

For the last 6 weeks, because of the relentless efforts of the White House and of Joe Biden to reduce gas prices, those gas prices have fallen every day for 6 weeks. That is because Democrats are focused on putting people over politics, and we want to lower costs, have better paying jobs, and safer communities.

What are Republicans focused on?

They want to end Social Security; they are attacking our democracy; and they want to criminalize women's healthcare decisions.

In fact, just last week, House Republicans voted "no" on providing access to birth control pills. Let me just repeat that again. We are in the 21st century, and House Republicans want government to ban birth control pills.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1, 2022, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

Mr. MORELLE, Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1289 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1289

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from August 1, 2022, through September 12, 2022, the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall

not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1100

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1289, providing for a motion by the chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Finally, the rule provides standard floor recess instructions for the August district work period from August 1 to September 12.

Madam Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of a historic package of long-overdue legislative actions that will strengthen our economy and reignite our competitiveness on the global stage.

Throughout our work in Congress, we have focused on fighting for and uplifting families, on creating opportunity and setting our community on a path toward a brighter future. This historic investment will deliver on the promise of a better tomorrow.

It means jobs, real jobs, that will keep families together and ensure our children can access the American Dream.

It means lower costs for essential, everyday items that will lessen the burden on families.

It means America will strengthen its competitiveness against countries like China and reestablish its place as the global leader in innovation.

It will reaffirm our leadership around the world by strengthening diplomacy, promoting human rights, and bolstering economic engagement.

I am proud that this bill is a result of comprehensive bicameral and bipar-

tisan negotiations, which I had the privilege of participating in as a member of the Conference Committee.

America has always been known as the land of opportunity, creativity, and entrepreneurship. We are the Nation that took to the stars and landed a man on the Moon, the birthplace of transformational inventions like the internet, and home to some of the world's greatest scientists. Technological advancement is in our DNA, and we need to continue fostering its long-term growth. That is why I am particularly pleased this legislation includes steps to enhance regional innovation, which has long been one of my top priorities and opens the doors for limitless potential.

Federal investment in regional innovation hubs will uplift communities across the country that are already leading the way in high-tech advancements, communities like my home of Rochester, which is already doing groundbreaking work in this field.

No longer will Silicon Valley be the only area synonymous with innovation. With this legislation, we are making investments in collaboration across public, private, education, and civic sectors that will be game changers for communities across the country, transforming underutilized cities into crucibles of America's global competitiveness.

Furthermore, this legislation addresses our deep concern that America is losing its competitive edge in semiconductor manufacturing, a clear economic and national security concern. Over the past few years, China has invested more than \$150 billion to build their domestic chip manufacturing capacity, while we have invested nothing. We have fallen behind. But not anymore.

The CHIPS and Science Act will bolster our domestic supply of semiconductors, putting us back on pace to match China while reducing our reliance on foreign supply chains and lowering costs for everyday families.

This legislation harnesses the spirit of ingenuity that has always guided America and turns the page on a new chapter in our history, one that creates economic opportunity for communities across the country and ensures our Nation is back on track as the global leader we have always been.

I extend a heartfelt thank-you to all of my colleagues who have helped make this legislation a reality. It has been an honor to collaborate with so many leaders, particularly the Honorable Chairwoman JOHNSON of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee on regional innovation provisions.

As a member of the USICA-COMPETES conference process, I encountered a strong commitment from fellow conferees and staff to ensure this final package reflects the needs of the entire country and provides a meaningful path forward for innovation and growth.

No legislation is perfect, but this package sends a clear message to the world that when it comes to our global competitiveness, we will set aside our differences and get the job done.

Today, we are taking decisive action to ensure our leadership remains strong, our economy remains robust, and our future remains bright.

Yesterday afternoon, this legislation received broad bipartisan support on the Senate floor, with 17 Republican Senators voting for final passage. I hope we see similar outcomes when it comes to the House floor.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in proudly supporting this important legislation. I look forward to seeing it passed in short order.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of the CHIPS and Science Act of 2022. After conference negotiations failed on a package to counter the malign actions of China, the Senate drafted this legislation to send billions of taxpayer dollars in the form of subsidies and tax credits to a single industry.

