



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2024

No. 147

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, September 23, 2024, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2024

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Dr. John S. Repsold, Mosaic Fellowship, Spokane, Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Sovereign Lord God, we desperately need You today.

We are deeply grateful for Your vast blessings to us as a people.

But we need You right now more than anything.

Our divided Nation needs You. Please, give us eyes to see Your wisdom. Give us ears to hear Your voice, and hearts that love to obey Your truth. Show us how to build a nation that respects You and Your laws above all, that loves across our vast differences and gives life to all.

We confess today that we are not enough. Only You are. Forgive us for our pride and many sins. Please come to us once again in deep spiritual awakening and revival. Pour out on us an all-consuming love for You that delivers us from every false god. Teach us to love one another sacrificially.

This we humbly plead in the name of Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TONKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING DR. JOHN S. REPSOLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my pastor, Pastor John Repsold from Spokane, Washington, for opening the House in prayer this morning.

Pastor John has had a lifetime heart for prayer, the call to humble ourselves and pray. He currently pastors Mosaic Fellowship in downtown Spokane, bringing the heart of God to the heart of our city. He also leads Spokane Prays, calling our community to unite in prayer.

I thank Pastor John and recognize his wife, Sandy, and their family, their beautiful children, grandchildren, and friends who have traveled across the country to be here this morning.

It is written in Micah 6:8: "What does the Lord require of thee? To act justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God."

Pastor John and Sandy Repsold have been faithful servants of the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, Albert Einstein once suggested that prayer is the most powerful force to be explored. Pastor John is helping us do that. I thank God and ask God to answer his prayer today in the people's House and for the United States of America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize POW/MIA Recognition Day.

Today, we remember the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who served honorably and who have not returned home. Currently, almost 82,000 servicemembers have not returned from the battlefield. This includes those who served in World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, the Cold War, and both wars in Iraq.

Our servicemembers have made immense sacrifices, allowing us to live our lives in freedom and in peace. We thank those who served and returned

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.

H5529

home, but most importantly, we remember those who served and never returned.

Last September, I introduced a resolution that would enhance research and recovery efforts through future trade agreements with countries that still have our servicemembers. We must do everything in our power to ensure every U.S. servicemember returns home.

Recently, two brave soldiers, Sergeant Richard M. Sharrow and Corporal Francis Jury, made their way back home to the Commonwealth 74 years after bravely fighting in the Korean war.

Madam Speaker, on this POW/MIA Recognition Day, I urge my colleagues to honor our commitment to bring our servicemen and servicewomen home.

PROTECTING AMERICANS' PRIVACY ONLINE

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, so let's focus on saving lives for those who are struggling with our mental health crisis, a crisis worsened by malicious online activity where children, teens, and women often bear the brunt.

As the internet evolves, we have seen the scourge of bad actors sharing others' intimate private photos online. This is a violation of privacy and dignity, and it has metastasized in recent years, causing anguish for victims, many of whom consider suicide. Too many, including children, have lost their lives.

That is why I introduced the bipartisan SHIELD Act, with Representatives MORAN, PLASKETT, FITZPATRICK, and MACE, to close the loophole in current law so that those who share exploitive nude photos of children will be held to account; to ban sextortion, the act of threatening to reveal private or explicit images for money or access; and to protect adults and their private photos from being exposed.

The internet is ever-changing, and Federal law must catch up. The SHIELD Act will protect Americans' privacy online and save lives.

REMEMBERING GREENE COUNTY FIRE RESCUE BATTALION CHIEF CHRIS EDDY

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

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, in John 15:12-13, Jesus says: "This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, that someone lay down his life for his friends."

Madam Speaker, Greene County Fire Rescue Battalion Chief Chris Eddy laid

down his life for his friends on September 4, 2024, while battling a tractor-trailer fire on Highway 15 north of Greensboro.

Chief Eddy grew up in Greene County and graduated from Nathanael Greene Academy in Siloam, Georgia. He spent his life dedicated to this community and lost his life in its service.

He leaves behind his wife, Lindsey, and son, Bryson, who are enduring the pain of loss that the families of all first responders know they could face.

Words can't adequately express our deep sadness at the loss of this incredible man and public servant, who was so dearly loved by his family and community.

We are thankful for who he was and know that it is men like him who keep our communities strong and safe.

May Chief Chris Eddy rest in peace. May he always be remembered for his honorable service to Greene County.

RECOGNIZING NEW YORK STATE TEACHER OF THE YEAR COLLEEN KEOUGH

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual who exemplifies the best of New York's capital region, a leader and educator whose commitment to her students has changed lives for the better. That individual is Ms. Colleen Keough, a second grade teacher at Hamilton Elementary School in Schenectady who earlier this month was recognized by the New York Board of Regents as the New York State Teacher of the Year.

In 16 years with the Schenectady City School District, including 13 at Hamilton Elementary, Ms. Keough has been a relentless champion for her students in the classroom and beyond. She has made her classroom a safe, fun, and supportive place for every student to learn, and she has helped build community with students' families through the monthly PTO events she started with a colleague.

A teacher is someone who drives students' academic progress, but a great teacher is so much more. Colleen Keough is one of those great teachers. I thank Ms. Keough and congratulate her again. Her heart, her leadership, and her dedication serve as an inspiration to her students and to us all. She has enabled her students to discover their gifts, their abilities, and their passions. We thank her.

RECOGNIZING TENNESSEE SHERIFF OF THE YEAR JAMES "JIMBO" BERRONG

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I recognize and congratulate my dear

friend and Blount County Sheriff James "Jimbo" Berrong on being named Tennessee's Sheriff of the Year. It was much deserved.

Jimbo has served for over 30 years, and he has done a great job keeping our constituents safe. He was appointed in 1989 and has been elected every term since 1990.

He is known for being a dedicated leader with a proactive approach in protecting the folks in Blount County. He knows his people and their problems, and he has taken great steps to address everything he can, from substance abuse to church safety to increasing the number of officers we have in our schools.

He started one of the first school resource officer programs as well as a senior outreach program. Sheriff Berrong also runs the top agency in the State for dealing with sex offenders and human trafficking long before it made the news.

I thank the sheriff for being my dear friend. He has always been good to me and my girls, and that means the world to me. I can't thank him enough, and I can't think of anyone I would rather have run the Blount County Sheriff's Office. His work does not go unnoticed. It has always been appreciated by me and my family. I know the folks of Blount County love him.

□ 0915

PROJECT 2025

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, in recent months there has been a lot of rhetoric around Project 2025, but many Americans still don't understand its very dangerous implications. Donald Trump's Project 2025 is a well-funded Presidential transition plan which would empower a future antidemocratic Presidential administration to carry out an extreme power agenda.

Therefore, if enacted, Project 2025 would eliminate the Department of Education and eliminate the Head Start education program which serves 1 million children and further expose 386,000 children in foster care to risk of increased discrimination.

If Republicans impose Trump's Project 2025, they will criminalize abortion nationwide and create a national monitor to track women's pregnancies and miscarriages. They are even threatening to imprison doctors and nurses who provide necessary care.

Project 2025 is a strategic plan to cut overtime protections for 4.3 million workers.

WESTERN CATTLE TRAIL 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a milestone in American history. In the aftermath of the Civil War, longhorn cattle ran free in Texas, and markets in the East had a dire need for beef. To meet that need, the Nation called on young cowboys to gather the wild cattle and move them north to the railroads in Kansas.

They brought the cattle to stockyard towns like Abilene, Wichita, and Ellsworth. As cattle diseases moved west, cattlemen needed another route to bring cattle north, and in 1874, the Western Trail was pioneered along Kansas prairies.

According to Kansas historians, the Western Cattle Trail would last longer, carry more cattle, and cover a greater distance than any other trail. These historic cattle drives set the stage for today's modern beef industry where the Big First District is the number one district for beef production in the country.

On November 1 and 2, the Western Cattle Trail and International Chisolm Trail Association will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Western Cattle Trail in Dodge City.

I commend those celebrating the history of cattle trails, while giving thanks to the farmers, ranchers, stockmen, and communities who continue the cowboy tradition while helping feed the world.

COMMEMORATING THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 13th anniversary of the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

For decades thousands of servicemembers were discharged, not because of any serious infraction, but because of who they are.

As ranking member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it has been a mission of my office to chronicle some of the stories of servicemembers affected by this regressive ban. However, more deserve the chance to tell their story.

I am sponsoring a bill to create a congressional commission to investigate the historic and ongoing impacts of discriminatory military policies on LGBTQ+ servicemembers and veterans.

I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring these servicemembers and veterans who sacrificed so much to serve our country.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "MULTI-POLLUTANT EMISSIONS STANDARDS FOR MODEL YEARS 2027 AND LATER LIGHT-DUTY AND MEDIUM-DUTY VEHICLES"

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1455, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 136) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 136

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles" (89 Fed. Reg. 27842 (April 18, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 136.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 136, led by Energy and Commerce Committee member Republican Representative JOHN JAMES.

Over and over again, the Biden-Harris Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, has doubled down on its radical rush-to-green energy agenda.

The EPA's latest tailpipe emissions rule is not really about reducing air

pollution. It is about forcing Americans to drive electric vehicles.

By the EPA's own estimation, the new rule will effectively require at least two-thirds of all new cars in the United States to be 100 percent electric by 2032, not hybrids, not plug-in hybrids, not hydrogen, not any other clean technology.

This unreasonable rule is just another example of how the Biden-Harris administration's rush-to-green agenda is handing China the keys to America's energy future, jeopardizing our auto industry, and forcing people to buy unaffordable electric vehicles they do not want.

Here are the facts: In May, the average fully electric model was \$17,326 more expensive than the average gas-burning compact crossover.

At the beginning of this year, nearly 5,000 American car dealers sent a letter to the President demanding that he hit the brakes on the EPA's unrealistic agenda after EVs stacked up on their car lots.

Moreover, recently, J.D. Power cut its projected sales of EVs by 25 percent, citing increased competition in the market for gas-powered vehicle alternatives.

Despite all of this, the Biden-Harris EPA has continued its de facto EV mandates, undeterred by the reality of what Americans actually want.

Instead of forcing Americans to spend more money on vehicles that they don't want to buy, on vehicles that only advance a political agenda, let's get back to the work of making sure that people have access to affordable, reliable, and functional means of transportation.

To ensure Americans drive what vehicle best suits their needs, vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 136 to put an end to the EPA's unrealistic tailpipe emissions rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican joint resolution, a resolution taken straight from Trump's Project 2025 playbook. The resolution invokes the Congressional Review Act to fully repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, rule setting new protective air pollution standards for light-duty and medium-duty vehicles.

Now, this resolution is yet another Republican effort to attack the Clean Air Act and roll back commonsense air pollution protections. It puts the profits of corporate polluters over the health and safety of the American people.

Not only is this CRA ripped right out of Trump's extreme Project 2025 playbook, it is just the latest attempt by House Republicans to do the bidding of their Big Oil allies and prevent the EPA from protecting public health and the environment.

Instead of focusing on funding the government, which is set to expire at the end of this month, Republicans are wasting time bringing up this resolution they know has zero chance of becoming law. Even Senate Republicans have publicly admitted that they have abandoned their strategy of using this CRA this Congress.

So one really has to ask the question: What are we doing here?

This is yet another example of House Republicans failing to be serious about governing or working to implement policies that actually benefit the American people.

Americans have the right to clean air and a safe climate, and EPA's clean vehicle rule would put us on the road to achieve those rights. The transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, making up nearly one-third of total pollution in the United States. This pollution affects more than 130 million Americans who live in counties with unhealthy air. Even worse, air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in our Nation every year. Thankfully, EPA is working to address this dangerous air pollution with the tools that Congress gave it.

Now, EPA's clean vehicle standards will avoid 7.2 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide between 2027 and 2055, that is equivalent to four times the emissions from the entire transportation sector in 2021. This incredible air pollution reduction will result in tangible benefits for Americans across the country. The rule is projected to yield approximately \$100 billion in net benefits each year.

Clean vehicle standards are also a win for consumers and our economy. EPA projects U.S. auto manufacturing employment growth of up to 188,000 jobs in 2032 thanks to this rule. That is on top of the existing 200,000 jobs that have already been added in clean vehicle manufacturing since the start of the Biden-Harris administration.

Once the standards take effect, American families are expected to save an average of \$6,000 over the lifetime of a light-duty vehicle, including fuel, operation, and maintenance costs.

So today we are going to hear a lot of false claims from my Republican colleagues. They are going to falsely say that this rule is a mandate, but let me be perfectly clear. EPA's standards are not an electric vehicle mandate. They are technology-neutral and performance based, as required by the Clean Air Act. Auto manufacturers have the flexibility to meet the standards with a wide range of clean vehicle technologies, like hybrids, plug-in hybrids, fuel cell, internal combustion engines, and full battery electric.

Manufacturers can choose the best option for them and to meet the needs of their consumers.

EPA worked closely with stakeholders to ensure that the final rule is ambitious and achievable and benefits all Americans. That is why EPA's final

clean vehicle rule is supported by a diverse coalition of autoworkers, automakers, and public health and environmental groups.

Now, the Biden-Harris rule accelerates the adoption of cleaner vehicle technologies that will offer expanded, better choices for consumers, lower costs, and make sure that the United States dominates the next century's worth of clean technology.

This Republican resolution reverses course, putting all of this at risk, and replacing it with nothing. What is more, it also prevents any future administration from taking similar action, and that is a recipe for disaster for our economy, the American people, and for our climate.

Madam Speaker, I just received an SAP, the Statement of Administration Policy, from the Biden administration. I am not going to read it all, but I just want to read the last part of it where it says that this rule is supported by U.S. automakers and autoworkers and that repealing it would jeopardize development in the critical technology sector, ceding the electric vehicle and battery future to global competitors like China.

I hear all the time my colleagues on the other side talking about Communist China and talking about Beijing and how we are not keeping up with them.

□ 0930

Well, the majority will be doing exactly the opposite with this repeal of the rule. Republicans will give Communist China the competitive edge.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 136, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), the champion and prime sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to be here today, and I remind my colleagues that Communism isn't fought with Communism. That is exactly what this government takeover of our American auto industry is.

I thank, again, Chairwoman RODGERS for her unwavering support of this resolution and her leadership and Leader SCALISE for his support on getting this to the floor, as well. They have been leaders not just on this issue, but on so many issues that are important to the livelihoods of Americans.

Again, I acknowledge how personal this moment is for me. My father was just inducted into the Automotive Hall of Fame last night. In 1971, he started his trucking company with one truck, one trailer, and no excuses. He had to fight all the way up to the Supreme Court for the next 7 years for the right to be able to travel across State lines. He was a pioneer, not just as an African-American MBE, not just as an African American in the industry, but for all small businesses.

My father fought to deregulate, to preserve the American Dream in the country, and, 50 years later, his son is standing here today fighting to deregulate, to fight for the American Dream in this country, against the burdensome regulations that are choking out jobs from my district and others.

It is the end of September. In the beginning of October, in my district, in Warren, 2,450 UAW jobs are going to be sent from Warren, not to Sterling Heights, but to Saltillo, Mexico, because the automotive industry is in survival mode because of policies just like this.

The audacity of my colleagues on the left to say that we are wasting time. I hope that every single UAW worker who you just quoted, Mr. Ranking Member, hears that you say that we are wasting their time.

We are fast-forwarding right now to what the automotive industry understands is a comply-or-die moment. We must fight for the American middle class that was born in Michigan, and we must fight for the American Dream that so many people feel is dying all over the country.

This tailpipe emissions standard is not just harmful, but it is catastrophic. People with their heads in the clouds in this town, who don't understand the way people are living across this country, need to come to reality.

The reality is the automotive industry itself, if you actually listen, has told you that in order to get to 67 percent compliant of new-vehicle sales, they cannot get there with the current technology or the current infrastructure or the current software without going to battery electric vehicles. Nobody here is against battery electric vehicles, but we are against telling the American people what they can do with their money and when they can do it.

This is why we are here. In 2032, the standard requires 25 percent of all sleeper-cab tractors and 60 percent of light heavy-duty vehicles, your cars and trucks, to have zero emissions. This mandate will cripple the trucking and shipping industries and drive up costs.

Does anybody in this country have a problem with inflation or cost of living? Well, just look to your left, and you will find the source.

In Michigan, the 10th Congressional District alone, we have over 1,000 manufacturing businesses, many tied to the automotive industry. Biden's extreme EV agenda threatens 77,000 manufacturing jobs in my district alone, the number one manufacturing district in the Nation. This is not just bad policy for Michigan. It is bad for the country.

Name a district that doesn't have a dealership, and that dealership is likely the largest philanthropist in your church, to your bake sales, to your Little League team. Guess what is going to happen when they have cars on their lots that they can't sell. Guess what is going to happen with the same policies that spent \$7.5 billion for charging stations and only got 7 in 2 years.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, I will wrap up. I am fairly emotional about the livelihoods of the people who sent me here.

This CRA takes a stand and sends a clear message that we will not abandon our people or our automakers or our autoworkers. Michigan isn't afraid of the future. Republicans are not afraid of the future, but we demand that every American have a part in it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of H.J. Res. 136. I think about every hardworking American whom Washington has forgotten when we talk about making vehicles that are affordable and making a nation that is competitive.

This isn't about partisanship. It is about common sense. It is called pragmatism.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Minerals.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

The transportation sector is the largest source of climate pollution in our United States and also a major emitter of other dangerous pollutants.

It should not surprise anyone that EPA has finalized a rule to fulfill its obligation to protect Americans from harmful air pollution. Unfortunately, this resolution will nullify a rule that, by all analyses, will save lives, save Americans money, and bolster our domestic manufacturing.

It is, indeed, expected to result in up to \$99 billion in net benefits annually, including major consumer savings on reduced fuel costs and vehicle maintenance that can range up to \$6,000 over the life of a vehicle.

Madam Speaker, just the other night, I attended the annual gathering of the Alliance to Save Energy as they recognized heroes in our communities who have moved forward with innovation and efforts to clean the environment and to make the air we breathe more safe.

It was interesting to watch these innovators, these start-up agents, members from the business and industrial communities, all talking about progress, significant progress that has been made simply by responding to demands for a safer and cleaner environment.

It is why this rule has worked in conjunction with the industry and the union workers, to make certain that there is a rule that can indeed be re-

sponded to. Putting aside all of the public health, environmental, and economic benefits, we should see this rule as an opportunity to further drive technological innovation.

EPA's rule is in line with market trends for light-duty vehicles. More and more Americans are choosing to go electric, thanks in large part to incentives, incentives like those in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act.

Even more of these vehicles, because of that and their components, will be made in America. In the years ahead, we expect the cost of EVs to come down and come down significantly, the performance and range of EVs to improve, and consumer demand for EVs to continue to grow.

This resolution will create tremendous uncertainty for American auto manufacturers, undermining the nearly \$200 billion in private-sector investment that has been made into our domestic EV and battery supply chains since the start of the Biden administration. Those investments are already creating hundreds of thousands of high-quality jobs.

Automakers want and need to know which standards they need to design and build their vehicles to. EPA's rule provides the certainty required to develop and produce American-made, clean-vehicle technologies. That certainty is a theme constantly brought to my attention by those who come and visit with us to advance progressive policy.

For over a century, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. We know other countries are competing to produce the next generation of zero-emission vehicles, and I believe there is a bipartisan agreement that the United States should not be dependent on China for EV technologies.

Here is where we depart: Republicans want to pretend that EVs are not coming, even though all the consumer trends say otherwise. The majority is okay with China dominating this market if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can stop Americans from going electric.

House Democrats know that increased adoption of EVs is going to benefit America, Americans' health, our environment, and our wallets. We believe that, if America competes, America wins. We will embrace the changes that are occurring in this sector and make certain our manufacturers have that regulatory certainty necessary to drive us forward to a cleaner and, indeed, a healthier future. That certainty is provided by the standards Republicans want to undo today.

Madam Speaker, for the sake of promoting American innovation, addressing our pollution challenges, and supporting our long-term national economic competitiveness, I urge Members to oppose this resolution.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, just to clarify, all the

incentives go away when the mandate takes full effect.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the auto capital of the world. We want to keep it that way and stop imposing China's agenda on us.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman speaks right about the auto capital of the world, Michigan.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 136 put forward by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. JAMES), which blocks the tailpipe emissions rule, EPA's de facto electric vehicle mandate, not Project 2025 gaslighting coming from the other side of the aisle.

Last December, with bipartisan support, the House passed the CARS Act, a bill I led to block the EPA's proposed rule and similar rules. A few months later, the EPA finalized its rule setting stringent emission standards, which would force automakers to ensure that 56 percent of light-duty vehicle sales are battery electric, and another 13 percent are plug-in hybrid by 2032.

The final tailpipe rule is nearly as radical as the proposed rule, which this body has already unequivocally opposed. Even with government subsidies, EVs continue to be out of reach for many Americans who have already been experiencing the effects of crippling inflation worsened by the Biden-Harris administration.

Consumers are not only worried about the price tag, but EVs also pose significant practicality challenges due to limited range and battery charging times. This executive overreach would also essentially hand China the keys to our automotive future, as around 90 percent of the EV supply chain, in aggregate, is controlled by China.

Instead of implementing unrealistic emission standards that effectively mandate EVs, we should be pursuing policies that promote innovation and preserve U.S. manufacturing.

I am a proud Michigander, and I know that this industry thrives off of American ingenuity and innovation from the engineers in metro Detroit, not the bureaucrats in Washington. The industry thrives off of consumers, as well. We must encourage consumer choice so that Americans can purchase the vehicle that works best for them.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a member of our committee.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.J. Res. 136, a resolution seeking to overturn the EPA's very important tailpipe emissions rule finalized in April 2024.

This rule sets strong pollution standards for passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty vehicles for model years 2027 through 2032. It is a vital step toward cleaner air and healthier lives for all Americans.

As an emergency physician, I have witnessed firsthand the severe health impacts of air pollution on our communities. In fact, recent scientific literature shows that those communities

that live in high-polluted areas live 10 years less than those that do not.

The Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley in southern California, in my district, despite their beauty, consistently rank among the worst air quality in the Nation. Without surprise, this has led to an alarmingly high asthma rate in our district, nearly double the average national rate.

□ 0945

Approximately 27 percent of our children suffer from asthma and experience some of the highest asthma-related hospitalizations in California.

Families, particularly those in low-income, frontline, vulnerable communities, are grappling with the consequences of living in one of the worst regions for air quality in the country.

