prior administration, only 11 illegal aliens on that same list were encountered by Border Patrol.

If we look just at the last quarter, we see how depraved the situation is on the southwestern border. More than 785,000 migrant encounters have been reported just since the beginning of this fiscal year, and last month's record high, the first time ever in American history, was 300,000-plus encounters along the southwestern border.

In fiscal year 2023, 27,000 pounds of fentanyl were seized at the southern border. This is almost double what fiscal year 2022 brought at 14,700 pounds, and it is six times higher than in fiscal year 2020.

We have seen more than 150,000 unaccompanied minors cross over the U.S.-Mexico border, and reports indicate that we have lost contact with over 85,000 of those unaccompanied children.

It used to be that most of the migrants who were coming up to our southern border were from Mexico, but now the landscape has changed. In fiscal year 2022, migrants from Mexico crossing illegally made up just 33 percent. Now, individuals are coming from across the world, more than 150 countries, and many of those countries have direct ties with terrorism.

When I was down at Eagle Pass on the border several months ago, we were told that there were at least 27 countries with ties to terrorism that had immigrants come across that southern border who were encountered in the last couple of years. How astounding and how problematic for this country.

Despite the authority that the President has to fix these issues, he simply will not do it. What policies are we talking about? The current administration has ended the Migrant Protection Protocols and the remain in Mexico policy. We are told by border security people that if we reinstate just remain in Mexico, that could end up to 70 percent of the encounters that we see coming across the border.

The administration also has reinstated catch-and-release policies. They have suspended asylum cooperative agreements with other nations, such as El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. They have ignored existing restraints on the abuse of parole. They have halted necessary border wall construction. They have undermined the Immigration and Customs Enforcement's core mission by preventing them from deporting certain aliens who violate U.S. law. They have enabled use of smartphone apps to facilitate the release of border crossers into the United

States. Moreover, they have redirected Customs and Border Patrol agents to do ICE paperwork processing instead of focusing on law enforcement work.

In short, the current administration's policies have led to the numbers that we are seeing today, numbers like 2.5 million just in the last fiscal year, 2.3 million in the year before, and 1.74 million in the year before compared to numbers like 400,000 or 500,000 per year under the prior administration.

One is too many, but 2.5 million is egregious. It has led to situations like overcrowded classrooms and children trafficked to do work in industries unsuited for children—unsuited for anybody; millions of dollars in unpaid medical bills in hospitals across the U.S., which overwhelm first responders in border communities; homeless veterans who are getting kicked out of shelters in favor of illegal aliens; and even the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans by fentanyl.

□ 1415

Because of the increased fentanyl crisis, these effects are being felt in rural and metropolitan communities in both blue and red States.

As of the beginning of December, the city of Denver had spent over \$33 million to house, feed, and educate around 30,000 illegal aliens. Chicago residents are up in arms, as well, as are New York City residents. Their mayor says that this crisis will destroy the city.

In 2022, here is the number I was citing for you just a second ago—73,654 people died from fentanyl overdose in the U.S. This is more than double the amount of deaths in 2019 and the highest in American history.

Assaults on Border Patrol agents doubled just last year. Nevertheless, the Biden administration is doubling down on these open-border policies.

What will it take for them to wake up?

What will it take for us to find a solution for the border crisis?

There is a lot to be done. There are lots that can be done by this body and the Senate and across this government, but it starts with leadership in the White House, policy leadership in the White House to undo the current open-border policies and to return to the policies that were preventing this crisis before.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 957 denounces these open-border policies, condemns the national security and public crisis that we are seeing today because of that, and urges the President to end those policies immediately. The people of America deserve better. They deserve to have the sovereignty and the geographic borders of this Nation protected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this country is facing real problems. The right to bodily autonomy is under attack across the Na-

tion. There was a school shooting just 4 days into the new year, leading to the tragic death of an 11-year-old and the injury of 7 others.

Our immigration system cannot function because Congress has failed to reform it for over 30 years, and Republican hard-liners are threatening to shut down the government if we don't "shut down the border."

House Republicans are not working to respond to any of these problems as they are too busy fighting among themselves. Their historic dysfunction has even prompted multiple Members of their Conference to complain that they have nothing to campaign on.

Today's resolution is not going to help. This resolution will do nothing to solve the situation at the border. It proposes no solutions of any kind. In fact, this resolution is nothing more than a highlight reel of the Republican talking points on immigration that we have heard over and over from Republicans since President Biden was sworn into office.

Let me say once again: The border is not open. The Biden administration has been removing people at a record clip over the last few months, restricting asylum with a new regulation, and placing thousands of families in expedited removal.

Since the end of title 42 last May, the Biden administration has removed or returned nearly a half million individuals. That is more than the number of people removed in all of fiscal year 2019 under the Trump administration.

However, because President Biden isn't saying that he wants to shoot migrants trying to cross the border, like Governors Abbott and DeSantis have, Republicans don't think he is doing enough.

Further, despite my colleagues' claims, fentanyl is largely not coming into this country between ports of entry. More than 90 percent of fentanyl interdicted is stopped at ports of entry where cartels attempted to smuggle it in through primarily vehicles driven by American citizens.

I am not sure how anyone can say the border is open.

On top of this, at every turn, Republicans have voted against giving the administration the resources it needs to do its job. Nearly every current House Republican voted against the bipartisan infrastructure deal in the fiscal year 2023 omnibus.

Both of these bills provided significant additional funding to increase staffing and modernize ports of entry to combat the smuggling of people and drugs.

We need to work together to address our broken immigration system. Right now we have a system where many, many people come into this country, present themselves to Border Patrol or not. They are apprehended. They claim asylum under our law. They are entitled to a hearing before an immigration judge, but because we don't have enough asylum officers and immigration judges, their case isn't heard for

years, so they are told to come back in 4 years or whatever for their hearing, and the Republicans call this catch and release.

If the Biden administration's proposals for funding for more border guards, more CBP people, more asylum and immigration judges would be approved, then these claims could be adjudicated in a matter of weeks, not years. Those entitled to asylum would be granted it in weeks and would be permitted to work, and those not entitled to it would be swiftly deported.

However, due to the lack of resources caused by Republican insistence on voting against those resources, this doesn't happen, and we have the catch and release system and millions of people staying in this country when they shouldn't entirely because of the Republicans, and then they say it is President Biden's open border policy.

We need to work together to address our broken immigration system. Unfortunately, House Republicans insist they will only consider H.R. 2, their fantasy, draconian, enforcement-only bill which stands no chance of passage in the Senate.

Real solutions require compromise, but MAGA Republicans aren't interested in compromise. What they are interested in is passing bills like the one before us today. I should say resolutions. This is not a bill.

This resolution is nothing but empty rhetoric designed to score cheap political points that bring us no closer to meaningful reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I hope we can get to serious work, but meanwhile, we should oppose this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I get a kick out of listening to the gentleman from New York who doesn't know a darn thing about the border crisis and gets to stand up and say: Oh, by golly, 90 percent of the fentanyl they are catching right there is in the port of entry.

Do you know why they catch it at the port of entry? Because that is where you have x-rays for the vehicles coming in. You have dogs that sniff. Most of the vehicles are getting picked up and looked at. It is the same with the pedestrians coming across.

Do you know why you don't find it between the ports of entry where 1.9 million people have come across the border, Mr. Speaker? You know why they don't find it? Let's say, right now if you are on the Tohono O'odham reservation, they have 62 miles right there along the border. You can drive that, and you are going to see maybe one or two agents in that entire area.

Do you know why? Because the rest of them are processing all of the people that the agents have had to encounter. They are out at these facilities.

When I was down in Lukeville right before Christmas, I was standing there

and I asked, hey, where you from? Guinea. How about you? Burkina Faso. How about you? Senegal. How about you? India. How about you? Pakistan. They are coming from all over the world to Lukeville, Arizona.

I happened to be there during a 2-week period where 30,000 encounters took place in that area alone. Oh, yeah, this border is secure. It is closed. What they don't tell you is that you have got a bunch of people coming in between the ports of entry that we can't even catch.

When I was down in Lukeville, we couldn't catch them. Why can't we catch them? We sense them. In some places we have sensors. Why couldn't we catch them? As I drove along for miles along that border, I didn't see a single agent. Why? Because they are all back at the facility processing. That is what they are doing. That is what these guys have done. That is what the Democrats have done.

When they say, parole is a good thing, the statute is real clear: It is supposed to be particularized. It is supposed to be case by case.

We actually heard in Oversight today that the million-plus people who have received parole are all being adjudicated on a case-by-case basis. I asked the witness: Have you ever been down there and watched the process before they grant somebody parole? I saw it on video. Go with me sometimes. Stand down there, visit, watch it, and you will be stunned to know that there is virtually no vetting whatsoever. Why? We are relying on those individuals to tell us where they are from and who they are. That is how open this border is.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that the gentleman from New York also explained the reason that they support this illegal migration is because they want people to pick our vegetables. That is how they view people coming in from all around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do so, as well.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the reason the gentleman from Arizona couldn't find any Border Patrol agents is because Republicans have refused to vote the appropriations to greatly increase the number of Border Patrol agents that the Biden administration has proposed.

We know there aren't enough Border Patrol agents. The administration knows this. The administration has proposed funding for many more Border Patrol agents, but the Republicans have refused to vote for it. Then they complain that they can't find Border Patrol agents along the border.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), the ranking Democrat on the Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement Subcommittee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 957.

Today, the Republican majority has brought up a pointless resolution that does nothing to address the situation at the border and repeats the same tired and untrue talking points about the border.

I, too, want to be clear: The border is not open. No matter how many times the Republicans repeat it, it doesn't make it true. Every time Republicans go on television with these false claims, the only people that are being empowered by those false claims are the cartels who use those false claims to then entice families to come to the border believing that it is open.

The fact is that Republicans have not had any interest in doing anything to fix the border because they want to keep chaos at the border until the election. They want to use immigrants as a political tool to ramp up fear and xenophobia in the run-up to the election.

Don't just take it from me, Mr. Speaker. Take it from my Republican colleagues themselves. On the issue of immigration, Representative NEHLS said: "I'm not willing to do too damn much right now to help a Democrat and to help Joe Biden's approval rating."

On the issue of holding Ukraine aid hostage for unworkable border policies, Representative CRENSHAW said: "Some might even be afraid of giving up the border as a campaign issue. They don't want a solution." That is from Republicans, not from Democrats.

That is the truth. There are real changes that are needed to immigration policies that haven't been updated in 30 years. Some even have bipartisan support, but none of them have moved because Republicans don't really want a solution to this. That is why time and time again when Republicans had a chance to support more resources and personnel for the border, they voted "no."

In 2021 and 2023, nearly every current House Republican voted against providing additional funding to increase staffing and resources at ports of entry to combat smuggling of people and drugs.

When my colleague from Arizona says that everyone is coming to the border, he is not wrong in that we have taken away all of the legal pathways for people to actually be able to come here and the only one that seems to be remaining open is now the border.

When he says that agents aren't out there, it is because they are processing; then you should want to fund agents to be able to process so that we can have border agents that are out in the field doing the work that they need.

The President's supplemental funding request for the border actually does include more money for immigration judges and asylum officers that would help process people in a legal and orderly fashion. It has money for cities to be able to help people work and support themselves as they wait for their immigration papers to be processed.

Furthermore, we could pass the American Dream and Promise Act and

the Farm Worker Modernization Act, which are both bipartisan, to help bring real solutions to a broken immigration system.

□ 1430

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. However, Republicans won't agree to that. Why? Because it would help make the situation at the border better, and they don't want that under any circumstance.

They would rather continue the cruelty:

The cruelty of seeing migrants fleeing horrific circumstances thanks to Republican Governors who use their own military to block Border Patrol agents from doing their jobs and saving lives;

The cruelty of blaming immigrants for everything just to try and win elections;

The cruelty of separating mothers from their babies.

That is the extreme Republican playbook.

Let's stop wasting everyone's time with this empty rhetoric and work on some real solutions. Vote "no" on this fact-free resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, a nation without borders is not a nation at all.

Currently, we have an administration that prioritizes illegal immigrants over American citizens, over our own constituents.

Since President Biden took office, more than 8 million illegal immigrants have entered our country without consequence; 300,000 since December alone. Within months, there will be more illegal immigrants than the population of my home State of New Jersey, a State that would rank tenth in population made up of illegals.

Yet, this President, Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, and my Democratic colleagues continue to deny that the crisis even exists, allowing millions of illegal immigrants, many from countries that hate America, threatens our national security, and it is wrong.

Using taxpayer dollars to give illegal immigrants free healthcare and making Americans pay for it is wrong.

Sacrificing the education of our American children to turn their schools into shelters for illegal immigrants is wrong.

Cutting public safety funding to pay for services like free housing, free legal aid, and welfare for illegal immigrants that many Americans struggle to afford themselves is wrong.

College education subsidies for illegal immigrants is wrong.

Those on the terror watch list slipping through our borders is wrong.

Sanctuary State status, sanctuary city status is wrong.

Standing idly by while tens of thousands of Americans, American young people, die at the hands of illicit fentanyl that is flowing freely across our border is wrong.

President Biden and this administration have had the power to stop it, but they refuse. Our Democratic colleagues had a chance to stop it by voting for H.R. 2, but they refused.

Four years ago this didn't exist, and now our Senate colleagues have refused to take up H.R. 2 and are working to increase incentives for illegal immigrants to come into our country.

We need to get serious. Those responsible must be held accountable, and once again I demand that this administration, for once, put American people first.

I hope and I pray that everyone will vote for this good resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleagues on this floor that what is really wrong is to misstate the problem, the facts to the American public.

I have been to the border numerous times in the last year as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Border Security and Enforcement. I just got back from Latin America.

I have spoken to the border guards at our border. Do you know what they have told me? They need relief. They need resources. They are tired of working overtime, two double shifts, not enough personnel, not enough resources, not enough technology. That is the answer to the problem.

The problem isn't an open border. The border is not open. The problem is a worldwide refugee challenge. Italy, Greece, Germany, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico all have a problem.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, the solution is simple. Let's fund additional resources for our borders, for border security. Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans are joining the President in negotiating a solution. House Democrats are there. I ask my colleagues across the aisle, join us. Let's come up with a solution. America deserves solutions, not political statements.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY).

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation at the southern border is utterly untenable. It is an urgent national security and public safety crisis. Everyone knows it. The American people know it. Members on both sides of the aisle in this House know it, and the President sure ought to know it.

What we have seen is absolutely beyond anything we have ever seen before. In the 3 years of this administra-

tion, there have been 6.7 million illegal border crossings and 1.7 million gotaways, folks that just evaded detection by Border Patrol. In the last month, we had days where there were 10,000 illegal crossings in a single day.