Democrats' reckless spending policies led to this record-high inflation that is crushing American families and small business. The government should not be spending hundreds of billions of dollars to provide subsidies benefiting one industry.

This legislation comes to the House just 1 day after Senate Democrats announced a deal to tax American manufacturers and energy producers, which will increase the cost to American families and worsen our supply chain crisis.

They also want to hire 87,000 new IRS agents, and let's be honest about this. Those agents will do nothing more than target American families and small businesses.

They also want to spend \$369 billion on their radical, far-left, Green New Deal agenda. There can be no doubt that this latest iteration of Biden's build back broke agenda will cause inflation to skyrocket even further.

The Biden administration is deflecting on our Nation's recession. They are classifying Biden's economic crisis as a "transition" to slower growth. While they are doubling down on their disastrous policies, they are devastating everyday Americans.

It is time my colleagues across the aisle abandon their socialist pipe dream and actually work with Republicans to get our economy back on track.

Madam Speaker, I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just reflect on what my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee said about a single industry. It is hard to imagine any industry in the United States—in the world, in fact—that doesn't utilize semiconductor chips. It is in everything. Chips run everything.

Whether it is your cell phone, your laptop, or your automobile, it really doesn't matter. Children's toys have chips in them. The fact is, we have lost our competitive edge. That is what this is all about. This affects industry in the United States.

Take, for example, General Motors announcing they have 95,000 automobiles awaiting chips. Do you want to increase the supply of goods to people and help bring down inflation? This is about increasing the supply of goods all over the United States in every single industry.

In my home in Rochester, New York, where we specialize in optics, centuries of optics and photonic integrated circuits, everything is involved with chips. We can no longer wait.

By the way, in addition to our economic security, our national security depends on this. If you want to not only compete with China economically but from a national security and defense perspective, we must do this.

This isn't about a single industry; it is about every industry.

It is like saying water is used to drink; water is in everything. We could not be clearer about this. This is about our competitiveness on every level, and it is about the future.

It is about our children. It is about our grandchildren. It is about what kind of country we want to have and what kind of economy we want to have. Are we going to be in a position to defend the United States' democracy and our interests around the world?

I appreciate my friend's comments, but I have to say it would be narrow-minded to look at this and simply say it affects the semiconductor industry only. It affects everything.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), my very good friend and another distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the CHIPS and Science Act. Our Nation has long been a global leader in science and technology, but we cannot afford to take that position for granted.

Our global standing rests not just on the ingenuity of our people but also on our government's bipartisan commitment to supporting innovation.

At this moment of unprecedented international competition, we urgently need an unprecedented investment in the groundbreaking research that powers America's economic growth. That is why the CHIPS and Science Act is so timely and so important.

In addition to bolstering domestic production of semiconductors, this landmark legislation will authorize more than \$81 billion for the National Science Foundation.

Crucially, the bill also funds research that will yield the cutting-edge clean energy technologies of tomorrow, cutting carbon emissions and helping combat global climate change.

Madam Speaker, my district includes much of the Research Triangle, our Nation's largest research park, which is home to hundreds of companies breaking new ground in medicine, energy, telecommunications, and more.

We are also proud of our leading research universities like N.C. State University, HBCUs like Shaw and Saint Augustine's, and our State's largest community college, Wake Tech, and we have a women's college specializing in STEM, Meredith College.

Our investments in public-private partnerships afforded by the CHIPS and Science Act will provide these North Carolina-based companies and educational institutions with unprecedented funding and research support.

Companies in my district, particularly startups, have struggled to cope with the consequences of the global semiconductor shortage. To meet that need, this bill includes more than \$50 billion in chips funding, which will mitigate current semiconductor supply chain concerns, incentivize domestic production, and prevent another chips crisis in the future.

I am also pleased that this package includes several bipartisan bills I led with members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, including the Energizing Technology Transfer Act, a version of the NSF Technology Research Institutes Act, and the National Science and Technology Strategy Act.