This is not just an issue in my district. Madam Speaker, this is an issue in your district. This is an issue in all of our districts.

Across the United States, air pollution is responsible for over 100,000 premature deaths each year and results in billions in healthcare costs. These are healthcare costs that the middle-class family cannot afford from preventable illnesses such as heart disease, lung disease, and asthma.

The EPA's new rule is expected to prevent nearly 1,000 premature deaths annually, reduce millions of tons of harmful emissions, and save American families who are struggling with the cost of living \$1.6 trillion in healthcare costs by 2050.

For my constituents, this rule means fewer children suffering from asthma attacks, fewer seniors rushed to the emergency room for respiratory illnesses, and cleaner air for everyone. Yet, some of my Republican colleagues are attempting to repeal it, prioritizing the profits of big polluters over the health of our families.

This resolution, in fact, is straight from Trump's 2025 playbook because it aligns with his plan to put corporate polluters in the driver's seat and prioritize Big Oil profits over Americans' health and well-being.

Repealing this rule would erase \$280 billion in net benefits and prolong the suffering of vulnerable communities from preventable diseases.

This resolution serves corporate interests at the expense of the public's health. This resolution will revoke the EPA's protections and replace them with nothing. This will not only repeal the EPA's rule but prevent any further administration from tackling this issue and taking any similar type of action.

By rejecting H.J. Res. 136 and supporting the EPA's rule, we are choosing to prioritize our constituents' health and advance justice for the most vulnerable. Clean air is a right. It is a common good.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critical EPA rule and vote against H.J. Res. 136 because our communities are suffering incredibly from the pollution that they breathe.

Asthma is a horrible illness, especially in children—children who come in from playing with their family and suddenly start wheezing. Sometimes you have minutes to give them the appropriate treatment to prevent them from dying. Sometimes, because they live in rural areas like in my colleagues' districts, they don't have the time to get to that emergency department for that treatment. I have seen it.

This would help reduce the risks that can lead to higher asthma mortality and is aimed at ensuring that we have healthier middle-class families, middle-class families that aren't burdened by the cost of disease, middle-class families that need the support to live healthy lives.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), chairman of the Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, EVs have a future in our transportation system. If you want to buy an EV, that is your choice. We will happily sell you one from the State of Georgia, but I don't think government should corner Americans into buying a car based on ideological bureaucrats' preferred models.

Rushed government mandates on arbitrary timelines without consideration of geopolitical factors undermine consumer choice, manipulate markets, and will further tie us to China's whims.

Congressman JAMES' CRA resolution would restore personal freedom and protect America. I urge its support.

EPA asserts its tailpipe standards are not a mandate for widespread EV adoption, but the numbers of the regulation tell a different story.

Even more telling, the market is not ready to voluntarily go there. J.D. Power has downgraded projections for EV sales by 25 percent. Cox Automotive's research team has found that the average consumer isn't sold on going electric, and many won't be easily convinced, even with incentives.

If we are being intellectually honest, the administration's policy outcome is only possible through this unrealistic market conversion mandate. Why? In addition to buyer sentiment, the regulation's most modest compliance pathway requires increasing the market share of new 2032 all-electric or plug-in hybrid vehicles by 62 percent over 8 years.

Moreover, car manufacturers have slowed their U.S. production of electric-powered cars. They realize these vehicles with subsidies and mandates are not selling, and the automakers only have so long to offset their losses with gas-powered vehicles.

Meanwhile, this rule aids China, which is further expanding its global dominance of inputs to make electric vehicles.

This situation is madness, and gaming our regulatory system this way will cripple hardworking Americans.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Congressman JAMES' CRA.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is the ranking member of our Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, the Inflation Reduction Act, the bipartisan infrastructure law, and the CHIPS Act constitute the most important climate legislation ever enacted. EPA modeling indicates implementation of the IRA alone can achieve a reduction of the transportation sector's carbon pollution by roughly 11 to 25 percent from 2005 levels by 2030. EPA's final rule is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from light-duty vehicles by about 11 percent every year.

Once fully phased in, the standards will save the average American driver an estimated \$6,000 in reduced fuel and maintenance over the life of a vehicle.

I am going to say that again because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to think this is bad for consumers when, in fact, it is good. Once fully phased in, the standards will save the average American driver an estimated \$6,000 over the life of a vehicle.

The beauty of this approach is that it allows automakers to do what they do best, which is innovate. EPA's rule does not mandate or ban any specific technology. Instead, it sets emission standards that apply across an entire auto fleet rather than specific vehicles. What this means is that auto companies could still produce cars with higher emissions provided that they balance out the emissions with sales from lower emission vehicles.

EPA did its homework. They worked closely with stakeholders in developing this rule, and that is why manufacturers can use a variety of approaches, from EVs to gas-powered vehicles with particulate filters, to comply. I am confident American automakers can rise to this challenge.

As States and auto companies plan, consumers are increasingly excited about lower emission and zero-emission vehicles. In my home State of Colorado, an Environmental Defense Fund analysis examined the net purchase cost of electric vehicles and found many offered thousands of dollars in lifetime savings. For example, it found cost savings as high as \$21,500 when comparing the cost of Ford's F-150 Lightning EV with the gas-powered Ford F-150.

Consumers are taking advantage. In 2023, U.S. EV sales reached 1.6 million, which is a 60 percent increase from 2022. This shows consumer demand for EVs is here and will only grow.

As the evidence shows, EPA's rule saves consumers money and reduces carbon emissions. It is not an either/or. However, to compete globally, we must continue to make progress.

One of the few countries that rivals the U.S. in EV adoption is China. Eight

of the top best-selling EVs in the world are made by Chinese companies. This administration has taken strong action to ensure U.S. automakers can compete in this critical sector.

Now, I will address a claim the EPA emissions limit will mandate electric vehicles. We hear this all the time. This is simply not the case.

EPA is relying on flexible performance-based standards. This means, as I said, instead of requiring any specific approach, automakers have the option to allow for a mix of technologies to meet the limits.

This has not stopped my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from pursuing CRAs that would raise emissions and hike costs for consumers. I find that so ironic because what we want to do is help consumers here.

Unfortunately, this isn't new. The majority has spent this entire Congress attacking progress in protecting human health and the environment, while the Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee has moved numerous bills attacking energy efficiency, including the so-called Refrigerator Freedom Act.

At the end of the day, the biggest threat to energy security is our country's dependence on foreign oil and natural gas. However, with this resolution and by ignoring the threats posed to the grid by the climate crisis, frankly, the majority is fiddling while Rome burns.

The Biden-Harris EPA has led. I am grateful for their leadership. If we care about our energy security, we should all support EPA's rule to reduce our demand for a finite resource.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my support for Mr. JAMES' resolution.

I am not anti-EV, and I support innovation, however, creating supply cannot force demand, and that is exactly what these rush-to-green policies are trying to do.

Over the years, I have brought together stakeholders in my district and around Indiana for roundtables, and we know that the EV mandate is unfeasible and just not working. We simply cannot get the energy where it needs to be when it needs to be there.

With this rule, it is clear that this administration wants to leave the consumer with no choice other than an EV. The consumer has made it abundantly clear that they want choice.

This rule would be devastating to consumers, manufacturers, and the transportation industry itself.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in overturning this administration's shortsighted rule.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Madam Speaker, Michigan put the world on wheels, and we are going to keep it moving forward. We are proud of our legacy that is ever-evolving, thanks to the grit of the American worker.

West Michiganders, in particular, are a key part of this legacy as folks across my district manufacture transportation components necessary to keep this country in motion.

I also take special pride in representing miles of beautiful Lake Michigan shoreline, the largest freshwater reserve in the entire world. My community knows that we must be good stewards of our Nation's most critical cargo ports.

Right now, we are fighting to preserve our resources so that our children might inherit a world where our kids can breathe, that can sustain our farms, is void of extreme weather events, and has clean water to drink and air to breathe.

This is not going to happen overnight. It requires a multifaceted approach. The EPA's effort to limit harmful air pollution from light- and medium-duty vehicles is a piece of this lifesaving puzzle.

Our Nation's transportation sector is critical, but it is also one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, so to safeguard the health and well-being of Americans, we have to work to slash pollution associated with our planes, trains, ships, and cars.

□ 1000

To be clear, the EPA's technology-neutral rule is not an EV mandate. It is a call on manufacturers to innovate and expand options for consumers to choose vehicles based on their potential environmental impact.

What exactly do so many of my colleagues across the aisle have against choice?

When it comes to forging a new path forward in transportation, I would never bet against Michigan, especially Michigan automakers.

Air pollution, particularly from tailpipes, is responsible for asthma and a wide array of respiratory illnesses in children, adults, and seniors.

If this rule stays intact, families across West Michigan will save on healthcare costs an estimated \$1.6 trillion and protect the well-being of their children. As a mom of two young children, two young student athletes in particular, I take this seriously.

If you are a parent out there of a child with asthma, I stand here on your behalf today. If you are an American autoworker, I stand here on your behalf today.

If you are ready to stand up to big polluters and China and stand up for American autoworkers, I am standing for you here today.

Rolling back this rule is bending a knee to big polluters while ignoring the broad coalition of autoworkers, automakers, public health advocates, and environmental organizations who

believe in addressing climate change head-on while furthering innovation in transportation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Madam Speaker, I am so proud of West Michigan's critical role in the transportation sector, but this CRA won't do anything to address the reality of the sector's emissions.

This is not a mandate. It is an opportunity to innovate for families, for farmers, and to get out there and keep China from eating our lunch.

I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership in pushing back against this CRA, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, after months of falsely claiming that the Biden-Harris administration was not pursuing a ban on gas-powered vehicles, the EPA has reversed their position by finalized policies that would create a de facto ban over the course of the next 10 years.

The light- and medium-duty tailpipe rule would require 68 percent of all sales of new passenger vehicles to be electric or plug-in electric hybrid by 2032.

The fact is simple. Electric vehicles cannot meet the demands of my constituents in Pennsylvania. The mountains in Pennsylvania, along with the harsh winters and the hot summers, make driving an electric vehicle both unreliable and unrealistic for my constituents.

Simply said, they do not want to be forced into choosing what type of vehicle they can drive. At a time when inflation has skyrocketed over 20 percent and the average electric vehicle costs more than \$55,000, forcing Americans to purchase these vehicles is a disaster for working families.

The Biden-Harris EPA cannot force the American people to purchase cars that they don't want and cars that they can't afford.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and stand up to the EPA bureaucracy that continues to harass working American families.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I was a little bit stunned when I came

down here today to hear the argument made on pollution.

I would just request that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do some research as to the amount of pollution that came from cars 50 years ago compared to today or just get pictures of Pittsburgh or Los Angeles 50 years ago compared to today. Things are already so wildly cleaner.

In any event, my major concern about this rule is it is another attack on the middle class. I have been told that a Chevy Silverado may cost \$20,000 more, EV or not. I mean, people cannot afford that.

It is understated, but because of the huge cost to repair and the cost of insurance, and most States, including Wisconsin, have mandatory insurance, it is dramatically more than a traditional car.

It wasn't until this week I found out that the resale value was less. If you are like a lot of people and like to trade in your new car 5 or 6 years down the road, you are going to get less for your EV vehicle.

When you combine the money you are going to lose on the depreciation, the huge increase in insurance, and the huge increased cost when you buy the car, it is just an assault on the middle class.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. This is unbelievable. I can't believe the radical left's absolutely relentless climate alarmism that has already claimed a bunch of victims: plastic straws, ceiling fans, gas stoves, you name it.

Now, the EPA is targeting our combustion engine cars, trying to shove their electric vehicle agenda down the throats of freedom-loving Americans. This is all in the name of so-called climate change, while making us even more dependent on the Chinese Communist Party.

To put this in perspective, how out of touch this friggling proposal is, there are 260 million gasoline- and diesel-powered passenger vehicles on the road today but only 3 million EVs. Let that sink in, Mr. Speaker. Of those EV drivers, 46 percent want to go back to gasoline cars. How about that?

One of the things I tell people is if you are driving an electric car, don't ever turn onto a dead-end street because you will be stuck on a road with no outlet. Let that sink in.

All jokes aside, I am absolutely proud to support my colleague JOHN JAMES' bill to protect consumer choice, allowing Americans—who would have known—to actually have realistic car options in the marketplace, which at the same time prevents further reliance on China.

I am tired of hearing all the climate alarmism. Now they are trying to make Americans do what they want them to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell the climate alarmists they can blow it out their tailpipes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and let Americans drive the agenda and not some high-minded bureaucrats.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 136 and thank Congressman JAMES for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, consumer choice is a vital component of our free market economy, which has grown wealth in this country substantially over the years.

However, an endless obsession with their rush to a green agenda, the Biden-Harris administration is seeking to strip away consumer choice in the form of a tailpipe emissions rule that would effectively mandate that at least two-thirds of all new cars in the United States be electric by 2032. This is a mandate straight from the top. Let me be clear. I am not anti-EV. I am pro-American consumer.

As I represent rural Georgia, for many of my constituents, EVs are impractical, considering the high cost, lack of charging infrastructure in rural communities, and overall time commitment to get that full charge.

The American people do not need or want this administration mandating what car best suits their family's needs.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 136 and to restore consumer choice and end this unreasonable rule. The American people are sick and tired of this.

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

Madam Speaker, I keep hearing arguments from my Republican colleagues that the EPA is forcing electric vehicles onto American consumers, but nobody's forcing anyone to buy an electric vehicle, and to claim that is happening is just false.

Expanding and diversifying our domestic vehicle manufacturing industry will increase consumer choice and provide more options for all Americans.

The rule that the Republicans seek to repeal today is actually supported by the auto manufacturers as well as auto unions.

We should be empowering industry to innovate and create better-performing, more affordable options for our constituents. This is about options. There is no mandate.

EPA's consistent vehicle emission standards have empowered decades of

innovation in the vehicle industry, which have benefited all Americans.

If we want to compete with China, we have to continue to provide choice. We have to continue to make sure that electric vehicles and other options are available. Otherwise, we are going to fall behind.

I urge my colleagues again to vote "no" on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, the numbers that we are quoting are from the final rule. We are not making it up.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 136, which would disapprove of the EPA's radical tailpipe emission rule and EV mandate.

This rule would mandate that two-thirds of the new vehicles being sold by 2032 be all electric, strong-arming auto manufacturers into building cars that simply do not reflect market needs.

America is in the middle of a historic surge in power demand, yet the Biden-Harris administration has chosen to implement policies that will force the early retirement of some of our most reliable power plants.

The EPA's EV mandate will put more strain on our electric grid and further undermine the grid's reliability for years to come.

Simply put, increasing demand on the grid through forced electrification while reducing our power supply is a recipe for disaster.

With the passage of this legislation today, we can reaffirm our support of the free market and consumer choice, and we can defend America's energy security.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this action taken under the Congressional Review Act to overturn the EPA's misguided tailpipe emissions rule.

This rule, if enacted, would force the majority of Americans to buy electric vehicles instead of vehicles powered by other technologies.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear. I have nothing against electric vehicles. I do, however, think that Americans should be empowered to make their own decisions about what vehicle technology works for them and their families.

The fact is that EVs cost on average \$12,000 more than the equivalent gasoline-powered vehicle. That is just the purchase price.

The same misguided policies that the EPA is pursuing here are also forcing the cost of electricity generation to go up in this country.

In fact, in my own hometown in California, the electric provider recently submitted a rate case that seeks to raise the base rate for residential electricity to \$0.45 a kilowatt hour.

Try doing the math on what it costs to drive an electric vehicle when you are forced to pay \$0.45 a kilowatt hour for the energy to charge it.

Madam Speaker, Americans should be empowered to make their own decisions about what vehicles to buy, not forced into that decision by misguided government policies. I urge a "yes" vote.

□ 1015

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, government market mandates are contrary to the very founding principles of America. Mandating EV purchases are especially egregious and fall short of the hopped-up environmental benefits supposedly driving the logic behind the mandate.

First, I have nothing against EVs. They are innovative technology. They will be part of our transportation future, and they are actually fun to drive if you can afford them.

However, EVs are not selling, especially in rural America, where they are unreliable, unaffordable, and can't even be purchased with the massive taxpayer-funded subsidies that are available right now. EVs are not the savior of the environment nor the climate. The EPA and DOE's own data clearly show this.

First off, the United States is responsible for 13.49 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. It is another topic, but China is more than double that. The entire transportation sector in the United States makes up 29 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions. Light-duty trucks and passenger vehicles make up 57 percent of transportation. The rest of it is planes, trains, and automobiles. Finally, 40 percent of U.S. electrical production comes from noncarbon-emitting sources.

When you do the math, the claims that EVs are going to save the climate and save the planet fall far short. Emissions in America equal 13.49 percent of the global greenhouse gas emissions. Twenty-nine percent comes from U.S. transportation, all forms of transportation. Fifty-seven percent of transportation comes from light-duty trucks and passenger vehicles. Forty percent of our energy or electricity comes from noncarbon-emitting sources.

If you multiply that out, the maximum potential if every passenger car and light-duty truck in America were made an EV overnight, you reduce global greenhouse gas emissions 0.9 percent. Madam Speaker, figures don't lie, but sometimes liars figure.

Americans are being force-fed EVs, and they are being force-fed a lie, saying that driving an EV is going to save the planet. It is not going to help one iota. While we are forcing people to drive EVs, China is building a new coal-fired plant every week. I encourage passage of this resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, may I ask again as to the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY). The gentleman from New Jersey has 5½ minutes remaining.

The gentlewoman from Washington has 6¼ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, we are not mandating EVs. We are not forcing anybody to use EVs. I am going to say that over and over again. However, what we are doing is trying to reduce air pollution. This resolution is a step backwards in addressing dangerous air pollution that contributes to climate change and contributes to asthma and all kinds of health disorders.

The transportation sector is responsible for a significant portion of our Nation's greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollutants that harm human health. Over 130 million people across the country live in counties with unhealthy levels of air pollution.

Even worse, air pollution is associated with 100,000 premature deaths every year. Let me repeat that because I don't think my Republican colleagues are getting how serious this is. Every year, 100,000 people across the country die sooner than they are expected to because of air pollution.

Congress directed the EPA to protect public health and the environment and granted it several tools to do so through the Clean Air Act. One of these tools is the authority to set vehicle emission standards for harmful pollutants emitted by vehicles, which is exactly what EPA did when it proposed and finalized the rule that the Republicans are attempting to repeal today.

This reduction in air pollution will result in fewer heart attacks, fewer respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses, fewer cases of aggravated asthma, and fewer cases of decreased lung function. The rule is also projected to prevent up to 2,500 premature deaths. With this CRA, Republicans want to wipe out these significant air pollution reductions and associated public health benefits. It is that simple.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who knows a little bit about cars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the Biden administration's proposed

rule to increase emission standards for light- and medium-duty trucks. In full disclosure, I am a car dealer. I know what I am talking about, and I am the expert in the room.

This rule is an attack on hard-working Americans and, if implemented, would require up to two-thirds of new cars and nearly 40 percent of trucks sold in the U.S. to be electric vehicles in the next 8 years, threatening consumer choice and furthering our reliance on foreign adversaries.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and owner and operator of car dealerships in Texas for over 53 years, I have seen firsthand the impact that overregulating can have on small businesses.

We are a country of competition, of risk and reward. The Federal Government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. We must let competition drive innovation and allow people to choose the vehicles that best suit them and their needs. The dealer must sell that vehicle, and the consumers must be able to buy it.

As you have and will hear today, this proposed rule will limit consumer choices and increase costs for Main Street America. Try pulling a two-horse trailer, a boat, and a jet ski from Weatherford, Texas, to Midland, Texas. You are never going to get there.

It is clear the Biden administration and the EPA are out of touch with the American people. While many families are struggling to pay bills and save for their future, this administration is ignoring out-of-control inflation while pushing a green energy bailout that nobody wants. Let me tell you, there is no market for EV vehicles. I can tell you firsthand.

Madam Speaker, I stand for consumers. I stand for the car dealer. I stand for the customer. I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and stop this administration's America-last energy policy. In God we trust. Does anybody want to buy a car?

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

I grew up with my father and my uncle having a used car business, and I know that because we still lease the business to another person who operates it today. They are still selling used cars. People will buy gas-powered cars, hybrids, and electric vehicles. There is nothing in here that mandates that they have to buy an electric vehicle.

The bottom line is, if we don't continue to invest in American innovation and help auto manufacturers and look for various options, we are not going to be able to compete with China.

If you pass this resolution, you are making it much, much more difficult for us to compete with China.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, we can build one battery electric vehicle for the same raw

materials as six plug-in hybrid electric vehicles or 90 hybrid electric vehicles. For one of the cars that EPA is going to mandate that Americans buy, we could build six plug-in or 90 hybrid vehicles for the same raw materials. Yet, the EPA is mandating electric, battery electric vehicles. That is how many batteries you can make with the same amount of minerals. Ninety hybrid electric vehicles reduces 37 times as much carbon as one of these vehicles the EPA is mandating, the 100 percent battery electric.

Let's get back to reality. America is leading the world in technology and innovation that is bringing down carbon emissions. Let's do it the American way, not this China forced-mandate policy on America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, underlying the gentlewoman's point, on top of that, you can get so much more out of current vehicles. The regulators will not allow the type of mining we need in this country to get the materials, the minerals to produce these electrified vehicles and electrified everything else.

I hear all morning that, oh, this isn't a mandate, nobody is forcing anybody to buy anything. You are forcing the marketplace to build these cars. In California, you can't buy certain models of gas-powered Jeeps because they have to sell X amount of electric Jeeps, so you have to go out of State to buy what you want.

This is being forced upon the people, and it is being forced on the manufacturers. It is going to force all of our jobs over to China or Mexico for production, all ostensibly to be chasing a little bit of carbon dioxide. I remind you once again, 0.04 percent is the greenhouse gas that we are chasing, carbon dioxide.

Indeed, we are forcing the marketplace to do things people don't want, people cannot afford. These vehicles weigh at least 50 percent more than the same type of gas vehicle, and they are tearing up our highways more. People don't want this. I talk to my dealerships, and I talk to regular people. They don't want to be forced into this. We need to support Mr. JAMES' legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, again, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

House Democrats are united in our understanding that we must decarbonize our transportation sector while preserving consumer choice and driving technological innovation in the domestic auto industry. This resolution would undermine our ability to achieve these goals. Instead of backtracking on decades of progress like

the CRA would do, I offer a different path forward.