These numbers are staggering, and they are unprecedented, but what is the meaning of those numbers? On the one hand, it has been an absolute bonanza for the cartels. On the other hand, it has been an absolute tragedy for the American people, as we have truly incredible amounts of fentanyl coming into the country, taking the lives of young people in every community in our country every day. We have more and more people suffering through the horror of human trafficking and being victimized. We have growing national security risks every day with the increasing likelihood of terrorists coming into this country, putting all Americans at risk.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't brain surgery. We know what a secure border looks like. The House has passed legislation, the Secure the Border Act, with commonsense reforms, beefing up our border security with physical barriers, with technology, with Border Patrol, with commonsense legal reforms to the parole and the asylum process, even reinstating remain in Mexico. That one simple step would solve a good portion of this problem.

This should not be a political issue. It is not a partisan issue. It is a basic matter of governance. It is the most basic thing that Americans ought to be able to expect from our government. It is the most basic responsibility of a civil society and of a nation-state.

That is why Americans—Democrat, Republican, Independent, it doesn't matter—are urgently calling for change. This resolution gives voice to that call for change, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent El Paso, Texas, a border community, and I rise today in strong opposition to this resolution, which is nothing more than a collection of Republican talking points.

Let's be clear: Reforming our outdated immigration laws is our responsibility, a congressional responsibility, and it is our responsibility to do so in a way that actually works and doesn't sacrifice our values.

Some Republicans prefer to go on TV to complain, and others openly acknowledge they don't want a solution, including the Speaker of the House, who says he wants to wait until after the election.

To those who claim their unworkable Secure the Border Act is a solution, please read your bill. You will see that fundamental to it is that Mexico will accept every single migrant the U.S. sends to them. That has never happened. It will never happen. Therefore, H.R. 2 is nothing more than a fantasy for you all.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, for those Republicans who are tired of complaining and really want a solution, please join our bipartisan coalition, a coalition that worked on real solutions, legislative solutions. It is called the Dignity Act of 2023. It addresses the border and beyond and does it in a way that doesn't sacrifice our values. Please join us. Let's fix this together because we can.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce President Biden's open border policies that have fueled the invasion—I repeat invasion—of our country through our southern border. I wonder how many of my liberal friends across the aisle have actually even been to the border.

Let us be clear: This is a crisis of Biden's making. He has not been to the border nor has Vice President HARRIS been to the border. They have been to a parking lot in El Paso, Texas, and that is as good as they could do.

For over 3 years now, Biden has ignored calls from the American people to secure our border and protect American lives. This administration's failed policies have allowed over 8 million illegal immigrants to cross into our country, forcing border States such as my home State of Texas to take matters into their own hands, only to be attacked by Biden's out-of-reach DOJ and be sued for protecting the lives of Texans.

It is time President Biden and his administration are held accountable for the lack of action at our southern border.

From my very first day, I have fought against the radical left's open border and pro-amnesty policies and the House Republicans have done their job with real solutions and passed H.R. 2 to fully fund and secure our border, but that too has been ignored by Senator SCHUMER and President Biden.

This is not the border between New York and New Jersey. It is totally different. Some don't see it that way. Today, we take another stand. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 957 to denounce President Biden's open border policies. In God we trust.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I am very glad that my colleagues, and some from Texas, want to have the real truth discussed on this floor.

The real truth is that President Biden has not fostered nor encouraged

open borders. In fact, the United States does not have open borders.

It would be truly an act of real leadership if Republicans would work with Democrats and the present administration to do as was done during the Reagan administration when, yes, whether you agreed or disagreed, immigration laws were passed. If this Republican contingent of Members, House and Senate, would work, we would find a resolution to some of the concerns that we have.

It is very clear that the impeachment of Secretary Mayorkas is not a solution. The present resolution that we have is not a solution.

Today, there are approximately 38,000 people in immigration detention, which is 4,000 more than what DHS is funded for. People without facts don't realize, somewhat similar to Trump, many of us are concerned about due process rights, but when accusations are made about one party is better than another, that is not true. Of course, there were those removed under title 42, and the Biden administration did that when that law was in place. The total is nearly equivalent to the number of people removed in all of fiscal 2019 in the past administration.

However, this administration wants to put forward reasonable and effective legislation so that we will get an additional 1,300 Border Patrol agents, 375 immigration judges, 1,600 asylum officers to speed up processing of asylum claims, 1,000 CBP officers, new detection technology for ports of entry, additional investigative capabilities to combat fentanyl trafficking, and \$1.4 billion more to help communities receiving migrants.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, quickly, fentanyl is not an immigration issue. It is a criminal issue, a crime issue. It is where we have to come together with our law enforcement across America.

What I will say, the utilization of State laws that effectively are not governed by the Constitution, States do not have immigration authority, and blocking the Border Patrol is not an effective immigration tool. Causing a mother and two of her children to die is not an immigration tool. I don't want to be a part of it.

I want to be a part of the work that the President is doing. I thank the President and Vice President. I want this House to be helping in this work so that we can, in fact, have border solutions that work, where visas are able to be given to the appropriate people.

Limiting or removing parole does not work.

Additionally, 8.3 million relatives of U.S. citizens and legal residents are awaiting a green card. That does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article written by David J. Bier ti-

led: "8.3 Million Relatives of U.S. Citizens & Legal Residents Awaited Green Cards in 2022."

[May 17, 2023]

8.3 MILLION RELATIVES OF U.S. CITIZENS & LEGAL RESIDENTS AWAITED GREEN CARDS IN 2022

(By David J. Bier)

The United States hit a new record of about 8.3 million immigrants at various stages in its family-sponsored permanent residence process in 2022—an increase of nearly 1 million since 2019. The staggering number of pending cases is primarily the result of outdated caps on green cards, but processing delays are also affecting a substantial number of applicants.

The U.S. immigration system's current caps came into effect in fiscal year 1992. Figure 1 breaks down the family-based backlog into its two main categories: immediate relatives ("uncapped") and family preference immigrants ("capped") from 1992 to 2022. Immediate relatives—spouses, minor children, and parents of adult U.S. citizens—have no *direct* cap (though their admissions reduce the cap for the family preference (or capped) immigrants from 480,000 to 226,000). The immediate relative backlog has increased from about 73,000 in 1992 to over 1 million in 2022.

Family preference immigrants are spouses and children of legal permanent residents, adult children of U.S. citizens, and siblings of adult U.S. citizens, as well as any spouses and minor children of those relatives. Immigrants who need a cap number available to apply for a green card made up about 86 percent of the family-based backlog in 2022. From 1992 to 2022, the number of capped family-sponsored immigrants stuck in the backlog increased from about 3.3 million to about 7.1 million. The cap is set at 226,000 annually.

These estimates differ significantly from the most commonly referenced source for information on the family-sponsored green card backlog: the State Department's annual immigrant visa waiting list report. The numbers from that report are shown in orange (Petition Approved-Wait Listed (Abroad)), but that report does not include several groups of applicants. It excludes the "immediate relative" or uncapped categories, anyone waiting to apply inside the United States, and—most importantly—anyone whose petition is yet to be adjudicated. As Figure 2 shows, 3.6 million had a sponsor's petition pending. This massive backlog in pending petitions is largely because of the government's correct view that it shouldn't waste resources adjudicating applications that will not result in a green card being issued thanks to the cap.

The overall cap is set at 226,000, but it is divided into 5 categories based on the immigrant's marital status and relationship to the U.S. sponsor:

1. F-1—Married adult children of U.S. citizens: 23,400
2. F-2A—Spouses and minor children of legal permanent residents: ~687,900
3. F-2B—Unmarried adult children of legal permanent residents: ~626,300
4. F-3—Unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens: 23,400
5. F-4—Siblings of U.S. citizens: 65,000

In addition, immigrants from each country have a separate limit. No single birthplace can receive more than 7 percent of the green cards, though 75 percent of the F-2A category aren't counted against the cap.

As a result of the country caps and category caps, applicants face wildly different potential wait times: anywhere from 6 years to 233 years (effectively infinite). As seen in Table 1, the odds of a new family-sponsor surviving to be able to act as a sponsor when

a green card is available under the cap is low in many category-country combinations. Virtually all new sponsors from Mexico in 2022—outside the F-2A category—will die before their family member receives a green card. In fact, nearly 40 percent of all new sponsors in 2022 and 58 percent of sponsors in non-F-2A categories will die before their relatives get to immigrate. Even if the sponsor survives for eternity, about 1.6 million immigrants currently in the backlog will die before receiving a green card.

Even the shortest wait for F-2A category—for spouses and minor children of green card holders—is unconscionable. 6 to 10 years to wait to be with your nuclear family? This would be unimaginable in nearly all developed democracies. The United States stands apart in having some of the most restrictive immigration laws among wealthy countries.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Restricting immigration and parole is a lose-lose situation, as is rejecting DACA young people who are, in fact, ready to be paramedics, lawyers, doctors, teachers.

The White House calls on Congress to advance critical national security.

All of this is what President Biden is doing, and I would make the argument that this is what we should be doing in order to have real immigration reform. I ask that we do not support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 957—denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies.

This resolution is yet another shameful effort to distract the American people with unviable solutions for immigration and border control—all in the face of inaction to prevent our government from shutting down once again.

This resolution does nothing to address legitimate issues at the southern border—instead, it repeats an old list of hyperbolic Republican talking points on immigration.

Rather than working constructively to address these issues, House Republicans continue to make the evidence-free argument that President Biden, Vice President Harris, and Secretary Mayorkas have intentionally created a “national security and public safety crisis” at the southern border.

This bill peddles the false narrative that President Biden has an open-borders policy and villainizes immigrants fleeing dangerous situations.

And it does nothing to advance common sense solutions to improve our immigration system like creating better legal pathways, increasing processing capacity at ports of entry, or funding more immigration judges to reduce the asylum backlog.

It is truly shameful that just days until a government shutdown, my Republican colleagues continue to waste time with a resolution that repeats the same, tired, inaccurate talking points on immigration and the border.

Once again, Republicans talk a big game when it comes to immigration and border security—but instead of trying to pass thoughtful and bipartisan legislation that might fix the problems in our immigration system, their resolution accomplishes nothing.

Let's look at the facts.

Today, there are approximately 38,000 people in immigration detention, which is 4,000

more than what DHS is funded for and roughly what the Trump administration averaged in Fiscal Year 2018.

The Biden administration has also significantly increased removals (in ways that many in our caucus worry violates due process).

Since the end of Title 42 last year, the Biden administration has removed or returned to Mexico over 470,000 individuals, including over 78,000 individual members of family units, including children.

The total is nearly equivalent to the number of people removed in ALL of fiscal year 2019 under the Trump administration.

This is hardly an open border.

Time and again, my colleagues across the aisle have refused to support additional resources and personnel for the border.

In 2021, all but six current House Republicans voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal, which provided additional funding to ports of entry to combat smuggling of people and drugs, and for modernization.

All but two current House Republicans voted against providing robust funding for Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and border security operations in the Fiscal Year 2023 appropriations omnibus legislation.

That bill provided more than \$17 billion to CBP, including funding for an additional 300 U.S. Border Patrol agents—the first increase since 2011.

The omnibus also included \$60 million to hire 125 CBP officers and \$70 million for non-intrusive inspection technology to detect narcotics and firearms at ports of entry.

In October of 2023, the Biden administration sent Congress a supplemental funding request, which included an additional \$13.6 billion for border security.

Yet House Republicans refuse to schedule a vote on this funding request, which would provide the Biden administration the resources it needs to secure the border and provide additional support for communities receiving migrants.

More specifically, this supplemental funding would pay for the following:

an additional 1,300 Border Patrol agents;

375 immigration judges and 1,600 asylum officers to speed up processing of asylum claims;

1,000 CBP officers with a focus on counter-fentanyl;

new detection technology for ports of entry;

additional investigative capabilities to combat fentanyl trafficking; and

\$1.4 billion more in grants to help communities receiving migrants, among other investments.

Democrats have put forward good faith bipartisan solutions to actually secure the border by expanding lawful pathways to relieve pressure on the border and adequately fund government agencies.

By forcing a vote on a meaningless resolution filled with empty rhetoric, Republicans are showing they have no real solutions to address the border. Members should not take the bait.

In sum, this resolution is a pitiful attempt to continue the politicization of our government's ability to function.

All a vote would do is put every Republican who supports it on record pushing this extreme agenda.

This is not what Congress should be focused on. Democrats and President Biden will

stay focused on putting people over politics and keeping our government funded and functioning for the American people.

As such, I ask my colleagues to vote NO on this shameful resolution providing for debate on these highly politicized and dangerous bills.

□ 1445

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, if we were to ask the cartels to design a border security apparatus for the United States, it would look very much like the one the Biden administration has given us—just enough of the illusion of border security for them to be able to charge a hefty premium but not enough to actually stop their trafficking of humans and drugs into our country.

The truth is, the Biden administration has every single authority and more resources than the Trump administration had to secure the border, but they refuse to do so. They blame Texas. They blame us in Congress by saying they need more money.

As one Border Patrol agent I talked to just 2 weeks ago on the border said, it is like we are holding a bucket in front of an open fire hydrant, and they keep asking for more buckets. We need to cap the fire hydrant.

The problem from Congress' perspective is that we send over a check to the administration, and on the memo column, we put “border security,” but this administration has taken that check, cashed it, and used it to aid and abet cartels with human trafficking and drug trafficking into our country. We have to stop this.

Money that is set aside for natural disasters to help Americans through FEMA goes to help NGOs, this entire cottage industry where cartels bring migrants to our country. Our border security apparatus, along with NGOs and Federal taxpayer funding, is then used to transport them throughout the country, where many times the cartels pick up that relationship and keep migrants in indentured servitude and as sex slaves. We cannot continue to allow this to happen.

What is happening when we talk about processing who is coming across the border right now? Primarily, it is military-age single adults.

When our border security has to collapse to a processing center, it leaves hundreds of miles open. It is where we have what we call known got-aways and, even more dangerous, the unknown got-aways that are coming across our border.

We have no idea what is happening. We have to secure our border. It is a humanitarian issue. It is a national security issue.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H. Res. 957.

I have a question. If we have open borders, which is what I hear on the

Homeland Security Committee all the time, then let me ask this question: Why are people dying—children—in the Rio Grande while attempting to enter our country?

Let me ask another question. Why are there over 38,000 people right now sitting in immigration detention? If the borders are open, why are families living in fear of separation by deportation?

We know many of them because they go to church with us—at least, I go to church with some of those immigrant families.

Republicans are not serious about making real policy change because if they were, they would do a couple of the things that you see on my board here: allocate resources and capacity to make our borders safer; adopt smart tech to stem fentanyl brought into the U.S. through the ports of entry, much of it by American citizens; expedite and expand work permits to address our labor shortages that are driving inflation; and alleviate the conditions across Latin America that motivate families to migrate.

I have been to the border. My mother crossed the border with me. I can tell you that the borders are not, in fact, open.

I invite those serious about change, though, to support any or all of the solutions, the things that we were sent to do here—find solutions.