These bills will help facilitate the commercial application of clean energy technologies by universities and private companies, the development of a national science and technology strategy, and investment in research and traineeship programs for graduate students.

The CHIPS and Science Act embodies the investment needed to empower innovation in North Carolina's Second District and across the United States. I support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I don't disagree that these chips are important to the U.S. economy and many manufacturers. What I take issue with is the fact that we are putting even more money, billions of dollars, into an economy that is already suffering from record-high inflation.

It is unsettled whether this will even make a difference. It can be argued that chips were already going to come back anyhow, and it is not just me saying it. I have an article right here from

The Economist, not exactly a right-wing publication. It was published on 10 July of this year. "When the chips are way down: After a turbocharged boom, are chipmakers in for a supersize bust?" That is the headline.

It goes on, saying: "Surging supply and softening demand are bringing the pandemic's superstar industry back to Earth."

My question is: If this industry is already coming back, if it is already as important as we think it is, why do we need to inject billions of dollars into the economy that is just going to further the economic crisis we are already in?

I know my colleague from North Carolina was talking about how to spur research and development. I can tell you how to do it: You cut taxes. You cut regulations.

If you look at the TCJA, this was a huge win for U.S. research and investment: 25 percent higher than in the years prior, reaching an all-time high in 2019 of \$584 billion and 3 percent of GDP.

If you want to stimulate the economy, you can do it by reducing taxes and reducing regulation, not by picking winners and losers.

To talk more about this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

□ 1115

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, this morning we are here to talk about the rule for the CHIPS Act to provide \$76 billion for semiconductor manufacturing and authorizing \$200 billion over 10 years for research and innovation programs.

Now, according to a long-term budget outlook released by the Congressional Budget Office just yesterday, our national debt sits at \$24 trillion and will rise to \$138 trillion over the next three decades. That is equivalent to \$370,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Our mandatory spending over the same period would grow from just over \$4 trillion per year to over \$18 trillion per year. The CHIPS Act includes billions in new mandatory spending and billions more that is authorized for appropriation.

We are experiencing the highest inflation in 40 years with multiple interest rate hikes. It has been widely reported that the Federal Reserve hiked interest rates again and with the statement that they have no choice but to try to slow the economy in order to tame this inflationary pressure.

And then here is the ironic part of all that, the CHIPS bill also is the key that unlocks the door for getting the long-stalled Build Back Better Act going over in the United States Senate.

And what does that do?

It provides billions of additional dollars of stimulus spending in the economy. But the Federal Reserve said they have no choice but to slow the economy.

So which is it? Is it a stimulant or a depressant?

As a medical professional, I will tell you, if you combine those two activities, you are going to end up with something that is just goofy. But then on top of that, there are tax increases at a time of recession.

Even the Obama administration in 2009 and 2010 said, we can't undo the Bush tax cuts, we have got to continue the Bush tax cuts that they had long hoped to undo because they could not raise taxes during a recession. And yet now we have the other body poised, basically, with their Green New Deal to tax America back into the stone age.

I agree that semiconductors are a critical component of likely everything we use, but we cannot put our fiscal future in further jeopardy, especially when this funding will benefit one specific industry. I am also concerned that the time required to ramp up the semiconductor production will be late in trying to alleviate current supply chain constraints. As my friend from Pennsylvania just pointed out, when this industry self-corrects, the likelihood is there will be too many.

Rather than provide funding to large corporations, many of whom are already undertaking significant development efforts, let's incentivize competitiveness in all industries and continue to promote research and development and not raise taxes during a recession.

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

Madam Speaker, I am a little surprised by the conversation here, it is as though we don't recognize the importance of semiconductors and the entire semiconductor supply chain to literally every activity we are involved in. Whether transportation, as I have already mentioned, or communications or medical devices or our satellite technology, literally every single thing we do depends on it.