First, we must protect the integrity of the Clean Air Act and EPA's authority to set forward-looking vehicle emission standards that protect public health and the environment.

Next, we need to foster innovation and technological development in the clean transportation sector.

Finally, we must continue to build on the historic investments in the Inflation Reduction Act and the bipartisan infrastructure law.

With this CRA, my Republican colleagues are attempting to strand these incredible investments and stop this tremendous progress. When Republicans oppose our investments in America's manufacturing, which is what they are doing today, they are advocating for American industry to stand down.

Rather than ceding ground to Communist China, House Democrats are investing in America's ability to compete and beat out our economic competition. That is why we have to oppose this bill.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1030

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

EVs are fine technologies for those who can afford them and use them. However, they should not be forced on people against their will when their means, their circumstance, or their preference requires traditional gas, diesel, or a hybrid vehicle.

EVs come with serious negative impacts for consumers, American security, and the environment. Over its lifetime, an EV only has lower emissions than a gas-powered vehicle if it travels between 28,069 and 68,160 miles and remains in service for more than 10 years, circumstances that are not being realized today.

EVs are not for everyone. Just because some people like them doesn't mean that they are going to work.

EV batteries rely on five critical minerals: lithium, cobalt, magnesium, nickel, and graphite. Compared to the conventional internal combustion engine, an electric vehicle requires six times the mineral inputs.

Further, IEA estimates that the demand for lithium will increase 43 times by 2040. Critical minerals are critical for EVs and batteries, and China dominates much of the supply chains for EV batteries.

Additionally, raw ore needs to be processed into usable minerals. Again, China does 100 percent of the processing.

A rush to EVs will directly increase our reliance on China. China controls 90 percent of the EV supply chain. It also currently controls 78 percent of the global EV battery production, 90 percent of the global rare earth ele-

ment refining capacity, 90 percent of refining, 70 percent of global cobalt refining capacity, 68 percent of global nickel refining capacity, and 50 percent of global lithium refining capacity.

What are we doing in the United States about that? Nothing. This administration is shutting down mining and processing. It takes, on average, 7 years just to permit anything in the United States of America.

This is a mandate from the EPA that is not in the best interest of America and not in the best interest of consumers. Let's vote "yes" today on this resolution. Let's unleash American energy and American innovation in the car sector.

We have led the world in the last 100 years in car manufacturing. Our goal is to make sure that America continues to lead the world in innovation and car manufacturing and do it in a way that is affordable and that can actually be implemented, not this unrealistic, expensive, unaffordable mandate by the EPA on Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1455, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit H.R. 5717;

Passage of H.R. 5717, if ordered;

Passage of H.J. Res. 136; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 9106.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NO BAILOUT FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 5717) to provide that sanctuary jurisdictions that provide benefits to aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status under the immigration laws are ineligible for Federal funds intended to benefit such aliens, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 200, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—190

Adams Golden (ME) Panetta
 Allred Goldman (NY) Pappas
 Amo Gomez Pelosi
 Auchincloss Gonzalez, V. Peltola
 Balint Gottheimer Perez
 Beatty Green, Al (TX) Pettersen
 Bera Harder (CA) Phillips
 Beyers Hayes Pingree
 Bishop (GA) Himes Porter
 Blunt Rochester Horsford Pressley
 Bonamici Houlihan Quigley
 Bowman Hoyle (OR) Ramirez
 Boyle (PA) Ivey Raskin
 Brown Jackson (IL) Ross
 Brownley Jackson (NC) Ruiz
 Budzinski Jacobs Ryan
 Bush Jayapal Salinas
 Caraveo Jeffries Sánchez
 Carbajal Kamlager-Dove Sarbanes
 Cárdenas Keating Scanlon
 Carson Kelly (IL) Schakowsky
 Carter (LA) Kennedy Schiff
 Cartwright Khanna Schneider
 Casar Kildee Scholten
 Case Kilmer Schrier
 Casten Kim (NJ) Scott (VA)
 Castor (FL) Krishnamoorthi Scott, David
 Castro (TX) Kuster Sewell
 Cherfilus-Landsman Sherman
 McCormick Larsen (WA) Sherrill
 Chu Lee (CA) Slotkin
 Clark (MA) Lee (PA) Smith (WA)
 Clarke (NY) Leger Fernandez Sorensen
 Clyburn Levin Soto
 Cohen Lieu Spanberger
 Connolly Lofgren Stanton
 Costa Lynch Stevens
 Courtney Magaziner Strickland
 Craig Manning Suozzi
 Crockett Matsui Swalwell
 Crow McBeth Sykes
 Cuellar McClellan Takano
 Davids (KS) McCollum Thanedar
 Davis (IL) McGarvey Thompson (CA)
 Davis (NC) McGovern Thompson (MS)
 Dean (PA) Meeks Tlaib
 DeGette Menendez Tokuda
 DelBene Meng Tonko
 Deluzio Mfume Torres (CA)
 DeSaulnier Moore (WI) Torres (NY)
 Doggett Morelle Trahan
 Escobar Moskowitz Underwood
 Eshoo Moulton Vargas
 Espallat Mrvan Vasquez
 Fletcher Mullin Veasey
 Foster Nadler Velázquez
 Foushee Napolitano Wasserman
 Frankel, Lois Neal Schultz
 Frost Neguse Waters
 Gallego Nickel Watson Coleman
 Garamendi Norcross Wexton
 Garcia (IL) Ocasio-Cortez Wild
 Garcia (TX) Omar Williams (GA)
 Garcia, Robert Pallone Wilson (FL)

NAYS—200

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

NOT VOTING—40

Aguilar Ferguson Meuser
 Barragán Granger Peters
 Bilirakis Graves (LA) Pocan
 Blumenauer Graves (MO) Rose
 Grijalva Grijalva Ruppertsberger
 Hoyer Salazar
 Huffman Salazar
 Johnson (GA) Smith (NE)
 Kaptur Stansbury
 Larson (CT) Stansbury
 Lee (NV) Titus
 Letlow Trone
 Luna Zinke
 Massie

□ 1053

Messrs. RESCHENTHALER, POSEY, CLYDE, PERRY, AND ESTES changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Mr. MCGARVEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 436.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 186, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—186

Adams	Gonzalez, V.	Pappas
Amo	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Green, Al (TX)	Peters
Balint	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Beatty	Hayes	Phillips
Bera	Himes	Pingree
Beyer	Horsford	Porter
Bishop (GA)	Houlihan	Pressley
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Quigley
Blunt Rochester	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Bonamici	Huffman	Raskin
Bowman	Ivey	Ross
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Ruiz
Brown	Jackson (NC)	Ryan
Brownley	Jacobs	Salinas
Budzinski	Jayapal	Sánchez
Bush	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Caraveo	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Carbajal	Keating	Schakowsky
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Carson	Kennedy	Schneider
Carter (LA)	Khanna	Scholten
Casar	Kildee	Schrier
Casten	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Cherfilus-McCormick	Kuster	Sherman
Chu	Landsman	Sherrill
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Clyburn	Lee (PA)	Soto
Cohen	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Connolly	Levin	Stansbury
Correa	Lieu	Stanton
Costa	Lofgren	Stevens
Courtney	Lynch	Strickland
Craig	Magaziner	Suozi
Crockett	Manning	Swalwell
Crow	Matsui	Sykes
Dauids (KS)	McBath	Takano
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McGovern	Titus
DelBene	Meeks	Tlaib
Deluzio	Menendez	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Meng	Tonko
Doggett	Mfume	Torres (CA)
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
Eshoo	Morelie	Trahan
Espallat	Moskowitz	Trone
Fletcher	Moulton	Underwood
Foster	Mrvan	Vargas
Foushee	Mullin	Vasquez
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Veasey
Frost	Napolitano	Velázquez
Garamendi	Neal	Wasserman
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Waters
Garcia (TX)	Nickel	Watson Coleman
Garcia, Robert	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton
Goldman (NY)	Omar	Williams (GA)
Gomez	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
	Panetta	

NOT VOTING—26

Aguilar	Ferguson	Meuser
Babin	Granger	Norcross
Barragán	Graves (MO)	Pocan
Cleaver	Grijalva	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Johnson (GA)	Rose
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Duncan	Lee (NV)	Trone
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Zinke
Evans	Luna	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1100

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO “MULTI-POLLUTANT EMISSIONS STANDARDS FOR MODEL YEARS 2027 AND LATER LIGHT-DUTY AND MEDIUM-DUTY VEHICLES”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 136) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles,” on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 191, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Emmer	Kyle
Alford	Estes	Kim (CA)
Allen	Ezell	Kustoff
Amodei	Fallon	LaHood
Armstrong	Feenstra	LaLota
Arrington	Finstad	LaMalfa
Babin	Fischbach	Lamborn
Bacon	Fitzgerald	Langworthy
Baird	Fleischmann	Latta
Balderson	Flood	LaTurner
Banks	Fong	Lawler
Barr	Fox	Lee (FL)
Bean (FL)	Franklin, Scott	Lesko
Bentz	Fry	Lopez
Bergman	Fulcher	Loudermilk
Bice	Gaetz	Lucas
Biggs	Garbarino	Luetkemeyer
Bilirakis	Garcia, Mike	Luttrell
Bishop (NC)	Gimenez	Mace
Boebert	Golden (ME)	Malliotakis
Bost	Gonzales, Tony	Maloy
Brecheen	Gonzalez, V.	Mann
Buchanan	Good (VA)	Massie
Bucshon	Gooden (TX)	Mast
Burchett	Goss	McCaul
Burgess	Graves (LA)	McClain
Burlison	Green (TN)	McClintock
Calvert	Greene (GA)	McCormick
Cammack	Griffith	McHenry
Caraveo	Grothman	Miller (IL)
Carey	Guest	Miller (OH)
Carl	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Carter (GA)	Hageman	Miller-Meeks
Carter (TX)	Harris	Mills
Chavez-DeRemer	Harshbarger	Molinaro
Ciscomani	Hern	Moolenaar
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Mooney
Cloud	Hill	Moore (AL)
Clyde	Hinson	Moore (UT)
Cole	Houchin	Moran
Collins	Hudson	Nehls
Comer	Huizenga	Newhouse
Crane	Hunt	Norman
Crawford	Issa	Nunn (IA)
Crenshaw	Jackson (TX)	Obornolte
Cuellar	James	Ogles
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Owens
D’Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Palmer
Davidson	Johnson	Peltola
Davis (NC)	Joyce (OH)	Pence
De La Cruz	Joyce (PA)	Perez
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Perry
Donalds	Kean (NJ)	Pfluger
Duarte	Kelly (MS)	Posey
Edwards	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler
Ellzey	Kiggans (VA)	Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Van Duyn
Rogers (KY)	Smucker	Van Orden
Rosendale	Spartz	Wagner
Rouzer	Stauber	Walberg
Roy	Steel	Waltz
Rulli	Stefanik	Weber (TX)
Rutherford	Steil	Webster (FL)
Salazar	Steube	Wenstrup
Scalise	Strong	Westerman
Schweikert	Tenney	Williams (NY)
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Williams (TX)
Self	Tiffany	Wilson (SC)
Sessions	Timmons	Wittman
Simpson	Turner	Womack
Smith (MO)	Valadao	Yakym
Smith (NE)	Van Drew	

NAYS—191

Adams	Gomez	Pelosi
Allred	Gottheimer	Peters
Amo	Green, Al (TX)	Pettersen
Auchincloss	Harder (CA)	Phillips
Balint	Hayes	Pingree
Beatty	Himes	Porter
Bera	Horsford	Pressley
Beyer	Houlihan	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Hoyer	Ramirez
Blumenauer	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin
Blunt Rochester	Huffman	Ross
Bonamici	Ivey	Ruiz
Bowman	Jackson (IL)	Ryan
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (NC)	Salinas
Brown	Jacobs	Sánchez
Budzinski	Jayapal	Sarbanes
Bush	Jeffries	Scanlon
Carbajal	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Cárdenas	Keating	Schiff
Carson	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Carter (LA)	Kennedy	Scholten
Cartwright	Khanna	Schrier
Casar	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Case	Kilmer	Scott, David
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Sewell
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Sherman
Castro (TX)	Kuster	Sherrill
Cherfilus-McCormick	Landsman	Slotkin
Chu	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Clark (MA)	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Clarke (NY)	Lee (PA)	Soto
Clarke (NY)	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Cohen	Levin	Stansbury
Clyburn	Lieu	Stanton
Cohen	Lofgren	Stevens
Connolly	Lynch	Magaziner
Correa	Magaziner	Manning
Costa	Mrvan	Swalwell
Courtney	Matsui	Sykes
Craig	McBath	Takano
Crockett	McClellan	Thanedar
Crow	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Dauids (KS)	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	McGovern	Titus
Dean (PA)	Meeks	Tlaib
DeGette	Menendez	Tokuda
DeLauro	Meng	Tonko
DelBene	Mfume	Torres (CA)
Deluzio	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	Morelie	Trahan
Doggett	Moskowitz	Trone
Escobar	Moulton	Underwood
Eshoo	Mrvan	Vargas
Espallat	Mullin	Vasquez
Fletcher	Nadler	Veasey
Foster	Napolitano	Velázquez
Foushee	Neal	Wasserman
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Schultz
Frost	Nickel	Waters
Gallo	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Omar	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Pallone	Williams (GA)
Garcia, Robert	Panetta	Wilson (FL)
Goldman (NY)	Pappas	

NOT VOTING—25

Aguilar	Ferguson	Meuser
Barragán	Granger	Murphy
Brownley	Graves (MO)	Pocan
Cleaver	Grijalva	Rose
DesJarlais	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Strickland
Duncan	Lee (NV)	Zinke
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	
Evans	Luna	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1106

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
Stated against:
Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 438, I was not recorded, but I intended to vote NAY.

ENHANCED PRESIDENTIAL SECURITY ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN). 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. 9106) to direct the Director of the United States Secret Service to apply the same standards for determining the number of agents required to protect Presidents, Vice Presidents, and major Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates, and for other purposes, 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 Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.
This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]
YEAS—405

Adams	Carbajal	DeGette
Aderholt	Cárdenas	DeLauro
Alford	Carey	DelBene
Allen	Carl	Deluzio
Allred	Carson	DeSaulnier
Amo	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Carter (LA)	Doggett
Armstrong	Carter (TX)	Donalds
Arrington	Cartwright	Duarte
Auchincloss	Casar	Edwards
Babin	Case	Ellzey
Bacon	Casten	Emmer
Baird	Castor (FL)	Escobar
Balderson	Castro (TX)	Eshoo
Balint	Chavez-DeRemer	Espallat
Banks	Cherfilus-	Estes
Barr	McCormick	Ezell
Bean (FL)	Chu	Fallon
Beatty	Ciscomani	Feenstra
Bentz	Clark (MA)	Pinstad
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Fischbach
Bergman	Cline	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Cloud	Fleischmann
Bice	Clyburn	Fletcher
Biggs	Clyde	Flood
Bilirakis	Cohen	Fong
Bishop (GA)	Cole	Foster
Bishop (NC)	Collins	Foushee
Blumenauer	Comer	Fox
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Frankel, Lois
Boebert	Correa	Franklin, Scott
Bonamici	Costa	Frost
Bost	Courtney	Fry
Bowman	Craig	Fulcher
Boyle (PA)	Crane	Gaetz
Brecheen	Crawford	Gallego
Brown	Crenshaw	Garamendi
Brownley	Crockett	Garbarino
Buchanan	Crow	Garcia (IL)
Bucshon	Cuellar	Garcia (TX)
Budzinski	Curtis	Garcia, Mike
Burchett	D'Esposito	Garcia, Robert
Burgess	Davidson	Jimenez
Burlison	Davis (IL)	Golden (ME)
Bush	Davis (NC)	Goldman (NY)
Calvert	De La Cruz	Gomez
Cammack	Dean (PA)	Gonzales, Tony
Caraveo		Gonzalez, V.

Good (VA)	Magaziner	Sarbanes
Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis	Scalise
Gosar	Maloy	Scanlon
Gottheimer	Mann	Schakowsky
Graves (LA)	Manning	Schiff
Green (TN)	Massie	Schneider
Green, Al (TX)	Mast	Scholten
Greene (GA)	Matsui	Schrier
Griffith	McBath	Schweikert
Grothman	McCaul	Scott (VA)
Guest	McClain	Scott, Austin
Guthrie	McClellan	Scott, David
Hageman	McClintock	Self
Harder (CA)	McCollum	Sessions
Harris	McCormick	Sewell
Harshbarger	McGarvey	Sherman
Hayes	McGovern	Sherrill
Hern	McHenry	Simpson
Higgins (LA)	Meeks	Slotkin
Hill	Menendez	Smith (MO)
Himes	Meng	Smith (NE)
Hinson	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Horsford	Miller (IL)	Smith (WA)
Houchin	Miller (OH)	Smucker
Houlihan	Miller (WV)	Sorensen
Hoyer	Miller-Meeks	Soto
Hoyle (OR)	Mills	Spanberger
Hudson	Molinaro	Spartz
Huffman	Moelenaar	Stansbury
Huizenga	Mooney	Stanton
Hunt	Moore (AL)	Stauber
Issa	Moore (UT)	Steel
Ivey	Moore (WI)	Stefanik
Jackson (IL)	Moran	Steil
Jackson (NC)	Morelle	Steube
Jackson (TX)	Moskowitz	Stevens
Jacobs	Moulton	Strong
James	Mrvan	Suozi
Jayapal	Mullin	Swalwell
Jeffries	Nadler	Sykes
Johnson (LA)	Napolitano	Takano
Johnson (SD)	Neal	Tenney
Jordan	Neguse	Thanedar
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Thompson (CA)
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Thompson (MS)
Kamlager-Dove	Nickel	Thompson (PA)
Kaptur	Norcross	Tiffany
Kean (NJ)	Norman	Timmons
Keating	Nunn (IA)	Titus
Kelly (IL)	Obermole	Tlaib
Kelly (MS)	Ocasio-Cortez	Tokuda
Kelly (PA)	Ogles	Tonko
Kennedy	Omar	Torres (CA)
Khanna	Owens	Torres (NY)
Kiggans (VA)	Pallone	Trahan
Kildee	Palmer	Trone
Kiley	Panetta	Turner
Kilmer	Pappas	Underwood
Kim (CA)	Pelosi	Valadao
Kim (NJ)	Peltola	Van Drew
Krishnamoorthi	Pence	Van Dуйne
Kuster	Perez	Van Orden
Kustoff	Perry	Vargas
LaHood	Peters	Vasquez
LaLota	Petterson	Veasey
LaMalfa	Pfleger	Velázquez
Lamborn	Phillips	Wagner
Landsman	Pingree	Walberg
Langworthy	Porter	Waltz
Larsen (WA)	Posey	Wasserman
Latta	Pressley	Schultz
Clark (MA)	Ramirez	Waters
Clarke (NY)	Raskin	Watson Coleman
Cline	Reschenthaler	Weber (TX)
Cloud	Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Wenstrup
Clyde	Lee (FL)	Westerman
Cohen	Lee (PA)	Ross
Cole	Leger Fernandez	Rouzer
Collins	Lesko	Roy
Comer	Levin	Ruiz
Connolly	Lieu	Rull
Correa	Lofgren	Rutherford
Costa	Lopez	Ryan
Courtney	Loudermilk	Salazar
Craig	Lucas	Salinas
Crane	Lutkemeyer	Sánchez
Crawford	Luttrell	
Crenshaw	Salazar	
Crockett	Salinas	
Crow	Lynch	
Cuellar	Mace	
Curtis		
D'Esposito		
Davidson		
Davis (IL)		
Davis (NC)		
De La Cruz		
Dean (PA)		

Magaziner	Sarbanes
Malliotakis	Scalise
Maloy	Scanlon
Mann	Schakowsky
Manning	Schiff
Massie	Schneider
Mast	Scholten
Matsui	Schrier
McBath	Schweikert
McCaul	Scott (VA)
McClain	Scott, Austin
McClellan	Scott, David
McClintock	Self
McCollum	Sessions
McCormick	Sewell
McGarvey	Sherman
McGovern	Sherrill
McHenry	Simpson
Meeks	Slotkin
Menendez	Smith (MO)
Meng	Smith (NE)
Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Miller (IL)	Smith (WA)
Miller (OH)	Smucker
Miller (WV)	Sorensen
Miller-Meeks	Soto
Mills	Spanberger
Molinaro	Spartz
Moelenaar	Stansbury
Mooney	Stanton
Moore (AL)	Stauber
Moore (UT)	Steel
Moore (WI)	Stefanik
Moran	Steil
Morelle	Steube
Moskowitz	Stevens
Moulton	Strong
Mrvan	Suozi
Mullin	Swalwell
Nadler	Sykes
Napolitano	Takano
Neal	Tenney
Neguse	Thanedar
Nehls	Thompson (CA)
Newhouse	Thompson (MS)
Nickel	Thompson (PA)
Norcross	Tiffany
Norman	Timmons
Nunn (IA)	Titus
Obermole	Tlaib
Ocasio-Cortez	Tokuda
Ogles	Tonko
Omar	Torres (CA)
Owens	Torres (NY)
Pallone	Trahan
Palmer	Trone
Panetta	Turner
Pappas	Underwood
Pelosi	Valadao
Peltola	Van Drew
Pence	Van Dуйne
Perez	Van Orden
Perry	Vargas
Peters	Vasquez
Petterson	Veasey
Pfleger	Velázquez
Phillips	Wagner
Pingree	Walberg
Porter	Waltz
Posey	Wasserman
Pressley	Schultz
Ramirez	Waters
Raskin	Watson Coleman
Reschenthaler	Weber (TX)
Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)
Rodgers (AL)	Wenstrup
Rodgers (KY)	Westerman
Rosendale	Wexton
Ross	Wild
Rouzer	Williams (GA)
Roy	Williams (NY)
Ruiz	Williams (TX)
Rull	Wilson (FL)
Rutherford	Wilson (SC)
Ryan	Wittman
Salazar	Womack
Salinas	Yakym
Sánchez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1114

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, due to personal circumstances, I regrettably missed votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 436, the Motion to Recommit H.R. 5717, Nay on Roll Call No. 437, Final Passage of H.R. 5717, Nay on Roll Call No. 438, H.J. Res. 136, and Yea on Roll Call No. 439, H.R. 9106.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I had to miss today's vote due to matters I had to attend to in the district. During that time, I was unable to make Roll Call Votes No. 436 through No. 439. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: YEA on Roll Call No. 436, H.R. 5717 on Motion to Recommit; NAY on Roll Call No. 437, H.R. 5717 on Passage; NAY on Roll Call No. 438, H.J. Res. 136 on Passage; and YEA on Roll Call No. 439, H.R. 9106 on Passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today during roll call votes on the Motion to Recommit and passage, H.R. 5717, No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act; H.J. Res. 136, Tailpipe Emissions Rule CRA; and H.R. 9106, Enhanced Presidential Security Act of 2024. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 436, YEA on Roll Call No. 437, YEA on Roll Call No. 438 and YEA on Roll Call No. 439.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 436, YEA on Roll Call No. 437, YEA on Roll Call No. 438, and YEA on Roll Call No. 439.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for today's votes due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 436, YEA on Roll Call No. 437, YEA on Roll Call No. 438, and YEA on Roll Call No. 439.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, my votes were not recorded today. Had they been recorded, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 436, YEA on Roll Call No. 437, NAY on Roll Call No. 438, and YEA on Roll Call No. 439.