I invite you to abandon H. Res. 957, which is a political stunt, and those sham impeachments that make no meaningful policy progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to see through the political performance of 2023. Let's leave it in '23. We shouldn't have brought it into '24. Let's vote hell no to H. Res. 957.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my Texas colleague's resolution condemning the purposeful actions of the Biden administration and Secretary Mayorkas for turning over our Nation's security and southern border to Mexican cartels and ushering in a vast tsunami of over 10 million illegal immigrants, who are overwhelming our cities and our States.

Ten million illegal immigrants have come here illegally, yet my Democratic colleagues insist the border is closed, nothing to see here.

Indeed, the Biden administration has enabled a horrific new era of human slavery, forced labor, and child sex trafficking that is destroying the lives of tens of thousands of people and causing crime to escalate across America, all because they refuse to enforce our laws that are already written.

This isn't about creating a whole new immigration process. This is about forcing the administration and agencies to do their jobs.

Democrats admit that the President's additional funding request isn't about securing the border or national security, but it is about processing illegals faster into the country.

With more than 100,000 dead Americans from Chinese-supplied and Mexican cartel-trafficked fentanyl into our country, we need to understand that we are at war.

The Biden administration has gleefully brought this misery and destruction to the American people. The first job of the Federal Government is to protect our rights and protect our homeland. Unfortunately, under the Biden administration's disgraceful and dangerous actions, the American people are less safe. We face a national security catastrophe, and the leftists running the White House could not care less.

All of Congress should stand up for the American people, stand up for truly secure borders, and empower Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the brave men and women of our Border Patrol to do their jobs, lock down the border, and fight the Mexican cartels. This is what Americans want, and this is what Americans deserve.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that our immigration system is broken and so deteriorated. The last time that Congress passed any immigration reform, real reform, was in 1996. That was 28 years ago.

It is not just Democrats or Republicans to blame. Frankly, both parties have completely failed to find the courage to really, truly dig deep and fix our broken immigration system. Prison first, humanity later doesn't work. We have a responsibility to act.

I have to tell you, as a former immigration attorney, I remember U.S. citizens waiting 10 years or more just to bring their children over, and it is even longer for those in Mexico. Siblings wait 12, 15, even 20 years to unite with their family members. The system is completely broken and does not work for our country.

Our immigrant neighbors deserve to live with human dignity, stability, and equal recognition as valued members of communities.

Right now, we have so many U.S. citizens who cannot have their immigrant spouses adjust their status here in the United States. Look it up.

It is so important to understand that we need to protect our immigration process by actually making sure it meets the needs of our country. For far too long, millions of our immigrant neighbors have waited in limbo while they face numerous challenges and obstacles to obtain legal status and a pathway to citizenship.

Please remember that migrants and asylum seekers come to our country to escape violence and seek a better life for their families. They should not be vilified, locked in cages, or dehumanized.

I ask all of us to please stop with the fearmongering. These policies are rooted in racism, xenophobia, and white nationalism. We must change our course.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years, we have sounded the alarm about the crisis at our southern border. Yet, this can no longer be called a crisis.

What we face is an existential threat to our Nation, and it is a threat enabled by the Biden administration. Since taking office, the Biden administration has flouted and defied countless laws of the United States in order to prop up their blatantly illegal open-border policies.

Countless officials, including Biden, Vice President HARRIS, and Secretary of Homeland Security Mayorkas, have violated their oath of office by failing to faithfully discharge the duties of their offices and protect our Nation.

Under President Biden, 8 million illegal aliens have been stopped at our borders, and over 1.7 million known gotaways have entered the Nation, with an untold number of illegal aliens crossing undetected.

In total, Biden's border failures have resulted in illegal immigrant totals that are well over 14 times the entire population of the State of Wyoming.

The 94 executive actions taken in President Biden's first 100 days alone have decimated all progress made by the Trump administration to secure our Nation, ending the remain in Mexico program, halting construction on the border wall, and handicapping the ability of Federal law enforcement to actually enforce the law. These actions and dozens like them by the Biden administration have deliberately created an environment where the rule of law no longer exists, where fentanyl kills our children and friends, and where no community in America can be considered safe.

Our hospitals are incurring literally tens of millions of dollars in uncompensated care, and our farmers are going broke because of the destruction of their crops.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H. Res. 957 and call on the Biden administration to end their dangerous open-border policies that place Americans at risk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

We know from the newspapers and from talking to our colleagues in the Senate that Senate negotiators, Democrats and Republicans, are close to an agreement on a bill to provide for border security and an immigration bill.

The Speaker of the House has said that no matter what they agree to, he is not willing to look at it, that he is not willing to have this House pass any immigration bill whatsoever.

It ill behooves the Republicans to decry lack of border security when the Speaker of the House has announced that under no circumstances will they do anything about it.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my Texas colleague's H. Res. 957.

We all know the eye-watering figures: 10 million greater than the population of our seventh largest State, 1.7 million got-aways.

I want to focus on the 100,000 minors that we have literally lost in the interior of the United States, supposedly because under some treaty, we are not authorized to collect and store information on minors.

They are simply in the United States, who knows doing what—slave trade, indentured servitude. The cartels will collect their pound of flesh from the people who pay them to bring them across the border.

They are in every State, and they are in many of our cities. They are now collecting from indentured servants, from the sex trade, from the slavery that we have, from the fentanyl that they bring across and sell.

No new policy, no new law, no new tax dollars are a solution for this issue. It is the lawless behavior of the administration that must change.

If you want a solution, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to address the lawless behavior of this administration. That is the only solution to secure our border.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Speaker, we need to work together to address our broken immigration system. Enforcement alone cannot fix it. We know this because that approach has largely failed for three decades.

We need to update our immigration system so that it meets the needs of our country. We need a balanced, bipartisan approach that expands lawful pathways. This will help relieve pressure on the border and allow people to come to this country in an orderly and efficient way.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will accomplish none of that. Instead of reaching across the aisle in search of meaningful solutions, this resolution uses empty rhetoric to score cheap political points.

This resolution doesn't claim to accomplish anything for immigration reform. All it does is condemn President Biden.

In a Congress that has broken records for its lack of accomplishments, this is just one more useless bill that does nothing to help the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said today.

The border is not open. Mr. CORREA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. NADLER all said that.

Ms. JAYAPAL said: "They don't want a solution."

Mr. CORREA also said that we need more resources.

In fact, that was one of the mantras throughout the debate today from the other side of the aisle: more resources, more resources, more resources.

Let me just tell you, funding is not the issue. Funding is at an all-time high for our border protection. Despite border protection funding being at an all-time high, we are seeing record-high encounters at the border.

Why is that? There is one reason for that. It is the administration's current policies.

I have provided this analogy several times to individuals over the months leading up to this debate: When I was being elected, I had a flood at my house. I came home one night, and there was water all over the floor in my house.

My first reaction was not to stand there and say that I needed to go get a bunch of moppers to come in and mop up the water that is there. My first reaction was to find where the water leak was and turn off the valve to shut off the flood.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we need to do. That is what this resolution re-sounds the alarm about. We have been talking about this for years on this side of the aisle. Apparently, both sides of the aisle are not getting the message.

This resolution helps us to admit that there is a problem. It helps us identify the cause and solve it.

Mr. Speaker, if the other side of the aisle was in charge of the flood at my house, they would say: Well, let's just let the flood continue and hire a bunch more moppers to come in to try to clean it up.

That is simply not the solution. You have to turn that valve off first. You have to stop the incursion of water. In this case, you have to stop the incursion of migrants coming across our border illegally.

It is a matter of the rule of law. It is a matter of the sovereignty of the United States. It is a matter of enforcing those laws that are on the books today and, frankly, a matter of the will of the administration to put back in place those policies that were working before 2021 began.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded by the fact that even today we are hearing over and over again from the other side of the aisle that the border is not open. I urge my colleagues to go visit. Having been in Eagle Pass and El Paso, I can tell you that it is casual. That is the word I would use for it. Watching people, myself, coming across the bor-

der casually and then taken right to a processing center, and before you know it, out into the interior of the United States to who knows where and who knows when to be found again and who knows what they are going to do in our midst.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a rise of terrorism across this world. To allow our southern border to have the porous nature it does presently puts our Nation at risk. It is a national security issue that must be solved. We must have the will to do it.

Frankly, the Republicans have already proposed the right solution: H.R. 2.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be one of the original eight cosponsors of H.R. 2, and we need to pass that in its entirety.

We certainly need to work with Senate Democrats and Republicans and the administration to get that done, but before that happens and for the last 3 years what should have been happening is that the administration should have enforced the policies that the prior administration had in place to solve the problem once and for all to get us to a place where we can, in fact, have our sovereignty restored, our geographic borders protected, and the interior of the United States protected.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, while the do-nothing extreme MAGA Republican majority wastes the time of the Committee on Homeland Security with a phony, baseless impeachment "investigation," they occupy the House floor with a symbolic resolution equally as false.

Put simply, there are no so-called "open-borders policies" to denounce.

The Biden administration is, in fact, fulfilling its Constitutional responsibility to secure America's southern border. It is apprehending, processing, and removing individuals with no legal basis to remain in the United States in accordance with the law.

Instead of working with Democrats to solve the challenges along our southern border, the extreme MAGA Republicans who run the House of Representatives have consistently squandered opportunities to work across the aisle to solve the challenges facing our Nation.

Last Congress, they voted against funding for DHS, to include billions of dollars in increased funding for border security. Democrats, meanwhile, put people over politics and got those funding bills enacted into law.

Last year, they rejected 43 common-sense amendments during the Homeland Security Committee's markup of its portion of H.R. 2, the MAGA "Child Deportation Act," a bill which would villainize nonprofit organizations and punish local officials providing aid to the needy.

This year, instead of constructively participating in bipartisan negotiations on immigration reform and border security with the Biden administration and Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas, House Republicans are pursuing a sham impeachment of the Secretary for supposedly not doing his job.

Mr. Speaker, how would the extremists in the House Republican Conference even know

Secretary Mayorkas isn't performing his job? They're not showing up to do their job at the negotiating table.

Instead, dressed in polos and perfectly creased khakis, MAGA Republicans fly down to Texas for photo ops while the real work of legislating remains undone—hamstrung by the endless drama within the House Republican Conference.

The talented, hard-working agents and officers of Customs and Border Protection don't need more political photo ops or baseless impeachments or symbolic resolutions. They need resources.

House Republicans would rather shut down the government than give those with their boots on the ground what they need to get their job done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H. Res. 957 and reject extreme MAGA Republicans' empty gestures and false campaign rhetoric.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I share my Republican colleagues' strong support of H. Res. 957, to hold the Biden Administration accountable for their shameful and disastrous handling of our Nation's southern border. Every day, this Administration's open border policies are allowing illegal immigrants and drugs, including fentanyl, to pour into our country's communities—including many in Kentucky's 5th Congressional District. It must be stopped.

The President has outright refused to enforce the law, and Americans are suffering for it. Data has shown that drug seizures at the U.S.-Mexico border increased by over 58 percent from 2022–2023, not to mention the drugs and fentanyl that are going around our ports of entry. In 2022, fentanyl killed over 70,000 people and accounted for over 50 percent of all overdose deaths, which are only increasing because of this crisis.

I urge my colleague to stand together to condemn this Administration's shameful treatment of our southernmost border by passing this resolution.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 957. We have all seen what is unfolding on our southern border, and the humanitarian and security issues it raises. The complex problems facing our immigration system need comprehensive reform, not more rhetoric and demonization of immigrants.

But rather than working toward real solutions, this week House Republicans are bringing to the floor a partisan resolution condemning the Biden Administration over its supposed "open border policy." Mr. Speaker, there is no "open border." The Biden Administration has worked from its first day to ensure that everyone who arrives to the United States is treated fairly and humanely, while navigating within an outdated and broken immigration system. Congress has failed to pass any meaningful efforts to fix it for three decades.

The fact remains, the United States needs comprehensive immigration reform. Reform that is compassionate, fair, and at times firm. For years, businesses, law enforcement, and faith groups have reiterated the harms of the current immigration system. We do not need more resolutions that do nothing but parrot partisan talking points.

This Congress, Republicans have demonstrated no willingness to engage in finding solutions. In fact, instead of working toward

solutions, House Republicans are making the problem worse. The Biden Administration requested additional resources for the border in October of last year, including an additional 1,300 border patrol agents and 375 immigration judges, but Republicans refuse to allow a vote.

And just today, Speaker JOHNSON was quoted saying "I don't think now is the time for comprehensive immigration reform."

If now is not the time for action, when is? If, as this resolution claims, we are in "the midst of the worst border security crisis in the Nation's history," why is this not the time to discuss solutions? Republicans must stop using the immigration system as a political talking point and an election ploy. Congress must immediately take meaningful action to reform a broken immigration system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 969, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. MORAN. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECRUITING FAMILIES USING DATA ACT OF 2023

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3058) to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve foster and adoptive parent recruitment and retention, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3058

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 "Recruiting Families Using Data Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. STATE PLAN AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 422 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 622) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(7), by inserting "through the development and implementation of a family partnership plan which meets the requirements of subsection (d) for identification, recruitment, screening, licensing, support, and retention of

foster and adoptive families" after "are needed"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(d) FAMILY PARTNERSHIP PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (b)(7), the requirements for a family partnership plan (in this subsection referred to as the 'plan') are the following:

"(1) The plan is developed in consultation with birth, kinship, foster and adoptive families, community-based service providers, technical assistance providers, and youth with lived experience with foster care and adoption.

"(2) The plan describes—

"(A) how the State plans to identify, notify, engage, and support relatives (and others connected to the child) as potential placement resources for children;

"(B) how the State plans to develop and implement child-specific recruitment plans for every child in or entering foster care who needs a foster or adoptive family;

"(C) how the State plans to authentically engage children and youth in recruitment efforts on their behalf;

"(D) how the State plans to use data to establish goals, assess needs, measure progress, reduce unnecessary placements in congregate care, increase permanency, improve placement stability, increase the rate of kinship placements, improve recruitment and retention of families for teens, sibling groups, and other special populations, and align the composition of foster and adoptive families with the needs of children in or entering foster care; and

"(E) how the State will stand up or support foster family advisory boards for the purpose of improving recruitment and retention of foster and adoptive families.

"(3) The plan provides that, not less than annually, the State shall collect and report on the State's actual foster family capacity and congregate care utilization, including the number, demographics, and characteristics of licensed foster families, including prospective adoptive families, the number of such families that haven't received a placement or are not being fully utilized and the reasons therefor, and the number, demographics, and characteristics of children placed in congregate care in-State and out-of-State.

"(4) The plan includes, and shall update not less than annually, a summary of the most recent feedback from foster and adoptive parents and youth regarding licensure, training, support, and reasons why parents stop fostering or why adoptive or legal guardianship placements out of foster care fail or foster and such adoptive or legal guardianship families struggle to meet children's needs.

"(5) The plan includes, and shall update annually, a report on the State's analysis of specific challenges or barriers to recruiting, licensing, and utilizing families who reflect the racial and ethnic background of children in foster care in the State, and the State's efforts to overcome those challenges and barriers.