The notion that we should somehow stand pat and allow other nations to invest and to build their supply chains to me is hard to accept, hard to understand, hard to process. If we do nothing over the next decade, China will be producing about 40 percent of semiconductor chips worldwide, the United States about 6 percent. If we want to put our reliance in the hands of foreign suppliers and foreign supply chains, I guess we can do nothing. But we need to invest, and that is why this bill is critical. That is why I suspect it received the support of 17 Republican Senators on the Senate floor yesterday. This is critical.

As I said earlier, China is investing \$150 billion in their semiconductor supply chain, and this is not just chips; it is chips, it is substrates, it is packaging, it is assembly. It is the whole thing. Anytime there is a gap in a supply chain, we rely on those who fill that gap for us.

Do we want to be in a position where our economic fortunes are dependent

on foreign competitors for a critical part of our supply chain?

Do we want to put our national security in jeopardy because those things which we need to be safe and secure are dependent upon foreign supply chains?

I don't think so. I don't think that is what the American public wants. And, frankly, I am glad to have this debate because I think it shows a divide. I think it shows a contrast between what we want to do to invest in not only this generation but next generations.

There are also a couple of other observations I will make. One is about just market forces and just allowing things to happen according to the market. While working on this bill—I talked a lot earlier, and I will continue to talk about regional innovation, but I also want to talk about Federal investment, two points.

The first I would make is: R&D investment by the United States Government has fallen to 0.61 percent of U.S. GDP. That is the lowest mark since the 1950s. At one point we were investing nearly 2 percent of GDP in research and development.

What came out of things like our investments in the space program are material sciences and advances, advances in telecommunications, advances in weather satellites, advances in so many different things, even fuel cell development. All those things came out of an R&D investment which we haven't kept pace with.

We talk about our competitiveness with China. This is vital to our national interest. I can't think of many things that are more vital to our national interest over the next several decades.

When you look at where we are making those investments, right now, if you are privileged to live in one of the five innovation hubs—such as Boston; the Silicon Valley; in Seattle, Washington; in Austin, Texas—those areas account for about 90 percent of private investment, and venture capitalists will spend in those areas.

But what about the rest of the country?

I live in a place, Rochester, New York, which is home to the Rochester Institute of Technology and the University of Rochester, both great research facilities. There was a book recently written, "Jump-Starting America" by Simon Johnson and Jonathan Gruber, two MIT economists. They rated 130 different communities across the country that are falling behind, despite the fact that they have great innovation ecosystems, but they lack investment.

The public investment which we are talking about making through our regional innovation hubs will drive private investment because private investment will partner with the investments being made by the U.S. Government in our innovation, in our entrepreneurship, in advancing our interests for the long term.

We have to do this. This isn't something that we could decide to wait a

year or two years. This is an investment we must make now. We have fallen behind, and we can no longer afford to fall further behind.

Our economic interests, our national security interests are intimately tied together, and that is why this legislation is so vital, and that is why I hope we will have strong bipartisan support when the bill comes to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, just a point of clarification. This is just an authorization. We will still wait a year anyhow to appropriate these funds, so trying to act like we have a gun to our head right now and this is a do-or-die moment is completely illusory. Again, this is just an authorization.

Additionally, I agree with my friend from New York on two points. Number one, we have got to be competitive with China.

Number two, the semiconductor chips are important for the economy.

But the way to compete with China is not to emulate the policies of a Communist police state. The way to compete with China is to unleash the American economy, to get back to our Western roots of free-market capitalism. If we want to bring more businesses onshore, if we want to fix our supply chain crisis, we can start by reducing the burdensome regulations that are crippling American businesses. We can reduce our income tax and our corporate income tax to make us more competitive globally, and we can do something to make sure we have cheap, reliable, abundant energy resources, such as exploiting our natural gas reserves and perhaps investing in nuclear power.

But to sit here and say that we are going to compete with China by doing what the Chinese do and having some bureaucratic monster in D.C. pick winners and losers for a particular industry is not a winning proposition.

What will beat China and keep us competitive with China is getting back to what made this country great in the first place, and again that is free-market capitalism.