EXPANDING THE JURISDICTION OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF DONALD J. TRUMP

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 1470, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

NOT VOTING—26

Aguilar	Fitzgerald	Meuser
Barragán	Granger	Murphy
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Pocan
DesJarlais	Grijalva	Quigley
Dingell	Johnson (GA)	Rose
Duncan	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Dunn (FL)	Lee (NV)	Strickland
Evans	Letlow	Zinke
Ferguson	Luna	

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISCOMANI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1470

Resolved,

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF JURISDICTION OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF DONALD J. TRUMP.

Section 2(a)(1) of House Resolution 1367, One Hundred Eighteenth Congress, is amended by inserting “and on September 15, 2024 in West Palm Beach, Florida” after “Pennsylvania”.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2024, TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2024

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

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

There was no objection.

BOAT PEOPLE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. STEEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the brave Vietnamese refugees who fled oppressive communism after the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, I have filed a resolution proclaiming September Boat People Awareness Month in honor of those who risked their lives at sea to escape.

These individuals were searching for freedom and a better life. I am incredibly proud to say that many of them found it in Orange County, California. More specifically, they settled in the community known as Little Saigon, which I represent.

Our country rightfully welcomed them with open arms. Sadly, many boat people did not survive the rough conditions. Dangerous waters and overcrowding took many lives.

We still honor their memory and pursuit of freedom, and we must use their story to fight for the rights of all people suffering under the weight of communism to this day.

MARCELLUS WILLIAMS

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

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today to say that State-san-

tioned violence has no place in a humane society.

Next Tuesday, Marcellus “Khalifah” Williams is scheduled to be executed for a crime he didn’t commit. Despite credible evidence of Williams’ innocence and mass scrutiny over the fairness of this trial, Missouri Governor Mike Parson and the courts have yet to stop an innocent man from being executed.

Within the last four decades, only four individuals on death row have been exonerated in Missouri. Since 1973, at least 200 people have been exonerated from death row in the U.S.

A 2014 study estimated that at least 4 percent of those sentenced to death are innocent, a majority of whom are Black and Brown.

I am urging Governor Parson not to let another innocent man be murdered at the hands of the State. He must heed this call. As a proud cosponsor of the Federal Death Penalty Prohibition Act, Congress must also act. Let’s end this racist, flawed, and inhumane practice once and for all.

Save the life of this innocent man.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LIFE OF ASA DAVISON, JR.

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

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of an American patriot from West Virginia, Asa Davison, Jr., who passed away on the 80th anniversary of D-day in June of this year.

Asa, a World War II veteran, had celebrated his 100th birthday just months before his passing. He enlisted in the United States Army in 1943 and proudly served in an all-Black regiment known as Harlem Hellfighters until 1946.

He would often recount how his Bible, gifted to him by his mother, sitting in a pocket near his heart, stopped a bullet and saved his life. That same Bible remains a treasured possession to his family today.

Asa was blessed with 73 years of marriage to his wife, Ethel. They lived their whole lives in Fairmont, West Virginia, raising their three sons, Asa, Brian, and Gregory. He was a grandpa of 8 and great-grandpa of 11.

Asa worked at the Fairmont Post Office for 34 years and was well-known for his volunteer work in the community. He truly lived a life of service. His legacy will continue to inspire many in the community that he loved.

A CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the

signing of the Violence Against Women Act.

Over the past 30 years, we have made major strides to reduce the rates of domestic violence and sexual assault, but there is much more to be done.

In 2022, Congress and President Biden continued to build on this landmark legislation with the most recent bipartisan reauthorization of VAWA.

I am proud that the VAWA reauthorization included my bill that will enable more survivors to receive timely trauma-informed care from sexual assault nurse examiners. These specialized nurses are trained to provide comprehensive medical and emotional care. They are also equipped to collect forensic evidence that can be used in court.

We owe it to survivors who endured unspeakable trauma to ensure that they get the care and the support that they need. Let’s continue working together to end the abuse that women have faced for far too long.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF BARRY BROWN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of Barry Brown, who sadly passed away this August at 69 years old.

Barry was a Savannah native through and through. After graduating from Savannah High School, he dedicated over 20 years to serving the Savannah and Tybee Island communities. From serving on the planning commission, the city council, and as mayor pro tem, Barry’s natural-born leadership set a valuable example for everyone around him.

Mr. Brown also faithfully served over 25 years on the Marine Rescue Squadron and belonged to both the American Legion Post 154 and the Tybee Island Republican Club.

Mr. Brown is survived by his wife, Sunni, his son, Brandon, and his four grandchildren.

We deeply honor and thank Mr. Brown for his service to the Savannah and Tybee Island communities over the years. I send my most sincere condolences to the Brown family. They along with Barry’s friends and all those who were blessed to know him are in my thoughts and prayers today.

ANNIVERSARY OF MIFEPRISTONE

(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, 24 years ago next week, the Food and Drug Administration approved the use of mifepristone, authorizing it as a safe and effective means for women to end a pregnancy through medication. In the ensuing two decades, there has been no evidence that it

is not effective, nor that it is dangerous in any way.

It is actually safer than Tylenol, and millions of women have exercised their right to control their own bodies by using it. Naturally, in their quest to control women's bodies, Republicans have fought tooth and nail to prohibit access to mifepristone.

Women's healthcare is not some abstract concept. It is a human right. When Republicans criminalize reproductive freedom, women die, as we learned this week about two women in Georgia.

On this 24th anniversary of mifepristone's FDA authorization, which remains the law of the land, I call on pharmacies around the country to continue to distribute this safe and effective medication to women who want it.

SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as Suicide Prevention Awareness Month.

Across the country, more than 60 million Americans are affected by mental illness. Unfortunately, many of those 60 million feel that they are alone, but we are here to let those struggling know that they are not alone.

No matter how dark the world may seem, there are people who care for you, and there are resources to help within an arm's reach. This world is worth being a part of, and you are too special for the darkness to win.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Mental Health and Substance Abuse Disorder Task Force, we are encouraging everyone to spread awareness about suicide prevention. Help us break the stigma around mental health. Lend a hand. Look out for those in need of help, and remember it is okay not to be okay, but it is not okay to try and fight this on your own.

□ 1130

RECOGNIZING RETIREMENT OF HOOVER HIGH SCHOOL COACH JERRY GOODPASTURE

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the longtime North Canton Hoover High School softball coach, Jerry Goodpasture.

After a long and successful tenure at the helm of the Hoover Vikings, Coach Goodpasture announced his retirement last week.

Starting as the team's pitching coach over two decades ago, Coach Goodpasture helped Hoover win its

first two State titles in 1998 and 1999 before taking over as head coach in 2005. He then led Hoover to not one, not two, not three, four, or five, but six Division 1 State championships, including four State championships from 2011 to 2014.

Coach Goodpasture's coaching prowess cemented the Vikings as a softball powerhouse, and as a result of his success, he is a three-time Hall of Famer. He has been inducted into the Hoover High School Athletic Hall of Fame, the Ohio Amateur Softball Association Hall of Fame, and the Ohio High School Fastpitch Softball Coaches Hall of Fame.

Coach Goodpasture will be remembered not only for his impact on the young athletes he coached on the softball field but also for the students he taught in the classroom for 30 years.

As one of Stark County's most successful high school coaches of all time, Coach Goodpasture's legacy will forever live on in the Goodpasture Stadium, the Hoover High School softball field named in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Coach Jerry Goodpasture on his incredible coaching and teaching career. I know the entire Hoover community is grateful for his years of dedication, and he will be greatly missed this upcoming softball season. I wish him the best of luck in his new chapter, and I thank him for making Ohio's 13th District the Birthplace of Champions.

HONORING EDWARD ROSS NEWTON FOR HIS HEROISM

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Edward Ross Newton, a remarkable Utahn who served his country with distinction and honor during the Vietnam war.

Edward, known affectionately as Ed to his family and friends, was born and raised in a small, tight-knit community in Juab County, Utah. With a love of his homeland embedded deep in his heart, Ed traded the peaceful farmlands of Mona, Utah, for the treacherous battlefields of Vietnam.

It was on the fateful day of October 16, 1969, that Ed's bravery would define his legacy. While serving as a rifleman in the 82nd Airborne Division, Ed and his fellow soldiers were engaged in a search operation in the jungles of Vietnam. Suddenly, they came under direct and intense enemy fire.

In the chaos of battle, Ed witnessed his platoon leader and medic fall under the hail of bullets. Without a moment's hesitation and with complete disregard for his own safety, Ed sprang into action.

Running toward the deadly barrage, Ed began to fire at the enemy position, enabling the medic to administer aid to the wounded.

Standing in the open, under the hail of enemy bullets, Ed suffered a griev-

ous neck wound, but even as he was forced to his knees, he refused to retreat. His focus was solely on the lives of his comrades.

For his extraordinary valor, Ed Ross Newton was awarded the Bronze Star medal with a V for valor, and he was also honored with a Purple Heart. These decorations serve as a testament to his bravery, devotion to duty, and deep concern for his fellow soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Ross Newton's legacy is one of unparalleled courage and sacrifice. His story is a powerful reminder of the values that define our Nation, the unwavering commitment to protect and serve others, even at great cost.

May God bless Edward Ross Newton and all those who serve our great Nation.

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY TO ROBERT "BOB" AIKEN, JR.

(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, residents are pulling out their cameras to take pictures with the legendary Robert "Bob" Aiken, Jr., of Snow Hill, North Carolina, in celebration of his 100th birthday.

Born and raised in Snow Hill, Bob went to college and returned home in 1945, discovering his passion for photography and opening Bob Aiken Photography.

For more than 70 years, he was the local photographer, and through his eyes and camera lenses, he captured the most precious moments of our residents.

If you wanted pictures of that special occasion, prom, or wedding, call Bob. He is even known for just showing up on occasion.

Bob was married to the love of his life, Seroba, for 64 years.

Mr. Speaker, his deep love for his family, our community, and capturing so many historic moments is unparalleled. The Greene County Board of Commissioners has designated September 21 as Bob Aiken Day.

Now, smile and say cheese, Bob. Happy birthday.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MATTHEW OSBORNE

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Matthew Osborne, a dedicated editor, family man, and cherished member of the northeast Georgian community, who tragically passed away last month.

After graduating from George Washington University right here in D.C., he began his 25-year career in journalism as a sportswriter in Florida.

Over the years, Matthew worked for several newspapers, going on to become

the editor of *The Northeast Georgian* in 2019. His love of writing and commitment to objectivity earned him respect, not only from his peers but from his local readers. Matthew won numerous State and regional awards for his outstanding work, and through it all, he never lost his passion for covering sports.

Matthew is more than a talented reporter and editor. He was also a devoted husband to his wife, Samantha, a family man, and father to their three boys, Hunter, Cal, and Ollie.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to comfort Samantha and her sons, as well as Matthew's peers and loved ones, during this difficult time.

Georgia's Ninth District will always remember the profound impact that Matthew Osborne had on his readers and on our community as a whole.

HONORING TYLER G. BROWN ON BECOMING A PUBLISHED AUTHOR

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tyler G. Brown, an author and constituent from Dallas, Oregon.

Not only is Tyler an author, but he is also a corporal with the Grande Ronde Tribal Police Department.

Late last year, Tyler published his first book, "Tribal Honor." His story is an inspiring one. This is actually the third novel he has written, as the first two did not make it into print. However, the setback did not stop him from realizing his dream of becoming a published author.

In his debut novel, Tyler blends his experience as a law enforcement officer with his passion for thrillers, mystery, and action-packed fiction novels. Unsurprisingly, his first novel quickly climbed the crime action fiction charts.

Every year, the Readers' Favorite International Book Award contest announces the top books in a variety of categories, and this year they had a record amount of entries. The contest showcases thousands of authors from around the world, and "Tribal Honor" won the gold medal in the action-fiction category.

As the daughter of a police officer, I know firsthand the challenges that come with being in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to let Tyler know how grateful I am for his dedication to keeping the Grande Ronde Tribe safe and how pleased I am to see his novel get the recognition it deserves. I thank him for inspiring people and showing them that they should always chase their dreams. I extend my heartfelt congratulations to him and his family. He has made Oregon's Sixth District immensely proud.

HONORING JUDGE JULIE KOCUREK FOR HER BRAVERY

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Judge Julie Kocurek, who is the 390th State District judge in Austin, Texas.

In 2015, the judge survived an assassination attempt by a criminal defendant seeking revenge for a decision she made in his case. Judge Kocurek and her family were stalked for a month before the individual attacked her, shooting her four times. Judge Kocurek miraculously survived and bravely returned to the bench to ensure that justice prevails over violence.

Mr. Speaker, this is happening on an increased basis all across this country. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 8093, the Countering Threats and Attacks on Our Judges Act, introduced in this House by Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL and the late Sheila Jackson Lee and in the Senate by Senator CORNYN and Senator COONS.

The bill would help judges by creating a State judicial threat intelligence and resource center to provide guidance and best practices for State judges. It informs law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the threats judges face because my father served as chief justice of the Western District of Texas in San Antonio at a time when one of his colleagues, the Honorable John H. Wood, Jr., was shot in the back by a criminal and killed.

I think that we need to pay attention to crime and criminals better in this country, especially where they aim themselves at judges and our judicial system.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ERNEST "ERNIE" WILLIAM MEASE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable life and legacy of an American hero and gentleman, Ernest "Ernie" William Mease, who recently passed away at the strong age of 99.

A proud Navy veteran, Ernie served our Nation with distinction from 1943 to 1946 during World War II, including at the Battle of Leyte Gulf, the largest naval battle of the war.

For his bravery, he was decorated with the Philippine Liberation Medal.

After his honorable service, Ernie, a man of his word, built a life of dedication to our Toledo community in northwest Ohio as a real estate developer and a tireless advocate of American Legion Toledo Post 335. The post marked its 100th anniversary with a ceremony at the Toledo Club earlier this year, and I had the great privilege of presenting Ernie with a U.S. flag

flown over the U.S. Capitol in the post's honor.

Ernie was more than a veteran and businessman. He was a devoted husband and father, a friend of hundreds, and a treasured community builder in our community intergenerationally.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife, Joyce; their children, Melissa and David; his brother, Norman; and all who loved him.

Today, we honor in America's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his memory and his contributions to liberty as one member of the most unselfish generation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from *The Blade*.

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

There was no objection.

[From THE BLADE, Sept. 17, 2024]

ERNEST WILLIAM MEASE: RETIRED REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER FOUGHT IN THE NAVY IN WORLD WAR II

(By Mike Sigov)

Ernest W. "Ernie" Mease, a retired real estate developer and Navy veteran of World War II, died Wednesday at Hospice of Northwest Ohio on South Detroit Avenue. He was 99.

He died of aspiration pneumonia, his wife of 54 years, Joyce Mease, said, noting that he lived 46 years after suffering a massive heart attack at age 53.

Mr. Mease was a machinist's mate on a Navy tank-landing ship during the October, 1944, Battle of Leyte Gulf in the Philippines, the largest naval battle of World War II, and was proud of his military service, Mrs. Mease said.

Decorated with the Philippine Liberation Medal for his part in the battle, he was a longtime member of American Legion Toledo Post 335, including years as the post commander, the position he held in retirement until 2023.

In May, the past commander received an American flag from U.S. Rep. MARCY KAPTUR (D., Toledo) during the post's centennial celebration at the Toledo Club downtown. Prior to the event, the flag Ms. KAPTUR presented had flown over the U.S. Capitol at her request.

"I am very proud, very proud, and surprised," he told *The Blade* after the award ceremony.

The retired real estate developer served in the Navy from 1943 until 1946, when he was honorably discharged with the rank of petty officer 2nd class.

He retired in 1990 after at least 30 years as an independent real estate developer. He built, renovated, and leased out apartments and houses in Toledo and Bowling Green.

"He was a fair and honest landlord and he had a great reputation," Mrs. Mease said. "He was admired for being smart, reliable, and articulate."

Born May 1, 1925, in Washington to Eva and Ralph Mease, he graduated from high school before joining the Navy.

Following his honorable discharge, he used the GI Bill to attend Lehigh University, where he graduated with a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering before getting hired by Toledo's former Houghton Elevator Co. to supervise elevator installations in Philadelphia.

Mr. Mease was later transferred to Toledo, where he continued as a mechanics' supervisor for the company until going into the real estate business.

In his free time, he enjoyed boating. He also worked out daily.

"He was a terrific guy," Mrs. Mease said. "He enjoyed life and life enjoyed him."

Along with American Legion Toledo Post 335, he was a member of Swanton American Legion Murbach-Siefert Post 479.

He was preceded in death by a twin sister. Along with his wife, Joyce Mease, he is survived by his daughter, Melissa Mease; a son, David Mease; and brother, Norman Mease.

Services will begin at noon Tuesday in Toledo Memorial Park, immediately followed by military honors.

Arrangements are by Walter Funeral Home.

CONGRATULATING OLYMPIANS AND PARALYMPIANS FROM COLORADO'S FOURTH DISTRICT

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

Mr. LOPEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Olympians and Paralympians from Colorado's Fourth Congressional District.

To compete in the Olympic and Paralympic Games is one of the highest honors an athlete can achieve. It takes years of hard work, grit, and determination, and I am honored to stand here today to celebrate their achievements in Paris.

Anna Hall, Jessica Thoennes, Sophia Smith, Mallory Swanson, and Derrick White have all dedicated their lives to advancing their sports, and to them, I say congratulations.

Each one of them has reached the top of their personal Everest. I hope that they feel incredibly proud when they reflect on their time in Paris and take a moment to celebrate their amazing accomplishments.

Each of them has had to persevere through injuries, defeats, and personal setbacks. The example they have set serves as an inspiration for future generations of athletes and is something they should be deeply proud of.

Mr. Speaker, Colorado's Fourth Congressional District was lucky to have such high-caliber athletes representing them this summer. They have made us proud, and I look forward to watching each of their careers grow.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS PAID TO THOSE WHO DESERVE IT

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

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our retired teachers, police officers, firefighters, letter carriers, and nurses, and the fact that, for decades, Congress has kept or stolen the Social Security benefits that they paid for and earned but have yet to receive.

The Social Security Fairness Act will fix this. Millions of retired public servants will get their benefits each and every month moving forward.

This bipartisan effort is the most co-sponsored bill in this 118th Congress. Yesterday, we hit a major milestone with 218 signatures on a discharge petition, forcing a vote on the Social Security Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to vote "yes" when this bill comes to the floor. Let's get it done.

CELEBRATING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF SONES DE MEXICO ENSEMBLE

(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 celebrate the 30th anniversary of Sones de Mexico Ensemble, a nonprofit organization founded in the community of Pilsen. They are focused on promoting a greater appreciation of Mexican folk and traditional music and culture.

Sones de Mexico Ensemble has been nominated twice for a Grammy award because of their world-class performances and their contributions to the recording industry. The group has also collaborated with Irish, blues, classical, jazz, country and western, and rock artists, helping expand the reach and understanding of Mexican music.

In 2014, with the objective of giving back to the community, Sones de Mexico Ensemble opened a Mexican Music School with an impressive Spanish language curriculum for children and adults that has now expanded to serve over 150 sites all over Chicagoland.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have such talented artists in my district, and I cannot wait to hear and see where they go next.

□ 1145

PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION IN THE MILITARY

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

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind this body of the incredible damage inflicted by the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

For 17 years, it was the official Federal policy to discriminate against LGBTQ+ servicemembers and prevent them from living authentically or risk being discharged.

This policy wasn't only hateful and isolating, it weakened our military and failed to live up to our values.

Today marks 13 years since we repealed this hateful policy, and we won't go back. We won't go back to Don't Ask, Don't Tell or the possibility of a trans service ban with the stroke of a pen or a tweet.

Countless queer people serve our country bravely, they serve our country proudly, they serve our country honorably, and they should serve our country authentically, too.

That is why we need to pass my Ensuring Military Readiness Not Dis-

crimination Act to prohibit discrimination in the military and protect trans servicemembers.

Our servicemembers sacrifice so much for us. They shouldn't have to sacrifice who they are.

HONORING DR. HUGH AUCHINCLOSS

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am rising to thank and congratulate Dr. Hugh Auchincloss who is retiring this month as the longtime principal deputy director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIAID, at NIH, and its former acting director.

Among other extraordinary accomplishments, Dr. Auchincloss' leadership at NIAID put U.S. scientists and researchers in a position to develop the COVID-19 vaccine, the fastest vaccine program in world history, a stunning and successful response to this staggering centennial emergency.

For decades, Dr. Auchincloss has served his patients and our Nation with a ferocious work ethic, unshakable integrity, and disarming humility and humor.

It is no exaggeration but rather a plain statement of fact to say that all of humanity has benefited from Dr. Auchincloss' devotion to the public's health, and I am very proud to be his Congressman.

I am wishing him, his wife, Dr. Mary McCain, and his children, Kalah, Hugh, and my always inspiring colleague, Congressman JAKE AUCHINCLOSS, the very best during this next chapter of his career and his life.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, or TAA, which provides a lifeline to workers who have lost their jobs due to outsourcing or other trade-related business decisions.

TAA provides up to 2 years of robust job training benefits, and according to the U.S. Census, recipients increase their earnings by an average of over \$50,000 over a 10-year period.

This is not just an economically sound thing to do, it is the right thing to do. We cannot realize the full benefits of trade if we are leaving our friends and our neighbors behind.