"(6) The plan includes such other information relating to foster and adoptive parent recruitment and retention as the Secretary may require."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 2024.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan approved under subpart 1 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by this subsection, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after

the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this subsection. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF INFORMATION ON FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE FAMILIES IN ANNUAL CHILD WELFARE OUTCOMES REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 479A(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)(C), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7)(B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) include in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (5) for fiscal year 2025 or any succeeding fiscal year—

“(A) State-by-State data on the number, demographics, and characteristics of foster and adoptive families in the State, and the number of potential foster and adoptive families not being utilized in the State and the reasons why;

“(B) a summary of the challenges of, and barriers to, being a foster or adoptive parent, including with respect to recruitment, licensure, engagement, retention, and why parents stop fostering, adoptions disrupt or dissolve, or foster or adoptive families struggle, as reported by States based on surveys of foster and adoptive parents; and

“(C) a summary of the challenges and barriers States reported on efforts to recruit a pool of families that reflect the racial and ethnic background of children in foster care in the State, and efforts to overcome those barriers.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3058, the Recruiting Families Using Data Act of 2023, supports States in addressing the nationwide shortage of foster homes.

In the United States of America, every child deserves a home. Unfortunately, our Nation's foster care system is facing enormous challenges, with a record number of children sleeping in social workers' offices, hotels, and hospitals because they have nowhere else to go.

Iowa lost more than 200 licensed foster care homes since 2019. Washington, D.C., lost nearly half of their foster homes since 2019. States like South Carolina have seen a 60 percent decline.

These foster homes are essential to providing vulnerable children with safe, loving homes, and we have to stop this dramatic decline.

We need to make it easier to find families who are willing and able to

foster children and those generous families who choose to foster to continue.

Unfortunately, the ability for States and nonprofits to respond to the challenges is limited by the shortage of information. We need to know why foster families quit fostering if we are going to make it easier to recruit and retain them. We need to be able to evaluate what the needs of foster families and their children are so that States can set goals for improvement and be able to evaluate whether they are making progress in meeting those goals.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the steps this bill takes to modernize child welfare by taking advantage of data to support States in their recruitment and retention of foster parents so children can be cared for in safe and loving homes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and I give a special thanks and shout-out to Representative KILDEE for his leadership on this bill and for the committee's work to strengthen the child welfare system.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking my colleague and friend, Mr. FEENSTRA, for his work on this legislation. I think we have proven once again that while we do have our divisions in this body and some divisions in this country, there are certain issues that bring us together across party lines and across different aspects of our society.

Mr. FEENSTRA and I, I think, proved that with our work on this legislation, along with other Members who have joined together to put this really important act together to help foster youth have a better path forward in life.

This legislation, as Mr. FEENSTRA said, is a commonsense approach to solving one of the problems that we see in the foster care system. It will improve the recruitment and retention of foster families so that we can get more kids into safe and loving homes.

Across the country, there is a severe shortage of foster parents, and retention of foster families, of foster parents, is a big part of the problem. Most foster parents stop fostering after just 1 year, and many stop fostering after their very first or second foster placement.

Under current law, States have the responsibility to develop plans, known as diligent recruitment plans, outlining the actions they will take to ensure that every kid in their care is connected to a family that meets their particular needs. However, a recent review conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services shows that these plans need significant reform and improvement.

States rarely use data to inform recruitment and retention strategies, and often, they fail to engage foster

parents or foster youth, the people who understand the system better than anyone, in developing those plans.

What this means is that States continue to have difficulty finding and keeping foster parents, which has devastating impacts for those foster kids.

The most recent Federal review of Michigan's foster care system cites countless reports of children sleeping in offices or hotels for weeks and months as they await placement in a foster home.

Our social workers are doing the best they can, stepping up to take care of these children when they don't have anyone else, but that is not the kind of home that any child deserves.

As we continue to grapple with this severe shortage of foster homes, we are also seeing a growing number of foster parents drop out of the system because they just aren't getting the support that they need.

In 2023, the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services reported that close to one-third of foster parents terminate their foster care licenses each year. This, of course, only puts more stress on a system that desperately needs more safe and loving homes.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation, the Recruiting Families Using Data Act, is the first step toward addressing this crisis. To help States better meet the needs of foster children in their care, the bill would replace the outdated diligent recruitment plans with family partnership plans that are developed in consultation with foster youth and their families; support foster family advisory boards, which give foster parents a voice in the policy development process; and, as the title of the bill suggests, use data to establish recruitment and retention goals and measure progress toward those goals.

This is a subject that is close to me. In my original career for almost a decade, I was a social worker working in this field. In fact, I was working in a residential agency for the most at-risk kids in our population, neglected and abused kids. So I know, from my own personal experience, the weaknesses in the system, and I know that fixing the system will require the expertise of the people who know it best.

The foster care system is known best by the people who are part of it, the families and the youth who have gone through it. By giving people a voice and using data that we derive from them and their experiences, we will find better ways to recruit and find retention strategies that really work.

While it doesn't solve the entire problem, this bill would make a significant improvement to the foster care system not just in my home State but all across the country.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK).

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3058, the Recruiting Families Using Data Act, introduced by Representative DAN KILDEE from the great State of Michigan.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation because we know all too well that protecting America's foster children starts by recruiting and retaining the best foster families to provide safe and loving homes.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer that we measure what we value. This bill takes a critical step to help States better meet the needs of the foster children in their care by replacing antiquated tactics with improved Family Partnership Plans to collect and utilize data to establish recruitment and retention goals while simultaneously tracking progress toward reaching these goals.

Even with the limited data that currently exists, we know that there is a severe shortage of foster parents across our country due to a lack of retention. By measuring what we value, we can better understand the root causes of low retention and help those willing to open their homes to those who need it the most.

We must never waver as a Congress and as a country to ensure America's foster families have what they need to keep our children safe and loved.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

I thank my colleague, Mr. FEENSTRA, for his work on this, as well as all my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee and throughout Congress for supporting this legislation.

As I said, there is much we need to do to improve the foster care system, to recognize the needs of foster youth, to make sure that they have a safe and loving home, to put them on a path to be the best versions of themselves. This is a step in that direction. I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Every year, thousands of families welcome foster children into their homes. Children in foster care need permanent, loving homes. Sadly, our Nation is facing a shortage of available foster homes, and children are left sleeping in hotels and hospitals and social workers' offices because they have nowhere else to go. These children need foster parents, and we need to show compassion and care for them as they face the trauma and hardship of being removed from their homes. We must do more to ensure that all children in foster care have safe and available placements.

This bill is so important that it has to get passed. I thank, again, Congressman KILDEE for all his work and sup-

port for this legislation. I also appreciate the comments that he just made. I truly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes 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:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5862; and

Adoption of H. Res. 957.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AUTHORITY OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION TO CONSOLIDATE, MODIFY, OR REORGANIZE CUSTOMS REVENUE FUNCTIONS

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 pass the bill (H.R. 5862) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 relating to authority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to consolidate, modify, or reorga-

nize Customs revenue functions, as amended, 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 motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 9, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]
YEAS—403

Adams	Cuellar	Hern
Aderholt	Curtis	Higgins (LA)
Aguilar	D'Esposito	Higgins (NY)
Alford	Dauids (KS)	Hill
Allen	Davidson	Hinson
Allred	Davis (IL)	Horsford
Amo	Davis (NC)	Houchin
Amodei	De La Cruz	Houlihan
Armstrong	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Arrington	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Auchincloss	DelBene	Hudson
Babin	Deluzio	Huffman
Baird	DeSaulnier	Huizenga
Balderson	Diaz-Balart	Hunt
Balint	Dingell	Issa
Banks	Doggett	Ivey
Barr	Donalds	Jackson (IL)
Barragán	Duarte	Jackson (NC)
Bean (FL)	Duncan	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Dunn (FL)	Jacobs
Bentz	Edwards	James
Bera	Ellzey	Jayapal
Bergman	Emmer	Jeffries
Beyer	Escobar	Johnson (GA)
Bice	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Biggs	Espallat	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Estes	Jordan
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Joyce (OH)
Bishop (NC)	Ezell	Joyce (PA)
Blumenauer	Fallon	Kamlager-Dove
Boebert	Feenstra	Kaptur
Bonamici	Ferguson	Kean (NJ)
Bost	Finstad	Keating
Bowman	Fischbach	Kelly (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Brown	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Khanna
Buck	Fletcher	Kigans (VA)
Bucshon	Flood	Kildee
Budzinski	Foster	Kiley
Burchett	Foushee	Kilmer
Burgess	Foxo	Kim (CA)
Bush	Frankel, Lois	Kim (NJ)
Calvert	Franklin, Scott	Krishnamoorthi
Cammack	Frost	Kuster
Caraveo	Fry	Kustoff
Carbajal	Fulcher	LaHood
Cárdenas	Gallagher	LaLota
Carey	Gallego	LaMalfa
Carl	Garamendi	Lamborn
Carson	Garbarino	Landsman
Carter (GA)	Garcia (IL)	Langworthy
Carter (LA)	Garcia (TX)	Larsen (WA)
Carter (TX)	Garcia, Robert	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Gimenez	Latta
Casar	Golden (ME)	LaTurner
Case	Goldman (NY)	Lawler
Casten	Gomez	Lee (CA)
Castor (FL)	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez,	Lee (NV)
Chavez-DeRemer	Vicente	Lee (PA)
Cherfilus-	Good (VA)	Leger Fernandez
McCormick	Gooden (TX)	Lesko
Chu	Gosar	Letlow
Ciscomani	Gottheimer	Levin
Clark (MA)	Granger	Lieu
Clarke (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lofgren
Cline	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Clyburn	Green (TN)	Lucas
Cohen	Green, Al (TX)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Greene (GA)	Luna
Collins	Griffith	Luttrell
Comer	Grijalva	Lynch
Connolly	Grothman	Mace
Correa	Guest	Magaziner
Courtney	Guthrie	Malliotakis
Craig	Hageman	Maloy
Crawford	Harder (CA)	Mann
Crenshaw	Harris	Manning
Crockett	Harshbarger	Mast
Crow	Hayes	Matsui

McBath
McCaul
McCain
McClellan
McClintock
McCormick
McGovern
McHenry
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger

Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil

Stube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Swallow
Sykes
Takano
Tennet
Thannedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES, CONDEMNING THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY CRISIS ALONG THE SOUTHWEST BORDER, AND URGING PRESIDENT BIDEN TO END HIS ADMINISTRATION'S OPEN-BORDERS POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 957) denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 187, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]
YEAS—225

Brecheen
Burlison
Cloud

Garcia, Mike
Himes
Massie
Meeks
Mooney
Moore (WI)
Norcross

Jackson (TX)
Norman
Perry

Ogles
Phillips
Rogers (KY)
Roy
Scalise
Turner

NOT VOTING—20

□ 1707

Messrs. GAETZ, CRANE, PERRY, and BURLISON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. TAKANO, TORRES of New York, and Mrs. TRAHAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was attending a bipartisan meeting at the White House with the President to discuss funding needs for our national security. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 12.

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

Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Luna
Golden (ME)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)

Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Landsman
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Moskowitz
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Owens
Palmer
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Sorensen

Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden

Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—187

Adams
Aguilar
Aمو
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Budzinski
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Correa
Courtney
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)

Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCormick
McGovern
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta

Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swallow
Sykes
Thannedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Bacon
Blunt Rochester
Brownley
Clever
Connolly
Costa
DesJarlais

Garcia, Mike
Massie
Meeks
Mooney
Moore (WI)
Norcross
Ogles

Payne
Phillips
Rogers (KY)
Roy
Scalise
Schneider
Takano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1714

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.

Stated against:

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall no. 13.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed three votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 11, "nay" on rollcall No. 12, and "yea" on rollcall No. 13.

HONORING WORLD WAR II
VETERAN JOHN WARD

(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 honor World War II veteran John Ward of Oil City, Pennsylvania, on his 100th birthday.

Mr. Ward enlisted in the U.S. Army at the age of 18 and participated in campaigns in Europe with the 405th Antiaircraft Gun Battalion. He saw time in Normandy and northern France, Germany, Belgium, and England, where he received numerous citations for his service to this Nation.

Mr. Ward said he has fond memories of his time in the Army, especially the people he met and the friendships he made. For a number of years, John and his late wife, Betty, enjoyed reunions of the 405th Battalion.

After he concluded his military service, John returned to Oil City and worked in the local steel plant for 39 years. He is a longtime devoted member of the Oil City Wesleyan Methodist Church. He was married to Betty for 72 years until her passing in 2019. They raised three children.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Mr. John Ward of Oil City a very happy 100th birthday and thank him for his service during World War II.

IN HONOR OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER
KING, JR.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the greatest Americans, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. King spent his life making sure all Americans were given the same rights regardless of color or creed. He had a dream. He had a dream the country would find a peaceful path to racial equality, and his dream attracted more than 250,000 people to Washington and the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

His work helped pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. These Acts restored rights to African Americans that had been denied

them for decades. For his work, Dr. King received a Nobel Peace Prize in 1964. For his work, he received assassination from a bullet.

If he had resorted to violence himself, none of these events would have happened, and we would not have the movement for equality we have today.

So let us take this week to honor the legacy of Dr. King and remember his legacy as we continue to fight for all rights of all Americans.

CALIFORNIANS DESERVE BETTER

(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, in my home State of California, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle there, the Democrats there, just know how to tax and spend other people's money.

Our State's massive \$100 billion budget surplus was wasted on far-left priorities. Now, California is facing at least a \$40 billion, maybe even a \$68 billion budget deficit in the coming year.

Instead of reckoning with these massive overspendings, our Governor Newsom is dipping into the State's reserves while delaying some of these program rollouts instead of making the necessary cuts and reductions in Big Government.

Governor Newsom is claiming California is in a fiscal emergency, yet he is still planning on giving millions of illegal immigrants free healthcare, including sex-change operations. He is not even delaying that idea, as well.

Of course, this healthcare for illegals won't actually be free. The taxpayers will pay, as you know. California has the highest top income tax rate of any State, some of the highest taxes in the country overall. Our tax dollars certainly don't go toward any projects that benefit Californians, such as much-needed water storage or fixing more of our crumbling freeways. Instead, we see more blackouts, wildfires, crumbling infrastructure, and social breakdowns in our cities. We must do better.

IN HONOR OF CAFE JUMPING
BEAN

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cafe Jumping Bean, a Latino-owned coffee shop in my district, on their 30th anniversary.

When then-26-year-old Eleazar Delgado was searching for a place for artists to meet in Pilsen, he realized that such a place was nonexistent on the southwest side of Chicago. So he took a chance and opened Pilsen's first coffee house, but not just any coffee shop; one featuring local artists and their local creations. From hosting cel-

list Yo-Yo Ma to local artwork displays, Cafe Jumping Bean has maintained its roots in a changing, diverse Pilsen and now has become a pillar in our community.

Whether you go for the chocolate mexicano or their famous Screaming Bean, one thing is certain: You will enjoy a taste of culture in a cup.