Let's talk about inflation because, again, this is going to put billions of dollars into the economy, which will make this situation worse. Americans are facing the highest inflation in over 40 years. This is literally the worst inflation in my lifetime. This morning we learned that GDP has decreased for a second quarter in a row.

Yet, the Treasury Secretary wants to downplay Biden's economic crisis by redefining recession, which for decades recession has been defined as two quarters of negative economic growth. Instead, Secretary Yellen and the leftists across the aisle want to play Orwellian and change the definition to "a period of transition." Even the extreme liberal think tank, The Brookings Insti-

tution, acknowledged we are in a recession, but it seems, again, my colleagues across the aisle have forgotten basic economics.

House Republicans want to set the record straight. That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider House Resolution 1290, a resolution affirming the longstanding definition of a recession.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LEE of Nevada). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my good friend and the sponsor of this resolution, to explain the amendment.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you, being on the Ways and Means Committee and never actually engaging in some of your Rules debate, you guys are really polite with each other.

But here's a simple question: What are the two times in life you think you know everything?

When you turn 13 years old and the day after you get elected to Congress.

I am going to argue the arrogance of this place right now doing a piece of legislation like this. Why is this bill, the underlying bill, the underlying rule here so dangerous? And why this resolution actually fits this.

Basically, the underlying bill is industrial policy. Let's face it, some of the scoring is saying this is \$400 billion, and it is the politicization functionally of a category of incredibly important industry, grants that you saw the President a couple days ago talk about—now you are going to have to come in front of me.

Do you understand how dangerous that is for an economy? That arrogance of the political class thinking you understand what the next disruption is. The controlling of intellect, the controlling of taking risk.

If you actually gave a darn about American competitiveness, of where chips—and who knows, quantum, and all the other possibilities of data management, data movement, of processing—are going, you would fix the Tax Code, you would fix the regulatory code.

If you care about China, deal with the made-in-America tax, the fact that they refund the VAT; and when we export, they put the VAT back on, and it makes us not competitive.

You also now have to deal with the reality, when The Economist is writing articles that we are heading toward a glut of chips. Look, I am from Arizona. On the side of my district, I have a \$16

billion investment from Taiwan Semiconductor. Down the street I have Intel, I think they are spending \$18 billion. It is coming.

But the brain trust around here is we are going to do industrial policy. We are going to control the money. It will be great for fund-raising. And the concept, once again, is we have politicized everything. Think of now the debate we have had the last couple days, is two quarters of negative GDP, well, that is not a recession. Okay, technically it might not be because the definition of recession now is a committee that is politicized.

Could we at least have some benchmarks here in Congress, here in Washington that we know what the rules are? I don't mean your type of rules. I mean the rules for society, the rules for tax policy, the rules for how we allocate capital, because you are offering right now functionally \$400 billion of subsidies, controls, management, and industrial policy, government.

Why don't you just nationalize the chip industry because you are pretty much heading that direction.

This is a simple amendment. In some ways, it is actually very symbolic of we can't even agree anymore on what a recession is.

Okay, fine. Let's just make it a rule instead of making it a committee of individuals that get to express their opinion and their feelings.

I would love to actually offer something more complex. Maybe we should go back to the old misery index debates of how many people can't afford living anymore. You do realize the inflation from just the last 12 months, my constituents—I represent the highest inflation in the Nation—get to work about 6 weeks without compensation. The purchasing power of their lives has crashed so much, they now work a month-and-a-half for free.

□ 1130

These are the brilliant policies this place has brought. It is time we actually start to set some benchmarks on what the rules are.

Simple amendment. Just saying, hey, we will call it a recession when we have two consecutive quarters, and we can stop the politicization of everything here in Washington.

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

I will admit that I am a little mystified about what I am hearing here, so let me try to unpack a lot of what I just heard.

In the first instance, a number of my colleagues have repeatedly suggested that regular order in the House is for the authorization of legislation and then appropriators identify how much money can be spent on those things authorized under law.