In my home State of Connecticut alone, over a thousand people have been helped by this program to find new jobs and to improve their skills, according to the Department of Labor.

Unfortunately, the program expired 2 years ago, and Congress has failed to

reauthorize it. That means over 121,000 workers who have submitted petitions seeking resources to improve their job skills have been ignored.

Elected officials on both sides of the aisle like to talk about supporting American workers. It is time that we put our money where our mouth is.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the American Worker and Trade Competitiveness Act and demand that it be brought to a vote.

The American people are watching. They want to know if we have their back. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

DEFINITION OF WOKE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as my Republican colleagues continue to rail against everything woke and for their Project 2025 agenda.

Now, most Members don't even know what woke even means, so let me just try to lay it out. As the NAACP reminded us in a 2023 resolution, the word "woke" has been used by Black Americans even as far back as the 1940s when the Black mineworkers issued the statement: "We were asleep. But we will stay woke from now on."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this official NAACP resolution titled: "Resolution-Reclaiming the Word 'Woke' as Part of African-American Culture" be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

NAACP—2023

RESOLUTION: RECLAIMING THE WORD "WOKE" AS PART OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CULTURE

Whereas, Black history is a critical aspect of American history and has shaped American culture, including the evolution of language; and

Whereas, The words "Wake Up" and "Woke" have served as a call to action as conveyed by social activist Marcus Garvey who stated, "Wake up Ethiopia! Wake up Africa", and the Negro Mine Workers who in 1940 issued the statement, "We were asleep. But we will stay woke from now on," in advocating against discriminatory pay; and

Whereas, The term "Woke" was first highlighted in the 1962 essay, "If You're Woke, You Dig It", featured in the "New York Times" by Harlem-based writer William Melvin Kelley who documented the cultural appropriation and distortion of language, resulting in certain idioms being abandoned by their original Black creators; and

Whereas, The term "Woke" has been similarly misused, as traditionally and white-focused media have reframed "Woke" as trendy new slang, eroding its cultural connection and separating the term from its historical grounding in social justice; and

Whereas, Six decades later, anti-Black racists have engaged in a similar exercise of cultural appropriation to weaponized and misdefine the term "Woke", as evidenced by the "Stop W.O.K.E. Act", specifically targeting the teaching of American history and Black educators; and

Whereas, Black educators are more likely to teach subjects that incorporate an inclusive view of history, and legislation like the "Stop W.O.K.E. Act" threatens the free speech and livelihood of teachers, and the quality of education received by all students, most recently students in Florida.

Therefore be it resolved, that the NAACP affirms the term "Woke" and its historical connection to Black history, Black liberation movements, and social justice.

Be it further resolved, that the NAACP through its units encourages a historically accurate and correct use of the term "Woke" when its misuse is identified.

Be it finally resolved, that the NAACP condemns cultural appropriation, misuse of Black idioms, and specific efforts by anti-Black racists to distort and redefine the specific term "Woke."

Ms. LEE of California. In 2010 it began to be used widely, primarily by Black Americans to bring awareness to social inequities such as racial injustice, sexism, and denial of LGBTQ+ rights.

Today, the Merriam-Webster dictionary defines "woke" as "aware of and actively attentive to important societal facts and issues, especially issues of racial and social justice."

Also, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary quotes me from a speech I gave several years ago: "We have a moral obligation to 'stay woke,' take a stand and be active; challenging injustices and racism in our communities. . . ."

A TWO-STATE SOLUTION

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

And still I rise today, and I stand alone. I stand alone, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

I stand today, mindful of the words of the great Voltaire, the great intellectual who reminds us that it is dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to be right in affairs where established men are wrong.

I rise today to take a stand and call to the attention of the Nation that I love, I love this country. I salute the flag. I stand for the national anthem. I sing the national anthem.

I remind everyone that the greatness of America will not be measured by whether the AL GREENS of the world will stand and sing and salute.

The greatness of America will be measured by whether the AL GREENS of the world will defend those who choose not to stand, sing, and salute, and I do. I defend them.

I believe that the greatness of the country resides in our ability to have people that we disagree with stand before us, look us in the eye, announce their disagreement, and yet, we take that understanding that in this country, we can disagree and still have a great country.

I stand today to call to the attention of the Nation and the many who may

not know, but a good many may know what I am about to share, and I have with me evidence of what I speak.

This, my dear friends, is from CNN by Andrew Carey, July 18, 2024, which would be a little more than 2 months, as I calculate things.

And it reads: "Israeli Lawmakers Vote Overwhelmingly Against Palestinian Statehood"—remember, July 18, 2024. It goes on to say: "Challenging U.S. Policy." This is the style of this article published by CNN.

These are the words. "The Biden administration received another rebuff from Israel Wednesday night—this time from the country's parliament." The parliament would be the Knesset. That would be similar to—not the same as but similar to our Congress.

This is a rebuff, per CNN, from the parliament of Israel "over the United States' longstanding support for the eventual establishment of a Palestinian state."

Now, this is important to me because since I have been in Congress, and I arrived in 2005, there has been a policy of a two-state solution, a state for Palestinians and a state for Israelis—long-standing.

In fact, I have voted for it. I have voted to send money to Israel because I thought the two-state solution was the goal that we were all working toward. I have voted for more than \$50 billion, thinking that we were moving toward a two-state solution.

Well, this article goes on to say: "A two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been U.S. policy for decades"—I agree with that, it has—"but absent negotiations between the two sides, and a lack of sustained effort by the U.S."—I shall repeat—"a lack of sustained effort by the U.S. to make it happen."

Now, the contention in this article is that the United States has not made a sustained effort to make it happen.

I believe that the Biden administration has. I have witnessed much of what the Biden administration is trying to do and has done.

It goes on to read: "On Wednesday evening, the Israeli Parliament made clear its position, voting by 68-9 to reject any creation of a Palestinian state."

Mr. Speaker, 68-9, the Israeli Parliament has voted to reject any creation of a Palestinian state. Many people don't know this. I am grateful that CNN has published it.

It goes on. "The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River]."

Actually, it says west of the Jordan, but we know that that is the Jordan River. The Jordan River is at the West Bank, and it is the West Bank of Jordan, not the West Bank of Israel. It is a part of what should be a Palestinian state. We have the West Bank.

I will read this again because this is exceedingly important. "The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River]."

Now, if you do that west of the Jordan River, that is another way of saying from the river to the sea, from the river to the sea, no Palestinian state from the river to the sea.

Now, in this country, if you say from the river to the sea, Palestine will be free, well, that would be anti-Semitic.

Well, what is it if the Knesset of Israel, the governing body, the Knesset of Israel—and this is not just some person on the street.

“The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River].”

From the river to the sea. That would include all of what at one time was known as Palestine. All of what at one time was known as Palestine.

I challenge anyone within the sound of my voice or anyone who is seeing this to look for a map with Palestine on it, a map depicting the area today.

It is not on the map. You may find it on some, but most maps will not have a place called Palestine on them today.

Now, remember, in 1948, the place that we are now calling Israel, as you will see later on in this article, was called Palestine.

The mandate was to have two states; one for Palestinians, one for Israelis. Somehow, this has metamorphosed into Israel in the minds of many people, but not in my mind.

I am still on the two-state solution program that I voted for and sent more than \$50 billion to help accomplish.

□ 1200

From the river to the sea, the Knesset of Israel firmly opposes a Palestinian state. This is the Knesset of Israel.

It goes on to indicate: “The establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel”—“a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel.”

Remember, 1948, all of this land was called Palestine—well, I should say 1947, 1948. Then there was a mandate. Pursuant to the mandate, there were to be two states, a State of Israel and a state of Palestine.

However, we find here that the Knesset of Israel has concluded that the establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel—what happened to Palestine? What happened to the land that was to become a Palestinian state?

“The establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel would pose an existential danger to the State of Israel and its citizens, perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. . . .”

What will happen if there is no state for the Palestinians? Will that be perpetual peace if there is no state for the Palestinians? What are you saying when you say that there will be no state for the Palestinians? What will there be? Will there be a one-state solution in a state called Israel?

If that is the case, what will the Palestinians become? Will they have full

citizenship in a state called Israel? Will they become a part of an apartheid state? What will happen to the Palestinians?

It is a fair question to ask when you have the Israeli Knesset indicating that there will be no Palestinian state from the river to the sea, which is all of what used to be called Palestine.

It goes on to indicate: “perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and destabilize the region,” the declaration read.

Well, there are many questions to be asked. I don’t know that the answers are going to be readily available, but it seems to me that this is perspicuously clear, and there will be no Palestinian state if the current Israeli Government has its way.

Let’s go on. Same news article. It reads: “Among those who backed it,” meaning this resolution, “was Benny Gantz, an opponent of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Gantz’ vote serves as a blow to those in Washington”—that would be us—“who see him as someone more inclined to seek a negotiated peace with Palestinians if he ever became Israel’s leader.”

Now we have the current Prime Minister, who is supportive of this resolution, and we have a potential Prime Minister, Mr. Benny Gantz, who has voted in favor of the resolution, as well.

It reads: “Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile.’” That is what this is supposed to signal, Mr. Speaker, futile.

We are trying to negotiate a two-state solution when the Government of Israel has already passed a resolution that says we are not going to do that, there will be no two-state solution from the river to the sea.

Can you imagine if someone in this country said there will be no Israel from the river to the sea, what our response would be?

Do we not care about the Palestinians? Are they not human beings? Did they not have a place in the land that was called Palestine prior to 1947, 1948? Do the Palestinians not matter to anybody? They ought to have a place in the land that was called Palestine.

“Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile.’”

Why are we imposing a Palestinian state on Israel? We are imposing a Palestinian state pursuant to the mandate in a place called Palestine. We talk about these things as though Israel owns all of the land, and the Palestinians are foreigners who have somehow encroached upon the land of Israel.

Futile. “Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile,’ leader of the right-wing opposition ‘New Hope’ Party, Gideon Saar, said, according to the Haaretz newspaper.”

Now we have the Knesset saying no. From the river to the sea, there will be no Palestinian state.

Let’s get another opinion. This article has been published in many publications, including the Times of Israel. This one was taken from the Economic Times, but the essence of what is here has been published many times.

Now, this reads: “‘We are not another star in American flag’: Israel minister dismisses U.S. criticism over emigration of Gazan civilians.” This is from January 3, 2024, not that long ago.

Then this Israeli Prime Minister says: “I really admire the United States of America, but with all due respect”—by the way, I am not angry with him for what I am about to read. I respect him. I am not upset. He says: “I really admire the United States of America, but with all due respect, we are not another star in the American flag.”

I agree with that. You are not another star in the American flag. No quarrel with that. Then he goes on to say—this is Ben Gvir—I want to make sure I get it right. No disrespect to you, sir. He heads the ultranationalist Otzma Yehudit party. This is what he said in the statement, “not another star in the American flag.” I agree, you are not.

Then he adds: “The United States is our best friend”—no disagreement there—“but before everything else, we will do what is good for the State of Israel.” Now, that is a minister, part of the Israeli Government, said he is going to do what is in the best interests of Israel. Who can be upset with him for saying he is going to do what is in the best interests of his country? I think he probably loves his country like I love my country, so he is doing what is in the best interests of his country.

Well, let’s see what he thinks is in the best interests of his country. He goes on to say: “Do what is good for the State of Israel.” Then he adds: “The emigration of hundreds of thousands from Gaza will allow residents”—this is being said parenthetically, but I will read it to you—“[of the border area] to return home and live in security and protect IDF soldiers.”

We need to focus on the word “emigration.” Emigration is thought by some to mean you will leave and you may return, but here is what Webster said emigration is “departure from a place of abode, natural home, or country for life or residence elsewhere.” You are not coming back. He has no problem with emigration of hundreds of thousands from Gaza.

Now, remember, Gaza and the West Bank are about all that the Palestinians can hope for at this point. Gaza and the West Bank, it is about all.

Well, if they leave and they can’t return, then that becomes more land for Israel, which then means that all that the Palestinians may hope for would be the West Bank, which, of course, is being encroached upon by the settlers.

We find ourselves now with this minister indicating that he sees nothing wrong, it would be good for the State of Israel.

Now, dear friends, friends, if this official can say that he will do what is good for the State of Israel, is it wrong for me to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America, born here in the United States of America, born in Louisiana, lived my life here in the United States of America, no desire to live anywhere else or move to any other place, is it wrong for me to say that I think I should do what is in the best interests of my country?

He does what is in the best interests of his country; I do what is in the best interests of my country. I don't believe it is in the best interests of my country for us to continue to send billions of dollars to Israel when Israel's Knesset has voted from the river to the sea there will be no Palestinian state. From the river to the sea.

My God, can you imagine what would happen if someone stood here in the well of the House of Representatives and said, from the river to the sea there will be no State of Israel? I don't have to imagine it. I have seen what happens. They get punished. They become an anti-Semite.

What do we call the people who say, from the river to the sea, there will be no Palestinian state? Is there a double standard? Is there a double standard? I believe that there has to be a Palestinian state, so I am out of step with a good many people. Remember, however, I believe it is better to stand alone than to not stand at all.

I don't think that it is good for the United States to continue to fund wars that a good many people in this country do not support. I am one of them. I think it is time to bring this war to an end. It is time for us to move toward a two-state solution, but also more importantly or equally as important, it is time to bring home the hostages. Negotiate so that the hostages can be released. It is time for them to be released. Let them go home.

It is time for us to negotiate a serious two-state solution, but unfortunately the Knesset has said that it will not happen. This government says that it won't.

□ 1215

Well, I contend that if this government says that it won't, that it is okay. The government in Israel has every right to make these comments, but I also think that the government of the United States has every right to say: No more money, no more bombs, no more planes. You can do what you choose, you are a sovereign nation, but so is the United States of America.

We are a sovereign Nation, Mr. Speaker. We have every right to say: That if you can't agree on the two-state solution that was mandated in 1948, 1947, then okay.

We don't have to support eternal conflict. We don't have to support the war

where thousands of babies have been killed. We don't have to support the taking of the land from the Palestinians in the West Bank by the settlers. We don't have to support this.

But I don't speak for us. I speak for myself and everybody who agrees with me, and a good many people do, by the way.

I believe that our alternative to continuing to support the erosion of Palestinian land, the taking of Palestinian land, the declaring that there will be no Palestinian state, I think we should acknowledge that you are a sovereign nation, but so are we and that we will stand for what we have stood for for decades and that is a two-state solution.

I compliment President Biden for making this a significant issue as we go through this time of great turmoil. I compliment him, but I think that we have reached a point now where there has to be a change in our policy. If Israel changed its policy, we can change ours. It is time for a change in the American policy.

We can still be friends. The government of Israel, the country of Israel, will be our friend, but we don't have to support this war. We can ask for peace, and peace is the solution. There is not going to be a solution other than a peaceful two-state solution if you want peace.

Now, if you want eternal conflict or if you want calm, if you want things to calm down, then you can have a one-state solution. Remember this: There is a calm in a dungeon where people are suffering. You can have calm in a dungeon, but that is not peace.

If we want peace where neighbors can work together, you have to work toward it. You don't make peace with friends. They are already in a peaceful relationship. You have to make peace with people who have been antithetical to your views.

It is time to say you don't have to make peace, but we don't have to support what you are doing.

We have got an aircraft carrier with Americans out there at risk, nuclear powered. It is like a floating military base. When we send out these nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, I am told they can be fueled such that, if need be, they can stay for 25 years, and it has other ships and other aircraft there with it, some 90 aircraft.

Our people are at risk because we have a state, by and through its government, who is saying there will be no two-state solution, and we have now what appears to be a conflict that is expanding and may eventually become a conflagration. It is expanding.

I am for everybody having the right to defend themselves, and that has to include the State of Israel.

I am also for peace, and peace is not going to be gained by continuing the process of making war. At some point, either someone is going to trigger something that will take this to a different place, or we will back off and try

to have arrangements first and then peace to follow. All of the hostages should be brought home, all of them.

Now, I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I have said that I don't think that our government should continue to support the war, but I don't speak for the government, so I am going to speak for myself now. I didn't speak for the government before. Everything that I have said, I speak for myself and all of those who agree with me.

Here is what I say. If you bring a standalone bill to this floor, I am going to vote against it. If it is a standalone bill, just as the last one was—I believe it was the last—to send more funds to Israel, it is no secret, don't count me as a yea. Count me as a nay if you bring a standalone bill.

Now, someone would say: Why wouldn't you just say that you are going to vote against any bill?

Well, because I have been here long enough to have the good sense to know that these things can be packaged such that you have to hold your nose and your breath and close your eyes and turn your back and just vote for it. You may not want to, but the way it is packaged can push you into a corner, a place that you dare not go and don't want to be, but you do.

If you bring a standalone bill, I am voting against it and probably will vote against others that are not standalone, depending on how they have been packaged. It is time for us to take a stand.

There is a song, a spiritual song, that has the words "just stand," "just stand." "After you've done all you can"—and I am doing all that I can.

After you have done all that you can, knowing that it is dangerous to be right in affairs where established men are wrong, after you have done all that you can, just stand. Just stand. Stand for liberty and justice for all as represented by that flag behind the Speaker.

Stand with Carlyle: "No lie can live forever."

Stand with William Cullen Bryant: "Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again."

Stand with Dr. King: "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

Stand knowing that the words of C.A. Tindley are powerful and right:

Harder yet may be the fight;
Right may often yield to might;
Wickedness high may seem to reign;
And Satan's cause may seem to gain.
But there is a God that rules above,
With a hand of power and a heart of love;
And when I am right, I just believe that
God will help me fight.

Harder yet may be the fight, Mr. Speaker.

Harder may be the fight.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL REFERENDUM PROCESS IN FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, this November, Floridians in my home State are going to be asked to vote on two constitutional amendments, State constitutional amendments. Not only am I opposed to both amendments, but I am vehemently against using the constitutional referendum process in the State of Florida to legislate. That is not what the referendum process was created for. It was designed to amend our State constitution, not to legislate.

We have a legislature. We have a process to pass laws that do not involve radically changing our constitution. The referendum process seeks to circumvent Florida's legislative process by offering quick, easy, and often worse fixes to complicated problems.

Need I remind everyone—Mr. Speaker, this is amazing—that in Florida's State Constitution, we have pregnant pigs discussed. I am not making that up.

If you are unfamiliar, in 2002, Floridians passed a constitutional referendum that made it unlawful to confine a pregnant pig in an enclosure that would prevent her from being able to turn around safely in that pen. That is in our constitution. We were the laughingstock of the Nation.

While Florida's Constitution is silent on the rights of cows, horses, chickens, or other barnyard animals, it addresses in considerable detail the rights of pregnant pigs. That is unbelievable. We passed that into Florida law.

With referendums, voters are forced to make decisions about complicated issues with the little information they receive, which is sometimes often just from political messaging, TV and radio ads. It is whoever can buy the most influence through the media who gets their referendum passed by the people.

For those of you who don't know, Florida's referendum process requires signatures in support of a proposed amendment from 8 percent of the total votes cast statewide in the last Presidential election from one-half of the 27 congressional districts in the State of Florida.

Now, that is a tough challenge. It is an expensive challenge. It is a huge undertaking that is usually only backed by large organizations with immense financial capability. This is not something for the people. They buy and sell an idea they can't get passed through our State legislature. That is what this special interest money is able to buy.

State constitutions should be what define the supreme law governing a State, the civil liberties and the rights of its people and the structure and power of the State's government. It is a governing document. What we put in should be carefully defined and agreed upon.

Unlike writing legislation, definitions are not even required in these

constitutional referendums as long as the amendment is "clear to voters." That leaves so much room for interpretation, and it is up to the State to host a lot of unnecessary lawsuits.

□ 1230

That brings me to our current predicament this November. Neither Amendment 3 nor Amendment 4, I believe, should be voted on at the ballot box. These are structural State constitution issues. That is what referendums should be used for, not this Florida Amendment 3.

The issue needs to be thoroughly examined and decided on by our Florida State Legislature and the Governor. We are a democratic republic for a reason. Referendums are shortcuts to hard answers. In order to govern well, we must leave the legislating to our State legislatures.

Now, I am rising today firmly opposed to Amendment 3, which, as you can see, is the Marijuana Legalization Initiative, a referendum that Floridians are being asked to vote on this November at the ballot box.

There are so many misunderstandings about what this referendum will actually do, so let's get into them.

First, this amendment would not legalize homegrown marijuana, as you see in the top right here. This amendment, instead, allows only State-licensed entities to acquire, cultivate, process, manufacture, sell, and distribute marijuana and related accessories.

Currently, medical marijuana treatment centers are the only State-licensed entities. They will remain the only ones allowed to trade marijuana in the State of Florida, so, instantly, you create pretty much a monopoly.

If someone wanted to legally grow and/or sell marijuana products, they would have to get approval from the State legislature first, but this will create a monopoly for big marijuana corporations that already have licenses to legally sell marijuana to anyone over 21 in the State.

Now, this is one of the most amazing parts of this that you never hear talked about in the ads that they actually are producing, and that is the fact that these corporations that are going to have this monopoly also get legalized immunity.

It will not get fentanyl-laced marijuana off our streets, as some have said. Supporters of this amendment claim it will better regulate the marijuana circulating, but the evidence tells a very different story.

In States where recreational marijuana has already been legalized, we have seen illegal drug markets flourish. People still turn to illegal and unsanctioned drug dealers to purchase marijuana because it is cheaper or easier to purchase, no matter your age.

According to Rutgers' Center of Alcohol and Substance Use Studies, California, which legalized it, produces about 40 percent of the Nation's mari-

juana, the vast majority of it grown by unlicensed growers. With three-quarters of the U.S. marijuana market made up of illegal products, that means that California is fueling a massive underground economy.

Of course, with a flourishing black market comes an increase in crime. Again, take California for example. It was the first State in the Nation to legalize the medical use of the drug in 1996. The State would go on to legalize recreational use in 2016.

Recent California police reports suggest that arrests for marijuana-related crimes have increased following legalization. Among such reports, there was a series of police records secured by the Los Angeles Times in early 2019 showing that arrests actually rose 166 percent since 1996.

Just this year, California has reported several massive illegal cannabis busts, with one resulting in the confiscation of over \$1 million worth of illicit weed cultivated by unlicensed growers.

It doesn't go away. It just stays underground.

California's Department of Cannabis Control has raided at least 60 alleged grow houses over the past 2 years, and they suspect well over 100 more remain in operation. You heard me right: California actually had to create a separate department to go after the marijuana.