I wish a happy anniversary to Eleazar Delgado and Cafe Jumping Bean. Here is to the next 30 years of serving Pilsen and the larger community.

STEFANIK CENSURE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution to censure Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK for providing aid, comfort, and support to the rioters and insurrectionists who violently attacked this Capitol on January 6, 2021, in an effort to undermine our democracy and illegally stop the peaceful transfer of power.

Since that attempted coup, Ms. STEFANIK has repeatedly and persistently expressed support for the duly convicted insurrectionists. Last week, echoing the inflammatory language of criminal defendant Donald Trump, Ms. STEFANIK disgracefully referred to the January 6 insurrectionists in prison as "hostages."

Ms. STEFANIK's support of convicted criminals charged with offenses against the United States Government, including attempted violence against Members of this body, is simply unacceptable from a Member of Congress, nor is it acceptable for a Member of Congress who purports to oppose anti-Semitism to equate convicted insurrectionists with the more than 130 Israeli hostages who remain subject to horrific conditions in Gaza. She, therefore, must be censured.

BRING THEM HOME NOW

(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, holding tightly to her stuffed animal as long as she could, Hila, an innocent 13-year-old young Israeli girl, was taken hostage and endured a horrible experience in Hamas captivity. As the father of three boys, hearing her story and others was heart-wrenching.

Hila Rotem Shoshani spent 50 days in captivity after being kidnapped from her home in Kibbutz Be'eri, along with her mother and friend Emily, who was at a sleepover.

Young Hila saw and experienced things that no child should ever have to. It has been over 100 days, and the families left behind direly want their loved ones home. No family should

have to endure the anguish and separation and the uncertainty that Hila, her mother, and other families have experienced.

Bring them home now.

□ 1730

APPRECIATING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LLOYD AUSTIN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to register my sincere appreciation to Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin for his lifetime of exemplary service to our Nation in the U.S. military. I wish him a speedy recovery from his recent successful surgery.

Critics who took the first occasion to swing at him obviously have no self-control, no discretion, and no understanding of what a military officer at his level endures.

From his hospital bed, Secretary Austin expertly orchestrated an American-led strike against Houthi terrorists who threaten global commerce and put American lives at risk through their continued assault on civilian ships in the Red Sea.

Let us remain steadfast in our Nation's strategic interests at a most challenging time globally.

Mr. Speaker, if you wish to be constructive, work with Members to serve on a bipartisan basis on our Defense committees. Address your concerns through proper channels.

Why air ill-informed grievances on social media or cable news?

Team America must remain steadfast and of united purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Secretary Austin for his service.

OPPOSING THE GOP'S ANTIABORTION LEGISLATION

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the GOP's two anti-choice bills which are going to be on the House floor this week.

These two bills, like so much of the House GOP's legislation, claim to support women and our communities while doing the exact opposite through a thinly veiled attempt to further restrict and stigmatize abortion as they meanwhile work to gut access to reproductive care all across this country.

These policies are so unpopular that they are now hiding them in education bills like the ones that they are bringing to the floor this week, as nearly three dozen of our House Republican colleagues are now trying to walk back their support for national abortion bans.

Be that as it may, the American people are not fooled. Do not be fooled by

these bills. Our reproductive rights are under attack, and these two bills are part of that attempt to gut the rights of women.

That is why I will not only be voting "no" but hell no to these bills.

CHOOSING LIFE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this week, House Republicans are doing important work to support pregnant women and mothers. As thousands of people across the Nation join together this week to promote their pro-life cause, we are grateful for the chance to do our part on the legislative level and bring two critical bills to the floor, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

We are also continuing to hold the Biden administration accountable for their policy failures at the southern border. Time and time again we are up here talking about this. We are visiting the border. We are, as the House GOP, intently focused on making some what should be very simple fixes to be able to reduce the ability for the cartels to run the border and to set so many people up for failure with this entire topic. We are going to continue to sound this alarm.

Since President Biden has taken office, there have been 8 million illegal crossings nationwide and over 6.7 million encounters at the southern border. It is unacceptable, and we just passed a resolution denouncing the administration's open border policies that are threatening the safety of our communities.

These are important items and important legislative topics. We have several colleagues of mine here to share their thoughts on this approach.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) for the first remarks of the evening.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. MOORE of Utah, for his efforts here today and certainly to all of my colleagues for having an exchange and conversation that I think is vital for our country.

It is important that we always examine what is taking place across America, what is appropriate for the Federal Government to do, not to do, and how best to do what is good for the Amer-

ican people within certainly the Constitution and its parameters.

There is a program called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF. Many caseworkers across America are familiar with TANF, and beneficiaries are, as well.

As far as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, it has come about that the administration is excluding various women in need of care for their pregnancy if they seek care or conversations within the delivery method of a pregnancy center. I find this disturbing.

I have been inspired, actually, by the work that these pregnancy centers do in meeting the needs of women. If a woman finds herself in a crisis pregnancy, if they present information and they ultimately offer care and a friendship, if you will, to a person in need to make decisions in their interests, certainly the interests of a little one, then the administration excludes this care.

I think it is important to note that it is one thing to be pro-life and it is quite another to make sure that a child is cared for and receives what they need for nourishment and care, hopefully with the mother and hopefully, with the father, as well.

As we sort out all of these policies that we see coming and going here through this institution and through Congress in general, I think it is vital that we certainly uphold the purposes of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families in making sure that those in need receive the resources that they need and that they would select.

I would say that the administration's policies of excluding pregnancy centers is actually restricting a young mother, a prospective mother, from information and approaches that they would prefer to have.

So as we look at all of TANF and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, I hope that given the fact that we allow States much latitude in carrying out what they think they need to do with these tax dollars that flow through the Federal Government but ultimately from taxpayers, I think it is absolutely incumbent upon us to make sure that those dollars end up where they need to go and can be expected to make a positive difference.

This is a very reasonable proposition.

As a Federal policymaker, as these dollars flow out across America, I believe that we would expect those dollars to be wisely spent.

For the critics of pregnancy centers, I urge all of them to visit a pregnancy center themselves. These pregnancy centers exist all across America in communities small and large. I have been very impressed hearing from the clients themselves of how they appreciated the care that they found through the pregnancy centers and that they had someone to walk with them through a very difficult moment in life, perhaps, and also taking a difficult moment in life and realizing that that can become a very triumphant moment, as well.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support our legislation later this week so that pregnant women will have access to information that they would select themselves and that we can honor those options that these expectant mothers should have along the way and that the Federal Government would not stand in the way of an expectant mother receiving information and the care that they would choose to have.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mr. MOORE of Utah, for holding this Special Order that I think is vital for our country and certainly vital to the future of America.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I joined the gentleman last week at our legislative markup on this exact topic. The point we were trying to make is in this situation, particularly with TANF dollars, we need to be able to provide more care and stretch those dollars to support as many situations as possible.

This is an unneeded rule. It is targeted at groups that are trying to do right by their communities and support women going through very difficult situations as best as they can.

So continuing, as we have been doing these Special Orders, Mr. Speaker, we have had an overwhelming number of individuals, particularly from Texas, as the border issue continues to just rage on affecting those communities acutely, and other States are becoming a border State because of it.

Our Representatives from Texas are so passionate about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 14th District of Texas (Mr. WEBER) to give a message on both the border and a pro-life message.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am going to start with what it means when we talk about being pro-life.

Mr. Speaker, let this sink in: 65,464,760 precious babies have been killed in abortions since Roe v. Wade in 1973.

Mr. Speaker, I have three children, eight grandchildren, and even a great-granddaughter.

As a Christian and as a father of those three children and a grandfather of those eight, the issue of abortion is extremely personal to me. Every single unborn child is a human life wonderfully made and worth protecting.

I can tell you from experience, Mr. Speaker, that the joy that children bring into the world is unparalleled. They are a gift from God that He gives to all of us. We need to look no further than Jeremiah 1:5 to know God's love for each child: "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I set you apart."

In Deuteronomy 30:19, we are called to choose life. Moses is laying out for the Israelites the blessings of obedience and the curses of disobedience.

He says in Deuteronomy 30:19 that we are called to choose life.

"I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: Therefore choose life that both thou and thy seed may live."

Mr. Speaker, when we are choosing the death of an unborn child by abortion, then our unborn seed is not living.

Our great Nation has carried this belief in and respect for life from the very moment of our founding. Our forefathers noted that we are endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are granted to each of us, assuming we have the chance to begin living that life, yet, our society seems to struggle with that simple proposition.

□ 1745

Life allows for liberty and liberty allows for the pursuit of happiness. Without the fundamental right to life, our society begins to look vastly different. Without the fundamental right to life, we have neither liberty nor happiness.

Then on June 24, 2022, after almost 50 years of living—many of us would say dying—under the tragically unconstitutional Roe v. Wade decision, the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade. What a victory. The voiceless, once again, finally have a voice.

As thousands prepare to stand for life in our Nation's Capital, my Republican colleagues and I continue our fight for life by voting for the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

I will always, always, Mr. Speaker, stand up and protect life.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct. In Texas, the border is important to us.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely no secret that the Biden administration has purposefully and willfully destroyed over 100 years of immigration policy, resulting in 8-million-plus illegal crossings since Joe Biden took office.

Mr. Speaker, I have been visiting the Texas border since my time in the Texas State House back in 2009. I was vice chair of the border committee my second term there. I got back from the border earlier this month, and I am heading back to the border soon.

What we are witnessing now is the worst I have ever seen. It is the worst that the Border Patrol agents and the Texas law enforcement officers have ever seen. They told us that in person.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Biden is responsible for creating the policies that are encouraging illegal immigration and he will not work in good faith with Republicans to fix the problem he created.

Mr. Speaker, we passed a border bill, H.R. 2, strong legislation to secure the American border. We passed that over 6 months ago. Just in the Border Patrol's Del Rio sector, we are seeing folks come across from countries like Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and China just to name a few, and over 300 documented cases of smuggling since October.

How many terrorists on 9/11 took down the World Trade Center? Nineteen.

Now we can identify a whole lot more terrorists coming in—300 documented cases of smuggling, as I said, since October. The weekly revenue for illicit human smuggling—let this sink in—\$30 million a week. That is \$120 million a month in the Del Rio sector alone, Mr. Speaker.

These are the people that Joe Biden is encouraging and enticing to come into our communities. We don't even know their background. Therefore, I can't say with confidence that we trust the Biden administration to perform due process, as he calls it, in processing illegal aliens before releasing them into our communities, into our States, and into our Nation.

This administration has a deliberate strategy to keep the border open and to continue the chaos, but Texas has had enough. Americans have had enough. Republicans are united to do whatever it takes to secure our southern border.

It is so simple, Mr. Speaker. All that the Biden administration needs to do to deter illegals and stop this crisis is to actually enforce laws already on the books.

Unfortunately, it has become painfully clear that President Biden prefers, instead, for 8 million or more illegal aliens to resettle in all 50 States and play a cynically partisan role in the future of American life by trying to make Democrats a permanent majority, or so they think.

They refuse to acknowledge what we understand so clearly, Mr. Speaker: it is simply that Americans of all stripes, all walks, all persuasions want a secure border.

The American people want these four things: End catch and release, Mr. President; build the wall, Mr. President; cease abuse of parole authority; reinstate remain in Mexico, Mr. President. It is just that simple. Secure the border, President Joe Biden.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments. I echo his sentiment of how simple and best it can be for the American people. It is just baffling that we can't have the administration understand this. I appreciate so many credible Members coming down and sharing their message from their own districts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas' 36th District, Representative BRIAN BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank my good friend from Utah for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in all the years of my life, never would I ever have imagined that I would witness an American President using every resource available to him to unravel American national security, but that is our reality.

Since Joe Biden's very first day in office, the American people have watched him repeatedly and deliberately turn a blind eye to the border crisis unfolding down at our southern border and even up in our northern border.

As a result of his negligence, millions and millions of illegal aliens, including

cartel members, terror suspects, human traffickers, deadly drugs, illicit weapons, and more, much more, have been allowed to enter the Nation freely with fatal results for tens of thousands of American citizens, and even the migrants themselves.

Monthly illegal alien apprehension all-time records have been set and then broken under this administration, which is by the Department of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas' own admission, releasing upwards of 85 percent of those unlawfully crossing the border into the interior of the U.S.—85 percent of those apprehended at the border are released into the country.

More than 242,400 illegals were encountered crossing the southern border last November, a 236 percent increase from November 2020, roughly the population of Scottsdale, Arizona.

I would give an appropriate metaphor for December's historic border apprehensions, which reportedly have surpassed 302,000, but the administration has yet to make those public.

Knowing this, the President and his cronies would still have us believe that the southern border is somehow secure, which leads me to think that either they do not know the definition of the word "secure," or they think the American people are stupid.

My bet is on the latter, especially when you look at the dramatic dip in illegal border crossings this month. We were at the border 2 weeks ago with our Speaker and inexplicably before we got there, numbers had dropped mysteriously.

The White House would most likely have you believe that this decline in daily border encounters is the outcome of policy change, but Americans are not stupid.

This is nothing more than another facade to fool the public into thinking that the left has finally come to its senses on border security. Don't fall for it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Whatever backhanded deal this administration has suddenly made with Mexico for a temporary period of time has nothing to do with your safety and everything to do with the optics surrounding a particular event taking place this November, a certain national election.

The only way to end this border crisis is to implement policies that stop incentivizing illegal immigration by finishing the border wall, by ending catch and release, by closing asylum loopholes, by blocking the exploitation of the Department of Homeland Security's CBP One app, restoring interior enforcement, and more. These are all policies that this administration and congressional Democrats clearly have no intention of doing on a permanent basis whatsoever.

I could go on and on, but the bottom line is this: The fate of America's sovereignty and very existence rests with its people, whose votes this November

will make that determination of whether America survives as we know it; as the great beacon of freedom shining on the hill for the rest of the world to see and emulate.

I will never falter. I will continue working to close the southern border and hold this administration to account.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very clear message on navigating solving this issue.

Again, I reiterate: There are simple policy fixes that would take off an enormous amount of strain at our southern border. We have got the data to show that these policies are effective. I don't want to oversimplify it because I know this is Congress, but the immediate fixes can be so simple, and we have to quit empowering the cartels to put people in these situations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Tennessee, Representative JOHN ROSE.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah, Vice Chairman MOORE, for yielding and for claiming time this evening to discuss these important issues facing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Tennesseans across the State will travel to Washington to March for Life in our Nation's Capital later this week. I have had the opportunity to meet many of these people at various pro-life events throughout the years.

As they make the trek, I want them to know that this week, House Republicans are standing up for life on the House floor. Thanks to Republican leadership, the House will consider two pieces of pro-life legislation—the Pregnant Students' Rights Act and the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act.

Both bills are important steps toward ensuring that every child has the right to live and is protected. The Pregnant Students' Rights Act would require colleges and universities to disperse information to both prospective and enrolled students on the rights and resources available for pregnant students.

Too often, college students make the irreversible decision to have an abortion because they are unaware of resources that would support an alternative decision. This bill ensures that they have important information on their options and rights while pregnant.

The Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act would block an out-of-touch, proposed Biden administration rule that could prohibit States from giving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, funds to pregnancy centers that support the life of both the mother and the unborn child.

Pregnancy resource centers provide miracles for children and mothers seeking assistance with pregnancy and raising a child. The last thing the Biden administration should be doing

is implementing rules that discourage their use.

These bills are in addition to steps House Republicans have already taken to protect the sanctity of life, like passing the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and a resolution supporting crisis pro-life organizations that have been attacked, like the one in recent years in Nashville.

I was honored to speak in support of this resolution when it was brought to the floor last year and I was a proud cosponsor of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

□ 1800

Just because *Roe v. Wade* was overturned does not mean our work fighting for the right to life for all children is over. In fact, our work has just begun. As a pro-life father of two young sons, Guy and Sam, I will always stand for the right to life.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSE for his heartfelt message on a very important week for this particular topic.

I yield to the gentleman from the Second District of South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), my former colleague on defense matters extraordinaire. I appreciate all his work in that regard.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the great work and leadership of Congressman MOORE of Utah, as he is conducting tonight's Special Order.

As the anniversary approaches for the 1973 infamous Supreme Court ruling *Roe v. Wade*, I was grateful to attend Proudly Pro-Life events at the South Carolina Statehouse in Columbia 2 weeks ago supporting mothers and children.

As part of that weekend, I joined South Carolina Lieutenant Governor Pamela Evette, South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson, State Senator Mike Reichenbach of Florence, and other State leaders for the 50th March for Life. The march began at Russell House on the University of South Carolina campus, and a rally began on the statehouse grounds. It was well attended by many supporters despite very cold weather.

Founded by South Carolina Citizens for Life in 1974, the group is a State affiliate of the National Right to Life Committee, the largest single issue right-to-life organization in the Nation. It exists solely to protect innocent human life from abortion, infanticide, assisted suicide, and euthanasia while supporting mother and child.

Courageous leaders in South Carolina are Holly Gatling, Lisa Van Riper, and Sally Zaleski. I am grateful that my eldest grandson, Addison Wilson III, several years ago participated in a National Right to Life March with classmates of the Holy Trinity Classical Christian School of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Through the legal and peaceful means of education, legislation, and political action, South Carolina Citizens for Life works to restore the right

to life of the preborn and to protect the lives of medically vulnerable individuals, including elderly, disabled, mentally ill, chronically ill, and terminally ill persons.

After the U.S. Supreme Court correctly overturned *Roe v. Wade*, State legislatures have become the determiners of abortion access. South Carolina, with strong bipartisan support in the General Assembly, is a right-to-life State. Additionally, South Carolina is upholding the State's ban on abortion after a fetal heartbeat is detected, as interpreted by the South Carolina Supreme Court.

South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson, in a statement, welcomed the decision saying: "The right to life is foremost and absolutely must be protected and prioritized."

This law protects life by prohibiting abortions after a fetal heartbeat has been detected with exceptions for rape or incest during the first 12 weeks of pregnancy, medical emergencies, or fatal fetal anomalies.

Upon signing the bill into law, Governor Henry McMaster said: "This is a great day for life in South Carolina, but the fight is not over. We stand ready to defend this legislation against all challenges and are confident we will succeed. The right to life must be preserved, and we will do everything we can to protect it."

It is sad that Biden has abandoned his pro-life position to export extremist, radical, murderous abortion of babies up to the time of birth. This is infanticide, killing viable babies, which is condemned across the world except in dictatorial China and dictatorial North Korea.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who have protected America for 20 years since the 9/11 attacks. Sadly, currently, due to the appeasement in Afghanistan, the global war on terrorism continues with Afghanistan as a safe haven for terrorists to bring more attacks to America with Biden open borders. All Americans must be alerted that terrorist attacks could be imminent and are imminent in America, as warned by the FBI.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. WILSON's message during this very important week.

I yield to the gentleman from the First District of California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. MOORE's leading us here tonight. Indeed, a lot of important issues, but we know January is typically a month of action for people who believe in being pro-life or those who are pro-abortion.

As we know, January of 1973 is when the *Roe v. Wade* decision was arbitrarily legislated by the Supreme Court, I believe by a vote of 7-2, to somehow make abortion a law instead of leaving that up to State legislators.

Well, that was overturned after many, many years. It is now in the hands of legislators to actually do the

legislating and search their souls on whether they think an unborn baby is actually a life or something else.

Many people have stood up around this country to have their voices heard on the wrongness of that decision, and you find that in rallies and marches like happened all over the country and happened right here in D.C. in January. People have certainly made their voices heard, and I think it was successful in a Court that actually decided to interpret the Constitution.

Science supports the idea that life begins at conception. We know as early as 5 weeks in the womb, babies have a heartbeat. Some States, some jurisdictions are deciding that would be the point at least to start and acknowledge it is a life.

Their brain and circulatory systems are beginning to develop at 10 weeks in the womb. They have arms, legs, fingers and toes. They can jump and kick if startled.

At 15 weeks in the womb, babies have fully developed hearts and can taste, yawn, and hiccup. By this time, their brain is developed enough to feel and respond to pain. That is why we have seen pain-capable legislation at that level.

If this isn't life, then what is?

Thanks to advances in modern medicine and science, the humanity of a child in the womb is undeniable if it wasn't already common sensibly, and denying this reality undermines the very foundation of our ethical principles of science. Trust the science, we hear in other quarters.

I believe that each one of these innocent souls was created by God in his divine vision and that we must stand up against the left's radical, extreme, and immoral abortion agenda that wants to allow for discriminatory abortions at any point in a pregnancy, even on the basis of a baby's sex, race, and disability, even including late-term abortions for babies that would be able to survive perfectly fine outside of the womb, which that number is moving lower and lower in the number of weeks in which they have viability.

We must uphold the value, dignity, and potential for every person's life. Choosing life also means protecting women's health and their families. Yes, protecting health doesn't necessarily mean abortions that you would hear on the left because there are side effects that can affect the woman, as well.

This week, the House is considering two pro-life bills aimed at supporting expectant mothers, helping them choose life. H.R. 6918, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act would strike down the Department of Health and Human Services' proposed rule that would prohibit funding for pregnancy centers.

It speaks volumes that the Biden administration wants our tax dollars to go toward abortion but not pregnancy centers which provide invaluable services and resources to expectant mothers who want to keep their children.

They provide both sides of the story to a prospective mother.

I have visited these centers before and seen the good work, the good cheer, the good attitude they have on actually helping a woman in a difficult decision to have all the facts, so that all the facts are known. They provide pregnancy counseling and information about pregnancy, offering free pregnancy testing and sometimes even clothing and supplies for the newborns.

The other bill, H.R. 6914, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act, requires higher-education institutions to provide prospective and enrolled pregnant students with a list of nearby resources for new and expectant mothers, as well as available accommodations on campus. Indeed, both sides of the story, not just the abortion one.

The bill is critical to ensure that mothers don't have to give up their education and can further their careers while, indeed, starting a family. Being pro-life means supporting initiatives that provide resources for pregnant women, promoting adoption as a loving option, and advocating for policies that protect the unborn, humans.

Abortion is a gruesome act that destroys families, harms women's health, and murders the innocent. I will fight for the unborn, the sanctity of life, and traditional family values because I think that is the right way to be in the eyes of God.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the message of the gentleman from California, particularly during this week again.

Finally, I yield to the gentleman from the Fourth District of Florida (Mr. Bean) for a special message.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a great week to honor life, but what about the secret to life? Most people spend their whole lives chasing the secret to life, but Chris Bryan figured it out early: Family, community, and caring about others.

I rise today to honor the meaningful life of Christina "Chris" Bryan. If you called her Christina, then you were a salesman from out of town. A true friend and long-time mentor of mine, Chris Bryan was a shining example of everything wonderful about northeast Florida. Throughout her life, she wholeheartedly invested in her family and friends and embodied the virtues of service, grit, determination, and generosity.

Born and raised in Fernandina Beach, Chris was a pillar of our community for the better part of a century. Chris dedicated her life to service. She was a key member of so many community organizations, including the Gator Booster Board of Directors, the YMCA, the Baptist Medical Center Nassau Board, the Fernandina Beach High School Foundation, the Nassau County Council on Aging. Chris was also involved heavily at the Memorial United Methodist Church.

Just speaking from experience, Mr. Speaker—you may know this—I do

charity auctions and have done a ton. One of my secrets to raising a lot of money was having Chris and the Bryan family in the audience because I knew if she and they were there, it was going to be a big night for the charity because of her unmatched generosity.

Although she made countless contributions to these organizations, many as a founder, her true legacy is the beautiful family she leaves behind. She is survived by her loving husband of 53 years, Bill Bryan; their daughters, Amy and Ginny; Ginny's husband, Heyward; and their grandchildren, Heyward and Liz. I am told they had a wonderful Christmas Eve this year. She and Bill cooked and spent the evening listening to her family talking about what was going on in their lives and letting her family know how much they were loved and cared for.

We knew she was sick, but she was so positive in her treatment that few knew just how sick she was. She passed away peacefully at the age of 78, and I am devastated about her passing. Chris put her family and her community and friends first. She forged strong bonds with those around her, and that is the reason why it is so hard to say goodbye. I count myself blessed and lucky to have called her a friend. I take heart in knowing that she is in a much better place, suffering no more.

Revelation 21:4 says:

He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more. Neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain anymore, for the former things have passed away.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the radiant life of Chris Bryan.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Every one of our constituents, the people who we serve deserve that type of attention. I appreciate you for highlighting the wonderful life that she lived.

Mr. Speaker, I will wrap up briefly just by saying House Republicans have an incredible focus this week, keeping the focus on finding the solutions needed at the border and pressuring and pleading with President Biden to just take a look at what has been done in the past.

We have got policies that existed in the previous administration that worked, and they limited border activity and cartel activity. These things are simple, and we need them reinstated. Embracing these things is what the American people need.

Lastly, we have got very important bills on the floor this week related to supporting women, parents, and babies, as women make incredibly tough choices, finding the support they need in various ways, whether they are in school, whether they are in their community, whether they are working, whatever the circumstance may be. These children need a chance to have every opportunity they deserve. We are focused on building out sound legislation that addresses that this week.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for sharing their messages, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

□ 1815

ASSESSING IMPACT OF MEDICARE CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. 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.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, a program called Medicare was inception. It was offering health benefits to those over age 65.

At first, physicians were very suspicious of allowing so much government intervention in medicine. After a while, more and more physicians doing their duty to take care of patients accepted it.

The sad fact and the problem is that Medicare now is what they, in 1965, were very afraid of, that so much of government has gotten into medical issues.

This is the main problem. Medicare does not reimburse the cost of care for patients. This is a real access issue. We are not really talking about paying physicians. We are talking about access to care.

This year, CMS is proposing a 3.37 percent cut to the physician fee schedule. It would be about a 20 percent cut over the last 20 years.

Doctors want to see Medicare patients, but they simply won't be able to, and this is going to affect access to care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend who is board-certified in internal medicine and dermatology.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for holding this Special Order to discuss the issues of the impact of the Medicare cuts.

In rural communities, like where I serve in south central and southwestern Pennsylvania, seniors rely on Medicare to see their doctors, to fill their prescriptions, and to take an ambulance in case of an emergency. Now, these patients are in serious danger of losing access to their trusted healthcare providers.

Medicare pay cuts, when compiled with 4.6 percent medical inflation, re-

sult in increased barriers to care for Medicare beneficiaries.

Let's be clear about what these cuts mean for a Medicare patient, and these cuts, for everyone's information, have already gone into effect on January 1.

These cuts mean that rural and small providers will be forced to restrict access to Medicare patients and, in dire cases, will be unable to keep their doors open at all.

As a doctor, I understand firsthand the negative impact that these significant year-after-year cuts have on rural providers.

Now, extrapolate that and then compound that with already existing workforce shortages in underserved areas like my district in rural Pennsylvania. I can assure you the repercussions are dire. These cuts jeopardize physicians' ability to provide quality care for elderly patients in our communities.

When physicians who participate in Medicare are increasingly being forced to do more with less, it is ultimately the patient who will suffer. These cuts will accelerate practice consolidation and force patients into higher cost settings for care. It will mean longer travel times and longer wait times for patients to see their family doctor, to see a surgeon, and to see a specialist.

As physicians and as legislators, we have an obligation to work to find a solution for Medicare patients. Congress must step in and address these cuts before they do any additional damage to our healthcare system.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order hour.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), one of the doctor co-chairs. He has been a stalwart in the Chamber for 20-plus years as a physician, a retired OB-GYN.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MURPHY for bringing us together tonight. I am here tonight not just because I am a Member of Congress from the 26th Congressional District, but I am also a doc. I practiced for 25 years back home. I am a Medicare patient. I know firsthand how hard it can be to find a doctor that still accepts Medicare.

I will tell you, there is nothing more injurious to our medical system here in this country than the repetitive cuts that this administration has delivered to the doctors of this country.

In November, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services finalized a 3.5 percent cut in physician payments for this year, 2024, a decision that took place on January 1 of this year, a blow to the very backbone of our healthcare.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, we had an actual historic event last month. We marked up a doc fix and a budget neutrality bill.

The GOP Doctors Caucus and the Energy and Commerce Committee took action to address the challenges by passing H.R. 6545, which was the Physician Fee Schedule Update and Improvements Act. That bill includes a conversion factor update as well as provisions

from H.R. 6371, the Provider Reimbursement Stability Act, also led by the GOP Doctors Caucus.

These provisions make needed changes to the budget neutrality requirement, allowing for long-term sustainability within the physician fee schedule. These are significant steps, and the urgency cannot be overstated.

On January 1, those lower rates went into effect. CMS has said they are going to hold payments until Congress acts, but if we don't act pretty darn quick, they will have to remit at the lower level. The doctors can never go back and recoup the money that they should have been paid.

This is a crisis that is not necessary. We can fix this. We can fix this in the CR. Unfortunately, congressional Democrats, the minority leader on the House side, and the Finance Committee chairman on the Senate side are blocking this very simple fix from occurring. It is wrong. It needs to change.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order hour.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is about access. Physicians want to see Medicare patients, but if you do not pay the bills, they can't keep the doors open.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my good friend and a board-certified podiatric surgeon.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, America and Members of Congress really need to understand the impact these recent cuts to the Medicare physician fee schedule have on patient access to healthcare across the country.

The cuts that took place January 1, 2024, took effect, impacting providers everywhere. Providers have to continue to bear the costs and the many challenges that arose during and after the pandemic, including staffing shortages, supply chain shortages, and continued rising inflation. As the cost of providing care continues to rise, the reimbursement to physicians who provide that care continues to be cut. We can't keep this up.

Here is the scary part. Doctors retire early. Some reduce Medicare patients out of survival for their practice or stop seeing them at all, and they hate that. They quit taking call. They go to a cash-only practice in order to keep their doors open.