That is exactly what we are doing here today. We are authorizing much under the CHIPS legislation. That is the way we do regular order. It is identifying those things that we authorize

and then identifying the dollars necessary to meet that authorization.

But let me just read from the actual report on the bill: Division A, CHIPS Act of 2022, Section 101, Short Title: This Act may be cited as the CHIPS Act of 2022. Section 102, Creating Helpful Incentives to Produce Semiconductors for America Fund, the CHIPS fund. In order to support the rapid implementation of the semiconductor provisions included in the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA, this division would provide \$52.7 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations.

This bill has nearly \$53 billion included in it, \$50 billion allocated over 5 years for the CHIPS for America Fund.

I could go on and list it, but this is exactly what we are talking about: Authorization to move forward over the next several years to strengthen American competitiveness in the world.

By the way, it is not just all of the industries I talked about. Try to order a refrigerator without a chip in it or a microwave oven or a dishwasher or a TV or a laptop or a cell phone or—I could go on and on all day. There isn't a consumer device, there is not an electronic device—even farm equipment. Everything we use has chips in it. We are falling behind the Chinese and others, and we are relying on foreign investment and foreign supply chain.

I can't imagine something more American than passing this bill. This is vital to our national interest. This is one of the most vital things we will do.

So we are following in the way that we are supposed to: authorization, appropriation. But there are emergency appropriations of over \$50 billion to move not just one industry forward, but to move all industries forward, to move our economic and our national security interests forward together.

By the way, just so if people tune in and wonder, What is this all about? Let me just say all the things I just mentioned, \$50 billion in emergency appropriations, the desire and the need and the will of the American people, as represented by the Senate and the House, to move forward on economic and national security interests.

We should put that all aside, my friends are suggesting, and don't do any of that today. So we are not going to authorize; we are not going to spend money; we are not going to move ourselves forward from an economic security and a national security perspective.

This is what they would like us to do instead, and I am reading from their bill, the thing they just said we should do instead of doing all the things I just mentioned: resolve that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that two consecutive quarters of negative growth in gross domestic product constitutes a recession. That is what they would like to do.

We would like to move America forward. We would like to build a supply chain that works for all Americans. We

want to make sure our economy is strong now and in the future. We want to make sure our national defense is strong, that the American public is protected, that democracy is protected across the world. And that is what we are doing. That is what our partners in the Senate are doing. They want to define what a recession is. That is their plan.

I would ask America: Should we stop what we are doing? Should we put an end to our desire to make sure we are competitive on the world stage? Should we not protect America's economic interests? Should we not protect America's national security interests? And we should define in the House of Representatives what a recession is? That is what we want to do? That is their plan?

I think most Americans watching would be scratching their heads. I think they would wonder why is it people don't want to make us competitive here in the House of Representatives. Well, we do. The majority—and I suspect a fair number of their colleagues are going to vote for this, too, because they know it is good for America, and they know it is good for the future, for not only my generation, but my children's generation, my grandchildren's generation, and generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just to clarify, this is not an either/or choice here. If we defeat the previous question, we can consider the resolution of my good friend from Arizona to actually define recession, and then we can take up the underlying bill. Again, this is a false choice saying it is one or the other. We can do both.

People may ask, Why is it necessary to define recession? It is necessary because the party across the aisle are trying to redefine recession. But I shouldn't be surprised. Because remember, this is the same party that tried to tell us that women are now known as birthing people. It is the party that all during the summer of 2020 told us that violent rioting and looting was mostly peaceful protesting. Now they are trying to tell us that a recession, which has been defined for decades as two consecutive quarters of negative GDP growth, that that is now called a transitional period.

So it is an absolute necessity that we define recession so that we have clarity in language.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my good friend and the ranking member on the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend Mr. RESCHENTHALER from Pennsylvania for yielding. He is right that it is disinformation. It is disinformation. We should defeat the previous question so that we can go

back to what defined a recession and what has defined a recession for decades.

Democrats have to stop playing games, playing games with misinformation and disinformation. Now, we have got another game being played with this rule today.