Rutgers also suggests illegal operations have increased in States where it has been legalized due to lax oversight, with some sellers skipping the acquisition of a legal license yet still operating out of storefronts, presenting themselves as licensed dealers.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want this in Florida. We do not need this in our community. We certainly don't need it in our own backyards.

Legalized weed sales do not get rid of dangerous fentanyl-laced marijuana either, another lie that is being told on the television ads that are trying to procure support for the referendum on Amendment 3.

In fact, in Missouri, a State where recreational marijuana is legal for people over 21 years of age, doctors are seeing more cases of marijuana being mixed with fentanyl—more, not less.

According to Dr. Michael Wenzinger, a psychiatrist at the Washington University School of Medicine, they have seen an increase in cases of teenagers inadvertently consuming these deadly combinations.

Dr. Wenzinger also suggests that people believe that since weed is sold in dispensaries, it is safe to consume. That is a lie. They are lulled into a false sense of security, thinking they are buying legal marijuana when, all too often, that is not the case.

Reports also show State law enforcement has found marijuana laced with fentanyl in Illinois and New York, two States where recreational use is legal, as well as Alabama and Louisiana, States where medical marijuana is legal.

It is clear that even in States with government-regulated dispensaries at the ready, people still choose to buy their marijuana on the black market, mainly, as we all know, because of their age.

We have also seen the potency of marijuana increase drastically. Mr. Speaker, this is the part of this issue that concerns me as a 41-year law enforcement officer. The percentage of THC, the main psychoactive component in cannabis, has increased by more than 200 percent from 1995 to 2015—more than 200 percent.

Even more concerning, a May study in the journal of Psychological Medicine found that schizophrenia cases in men ages 21 to 30 may have been preventable by up to 30 percent without the persistent use of marijuana.

We think we have a mental health issue in this country now. Wait until we have had all these 21- to 25-year-old or 18- to 25-year-old young developing brains on high levels of THC for extended periods of time, and we begin to see the increase in schizophrenia, paranoia, and other psychotic breaks.

Florida's Amendment 3 increases crime and illegal distribution of marijuana. It doesn't reduce it.

It monopolizes the industry, creates blanket legal immunity for big marijuana corporations, does not legalize home growth, and promotes marijuana use that is linked to psychotic disorders.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, I am adamantly opposed to Florida's Amendment 3 in November.

I also want to mention Amendment 4, as I discussed earlier, because Floridians are being asked to vote on Amendment 4, and this one really is just a travesty. If passed, this amendment would prevent any law from prohibiting, penalizing, delaying, or restricting abortion before viability, or when necessary to protect the patient's health, placing the decision in the hands of the healthcare provider.

Here is what is amazing about this: Under current Florida State law, in order to receive an abortion, it must occur before the baby reaches 6 weeks of gestation. However, there are exceptions built into the State law, including rape, incest, and human trafficking, that allow for the procedure up to 15 weeks of pregnancy.

It also allows physicians—physicians, and I say that specifically—to terminate a pregnancy if necessary to save the life, not just for health reasons, but to save the life of the mother or to prevent a serious risk of substantial and irreversible physical impairment. Two physicians are required to approve such a procedure.

Let's get this straight. First, Amendment 4 does not define what "viability," "healthcare provider," or "patient's health" means. As you see in the left bottom here, it does not define any of that.

Under current Florida statutes, "viability" has been defined as the state of

fetal development when the life of a fetus is sustainable outside the womb through standard medical measures, but there is no universal consensus.

As science continues to advance, the age of viability of a fetus has become earlier. In the 1960s, infants weighing less than 1 kilogram, equivalent to about 27 weeks, were considered non-viable. In the 1970s, when *Roe v. Wade* was established, viability was estimated to be between 24 to 28 weeks. Today, it is closer to 23 to 24 weeks, with some hospitals even successfully delivering and caring for babies at 22 weeks.

Not only does Amendment 4 not define "viability," it doesn't define "healthcare provider," leaving it up to interpretation. This means anyone can decide a woman should get an abortion, and I mean really anyone.

"Patient's health" is left up to the interpretation of these so-called healthcare providers, whoever they are. It is not to save the life. It could be for any reason.

Under current Florida State law, abortions are not allowed past 6 weeks. With this amendment, there is really no limit to when an abortion can be performed. It says abortions are legal "before viability or when necessary to protect the patient's health."

A so-called healthcare provider could decide it is best for the patient's health to terminate that pregnancy at 9 months, as late as they want, and with total disregard for the viability of the baby.

Mr. Speaker, they are talking about taking limbs off of babies when they are aborted at 9 months, ripping them apart in the womb when they can feel pain. We know they feel that pain.

□ 1245

It is unconscionable that that is going on in America. They want it to go on. It is actually already happening. In Wisconsin, there are eight documented cases. This is essentially approving a rubber stamp for late-term abortions going even further than *Roe v. Wade*. This is extreme.

With *Roe v. Wade*, in the first trimester, zero to 12 weeks, there was almost no regulation.

In the second, 13 to 27 weeks, there were regulations to protect women's health when necessary.

In the third trimester, 28 to 40 weeks, it allowed States to ban abortions so long as exceptions were made to protect the life and health of the mother, as defined by a physician, I might add.

Amendment 4 would allow abortions without restrictions up to viability, which is currently believed to be 23 weeks, a time that is well into the second trimester. Even under *Roe v. Wade* it would have only been allowed at that time to protect the woman's health or life.

With amendment 4 in Florida, what they are trying to do is that abortion could occur for whatever reason one decides whenever they decide.

As you can see in the lower left here, Mr. Speaker, this removes parental approval, parental consent. Currently, minors have to get parental consent to get a tattoo, to have their ears pierced, or any other medical procedure. That is not Florida law.

This amendment, however, would only require notification but not permission. That means parents can be notified immediately before or even after their 14-year-old daughter has had an abortion by one of these healthcare providers at any time in her pregnancy. There is no parental consent required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you watch the television ads that are being run in the State of Florida right now, you would not think that to be the case. This constitutional amendment No. 4 is the most deceptive amendment I have ever seen. It is not what it seems, and it has no place being voted on in the ballot box.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this is amendment 4. This is amendment 4 printed out. It is just this little piece at the top. It is less than one-quarter of a page to take the life of a baby at 9 months old, where we are going to rip its limbs off to abort it. It is less than one-quarter of a page.

This is a tax referendum, and it is eight pages. We are more clear about how we are going to cut taxes than we are about how we are going to execute a baby in the womb. Mr. Speaker, tell me that is not deceptive.

The ads that they run are so misleading. They create such falsehoods. A referendum on taxable values of a home is far more fleshed out and defined than one concerning the life of a child. It is ridiculous.

This is bad legislation. This is a bad way to legislate. In our Constitution, it is a bait and switch trying to fool Floridians into changing our constitution to include abortion without any restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Floridians to vote "no" on this amendment.

Referendums are shortcuts to hard answers. Let's leave the hard answers to the State legislature where they belong. That is why we are a democratic republic. Let them do their job. Do not allow those with special interest money to decide what the law is going to be in Florida.

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

FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EZELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, America is facing a farm and food crisis. As we are here speaking today in the Nation's Capitol, there are farmers and ranchers who are

struggling. They are struggling with so many burdens and so many natural disasters. They are struggling in an economy with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that again: America is facing a farm and food crisis.

Now, as the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have had the honor to travel across this country to hear from the farmers, ranchers, producers, consumers, and everyone in between across our great agricultural value chain.

My colleagues and I have taken what we heard on the road to craft a bipartisan and highly effective farm bill. No matter where we traveled, one thing was clear: America's farm economy is in crisis, and with no farms, there is no food.

The last time we passed a farm bill was in 2018, and a lot in our world has changed since then.

As I stand before you today, Mr. Speaker, farmers across the Nation are grappling with immense challenges. For the first time in years, we are witnessing a downturn spiral in net farm income with projections for 2024 showing a staggering \$54 billion decline. That is the largest 2-year loss in net cash farm income in history, and that is across just eight of the commodities. If you add into that the specialty crops, it is a farm and food crisis.

These are not just numbers on a spreadsheet. They are the livelihoods of American farmers, the backbone of our rural communities, and the source of food, fiber, and fuel for our Nation and the world.

Why is this happening?

Simply put, farm production costs have skyrocketed. Input prices remain near record highs, yet the prices farmers receive for their crops have plummeted. The prices of corn, soybeans, cotton, and wheat have seen an average drop of 21 percent, all while operating expenses continue to soar.

The U.S. trade deficit will reach a record-breaking \$30.5 billion in 2024, but according to the USDA, that record will be broken next year with the 2025 agricultural trade deficit expected to reach \$42.5 billion, all contributing to this Nation's farm and food crisis.

Many producers are barely breaking even, if they are lucky. Others are sinking deeper into debt, with the United States Department of Agriculture forecasting farm-sector debt to hit a record \$54 billion by year's end, the highest inflation-adjusted level in more than 60 years.

While these numbers are daunting, they reflect only part of the story. Since the last farm bill was passed in 2018, America's producers have faced powerful headwinds from extreme weather, rising foreign subsidies, trade barriers, global conflict, and supply chain disruptions. From the trade war with China to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, our agricultural sector has taken hit after hit.

Despite these challenges, Federal support for production agriculture in

2024 is projected to be at its lowest level since 1982. Let me say that again: 1982.

Imagine the impact this downturn has on our rural communities who already struggle with declining populations and a shrinking tax base. Imagine what it means for national food security and inevitably national security when the very people who grow our food are unable to sustain their operations.

Current economic conditions have resulted in farmers and ranchers eating through their available liquidity and working capital. In the September Beige Book, the Federal Reserve bank reported declining conditions for the agricultural sector in their respective regions. Various banks reported that credit providers see building financial stresses within the ag sector. Without financial certainty, lenders will be facing a credit crunch, and it will become increasingly difficult to get producers to cash flow.

The time for Congress to step up and pass a new farm bill is now. An extension of current policy is not acceptable. Our current farm safety net, while it was crafted in 2018 and while it was great for 2018, is simply outdated. While supplemental assistance kept many farms afloat, it is clear our existing programs have not kept up with inflation or the realities on the ground.

In fact, in our July hearing before the House Agriculture Committee on the state of the farm economy, producers and lenders told us that even if we deliver an improved farm safety net, additional assistance may be necessary to account for the losses experienced over the last year while Congress has failed to act.

I stand ready to work with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and leadership to deliver near-term assistance to bridge the gap to a highly effective 5-year farm bill.

A strong farm bill isn't just about agriculture, it is about our food supply, our rural communities, and our national security. If we fail to act before the year's end, if we settle for just extending the current law, we will be condemning thousands of farm families through an uncertain and potentially devastating future.

When you lose farms, you lose food, and when you lose food, you have food insecurity which leads to national insecurity.

Thankfully, the House has a bipartisan solution to the crisis in our farm economy. The bipartisan Farm, Food, and National Security Act was crafted by farmers for farmers. It is the product of intensive input, feedback, negotiations, and the realities of where our agricultural industry is and the tools it needs to succeed.

I want to walk through how this critical piece of legislation will benefit our rural communities, our food security, and our national security.

The commodity title aids farmers in managing risk and provides assistance

following precipitous declines in commodity prices. Through the reauthorization and enhancement of commodity, marketing loan, sugar, dairy, and disaster programs, producers are provided some certainty in times of unpredictability.

Our bipartisan farm bill increases support for the price loss coverage and the agriculture risk coverage programs to account for persistent inflation and rising costs of production, the volatility within the agricultural markets. We have not invested in this area significantly or had any increase for decades.

This provides authority to expand base acres to include producers who currently are not able to participate in our ARC or PLC. That is extremely important when you look at new, young, and beginning farmers, the future farmers. The future farmers are going to provide us our food security. They will provide food and fiber, building material, and energy resources. They need to be able to have that tool of base acres.

It modernizes marketing loans and the sugar policy. The sugar policy has always been divisive on this floor, picking sides between those who produce our sugar, the cane and the sugar beets producers of this Nation, and those who utilize it, those who use it to make our food, the bakers and the confectioners with great companies across both of those spectrums; they are great family-owned businesses.

Mr. Speaker, both sides of this farm bill are holding hands. We have worked hard to get them in a room and to work out modest reforms that both sides can agree upon. This will be the first farm bill that I know of where we don't have sugar wars and where they have come together. I appreciate the folks who came to the table to work those out.

It bolsters dairy programs to continue providing vital assistance. That is the number one commodity, and in my home State of Pennsylvania, agriculture is the number one industry.

We have included in this farm bill improvements in the dairy margin coverage. We have increased the amount of pounds that can be insured which is really important when you look at the consolidation of dairy farms over the years. Over the past decade, we have lost one-third of our dairy farms in this Nation. We don't ever want to be dependent on another country for our food supply, and that includes dairy.

In this farm bill we increased the amount of pounds from 5 million to 6 million pounds that can be insured under the dairy margin coverage.

□ 1300

We modernized the cost factors, which basically predated 2018 in terms of that insurance program. It is not a handout. These are public-private partnerships where the farmers step up. They purchase coverage. They decide how much coverage they want to purchase. We have engaged the private sector to create these programs.

Yes, the government does make them more affordable so that our farmers are able to keep farming, so that we are able to have continued food security, that we can have continued national security as a nation.

We enhanced the standing disaster programs and expanded eligibility for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, when you look around this country and, just in the past year, the amount of flood, the amount of drought, hurricanes, and wildfires that have impacted our farmers and that acreage in so many devastating ways, to be able to enhance standing disaster programs so that they are more reliable, more timely, that they help keep our farmers farming, that is the direction we need to go in. The language within the Farm, Food, and National Security Act accomplishes that.

The conservation title provides farmers, ranchers, and growers with financial and technical assistance to address a variety of natural resource concerns, such as soil health and erosion, water quality and quantity, and the wildlife habitat.

The 2024 farm bill continues to support our proven system of voluntary, incentive-based, and locally led conservation through various improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you know this, but, in terms of endangered and threatened species, there has been more endangered threats and species delisted through the efforts of these locally led, voluntary, incentive-based conservation programs that are in this farm bill than, quite frankly, what U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or anyone else has done through more punitive measures. We are proud of that fact.

These are great programs. They do a lot of good things. We provide historic investment in title II by reallocating the Inflation Reduction Act conservation dollars and expanding covered conservation practices.

It protects and enhances working lands conservation programs, like the environmental quality incentive program and the conservation stewardship program while promoting precision agriculture, the agriculture of today and tomorrow.

It includes commonsense easement reforms and protects working forest lands through newly authorized forest conservation easement programs.

It strengthens and improves program administration for the regional conservation partnership program and the technical service provider program and PL566, which deals with our watersheds.

It modernizes the conservation reserve program by incentivizing the enrollment of marginal lands and emphasizing State partnerships. We need to use soils that are fertile for growing. We need to be growing our crops. We need to be grazing our livestock. We have a nation to feed. Quite frankly, a lot of the rest of the world relies on

food that is produced in our great country.

These programs do that. We discourage fertile land from sitting idle. It is the marginal lands we invest in with this modernization.

It reauthorizes and funds successful programs, such as the feral swine eradication program—and, quite frankly, they are devastating in many parts of the country—and the voluntarily public access and habitat incentive program, an incredible program when it comes to wildlife through promoting the right kind of habitat on that rural acreage.

It emphasizes science, technology, and innovation, including within the conservation practice standards establishment and the review processes.

Agriculture is the backbone to most of the world's economies, and robust promotion programs not only create market access, but protect our agricultural interests and act as a catalyst for innovation and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, the trade title expands the research and impact of the market access program and the foreign market development program.

The 2024 farm bill will mitigate global food insecurity while providing U.S. producers new markets, improving local economies, and lessening the damage of this administration's ineffective trade agenda.

Mr. Speaker, our bipartisan farm bill doubles funding for MAP and FMD. They have never been increased since those programs were created. We have doubled those. We know how important that is. We have listened to our farmers and ranchers around the country.

It prioritizes U.S. commodities rather than unlimited market-based assistance.

It balances the authorities of USAID with those of USDA.

It lessens the bureaucracy associated with programs meant to respond to immediate crisis.

It addresses trade barriers and infrastructure deficiencies.

It fosters education partnerships to ensure developing countries can benefit from our Nation's advanced research and developing technologies.

The nutrition title, Mr. Speaker, is a really important title within the farm bill. The fact is I think it is a value and a principle where we are from, right? Neighbors help neighbors in need, but it is also a market program for our farmers. It is a workforce development program as we provide assistance for individuals who are struggling in poverty and need nutrition assistance, to get the type of SNAP, employment, education, and career and technical education, to climb the ladder of opportunity.

It supports families formally disallowed to receive benefits. It refocuses work programs to support upward mobility. It vests in and modernizes food distribution programs to create parity with urban programming. It promotes program integrity and State accountability.

The biggest problem we have had with the nutrition program is not the farm bill program. It is how certain States have inappropriately implemented and administered that program. We take actions to provide better oversight and accountability on those States as they execute those programs in their States.

It advances policies related to healthy eating, healthy behaviors, and healthy outcomes. Our bipartisan farm bill provides resources across multiple programs that have successfully benefited Tribal communities, seniors, and households pursuing healthier options.

It offers significant opportunities for individuals to remain on their current career pathways without choosing between SNAP and employment. We encourage them to stay on those rungs of the ladder of opportunity and to climb higher.

It creates new access for participants either formerly disallowed or beholden to arcane restriction.

It corrects egregious executive branch overreach and disallows future unelected bureaucrats from arbitrarily increasing SNAP benefits. Congress holds the power of the purse, and no one else. We are the closest to the people here in the House, so this provision allows us to do our job as Members of Congress going forward.

It creates a stronger, more sustainable connection between health and Federal feeding programs. For example, the dietary guidelines process is flawed. The committee-passed bill makes certain that scientific rigor and total transparency are at the forefront of any Federal dietary policy. At a time when most of our food industry is under attack, it is so important to remember that science should guide our policymakers.

It holds USDA and States accountable to the generosity of the American taxpayer. There are ongoing integrity issues in SNAP, including billions of dollars in fraud, families falling victim to transactional criminals and States manipulating data to avoid able-bodied individuals in joining the workforce or pursuing career and technical education. We take measures to end that in this farm bill, Mr. Speaker.

Our Nation's producers borrow more capital in a single harvest season than most Americans do in their entire lives. Interest rates have exploded under the Biden administration, resulting in skyrocketing borrowing costs, which fall especially hard on our Nation's younger, less-established producers. Programs within the credit title are instrumental in helping producers both start and maintain their operations.

It enhances financing options for producers who are unable to obtain credit from a commercial lender.

It provides resources to new, young, beginning, and veteran farmers in their transition into farming and ranching.

It protects and enhances the ability of commercial lenders to provide rural

America with a reliable source of credit and capital. That is so important when you look at bigger projects in rural America, whether it would be schools or hospitals, rehabilitation centers, or nursing homes.

Programs offered by USDA's rural development play a vital role in enhancing rural life and fostering economic growth. The rural development title of the 2024 farm bill continues the long history of bipartisan support for rural development initiatives and implements important improvements to enhance a robust, rural economy.

It strengthens broadband connectivity to rural communities.

It improves precision agriculture practices and increases accessibility of precision agriculture services.

It protects access to healthcare in rural America.

It enhances efforts to meet childcare demands of rural areas.

It addresses existing workforce challenges within rural communities to effectively meet their needs.

It encourages private capital investments in rural communities, and it streamlines the permitting process for rural development processes.

The research and extension title of the 2024 farm bill keeps American agriculture at the forefront of innovation and productivity through the cutting-edge research and supports the Nation's land-grant and nonland-grant colleges of agriculture.

Our bipartisan farm bill supports the modernization of the agriculture research facilities by providing funding for the Research Facilities Act.

It increases funding for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative, allocates funding for research and the development of mechanization and automation technologies for the specialty crop industry.

It maintains funding for the emergency citrus disease research and extension program.

It provides continued funding for scholarships for students at 1890 institutions, and it promotes interagency coordination for further agricultural research and other Federal agencies.

The forestry title of the farm bill promotes active forest management through incentivizing public-private partnerships, creating new market opportunities and revitalizing rural communities while reducing wildfire risk and improving forest health to ensure healthy and productive Federal, State, Tribal, and private forests.

It incentivizes active forest management through the public-private partnerships by expanding existing authorities like the Good Neighbor Authority and the Stewardship End Result Contracting.

It creates new and enhances existing market opportunities for forest products, including existing and new data sources and tools, including investing in innovative wood products and expanding the use of biochar.

It revitalizes rural communities and forest health through cross-boundary

authority. It simplifies environmental process requirements while ensuring environmental protection by building upon the success of categorical exclusions and other streamlined authorities.

The energy title of the farm bill increases access to energy system and efficiency updates for farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses while encouraging growth and innovation for biofuels, bioproducts, and related feedstocks.

It allows for critical cost and energy savings by increasing access to the Rural Energy for America Program.

It streamlines program delivery and enhances program integrity for biobased market programs and biofuels and bioproducts development program like the biopreferred program and the biorefinery, renewable chemical, and biobased product manufacturing assistance programs.

It requires the administration to study the impacts of solar installations on prime, unique, or statewide or locally important farmland.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the horticulture marketing and regulatory reform title provides critical investments to enhance the competitiveness of specialty crops and protect plant health. It delivers commonsense regulatory reforms necessary to relieve American farmers and ranchers from overregulation by the Biden administration.

It provides additional funding for the specialty crop block grant program and directs program administrators to consult with specialty crop producers when setting priorities for the program.

It increases funding for plant, pest, and disease management to further safeguard American agriculture and natural resources.

It maintains funding for the local agriculture market program and approves program delivery through simplified application.

It continues support for organic production through the national organic program, organic production, and the market data initiative and the national organic certification cost-share program.

Agricultural producers are greatly affected by numerous factors outside of their control, ranging from extreme weather to geopolitical instability.

Crop insurance, a vital risk management tool, is available to help producers manage the unique risks of farming and is delivered through an effective public-private partnership in which the Federal Government shares in the cost of the premiums, which would otherwise be unaffordable for most farmers.

The crop insurance title of the farm, food, and National Security Act ex-

pands premium assistance for beginning and veteran farmers.

□ 1315

It directs research and development of new policies and establishes an advisory committee for more robust engagement with specialty crop producers. It enhances certain coverage options to reduce the need for unbudgeted and ad hoc disaster relief. It bolsters the private-sector delivery system.