If we don't act swiftly to address these cuts now and in the long term, patients are going to suffer the most. The physician shortage will continue to rise. Hospitals and independent community-based providers will continue to shut their doors. America's seniors will be left with no option for high-quality, affordable healthcare. Rural communities in underserved areas will become healthcare deserts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge congressional leadership to put the health of America first. Ensure that patients and Medicare beneficiaries have access to the providers who care for them.

We have to stop these cuts. Every cut the government makes affects the en-

tire United States. We are one great Nation, but we become a less healthy Nation.

This is just one issue that gets in the way of our goal to make the United States of America the healthiest nation on this planet.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a doctor shortage, and it is going to get worse and worse, driving physicians out because they no longer are able to be paid for their services or forcing them into employment that destroys the historically great quality of medicine in America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), my good friend from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very pressing issue that not only have we heard about throughout our country but especially in the 19th Congressional District of California, which I represent. It is the decreasing amount of reimbursement rates to Medicare providers. It is an issue, unfortunately, that threatens the care for many senior citizens that I represent.

Now, as the proud Representative of California-19, it is a place where the cost of living, unfortunately, can be pretty high—not just for families, not just for workers, but for doctors, as well.

We in the 19th are already facing challenges when it comes to keeping enough medical providers around to care for our seniors. It is actually a problem throughout California where not only is the cost of living too high, but also Medicare reimbursements are way too low.

Mr. Speaker, 76 percent of California physicians report that Medicare no longer covers their cost to provide care. That puts more than 6.5 million Californians enrolled in Medicare at risk as many primary care doctors are not even taking new part B patients.

A key driver of this is how Medicare isn't reimbursing physicians enough. This past year, Medicare expenses rose 4.6 percent. In the past two decades, payments to providers have declined 26 percent while costs to providers have risen 47 percent, according to the AMA.

What is worse is that when CMS updates payment rates for billing codes under part B, that creates many unsustainable cuts for too many providers and leads to way too many scheduled decreases to Medicare physician reimbursement.

Because of that, we are seeing physicians take on fewer Medicare patients, and we all know what that means—that there are more seniors with fewer healthcare options.

Now, fortunately, thanks to the leadership of Mr. MURPHY and other Members of Congress who have come together in a bipartisan fashion for a temporary fix, this legislation would provide an offset for the cuts to providers so that our providers keep getting reimbursed appropriately, so that

we can keep providers in our communities, and so that providers can keep serving the needs of seniors.

I am proud to work with Representative MURPHY on the Ways and Means Committee for this straightforward fix to this problem, but this Congress needs to act with urgency, as these cuts have already taken effect.

Ultimately, we need a long-term solution to this issue by ensuring that Medicare reimbursement is keeping up with inflation and that the system is streamlined so physicians can continue to care for their patients.

We can't underestimate how Medicare plays an essential role in the health of senior citizens. That is why Congress must ensure that in order for it to continue to be that cornerstone of healthcare, we must provide our providers with the proper reimbursement so that our seniors can get proper healthcare.

I appreciate Mr. MURPHY's leadership on this, and I look forward to working with many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do our job by making sure the Federal Government works for our constituents by ensuring that Medicare always allows our providers to care for our senior citizens.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this is obviously a bipartisan issue. We care about our constituents, but we also care about the health of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, 10,000 Americans each day are added to the Medicare rolls. Again, with such a doctor shortage, you are adding more and more individuals where Medicare doesn't pay their bills, and it is harder and harder to take care of them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), another physician friend of mine from the great State of California, to discuss the difficult problem we are facing today.

□ 1830

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, over 30 years ago I graduated from medical school. As you are kind of figuring out what you want to do as a resident, I chose to become a primary care internal medicine doctor.

The rationale for that decision was to take care of our seniors: Our moms, dads, grandparents, and so forth.

I love the job. You put that white coat on, you are there and able to help people immediately. That is the joy of being a doctor.

When I talk to my colleagues today, the practice of medicine has gotten harder and harder: The administrative burdens, the lack of reimbursement, the cost of care, the amount of physician burnout.

That is not why we went to medical school. That is not why we went into this profession.

We went into the profession to take care of folks, but if you can't cover your expenses, if you can't give the necessary care to those individual patients, to our parents and grandparents, then it becomes hard. It becomes challenging. We have to fix this.

We have to at least make sure the cost of care, what we give our providers, our doctors, keeps pace with inflation. You see it in every other aspect of healthcare, yet, physician reimbursement is going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, all we are asking for is to keep up with the pace of inflation and allow our doctors, America's doctors, to take care of our senior citizens. These are folks that have worked their entire life. They have paid into Medicare. They just want routine care.

So let's do what is right. Let's fix this. Let's do a temporary fix in this Congress.

We can do it. We have a few weeks left to get that done, then let's actually come together as Democrats and Republicans, take a look at it, come up with new ideas so there is predictability so that America's seniors and America's doctors can take care of our patients.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Dr. MURPHY, for his leadership.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman points out a perfect issue. We are depriving access to patients and developing more and more concierge medicine, which is wonderful for those who can afford it, but for those who can't afford to go and see one of these cash doctors, and you can't get into a doctor's office because they can't take more Medicare patients, guess what happens? They get driven to emergency departments where a more costly care goes on.

We have to stop this nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), a pediatrician.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about fair physician reimbursement to urge my colleagues to immediately address the physician fee schedule cuts that went into effect on January 1, and in a broader sense, address chronically lagging Medicare physician care reimbursement.

Fundamentally, fair reimbursement respects the work that physicians do, and it keeps those physicians' practices open and available to patients so that seniors and others can get the care they need.

Over the past 22 years, adjusting for inflation, physicians have essentially taken a 26 percent pay cut from Medicare. This is in the context of everything else increasing, with expenses up about 47 percent.

I cannot think of another profession whose compensation has dropped by 26 percent over two decades.

If we continue down this path, we will soon find ourselves with loved ones or ourselves unable to find a physician because physician offices will close.

Because of CMS rules, on January 1, physicians just took a 3.4 percent cut in Medicare reimbursement. The least we can do is reverse that.

Last month, I co-led a letter with my colleagues encouraging a fix to this. Here is a way to do it: I co-led a bill

that passed out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that would level physician reimbursement from Medicare and keep it essentially unchanged this year.

Physicians are nervous, and, fundamentally, we need a longer term solution, and that means we need Medicare reimbursement to keep pace with inflation.

That is how we will keep these practices open. We are already seeing practices in rural communities and small towns closing their doors or being consolidated.

Without adequate reimbursement, we are going to see more of this, offices closing, and that will result in patients, seniors, and others who require or depend on Medicare not being able to access the high-quality care they need.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, if you owned a hardware store and sold hammers that cost \$1 apiece but you had to sell them for 40 cents apiece, how long would you sell hammers?

You wouldn't sell them very long because it just doesn't make financial sense, and you literally can't just give money and walk money out the door.

Unfortunately, this is what is happening with Medicare patients. Physicians want to take care of their patients. They are caring individuals, but when the numbers don't matter, you just can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. McCORMICK), and emergency room physician, to talk on this issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is rare in this Chamber, especially recently, that you find a bipartisan effort, especially one that is all about the people. In this case, it is about the people.

You have seen several physicians and several people from different committees from all over the Nation agree on one thing: We are not doing the right thing.

By cutting Medicare payments to individual practitioners, we have done the opposite of the right thing. We will consolidate healthcare. You lose the cheapest way to deliver healthcare to the most people.

Right now, hospital systems employ 71 percent of all physicians, and that is going up every year.

Physicians deliver healthcare at the lowest possible rate. That is a fact. By doing the Medicaid payment cuts just to physicians, not to hospital systems, just to physicians at this quantity, you are forcing more physicians to work for hospitals, which means less competition and higher prices. That is the end-all-be-all to what is going to happen right now.

It is not going to save more money. It is going to mean more consolidations, more monopolistic practices, higher prices, and worse access, because physicians simply won't be out there to accept you as patients.

You will have people retire; you will have people go out of business. When those physicians aren't there to take care of you at the most rudimentary level, the best and more affordable level, you will have nothing but worse patient care and a worse environment for physicians.

Therefore, I do recommend, just like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to do the right thing. If people in Congress on both sides of the aisle are demanding to do the right thing, why can't we make it happen?

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of us to stand with our fellow physicians in a bipartisan effort to pass legislation to prevent cuts to the Medicare payments to physicians.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have seen Medicare patients for more than 30 years. I have had individuals come in my office after I have operated on and cared for them in the hospital and apologized, flat out apologized for the lack of payment that we received from Medicare.

I tell them I do it because I love operating and taking care of people, but there comes a point where you have to keep the lights on, you have to pay your nurses, and pay your mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER), a doctor of pharmacy, to talk about the ridiculous cuts that are facing our colleagues as physicians.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the rising cost of healthcare due to inflation and the need to address Medicare physician payments to ensure quality care for our seniors.

Adjusting for inflation and practice costs, Medicare physician pay has declined over 25 percent since 2001.

Despite this important statistic, Medicare payment updates are scheduled for all healthcare providers except physicians in 2024.

Last November, CMS finalized a rule that would decrease Medicare reimbursement for physician services by 3.37 percent this year. Combined with 3 years of consecutive cuts to Medicare and the rising practice costs, Medicare payments have been cut by nearly 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what physician will continue to practice when their salaries are being cut by 10 percent?

It is critical that Congress takes action to address these unsustainable Medicare cuts immediately in order to ensure that patients continue receiving quality care.

The negative effects of these cuts will hit our seniors living in rural areas the hardest; areas that already face significant healthcare challenges.

As a community pharmacist in one of the country's most rural districts and co-chair of the Rural Healthcare Caucus, I urge the House and Senate to act

swiftly on passing legislation that would stabilize Medicare payments to physicians and other providers to ensure that our seniors maintain access to quality healthcare.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, we submitted a bill, H.R. 6683, a couple weeks ago, and while ENC was able to keep the cut at 1.25 percent, we are actually desiring to not allow the cut at all. We are taking money from the Medicare Improvement Fund, which is what the money is for, to solve problems within Medicare.

Unfortunately, as this was a wonderful bipartisan discussion this evening, we are oftentimes imprisoned, if you will, sometimes to the will of some of the leaders over in Senate, sometimes even here in the House.

Leaders over in the Senate didn't want anything for a doctor fix. The Democratic leader said, no, we want this huge wish list of things done, and we will trade that for the doctor fix.

Well, guys, you can't take poison pills to try to help physicians. This is where there should not be politics whatsoever. We saw both sides tonight, Democrats and Republicans, speak about the healthcare of patients in this country.

Mr. Speaker, at some point it is going to snap. At some point, whether it be what Obamacare was trying to do, absolutely starve private practice so that everybody would either be bought out by private equity or have to be assumed by hospital systems. Where, by the way, physicians don't work as efficiently, physicians cost more, and they see fewer patients. It is a closer ownership care of patients.

When I was practicing full-time, if another doctor called me and said, hey, can you see somebody? My response was always: Do you want me to see them today or tomorrow?

The sad fact is once physicians become employed, not only do they cost more to the system, but the work ethic is not as good. That is just point-blank what is seen.

What we need to understand is that private practice is the most efficient way of delivering healthcare in this country, but it is also the one where we care the most, and we follow up. We are always happy to see that next patient and make sure that we keep our doors open.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, we are going to approach a calamitous cliff, if you will, in the next 3 to 5 years with the number of surgeons that are available to take care of patients.

I am a urologist. I take care of disorders of the kidney, prostate, and bladder—those type of things. We are the most critically short specialty in the country.

Right now, the median age of individuals practicing urology is my age, the age of 60. If now we are not paying doctors enough to stay in business, they are going to quit. We are going to make a bad shortage even worse. We have to pay those who take care of patients what they need to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this was a bipartisan discussion this evening, something that is easy for our leadership to fix. I ask that they do that.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address a few issues tonight that have been brought to my attention by my constituents back home.

First of all, I rise to address the current policy of so much of the left of trying to encourage more and more people, and, in California, even require people, to build electric vehicles.

Now, I am very concerned, given other policies, that we are making it harder and harder in America to become a member of the middle class. One of the things that has kept America a free country is the fact that we have always had a large, strong, middle class, who when they go to the polls, protect the freedoms our forefathers have given us.

In order to become a member of the middle class, to me, you have to buy three things: you need a house; you need food; and in America today, you need a vehicle.

Americans have been in love with their cars for over 100 years, and that has been something owned by not only every member of the middle class, but even people who don't have as much money.

I am very afraid that the high-income, leftwing, liberal element has taken over the Democratic Party, and by pushing electric vehicles, that they are creating something that will make it very, very difficult to achieve middle-class status.

Mr. Speaker, I have been alerted by some insurance agents that when you buy an electric vehicle, your insurance can go up 125 percent. That is right, 125 percent.

Now, that is not something that the uber wealthy have to worry about; they always have money to pay their bills. And, quite frankly, it is not something that the incredibly poor people have to worry about, because a lot of times they don't have any auto insurance anyway, or they try to find a way to get around it.

□ 1845

However, for the average American to have their auto insurance go up 125 percent is devastating, and you are hitting the most responsible members of society. Not only is your cost of auto insurance going through the roof, but I am informed the cost of a new vehicle, if you have to buy electric instead of buying the old gas engine, will also go up by 25 percent.

On one shot, the policies we are seeing in California, the policies we are encouraging on a national level, are going to make it much more difficult to buy that automobile that all Americans need, make it much more difficult to obtain middle-class status, much more difficult to have enough money left over to have children.

It was also recently brought to our attention, at least in Chicago—we have had a snap of a bit of a cold spell in the Midwest—that it is frequently true that when the weather gets cold enough you cannot get a decent charge on these vehicles anyway. Even if you do get a charge, I am told the maximum mileage you can make on a full charge may drop 35 or 40 percent.

In other words, it may not be a problem for people in Hollywood, it may not be that big a problem for people on Martha's Vineyard, but I will tell you, it is a big problem for people in a lot of America, including Wisconsin.

I think before we continue the laws which encourage more and more use of electric vehicles, we ought to have a look and see how well they operate at times like today, when the temperature is under 10 degrees in my district back home. It is time to stand up to the leftwing, wealthy set who think it is all cool to buy an electric vehicle, because they have always got enough money to deal with the insurance, deal with the high cost, and probably have another car that they can use when the temperature gets below zero. For the average person, this is really a body blow as you try to achieve the middle class.

The next thing I am going to deal with is an issue I touched on briefly last week, and I think some people wrote about it incorrectly. That is with regard to anchor babies.

Anchor babies are babies that somebody comes here, is not a citizen, and has a child. By custom today, we are calling those children U.S. citizens, but this is not guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution. It is important that all Americans understand it is not guaranteed under the Constitution. People get the idea that you should be able to come here, have a baby, and go back to China, or go back to wherever, and that child will immediately become an American citizen. They get that from looking at the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution.

To understand why this did not create birthright citizenship, you have to look at when the 14th Amendment was passed and why it was passed.