This is a rule, as my good friend from New York talked about, that is going to allow a bill to come to the floor that has some very good bipartisan provisions. I think many Republicans would support a lot of the provisions in this CHIPS bill.

The problem is, why in the world does the majority have to continue to play games instead of actually working with us and doing anything in a bipartisan manner?

Tucked into this rule is a provision that will completely eviscerate the intent of a rule that was negotiated in a bipartisan way by Republicans and Democrats that if a Member of Congress was able to secure 290 cosponsors on a bill, he or she would have then been given the right, as a Member of this institution, to have that bill debated and voted on, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I remember Democrats and Republicans standing up and touting this provision, that this is going to bring power back to every Member of Congress. Until today—until today when the Rules Committee decides to turn this provision off, to deny the 294 cosponsors of the Social Security Fairness Act that is in place because all 294 of us want fairness for our retired teachers, our retired firefighters, and our retired police officers. They are turning off this rule for one reason and one reason only, to not have a vote on the floor like they promised us they would do.

We followed their rules. And what did Democrats do? They changed the rules in the process.

Do you want Republicans to vote for legislation in a bipartisan way when you play games like this? Well, don't be surprised when there are a lot of noes popping up on the board today for a piece of legislation that I think a lot of Republicans would normally support.

It is games like this that hurt the retirees the most. Democrats for decades have promised retired teachers, firefighters, police officers, and other public employees—they promised those individuals that they would do something to fix these egregious provisions, the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision in the Social Security Code.

This is their shot—this is your shot, Madam Speaker, to get the majority—

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this is the majority's

shot to live up to the promises the Democrats have made for decades to those who have been begging for a solution. All you have got to do is take this rule back, remove this turn-off provision, allow the consensus calendar to continue as it was intended to continue when this rule change was negotiated.

If I was a bipartisan member of the Problem Solvers Caucus, I would be coming to the floor screaming. What I want to do is I want every single cosponsor of H.R. 82, the Social Security Fairness Act, to consider—all 293 others besides me—I want you to consider voting against this rule. Because if they can turn this off and they can change the rules midgame, then why celebrate a bipartisan success story that was put in place in 2019? Stop playing politics.

Madam Speaker, Members of the majority, quit playing games, vote down this rule, and change this provision.

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

I do worry sometimes that the public sometimes doesn't understand what is being said here. It is curious that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, would scream about the consensus calendar.

Let me just be clear, folks back home. We created the consensus calendar. It didn't exist in the past. The Democrats created it to try to create more bipartisanship. What we are doing here is simply pausing, as we have done on both sides when both sides were in the majority—pausing during the August district work period.

This is something that I just find fascinating. We didn't even have a consensus calendar when Republicans were in charge. We are pausing it for the next 6 weeks. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman, but I want to assure the American public that what they should be focused on is the work we should be doing today, the work that is actually getting done to strengthen our resolve around the world, to strengthen our economic position, to build jobs for families across America, to aid consumer electronics and business electronics, and all the things that we want to do around quantum computing and quantum communications, and taking American ingenuity, American innovation, which has been the hallmark of our growth as a Nation for two centuries, and doubling down and saying we are not going to stand aside and let others take a leadership position in this world.

America is going to stand up. We are going to do what we have always done. We are going to invest in smart people; we are going to build our economic future; and we are going to build our national security future. It starts here today. That is what we should keep our eyes on.

Everyone should pay attention. This is what we are doing. I am expecting and hoping that we are going to have a substantially bipartisan vote on this

bill when it comes to the floor as it did in the Senate just yesterday.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for the purpose of a rebuttal.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have the utmost respect for my friend and colleague from New York, but he is dead wrong in the information and advice that he got from the Committee on Rules.

The sheer fact that this so-called turn-off provision is nonchalantly just used as—well, it wasn't part of the consensus process, but let's pound our chest and say we created the consensus calendar process to begin with, so we are great. Well, when you disrupt the consensus process, you are not great. You are actually changing the rules midgame.

Really, here is the kicker: There is talk about us having to come back to do a few votes while we are in the midst of August. The way this rule is written, those days won't even count toward the consensus calendar.