Mr. Speaker, the miscellaneous title brings together provisions related to livestock health and management, foreign animal disease preparedness, young and beginning farmers, and other key areas. It directs additional resources toward the three-legged stool to protect the entire livestock and poultry industry in the United States from foreign animal diseases.

This title provides guidance documents and other resources for small and very small meat and poultry-producing facilities. It allows livestock auction owners to invest in packing facilities, subject to capacity limitations. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to work in consultation with the U.S. Trade Representative to negotiate animal disease regionalization agreements with our trading partners. It enhances protections for dogs under the Animal Welfare Act.

It clarifies that States and local governments cannot impose a condition or standard on the production of covered livestock unless the livestock is physically located within such State or local government boundaries.

It requires the Secretary to conduct regular assessments to identify risks and security vulnerabilities to the food and agriculture critical infrastructure sector.

It reforms certain reporting requirements under the Agriculture and Foreign Investment Disclosure Act to ensure accuracy and transparency of data on farmland owned by foreign persons or foreign entities.

Again, farm security is food security is national security.

Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up, I thank the thousands of stakeholders across the country who have made themselves heard and been a part of this process so far, from fly-ins to speaking directly to staff and Members, to hosting roundtables, webinars, social media campaigns, drafting letters of support, and so much more.

Mr. Speaker, we approach this bill in a tri-partisan manner. That means bringing Democrats and Republicans to the table, and it means bringing the people of rural America, and specifically agriculture and farming, to the table. We did that in traveling the country to around 40 States and one territory. I have been honored to chair and lead somewhere close to 100 listening sessions in those areas.

We brought the voices of American agriculture and American consumers to the table, and that is how we wrote

the bill. We wrote the bill with their voice. We did it in a manner I like to call from the outside in.

Too frequently and often in this Chamber, we write legislation that is inside out. We gather a handful of so-called experts here on Capitol Hill to write these bills, and then we take them outside the beltway of Washington and try to convince everybody it is the best thing since sliced bread. That doesn't always work out.

We did this bill from the outside in. We traveled the Nation. We heard from the very people who provide us food and fiber and building materials.

We heard from vulnerable populations who need nutritional assistance, the families that are living in poverty. There are way too many of them living in poverty today. That is why the cost of the nutrition title is so high. It is reflective of the fact that there are way too many American families living in poverty today.

This bill can help change that because within the moneys that are invested, as I talked about in the nutrition title, quite frankly, we invest in employment, education, and career and technical education, helping them reach the next rung on the ladder of opportunity so they can wake up one morning and don't need this type of assistance because they found the great American Dream, which is opportunity.

I often say, Mr. Speaker, if you are not at the table, you are probably on the menu, and it has been a truly rewarding experience to see so many advocates for our agricultural industry at the table as we crafted this bipartisan bill.

When I became chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I took seriously my mandate to protect our food supply and enhance the impact of our Nation's agricultural value chain.

As I have just highlighted, across each title of this bill are new and better tools and resources for our farmers and rural communities. From production and processing to delivery and consumption, this bill strengthens the rural economy across every region, State, and district.

The farm bill has long been an example of consensus, where both sides must take a step off the soapbox and have tough conversations. I do not draw redlines. I do not close the door to conversation. I do not keep anybody from coming to the table to work on legislation, and we certainly didn't do that here. I have encouraged everyone to come to the table with this farm bill.

Finally, let me be clear, we continue to have productive conversations across the aisle and across the Capitol Building. The stakes are too high to get this wrong or to fail to deliver, and I firmly believe the four corners of our Agriculture Committees agree on this.

Working together, we can pass a bipartisan, bicameral, and highly effective farm bill. Quite frankly, coming

out with the bipartisan bill for the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024 that passed out of committee is a huge step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I so appreciate the opportunity and the privilege of speaking on this floor about America's number one industry, which is agriculture, the industry that every American family is so dependent on, and not just those three times a day when they pick up the tools of American agriculture, be it a knife, fork, or spoon, but when it comes to the economy, when it comes to jobs, when it comes to economic impact, when it comes, quite frankly, to the taxes that are paid by these hard-working members of the agriculture industry, processors and producers, at all levels of government. Significant tax dollars get paid to pay for what we hope are the essential services at all levels of government.

This industry and the tools around it make a better environment and a cleaner climate. I always like to cite data that I was so excited to read here that shows that our American farmers are the climate champions of the world. They sequester 6.1 gigatons of carbon annually. That is 10.1 percent more than what they emit.

Nobody does it better when it comes to a cleaner climate than the American farmer, rancher, and forester, and our processors, as well, with the processes that we use and the products that are developed.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, America is in a farm and food crisis. If we don't have farms, we don't have food, food security, national security. A nation that cannot feed itself will not exist.

I am hoping that all of my colleagues will join me, as many have, in supporting the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2024. I look forward to getting this bill to the House floor in the lameduck session. I know I have the support of the other three corners, which is the leadership of the Senate and the House Agriculture Committees. They have made a commitment to do that.

We don't see a need for an extension. We see a need for Congress, that being the House and the Senate, to do our job and get the work done on behalf of the American people.

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

FOCUSING ON PRIORITY ISSUES

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, there are a variety of issues that I think ought to be talked about, at least once, before we leave for our districts this Friday. They are topics I don't think the press is paying enough attention to, so one more time, I beg them to pay attention to these topics.

The first one is the border. Our fiscal year wraps up on September 30. Right now, we have 11 of the 12 months in the books for fiscal year 2024.

Now, something that I think has been underreported, we have one more time hit the all-time high of the number of people coming into this country who are—other than traditional means, I will say—coming across the southern border, in August, with 154,000 people. We have now hit 2,700,000 people for the year as a whole.

This is by comparison with Donald Trump in his last entire year, which was a little under 100,000. Part of that year was COVID, but nevertheless, even the next year after that was well under the million total.

It is a difficult number to get an exact count on. It includes people who have been released at the border. It includes what they call got-aways, which are a more dangerous class of people. It includes people who have entered the country on what we call the CBP One app, which is something I don't think President Biden had the ability or constitutional authority to do. It includes other people who he has allowed across under the Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan, and Venezuelan program.

Nevertheless, 11 months in with 1 month to go, we are at 2,700,000 people entering the country, breaking the previous record in the third year of the Biden administration, giving us a total of what appears to be 20 times as many people entering the country than President Trump's last year.

I think it would be useful at this time to deal with the argument that we have to allow some people here. Another number that I don't think is talked about enough, if you look in 3-year increments, we recently hit the all-time high—and we monitor when the new numbers come out—the all-time high of the number of people who were sworn in as legal citizens in the United States.

In the last 3 years, we have had an average of just under 900,000 people sworn in as legal citizens. By comparison, in both the Clinton and Bush years, we were around 700,000. In the 1960s, when I grew up, we were only a little over 100,000.

The reason I point that out is, people who think we should ignore the laws kind of imply that it is very difficult to come here and that we are desperately in need of more people from other countries.

Again, I repeat, in the last 3 years, we have had an average of just under 900,000 people sworn in, something that is the all-time record.

We now should combine that with the 2,700,000 people, who—it is not exactly the same thing—have come across our southern border or are allowed in under these special programs by President Biden.

It is important to remember the human cost of all these programs. In addition to changing the United States and having a lot of people who aren't

used to abiding by and necessarily revering or understanding our Constitution, the growing number of people coming across the southern border is where our fentanyl crisis comes in.

I have to repeat, from illegal drugs, twice as many people are dying every year as died in 12 years of the Vietnam war. Mr. Speaker, 110,000 people are dying from fentanyl, which I think is, in part, a function of the current administration and the Vice President when she was in charge of the southern border and allowing everything to come across.

□ 1330

I also want to point out that the last time I was at the border, I talked to a woman who was kind of in charge of talking to the women who were coming across the border, and she spoke in hushed tones over all of them that are being sexually assaulted.

I know President Trump tried to bring this to the fore, and of course, he was attacked for being racist, for pointing out that there were a lot of sexual assaults done on the southern border.

Another problem we have here is we are making the drug gangs, which are doing so much to control Mexico, wealthy.

Every time I have been at the border, Border Patrol is under the impression that these brutal drug gangs that are responsible for so many murders in Mexico are making more money bringing people across the border than they are from selling drugs.

I also point out as part of the over 2 million people who come here every month, 8,000 are unaccompanied minors.

Of all the ridiculous ways the Biden administration is ignoring our southern border, the idea that we are letting 8,000 or 9,000 children come across the border without their parents is maybe the most outlandish thing you can think of.

In this country, if a 10-year-old child is moving about the country, and we didn't know who their parents were, we would consider it a scandal, but that is what is routinely done at the southern border.

Sometime in the next month, numbers will be released for the amount of people coming across the southern border in September.

We already have the all-time record. I hope the press gives banner coverage to the new total of people coming into this country when the numbers are out for September, and we have the final fiscal year taken care of.

Now, the next issue I don't think we have talked about. People do talk about inflation, and inflation is a big problem, and we know inflation is brought about when you spend money that you are not taking in.

We know there were two big bills that were what we call supplemental bills, in addition to the regular bloated budget we pass around here.

President Biden and the Democrats here passed something called the American Rescue Plan and an infrastructure bill.

That infrastructure bill had some spending, which would have been done otherwise, but nevertheless, between the two, we were well over \$2 trillion.

What isn't talked about enough, and I wish the press would point it out more, is there was another program called the Inflation Reduction Act.

Now, the spending there was about \$1.2 trillion; it is sometimes forgotten that it was the goal. From what I can see of every Democrat around here, except for the Senators from Arizona and West Virginia who held it up, they wanted that program to be about three times the normal size of what it is.

Frequently in this Chamber, even from Republicans, they blame this inflation on the 1.2—it is hard to believe around here that they still don't have an exact number, but the 1 to 1.2 trillion in the Inflation Reduction Act.

Actually, virtually every Democrat wanted that number to be three times as high, \$3.5 trillion. I think given that that was the mainstream thinking of the Democratic party at the time, the press ought to talk a little bit more about that proposed bill that would have passed out of this House if it weren't for two brave Democrat Senators, KYRSTEN SINEMA, and Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia, who held it up.

Things could have been a lot worse if you didn't have two moderate Senators stand up to the ultraradical, mainstream Democrats that we now have in the House and the U.S. Senate.

Let's see a little bit more discussion about the high level of spending that people really wanted at that time.

The third issue, which I think should be one of the major issues of the campaign, but because we have a comatose press corps, they don't talk about it, is the war on marriage and the degree to which the U.S. Government today has passed program after program—largely exploding in the sixties, but since then, many of these programs have been expanded and no new programs added to them—in which a single parent gets government money as long as they are not living with the other parent.

As a practical matter, these programs have caused countless children to be raised without a father in the home because that is apparently what the U.S. Government wants to do.

Whether you look at the food-share program, the low-income housing program, the SSI for handicapped children program, the earned income tax credit, the daycare program, the Pell Grant Program, they all give significantly more money to a family if both parents are not around, and I say that if a working spouse is not around.

Usually this means that if a man joins the mother and children and has a decent job, a \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year job, all of a sudden, the mother would lose all of these other programs.

That is why we have gone from very, very tiny amounts of single parenthood in the sixties to over 40 percent in the nineties, and we are now on the march again.

This has fundamentally changed life in America, it has fundamentally changed what it is like growing up in America, and it is something that is not questioned.

Our conservative commentators should talk about it, and if they really cared about the future of society, our journalism professionals ought to be talking about it.

People sometimes wonder why the mom and dad at home is now so rare, like it was a mystery as to why that happened or an inadvertent effect of the Great Society pushed by Lyndon Johnson, in my mind, until now, the worst President we have ever had.

Let's not forget that Karl Marx, who still has a lot of influence in academia, said that we had to abolish the American family to have the communist heaven that he wants.

Actually, this thinking went before Karl Marx. It was also the thinking in the French Revolution where people who wanted to get rid of the church felt that one of the things they should do is try to break up the family.

During the sixties, this thinking was again out there. They weren't things that everybody read, but they were the type of things the intellectuals who sometimes decide the course of history have read.

Feminist Kate Millett said that destroying the American family was necessary to bring about a leftwing cultural revolution.

Later on, Angela Davis, another prominent radical at that time who was a communist, also came out against the American family and particularly the role of men in the family.

More recently, Black Lives Matter called for ending the Western prescribed nuclear family structure. We all know that some of the major businesses and corporations in America gave money to Black Lives Matter even after that was put on their website.

Two of the three co-founders of Black Lives Matter prided themselves on being Marxist and wanted to get rid of the American family.

This did not stop Black Lives Matter from being a group that many politicians wanted to associate with, and they would show up with their signs at a rally. Just horrible.

It is obvious to me that a goal of the new administration, whoever is sworn in this January, ought to look at whether it is time to change the rules, to change the formulas so that we no longer have an apparent policy in the United States of keeping both parents away from the children at the same time.

Here is another quote, which I think is illuminating, and this quote comes from a member of the Wisconsin Supreme Court.

A lot of people don't know people who are on the Wisconsin Supreme Court. The Wisconsin Supreme Court is nominally nonpartisan, but nevertheless, races for the Supreme Court clearly have one person backed more by the Democrat Party and one backed more by the Republican Party.

Recently in a case, and this was just dicta, one of the liberal judges, Jill Karofsky, wrote a concurring opinion in which she said, "The notion that marriage serves as the foundation of society is at best outdated, and at worst misogynistic." In other words, overtly anti-father.

It is a scary quote because she kind of implies that marriage is already done. It is over with. The left has won. She can say that marriage is at worst misogynistic, anti-male.

It is something I want the American people to think about. I want the people in Wisconsin to think about it. I want the journalists in Wisconsin to think about it.

Is Justice Jill Karofsky right? Is it already the end of the American family, or can we fight and bring it back and make it the norm like it was 50 or 60 years ago?

In any event, I think it is something that should be brought up and has not been brought up anywhere near enough.

The third topic that I think we ought to discuss is the Biden administration's policy of giving preferences to one more ethnic group, something that nobody back home knows has happened. The reason they don't know it is happening is because it hasn't been covered in the press.

The DEI effort, the idea of judging people by their ethnicity, judging people by their sex is something that has been around for over 50 years now, but the Biden administration, I think, keeps trying to push it more to the fore. It is something else that ought to be talked about in this campaign.

The Biden administration last year changed the policy, as a practical matter, to create preferences for people who come here from the Middle East or North Africa.

Now, we know there are already other groups that if they apply for a government job, they may be given preferences.

If they own a company and want to receive a government contract, they will get preferences over Americans of European descent.

By the way, you also get preferences for jobs if you work for a company that does over \$10,000 of business with the Federal Government each year.

In any event, we are now adding people from Morocco, Egypt, Iran, and Syria to this list. We are adding people who come here from Gaza to this list.

Is that a good idea? Do we think when people are fleeing Gaza with all their wonderful anti-Semitic ideas and coming to this country that they should also be given preferences?

Apparently, I believe that is what will happen now unless somebody does

something and prevents that from happening. It is something most Americans don't know about. It is something that should be talked about.

The next thing that should be talked about, and I brought five issues here. Obviously, we are giving them to the chair but also anybody in the press corps, and that is as we look to hire new people to run this government in January, are we committed to the First Amendment, which should be obvious.

In August, it came out that Mark Zuckerberg, owner of Facebook, was apparently threatened in some way or cajoled into keeping things off something, which presumably was supposed to be kind of a wide-open medium that you could pursue and find out what was going on in America today. Instead, the people in the current administration decided to weigh in and say there are certain ideas that Americans apparently shouldn't be able to know about.

At the time, a lot of it was concerning COVID, and, of course, different people had different opinions on social distancing, on the treatments that people received when they went to the hospital, on the vaccines, on all these things.

Apparently, the past government didn't feel that Americans could handle all the information, so like maybe a government in the Soviet Union or China, there were some things that they felt had to be removed from people's computers, and that is why they weighed in with Mark Zuckerberg.

We know before that, there were people who weighed in, the same political party, because they felt information regarding Hunter Biden was not something that the Americans could handle on their own, so we had to remove it and keep Americans in the dark.

Maybe that was significant enough, it changed who won the last election, but in any event, it is another example of people of importance in America who kind of view the First Amendment with contempt.

I would like to know, going in for the next election, where the people running for public office stand on the First Amendment.

□ 1345

The final issue I would like to bring up which seems to be dropped is, in August when we were not in, like many other politicians, I rang doorbells in my district to see what was on people's minds.

I ran across two grandmothers who had grandchildren who had tried to go down this transgender route. It was obviously very disturbing for both grandmothers. One of them only had one grandchild, and I could tell it broke her heart that her granddaughter, who she loved so much, had decided to go down the transgender path.

This is obvious that we have far more of this than we had when I was a child. Most people who have what they call

gender dysphoria will grow out of it. Unfortunately, we have a policy right now pushed by the Department of Education in which we have to, I would say, encourage or tell people that this is an acceptable way to behave.

Right now, the Department of Education is threatening to withhold funds from school districts who don't, say, allow transgender guys into the girls' bathroom or such. In other words, this part of the culture is kind of, I believe, encouraging an increase in this sort of behavior.

It is not something that affects many Americans, but if it affects Americans like the grandmothers I talked to, it is devastating. I would hope in the future that politicians who talk about this issue realize that when they, as President Biden is, talk about it like it is a very positive thing, the result is, I think you are going to have more and more people go down this path, and you are going to have more and more people who would have come out of it eventually stay in it.

It is something else that should be talked about. Is the reason we have such a big increase in transgenderism because it was always there or is it because our culture is making it a more a permissible lifestyle and, as a result, encouraging children to go down this path?

In any event, that is five issues that I wish the press would take up in October. I wish they would publish, as it comes out, the new all-time record for people coming across the southern border. I wish they would focus on not only the excessive spending that leads to the inflation but the even more excessive spending that virtually every Democrat in this Chamber was prepared to vote for about three times more than what became the Inflation Reduction Act.

I hope that going into the election the press weighs in, should the United States continue the current policy of greatly increasing Federal benefits if you don't have both a working man and woman at home. In other words, the policy of encouraging single parenthood at the expense of having two parents at home.

I hope the press focuses a little bit in the next election on are we going to have people who will stand with the First Amendment or are we going to have people who like to lean on our social platforms and say that there are certain things that Americans shouldn't know and are we going to see whether we are going to use America's schools to continue to encourage the transgender lifestyle.

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

LAMENTING THE DEATH OF COMEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISCOMANI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lament the death of comedy in California, the death of satire in California or, more seriously, to lament a serious blow that has been struck against freedom of speech and a healthy democratic process in California.

That is because the California legislature has passed, and Governor Gavin Newsom has signed, a law explicitly designed to outlaw political parodies. We don't need to speculate about this being the purpose of this law because the Governor said so directly.

Several weeks ago, a parody video of KAMALA HARRIS began circulating on social media. Governor Newsom reposted it, and he said this should be illegal. "I will be signing a bill in a matter of weeks to make sure it is." This week he made good on that promise. The Governor again reposted the parody and said: "I just signed a bill to make this illegal in the State of California."

Sort of on its face, it is a classic authoritarian move, a person in power sees speech he doesn't like, sees speech that threatens his power, and so he uses that power, uses whatever tools he has at his disposal to silence those who would dare speak against him to make them go away. That is by his own admission, in his own words what he has done.

Now, I will say, there are legitimate issues when it comes to AI, deep fakes, voice cloning, generative video, and other tools that may be maliciously wielded to confuse voters and corrupt the political process. There is room, and perhaps even a need, for regulation designed to assure that these tools are not abused.

However, that is not what Newsom is doing. By his own acknowledgment, what he is doing is banning parody. Parody and satire have been central to American political discourse throughout our history, from the founding era, with satirists lampooning King George, through the works of Mark Twain, through the advent of television, "Saturday Night Live," through the present day with *The Onion*, *The Babylon Bee*, and all manner of parody and satire on social media.

It has thrived as a way for artists, comedians, and the public at large to humble those who have become too powerful, and to convey truths in a particularly compelling way.

Not only that, but satire and parody are clearly protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution. The Supreme Court has long held that parodies of public figures are protected even if they are "outrageous," and the Court has long held that any satirical statement is protected so long as it cannot reasonably be interpreted as stating actual facts.

In short, if a reasonable person could discern that something is a parody, then it is protected by the First Amendment; so the question, when evaluating this new law, would be, is it stepping over that line? We have a very

clear test case in the Kamala Harris video that in the Governor's own acknowledgment was the inspiration for the law. It is exactly the sort of thing that the law was designed to stamp out.

Let's just look at a few lines from this Kamala Harris video and see whether a reasonable person would actually believe that it is KAMALA HARRIS.

The first line of the video is this: "I, KAMALA HARRIS, am your Democrat candidate for President because Joe Biden finally exposed his senility at the debate."

Now, would a reasonable person think that KAMALA HARRIS said that when they see this video, that she actually made that statement?

The video goes on. It says: "If you criticize anything I say, you are both sexist and racist." Would a reasonable person believe that was actually KAMALA HARRIS saying that in that video?

There are other examples. It goes on: "I may not know the first thing about running the country, but remember, that is a good thing if you are a deep state puppet." Would a reasonable person believe that KAMALA HARRIS actually said that?

It goes on: "Joe Biden taught me, rule number one, carefully hide your total incompetence." Would a reasonable person believe that this is actually KAMALA HARRIS saying "rule number one, carefully hide your total incompetence"?

The video goes on. It says: "My work on the border was 'catastrophic.'" Would a reasonable person think she said that?

One of the keys to effective satire, and you can judge for yourself whether this is effective or not, is that it actually does illuminate a deeper underlying truth. Therefore, one might argue, I would argue, that KAMALA HARRIS' performance as border czar was, in fact, catastrophic, but a reasonable person will not actually believe that she is saying that herself in this video.

Gavin Newsom, in order to maintain that consistent with the First Amendment he can eliminate this video from our public discourse would have to somehow argue that he thinks a reasonable member of the public would actually think that KAMALA HARRIS would say those things. It makes you wonder about the regard that Mr. Newsom has for the public in California and across the country.

The better explanation for his behavior is just that he doesn't have any regard for the First Amendment at all. The courts have time after time struck down measures that he has signed on First Amendment grounds. It just happened again a couple weeks ago.

It happened not that long ago with respect to a law that he signed that sought to punish people for supposedly spreading COVID misinformation. The legislature and Newsom had to repeal

their own law after the court weighed in on First Amendment grounds.