At the time, when the Civil War wrapped up—so many Americans fought and died in the Civil War. I had at least two ancestors myself who fought in the Civil War. At that time, there was concern that as the other party regained power, they would claim that since Black people who were slaves at the time in the South, that the Southern States would claim that they were not citizens and their children were not citizens. At the time,

you became a citizen if your parents were citizens.

They passed the 14th Amendment to make sure if you were in this country when that child was born, that child was a citizen. Of course, it was designed to make sure that—some of the people in the South didn't want to give up the fight—they did not try to say that if your parents were slaves, you were therefore not citizens.

It was not designed—and it makes no sense to say it was designed—that if somebody wanted to come here from another country and just have a child and return back home, that that child would automatically become an American citizen. That would make no sense.

There are two Supreme Court cases that misinform people and sometimes try to confuse people into thinking we have birthright citizenship in this country. One of those cases was in 1898. The court case revolved around people who were here legally, legal citizens, having a child and saying that then that child was a citizen. I don't really think that is what the Congress, after the Civil War, meant. At least it was restricted to people who were legal citizens here.

Later on, there were some dicta put in there by Justice Brennan, which is not binding on anybody, talking about birthright citizenship. Of course, Justice Brennan was one of the most far-left Justices we had in my lifetime. In any event, that was a case not reaching a decision on birthright citizenship; that was just some language that Justice Brennan threw in a decision, but it is not determinative.

When we look at this, we should rely on our common sense. In America today, while there are bills out there—and I have cosponsored the bill to get rid of birthright citizenship—any President, if they want to, can say that the 14th Amendment solely applies to situations which were anticipated by the Congress after the Civil War. There are really none of those situations left today, because all the children of slaves have long since passed away.

It is scandalous that people will take the work done by that Congress, including people who were related to and were so familiar with the people who gave all to end slavery in this country, and they would try to take this amendment designed to protect children of slaves and claim that creates a situation in which you have a tourist industry in which somebody can fly here from Asia, come up here from Latin America, just step across the border, have a child one week after you are here, go back home, and forever that child is an American citizen. That obviously makes no sense.

Insofar as journalists try to confuse the public, you have to remember that the Supreme Court decision in the 1890s was not all encompassing, was not intended to be all encompassing, and the Supreme Court decision in which there were some dicta put in there by Justice Brennan is also not binding.

We should pass legislation, if we have to, but hopefully, we will get a good President in here who will get rid of birthright citizenship. The idea that somebody who just comes across the border can have an American citizen child makes no sense.

My final comment for the day is with regard to a hearing we had earlier, and that hearing was with regard to deportations or the lack of deportations under President Biden.

A lot has been talked about with regard to the huge number of people who are crossing the southern border. I have talked many times at this microphone that we have gone from under 20,000 people coming here a month 3 years ago to right now over 300,000 people being left in the country every month.

It is not as publicized that not only are we trying to change America by letting an unlimited number of people come here, but we are also trying to change America by not deporting people even after they have committed crimes. Right now, we have dropped from a situation in which over 250,000 people were being deported during the Trump administration. Perhaps people will remember that under President Trump, he was rightly criticized for not deporting enough people. That was one of the few times the Republican Party stood up and was critical of President Trump.

After getting over 250,000 people deported a year, that has fallen now to under 75,000. We are in a situation in which we are at about one quarter the number of people being deported as were deported 3 years ago. Not only are we changing America by letting so many people in here; we are also trying to change America by not kicking out people who I think the average American citizen wish would be deported.

I hope this is something that our leadership team, in negotiating the appropriations bills with the Democrats at this time, bring to the floor and insist President Biden deport people at least at the low rate that President Trump was deporting people. When you see less deportations today, at a time when there are so many more people that you could deport, so many more people committing crimes, so many more people we wouldn't want to have here.

I call upon President Biden to look out for the future of America, to look out for the future of your children, and not only not let so many people in the country who we have not vetted but begin to remove the people that we used to remove after they had committed crimes in America.

Those are three issues that I don't think have been adequately covered in the press: Both the degree to which the electric vehicle scandal is going to put vehicles beyond the reach of the middle class or create a situation in which you have to spend so much on vehicles you won't have enough money for food, you won't have enough money for a house,

and you won't have as much money as you should to have children.

The next issue for the press to cover is the lack of deportations in this country, which goes hand in hand with the unlimited people crossing the southern border.

Finally, I hope we cover a little bit more accurately the laws in this country regarding birthright citizenship. We should not say that someone can come in here from another country, fly in on an American airline, have a baby within a week, go back home, and forever that child is an American citizen.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 18, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2929. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Market Development Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Potato Research and Promotion Plan; Changes to Board Membership and Administrative Committee [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-22-0041] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2930. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order for Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Pummelos Grown in Florida [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-21-0054] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2931. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Chemical Substances Designated as Inactive on the TSCA Inventory; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2022-0867; FRL-9655-02-OCSP] (RIN: 2070-AL10) received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2932. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; NAAQS Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2022-0673; FRL-10900-02-R5] received January 11, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2933. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines

for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-0317; FRL-8510-01-OAR] received January 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-2934. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled, "International Exchanges and Training Programs: Activities of the Interagency Working Group", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2935. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled, "Resolution of the Cyprus Dispute", pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Publication, Coordination, and Reporting of International Agreements: Amendments; Correction [Public Notice: 12266] (RIN: 1400-AF63) received January 8, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-067, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-072, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 22-026, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. FISCHBACH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 969. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6914) to require institutions of higher education to disseminate information on the rights of, and accommodations and resources for, pregnant students, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6918) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from restricting funding for pregnancy centers; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 957) denouncing the Biden administration's open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration's open-borders policies (Rept. 118-350). Referred to the House Calendar.

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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 7002. A bill to provide for a wage differential program to support new nursing

school faculty members; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 7003. A bill to amend the National Landslide Preparedness Act to reauthorize such Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Ms. MALOY, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 7004. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to amend references of gilsonite to asphaltite; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 7005. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a vetting process for prospective applicants for high-cost universal service program funding; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7006. A bill to prohibit natural asset companies from entering into any agreement with respect to land in the State of Utah or natural assets on or in such land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 7007. A bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Bilingual programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language, and early language programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURLISON (for himself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7008. A bill to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to judicial review of a permit issued under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CARAVEO (for herself and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7009. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to approve as allowable costs the expenses of certain security measures in a revenue producing parking lot under section 47119 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CHU (for herself and Mrs. HOUCHIN):

H.R. 7010. A bill to provide an incentive for States to extend child welfare support and services for youth through 21 years of age, and to allow youth to re-enter foster care after attaining 18 years of age, both without regard to the AFDC eligibility of their parents or legal guardians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 7011. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 209 Main Street in Duncan, Arizona, as the "Sandra Day O'Connor Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. D'ESPOSITO (for himself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LAWLER, Ms.

BROWNLEY, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BACON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 7012. A bill to modify the public transportation emergency relief program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUARTE (for himself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7013. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the scope of national pollutant discharge elimination system permit discharge authorizations and the expression of effluent limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 7014. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit Federal Medicaid funding for the administrative costs of providing health benefits to individuals who are unauthorized immigrants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY (for himself, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. MANN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 7015. A bill to amend the Rural Innovation Stronger Economy Grant Program of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LEE of Nevada (for herself, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 7016. A bill to establish a grant program for innovative partnerships among teacher preparation programs, local educational agencies, and community-based organizations to expand access to high-quality tutoring in hard-to-staff schools and high-need schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 7017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to take certain Medicare premiums of household members into account in determining the health care insurance premiums tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 7018. A bill to prohibit the sale and use of glue traps for the trapping of rodents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 7019. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to address disclosures by directors, officers, and principal stockholders of foreign private issuers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. McCLAIN (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. JAMES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 7020. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to conduct high-resolution mapping of the lakebeds of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7021. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the procedure for the development of water quality criteria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 7022. A bill to provide equitable treatment for the people of the Village Corporation established for the Native Village of Saxman, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 7023. A bill to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 7024. A bill to make improvements to the child tax credit, to provide tax incentives to promote economic growth, to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters, to make improvements to the low-income housing tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 7025. A bill to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2026; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7026. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify when the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to prohibit the specification of a defined area, or deny or restrict the use of a defined area for specification, as a disposal site under section 404 of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. OGLES, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLINE, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 7027. A bill to amend title 1, United States Code, to clarify that certain tax exemptions are not treated as Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself, Ms. CHU, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. NICKEL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. FROST, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. BALINT,

Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHU):

H.R. 7028. A bill to authorize the issuance of visas and admission of certain aliens, and their derivatives, who were selected to apply for diversity immigrant visas but were unable to be issued such visas or be admitted to the United States as a result of certain Presidential Proclamations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BACON, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution recognizing and supporting the efforts of the New Heights Bid Committee to bring the 2027 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) Women's World Cup competition to the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York:

H. Res. 970. A resolution censuring Representative Elise Stefanik of the 21st Congressional District of New York; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. PELTOLA, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGARVEY, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. OMAR):

H. Res. 971. A resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the War on Poverty and acknowledging its shortcomings; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

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 Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 7020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Nursing

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 7003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Reauthorizing the national landslide preparedness act

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, clause 2
The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Mineral Leasing Act to amend references of gilsonite to asphaltite

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a vetting process for prospective applicants for high-cost universal service program funding.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7006.

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:

the management of lands in the state of Utah.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 7007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. BURLISON:

H.R. 7008.

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:

The bill relates to section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (U.S.C. 1344)

By Ms. CARAVEO:

H.R. 7009.

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 expand the Airport Improvement Program to be used to combat car theft at airport parking lots.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 7010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide an incentive for States to extend child welfare support and services for youth through 21 years of age, and to allow youth to re-enter foster care after attaining 18 years of age, both without regard to the AFDC eligibility of their parents or legal guardians, and for other purposes

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 7011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To designate one post office

By Mr. D'ESPOSITO:

H.R. 7012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 modify the public transportation emergency relief program, and for other purposes.; Transportation and Public Works

By Mr. DUARTE:

H.R. 7013.

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:

This bill amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act regarding the scope of national pollutant discharge elimination system permit discharge authorizations and the expression of effluent limitations.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 7014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:
Medicaid

By Mr. LANGWORTHY:

H.R. 7015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Workforce

By Ms. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 7016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes Duties, Imposts, and Excises"

The single subject of this legislation is:
Education

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 7017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Health care affordability

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 7018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const., Art. 1, Sec. 8

The single subject of this legislation is:
Animal welfare

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 7019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of this bill is based upon Congress's power under the Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to address disclosures by directors, officers, and principal stockholders of foreign private issuers, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. McCLAIN:

H.R. 7020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This map authorizes NOAA to map the lakebeds of the Great Lakes.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 7021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this legislation is water quality

By Mrs. PELTOLA:

H.R. 7022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide equitable treatment for the people of the Village Corporation established for the Native Village of Saxman, Alaska, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 7023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 7024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

to make improvements to the child tax credit, to provide tax incentives to promote economic growth, to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters, to make improvements to the low-income housing tax credit, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Policy

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 7026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

The purpose of the Reducing Permitting Uncertainty Act is to clarify when section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act can be used.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 7027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 1, United States Code, to clarify that certain tax exemptions are not treated as Federal financial assistance.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 7028.

Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 16: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 24: Mr. CRANE and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 41: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 51: Ms. CARAVEO.

H.R. 82: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 279: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 330: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 407: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 431: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 537: Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 547: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 562: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 619: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 632: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 652: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 696: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 709: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 751: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 766: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 808: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 895: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 909: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 926: Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. MANNING, and Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 932: Mr. CASAR.

H.R. 1046: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 1083: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 1102: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1118: Ms. CARAVEO and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1182: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1247: Mr. D'ESPOSITO and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1278: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1387: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1437: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1470: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1477: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1572: Ms. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 1741: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1770: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1824: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2413: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2440: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 2474: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FINSTAD, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 2480: Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 2484: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 2573: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2620: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 2669: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2685: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 2707: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2742: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.

H.R. 2748: Mrs. RAMIREZ.

H.R. 2814: Ms. MALOY.

H.R. 2825: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 2870: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 2918: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2950: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 2955: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 2992: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 3005: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 3074: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 3083: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3086: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 3133: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3220: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3238: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 3329: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 3347: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3350: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 3470: Ms. ADAMS and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 3475: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 3599: Mr. SORENSEN.

H.R. 3625: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 3654: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 3680: Mr. THANEDAR.

H.R. 3850: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 3892: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 3982: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3990: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4050: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 4052: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4059: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 4138: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 4175: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4273: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.

H.R. 4322: Ms. SALINAS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4335: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 4423: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4438: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4538: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 4545: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 4565: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 4663: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4673: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 4779: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 5003: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5012: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 5048: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 5124: Mr. DELUZZIO.

H.R. 5134: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H.R. 5167: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 5184: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 5263: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 5266: Mr. VAN DREW and Mrs. LUNA.

H.R. 5399: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 5433: Mr. LIEU.

- H.R. 5526: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 5530: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5608: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5644: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 5658: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia and Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 5799: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5810: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5840: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 5867: Mr. MOSKOWITZ and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 5883: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 5896: Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 5909: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5934: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 5985: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 5995: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6003: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 6023: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 6049: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 6094: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 6143: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6191: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6203: Ms. STANSBURY and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 6283: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6319: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6331: Ms. CARAVEO.
H.R. 6349: Ms. TITUS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MAST.
H.R. 6351: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 6377: Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 6394: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. HAYES.
- H.R. 6415: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6438: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 6451: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 6459: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 6504: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 6542: Mr. BABIN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 6555: Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 6563: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 6573: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 6683: Ms. TOKUDA and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 6687: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 6696: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 6727: Mr. JAMES and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 6734: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 6747: Mr. RYAN and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 6751: Mr. SOTO and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 6808: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 6810: Mr. FROST and Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 6831: Mr. JAMES.
H.R. 6853: Mr. SMUCKER.
H.R. 6870: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 6926: Mr. BOST and Mr. JAMES.
H.R. 6933: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 6934: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 6939: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 6941: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6942: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 6944: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 6963: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 6972: Mr. LAWLER, Mr. MILLS, Mrs. BICE, and Mr. FINSTAD.
- H.R. 6973: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 6974: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 6980: Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 6988: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.J. Res. 13: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 37: Mr. PALMER.
H.J. Res. 78: Mr. DELUZIO.
H. Res. 81: Mr. STANTON.
H. Res. 82: Mr. GUEST, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BAIRD.
H. Res. 280: Mr. NADLER.
H. Res. 608: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 643: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 738: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H. Res. 837: Mr. ROSE.
H. Res. 872: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H. Res. 881: Mr. FROST.
H. Res. 882: Ms. MENG and Mr. LAWLER.
H. Res. 915: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 920: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H. Res. 936: Ms. NORTON and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 938: Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 955: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. FINSTAD.
H. Res. 962: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 963: Mr. CORREA and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H. Res. 965: Mr. MCCORMICK, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 967: Ms. SCHOLTEN and Mr. BURCHETT.