This highlights a broader, very concerning tendency, not just in California but across the country, where we have this brewing crisis of freedom of speech, which in many ways started at colleges and universities and then expanded to certain social media platforms, and then became intertwined with the government.

We got an acknowledgment of this recently from Mark Zuckerberg, CEO at Facebook, Meta, who said that he was, indeed, pressured by the Biden administration to censor content on his platform, and he acknowledged that Facebook was wrong to give in to that pressure.

We are also seeing elsewhere in the world some alarming regression when it comes to protections for freedom of speech. This has been, throughout U.S. history, one of the things that has set our country apart. We have always had ironclad or at least striven to have ironclad protections for freedom of speech. It is one of the things that has propelled progress of all kinds in the history of our country.

I would argue that there is perhaps no greater threat to democracy than the suppression of freedom of speech, so the assault on free speech led by Gavin Newsom and the Biden administration is cause for great alarm by all Americans.

Fortunately, I think there are some reasons to believe that the tide is starting to turn. Of course, the social media platform X has become a leader in protecting freedom of speech after we have learned about prior efforts at that platform and others working at times with the government.

We have seen, of course, the Zuckerberg letter that I just mentioned where Facebook is committing to be more mindful and respectful of free speech principles in the future.

Just yesterday, this House passed my Free Speech on Campus Act, which is designed to restore the importance of freedom of speech on our college campuses as a foundational campus value. I would urge the Senate now to pass that same measure, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in whatever efforts we can to end the assaults on free speech we have seen in this country and return to the founding principles that have been so central to our country's prosperity and progress.

PROPOSITION 36

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pass on some incredible news about Proposition 36 in California. This is an initiative that is designed to make crime illegal again in California, to restore appropriate consequences for theft and drug crimes.

Prop 36, which will be on the ballot in just a few weeks here, was recently polled by the Public Policy Institute of California, and the results are overwhelming—71 percent of California voters are in support compared to 26 opposed. You have 85 percent of Republicans in support with just 11 percent

opposed. You have 73 percent of Independents in support with just 24 percent opposed. There are 63 percent of Democratic voters in support with only 33 percent opposed, about two-thirds of even Democratic voters in support of this initiative to make crime illegal again in California.

Seeing those numbers, you understand why the Governor of California, Gavin Newsom, fought tooth and nail to keep this from this even being on the ballot. He concocted a number of truly outrageous schemes that were specifically designed to cancel the vote, to stop Californians from even having an opportunity to vote on this important proposition. Fortunately, those efforts failed, and a vote will be held very soon.

When the Governor was told about these numbers at a press conference yesterday, he said: "I was wondering what State I am living in." "I was wondering what State I am living in," Newsom said, when informed that Californians overwhelmingly favor restoring consequences for criminal activity.

Maybe I will enlighten him about the State he is living in. The State he is living in is one where crime has simply spun out of control and where people are seeing the consequences of that in their daily lives.

Proposition 47 is the primary culprit. It was passed about a decade ago, and it effectively eliminated consequences for retail theft, no matter how many times you stole, and it eliminated consequences for possession of even hard drugs, which basically ended the ability to get addicts into treatment.

□ 1400

The consequences of these two things are that in many parts of California, on your way to the grocery store or walking around a downtown, you will have to go through open-air drug markets. You will have to dodge needles. You will see people suffering, withering on our streets, tragically dying all too often from overdoses on our streets.

Then if you want to go in and shop at a grocery store or even a convenience store, a CVS, you will see almost everything under lock and key. You have to go get a clerk to open up the lock for you if you want to buy frozen goods or if you want to buy shampoo and conditioner. It is really the sort of thing you really would have never expected to see in America, and yet it is what Prop 47 and its progeny in California have spawned, the reality they have created where Californians overwhelmingly say that crime has continued to get worse.

Indeed, that is borne out in the numbers. Property crimes have gotten much worse since Prop 47, all types of crime. Violent crime has gotten significantly worse in just the last few years.

The results of this poll, the overwhelming support for Prop 36, are a recognition of that. I will read you, by the way, the title of the initiative. It

says: "Allows Felony Charges and Increases Sentences for Certain Drug and Theft Crimes." That is all it says. That is the information people have.

The overwhelming majority of California voters, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, liberals and moderates, conservatives, folks of all economic and racial backgrounds from all parts of the State, across every group, people say overwhelmingly: Yes, that is something we need. Yet, somehow, the Governor still lectured Californians yesterday about how they are wrong.

I believe that once this measure passes—and there can be no doubt that it is going to pass—it is going to be a new day for California. We are going to restore commonsense policies when it comes to public safety. We are going to provide law enforcement with new tools to keep our communities safe. We are going to go a long way toward reversing the homelessness crisis in California. Maybe most importantly, the people of California will demonstrate the agency that we all have to set our State on a different course, even when our out-of-touch political class attempts to stand in the way.

CONGRATULATING SPACEX

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate SpaceX on the Polaris Dawn mission, which is the first of three planned missions in the program and took astronauts in an elliptical orbit 870 miles from Earth.

The four astronauts pictured here are Jared Isaacman, Scott Poteet, Sarah Gillis, and Anna Menon.

Now, this mission sat a number of records, a number of firsts. For example, it climbed higher over Earth than any human spaceflight since the last Apollo mission in 1972. It contributed to having the most humans in Earth orbit at the same time ever. It was the first commercial space walk and the first time four people were exposed to the vacuum of space at the same time. They even downlinked the first violin performance from space using Starlink, and it was the first time that Doritos were eaten from space, with a special safe-for-space chip that was designed. As part of this, they collected data for future missions to the Moon and beyond.

SpaceX, of course, is a company that started in California. I had the opportunity to tour their facility a few years back. It truly is a marvel.

The company is also vital to U.S. leadership around the world when it comes to space, and is vital to our national security. This was recently underscored as NASA is now having to rely on SpaceX to bring home two astronauts that are stranded at the International Space Station.

It is also underscored by the statistics. When it comes to delivering payloads into orbit, in Q1 of this year, 87 percent of the world's tonnage to orbit was delivered by SpaceX. Eighty-seven percent of the total tonnage delivered to orbit around the world was delivered by SpaceX. This includes commercial

customers. It includes SpaceX's own Starlink system, which is providing internet to remote areas of the world, in fact, to some of my constituents in Death Valley as well as to cruise ships and airlines. It also includes launches that are absolutely vital to U.S. national security and space exploration.

Given what a tremendous asset this company is, it makes it all the more stunning that the company is being targeted in multiple ways and for frivolous reasons. Recently, the FAA fined the company \$633,000 for trivial, non-safety-related reasons. More concerning, the agency has delayed flight 5 of Starship for 2 months, again for nonsafety-related reasons.

Now, Starship is the largest and most powerful space transportation system ever developed. It is fully and rapidly reusable in its design. They have already had four very successful missions where they have done better each time, and the idea is they iterate their design, and they learn from each flight. This fifth flight, which is ready to go, would attempt to return the super heavy booster to the launch site and catch it midair using what they call their giant chopsticks.

Now, this rapid reusability is completely—and already is—changing the economics of space exploration and making it orders of magnitude more affordable. It is truly a Herculean feat of technology and ingenuity in order to make this happen. Yet, we have these roadblocks that are being thrown in its way.

SpaceX itself put it this way: "We continue to be stuck in a reality where it takes longer to do the government paperwork to license a rocket launch than it does to design and build the actual hardware."

When it comes to launching a rocket, obviously there are important regulatory concerns when it comes to safety. The company has been steadfast in prioritizing safety, and it is important that that collaboration exist.

In this case, the reasons they are being held back are completely unrelated to safety or any other legitimate public interest. In fact, the company has bent over backward to comply with environmental regulations. There simply should not be delays related to paperwork or bureaucracy. The FAA and related agencies need to prioritize enabling launches, not standing in their way.

Some have suggested that there might be political motivations here. I think that perhaps the broader issue might be one of cultural incompatibility, in the sense that when you think back to the lunar program, when you think back to President Kennedy saying that we will put a man on the Moon within this decade, not because it is easy, but because it is hard, and when you think about the way that the entire country was captivated when that vision ultimately came to fruition and what it meant for U.S. leadership in the world, for our national security

during the Cold War, it was a way in which the country was able to come together around a truly awe-inspiring vision.

That is the sort of vision that SpaceX is pursuing, the sort of truly big and forward-looking thinking that captivates people's imaginations, that allows us to push beyond the limits of our current knowledge and to explore new frontiers.

There is just something perhaps about the nature of modern bureaucracies in this country that is incompatible with that way of thinking. When they encounter it, their impulse is not to facilitate it but to throw roadblocks, to find trivial reasons to hold it back.

I do think it is a moment to think about how we got to this point and the sort of reforms that we might make to our bureaucracy here and really across the board that will allow our government to be on the side of innovators, to facilitate innovation rather than constantly trying to hold it back.

Notwithstanding, I know that SpaceX as well as others in this industry are going to push forward. I congratulate them on this latest history-making success, and I look forward to many more history-making successes in the years ahead.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 265.—An act to reauthorize the rural emergency medical service training and equipment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1648.—An act to facilitate access to the electromagnetic spectrum for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries, and for other purposes.

S. 2825.—An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dustoff crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam.

S. 2861.—An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, an American icon, in recognition of a remarkable life devoted to championing equal rights for all, in sports and in society.

S. 4351.—An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 23, 2024, at noon 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-5409. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, USD(A&S)(A)/DPCAP, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Sustainable Procurement (DFARS Case 2024-D024) [Docket DARS-2024-0026] (RIN: 0750-AM21) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5410. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, USD(A&S)(A)/DPCAP, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act Reform (DFARS Case 2023-D014) [Docket DARS-2024-0024] (RIN: 0750-AL87) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5411. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Quality Control Standards for Automated Valuation Models [Docket No.: NCUA-2023-0019] (RIN: 3133-AE23) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-5412. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Investment Management, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Qualifying Venture Capital Funds Inflation Adjustment [Release No.: IC-35305; File No.: S7-2024-01] (RIN: 3235-AN33) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-5413. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and definition — Transitioning Gang-Involved Youth to Higher Education Program [ED-2024-OPE-0073] received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-5414. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Resource Centers Program and Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships Program [Docket ID: EC-2024-OPE-0017] (RIN: 1840-AD94) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-5415. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5416. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from January 1 through June 30, 2024, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102(g)); (110 Stat. 792); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5417. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national

emergency with respect to the situation in and in relation to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-5418. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Clarification of Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Regulation Regarding Monitor National Marine Sanctuary; Final Rulemaking [Docket No.: 200313-0080] (RIN: 0648-BI82) received August 20, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-5419. A letter from the Chief of the Division of Bird Conservation, Permits, and Regulations, Migratory Bird Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; 2024-25 Seasons for Certain Migratory Game Birds [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2023-0113; FXMB1231099BPP0-245-FF09M32000] (RIN: 1018-BG63) received September 3, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-5420. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a compilation and summary of reports received from chief district judges detailing each public event conducted in accordance with the POWER Act's requirements during the previous fiscal year, pursuant to Public Law 115-237, Sec. 4(b)(1); (132 Stat. 2449); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5421. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a Judicial Conference determination that former United States District Judge Joshua M. Kindred (D. Alaska) has engaged in conduct for which consideration of impeachment may be warranted, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 355(b)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5422. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31562; Amdt. No.: 4127] received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5423. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31563; Amdt. No.: 4128] received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5424. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31561; Amdt. No.: 580] received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-5425. A letter from the Management Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Modernization of Passenger Information Requirements Relating to "No Smoking" Sign Illumination [Docket No.:

FAA-2024-2052; Amdt. Nos.: 25-153, 91-377, 121-393, 125-76] (RIN: 2120-AM00) received September 6, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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:

Ms. FOX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 8932. A bill to establish an earlier application processing cycle for the FAFSA; with an amendment (Rept. 118-695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEIL: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 9488. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require the disclosure of the card verification value as a condition of the acceptance of online contributions made through the use of credit or debit cards in elections for Federal office and to prohibit the acceptance of contributions made through the use of gift cards and prepaid credit cards in such elections, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 118-696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 8108. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to add a Medicaid State plan requirement with respect to the determination of residency of certain individuals serving in the Armed Forces; with an amendment (Rept. 118-697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 8610. A bill to reauthorize and reform counter-unmanned aircraft system authorities, to improve transparency, security, safety, and accountability related to such authorities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-698 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 7073. A bill to improve public-private partnerships and increase Federal research, development, and demonstration related to the evolution of next generation pipeline systems, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3433. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to molecularly targeted pediatric cancer investigations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 8610 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCLAIN, and Mr. LOPEZ):

H.R. 9714. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to require the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to provide testimony at annual hearings held by the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN (for himself and Mr. RESCIENTHALER):

H.R. 9715. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide fluid or powdered milk to members of the Armed Forces at dining facilities on military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 9716. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to require the Congressional Budget Office to provide baseline updates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 9717. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain minerals from the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 9718. A bill to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 9719. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to modify requirements regarding management of the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 9720. A bill to direct the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to update the national vulnerability database to reflect vulnerabilities to artificial intelligence systems, study the need for voluntary reporting related to artificial intelligence security and safety incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 9721. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 to add whistleblower protections to certain modified contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 9722. A bill to establish a pilot program to assess the use of technology to speed up and enhance the cargo inspection process at land ports of entry along the border; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 9724. A bill to provide additional authority of the United States International Trade Commission under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974; 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 Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 9725. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs to provide to certain veterans who are women a compensation benefit and an upgrade to the discharge status of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 9726. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop a flood insurance information tool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 9727. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Accountability, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 9728. A bill to require the Attorney General to issue rules pertaining to the collection and compilation of data on the use of deadly force by law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 9729. A bill to require the Department of State to improve its emergency response system and planning; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIMENEZ:

H.R. 9730. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the use of detection at range technology for the screening of passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia (for herself, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 9731. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself and Mr. IVEY):

H.R. 9732. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify that private, one-on-one communications constitute a notice or advertisement for purposes of the Federal crime of making a notice or advertisement to seek or offer child pornography; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGARVEY:

H.R. 9733. A bill to establish the School Bus Driver Shortage Task Force to address the nationwide school bus driver shortage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 9734. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to former members of the Armed Forces, discharged on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, certain benefits furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 9735. A bill to amend title 31 of the United States Code and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to automatically increase the debt limit for the fiscal year of a budget resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 9736. A bill to ensure that irresponsible corporate executives, rather than shareholders, pay fines and penalties; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 9737. A bill to improve the tracking and processing of security and safety incidents and risks associated with artificial intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 9738. A bill to increase the penalties applicable to persons facilitate fraud with respect to any COVID-related employee retention credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MFUME, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER):

H.R. 9739. A bill to amend the National Apprenticeship Act in order to increase and expand the national apprenticeship system to include the immediate recruitment, employment, and on-the-job earn as you learn training of young African Americans, and to promote the development of equitable hiring standards necessary to safeguard the diversity of apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mrs. NAPOLI-

TANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACOBS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. ROSS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. AMO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CHU, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 9740. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to increase the maximum amount of contraceptive supplies provided to a beneficiary through the TRICARE Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JACOBS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. ROSS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. AMO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 9741. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that beneficiaries and health care providers receive certain information regarding reproductive health care under the TRICARE program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SYKES (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. PEREZ, and Ms. BUDZINSKI):

H.R. 9742. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 9743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for traveling expenses for Federal disaster relief workers away from home for more than 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 9744. A bill to require a study on the critical data gaps experienced by Federal agencies providing grants for the recovery of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. DUARTE, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BACON, Mr.

TONY GONZALES of Texas, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 9745. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of certain regulations relating to sale, donation, and transfer of Federal Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. SWALWELL):

H.R. 9746. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow borrowers of Parent PLUS loans or loans under section 428B made on behalf of a dependent student to repay such loans pursuant to an income-contingent repayment plan or income-based repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SELF, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 207. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Implementation of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H. Res. 1479. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideas of "National Hydrocephalus Awareness Month" and "World Hydrocephalus Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CARAVEO (for herself, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GALLEGU, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. CORREA, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. VASQUEZ):

H. Res. 1480. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Restaurant Week and the contributions of Hispanic restaurant owners and employees to the restaurant industry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H. Res. 1481. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of September 2024 as "National Children's Emotional Wellness Month" and for increased public awareness regarding children's emotional health and wellness; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST:

H. Res. 1482. A resolution condemning the attempted assassination of former President Donald J. Trump at the Trump International Golf Club in West Palm Beach, Florida, and honoring the Martin County Sheriff's Office for their rapid response and bravery in apprehending the would-be assassin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H. Res. 1483. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 25) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARSON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H. Res. 1484. A resolution recognizing the importance of evidence-based parenting and caregiving education in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 9714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Mandate that the CBO Director testify in front of the Budget Committee no less than twice a year.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 9715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide fluid or powdered milk to members of the Armed Forces at dining facilities on military installations.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 9716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Budget

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 9717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the importation of certain minerals from the Russian Federation.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 9718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 9719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to modify requirements regarding management of the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes.

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 9720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Directs NIST to initiate a process to update processes and procedures for the voluntary tracking and processing of security

and safety incidents associated with artificial intelligence

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 9721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would make clear what contract activities mandate the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make best efforts to include in any modification made to a contract into which it has previously entered a contract clause that provides for the same whistleblower protections that are contained in Section 4712 of title 41, United States Code.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a pilot program to assess the use of technology to speed up and enhance the cargo inspection process at land ports of entry along the border.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Reauthorizes the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 9724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would amend Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 to allow the U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) to investigate tariff evasion from non-market entities into third countries, and advise USTR or Congress to enact a trade remedy against the third country investment if tariff evasion is determined.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 9725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Service members

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 9726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

The single subject of this legislation is:

The NFIP Premium Transparency Act would require FEMA and Insurance Companies to provide NFIP policyholders with data used to calculate their NFIP premiums. The NFIP Premium Transparency Act would also direct GAO to conduct a study examining additional data that could be shared with NFIP Policyholders and potential uses of that data. (FINANCIAL SERVICES)

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 9727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Voting Rights

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 9728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Law Enforcement

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 9729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Department of State to improve its emergency response system and planning

By Mr. GIMENEZ:

H.R. 9730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution stating that Congress has the Authority to “make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution”

The single subject of this legislation is:

TO amend title 49 United States Code, to clarify the use of detection at range technology for the screening of passengers and for other purposes

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 9731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, and for other purposes.

By Ms. LEE of Florida:

H.R. 9732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Protection of Child Victims from Online Predators Act

The single subject of this legislation is:

Child Protection

By Mr. MCGARVEY:

H.R. 9733.

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. PAPPAS:

H.R. 9734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that “Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veterans

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 9735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Budget

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 9736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To ensure that irresponsible corporate executives, rather than shareholders, pay fines and penalties.

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 9737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improves the tracking and processing of security and safety incidents and risks associated with artificial intelligence

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 9738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sixteenth Amendment provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect taxes on incomes."

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase the penalties applicable to persons facilitate fraud with respect to any COVID-related employee retention credit, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 9739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 9740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Defense to increase the maximum amount of contraceptive supplies provided to a beneficiary through the TRICARE program.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 9741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that beneficiaries and health care providers receive certain information regarding reproductive health care under the TRICARE program.

By Mrs. SYKES:

H.R. 9742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill extends existing Veterans Affairs authorities.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 9743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for traveling expenses for Federal disaster relief workers away from home for more than 1 year.

By Mr. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 9744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

The single subject of this legislation is:

Disaster recovery

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 9745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Defense and Law Enforcement

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 9746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 549: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 782: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 927: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 957: Ms. BUDZINSKI.

H.R. 1183: Ms. BOEBERT.

H.R. 1298: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1330: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 1507: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1565: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1633: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1638: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1705: Ms. BROWN.

H.R. 1716: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1770: Mr. CLINE and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1838: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2394: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 2480: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 2725: Ms. SCHRIER and Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 2744: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2830: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 2854: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 2923: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3005: Ms. MENG and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3042: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 3130: Ms. DELLAURO.

H.R. 3537: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 3654: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3670: Mr. MILLS.

H.R. 3686: Mr. IVEY.

H.R. 3730: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 3868: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 3876: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3894: Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3946: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

H.R. 4059: Mr. BEAN of Florida.

H.R. 4273: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 4303: Mrs. SYKES.

H.R. 4326: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 4340: Mr. LANDSMAN and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 4663: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4724: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4963: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 5012: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York.

H.R. 5266: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5308: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5502: Mrs. FOUSHEE.

H.R. 5623: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 5682: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 5820: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 6159: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 6205: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 6672: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 6727: Mr. CARL.

H.R. 6860: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6863: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 6936: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 7039: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 7083: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 7137: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 7149: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 7203: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 7258: Mr. EZELL.

H.R. 7272: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 7382: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 7566: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 7597: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 7599: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 7618: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 7799: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 7880: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 7921: Ms. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 8028: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 8147: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 8203: Ms. SEWELL and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 8220: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 8303: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 8340: Ms. ROSS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. LOPEZ.

H.R. 8366: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 8378: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 8419: Mr. RULLI.

H.R. 8426: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 8545: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 8575: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 8617: Ms. SALINAS and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 8621: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 8639: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 8702: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 8706: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 8715: Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 8758: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 8777: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 8796: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 8858: Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 8896: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 8918: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 9060: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 9109: Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 9131: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 9161: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 9218: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 9227: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 9260: Ms. LEE of Florida.

H.R. 9274: Ms. STEVENS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Mr. DUARTE.

H.R. 9310: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 9360: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 9374: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 9382: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 9394: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 9466: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 9503: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 9534: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 9561: Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 9568: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 9625: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. KILEY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. D'ESPOSITO.

H.R. 9649: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 9657: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 9678: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 9697: Mr. FRY.

H.J. Res. 147: Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. VALADAO.

H.J. Res. 193: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. PETERS.

H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 376: Mr. MCGARVEY.

H. Res. 1327: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MULLIN.

H. Res. 1348: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. LOPEZ, and Mr. CLYDE.

H. Res. 1444: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 1447: Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Res. 1448: Ms. SALINAS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 1449: Mr. COSTA, Ms. WILD, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
H. Res. 1450: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H. Res. 1457: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.
H. Res. 1473: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CHU, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. T5Sherman, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HOYER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MANNING, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. AMO, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CASAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BALINT, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. WILD, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. STANTON, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BEATY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. MCGARVEY.