Rest assured, there is no other reason that the Democrats and the majority on the Committee on Rules are doing this than to stop the progress of actually addressing the Social Security Fairness Act.

We have 294 cosponsors. We played by the rules. Democrats changed the rules midgame. And you trust this majority to actually put a bill together that is going to stop China from dominating the chip production industry in the globe when they play games like this?

That is what the American people are sick and tired of. That is why that is an outgoing majority. That is why we are going to have a new majority. It is games like this that have to stop being played when you talk about bipartisanship, but you don't actually govern in a bipartisan way.

□ 1145

Today is another shining example of that. Again, 294 cosponsors. We play by your rules, we play by the majority's provisions, and you change the rules midgame. I certainly hope our umpires tonight at the Congressional Baseball Game are better at actually codifying the rules that exist.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, while I have just a moment, I want to share with those who tuned in some comments about the underlying bill for this rule. "This funding will help kickstart domestic production of these semiconductors in a way that will prevent a vulnerability of our supply chain . . ." "One other benefit to this bill is that this bill could create roughly 185,000 jobs every year as these new facilities are constructed." That was said by JOHN CORNYN from Texas yesterday on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

From ROY BLUNT, a Republican Senator from Missouri said: "This bill includes targeted investments in techno-

logical development and manufacturing that will strengthen our position in a global economy. The bill expands the successful Manufacturing U.S.A. program by creating new innovation hubs and helps ensure we have the right Federal policy in place to support the research and development of emerging technologies. I was proud to be a part of this effort, and I urge our House colleagues to get this bill to the President's desk."

SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Republican from West Virginia said this: "America can never be replaced as the global economic and innovation leader. Winning the future means making the necessary investments to address issues like the microchip shortage, prepare the next generation of workers in science and technology fields, and keep up with our competitors, including China. This legislation not only bets on American ingenuity, but it also authorizes funding that can be utilized by our institutions of higher education . . ."

How about TODD YOUNG, a Republican from Indiana: "It's time to go on the offensive, and that is exactly what this legislation, which has gone by many names—from the Endless Frontier Act to the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act to CHIPS-Plus—will do . . ." "This bill will unleash private sector innovation while significantly boosting Federal national security investments. It's been a long journey to get to this point, but history will show that by passing this bill, we are confronting the challenges of today and building a prosperous and secure tomorrow for all Americans."

ROB PORTMAN, a Republican from Ohio: "Today's passage of the CHIPS Act is critical in the effort to bring semiconductor manufacturing back to the United States, protect our national security, and create thousands of high-paying jobs in Ohio. I was proud to help lead efforts in the Senate to pass this legislation and ensure that Intel's planned semiconductor plant in central Ohio remains on track and reaches its full potential. I urge the House to act quick on this bipartisan legislation so the President can sign it into law, and I look forward to attending the groundbreaking for this transformational project in the coming months."

The reviews keep coming, and they are all positive. We have got to move this today in the House. We have got to get it to the President's desk. We have not a moment to lose in the race for America's future and to make sure that we are secure for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, my good friend from New York was talking about jobs and the promise of more jobs with this act. We have heard this before. The American Rescue Plan. We sat here and debated that, and we were told by the

leftists across the aisle that this was going to create 4 million new jobs. You know what didn't happen? We didn't create 4 million new jobs. And that is not me saying that. That is a study from the American Enterprise Institute, which found that the American Rescue Plan failed to create any of the 4 million new jobs that Big Government Democrats had promised.

While we are talking about stats and figures, let's put a real cost to the inflation and the pain that is being inflicted on the American people by injecting billions of dollars into the economy. So let's put real numbers on it. Inflation will cost the average American household more than \$6,000 a year. That is so high that if you have had a constant salary for the last year, you have essentially worked for more than a month without pay.

So, let me ask this: If you are sitting here watching at home, could you take one paycheck from this year, one paycheck, and just throw it out the window? Probably not.

Now, if you are part of the coastal elite and the woke, yuppie, Zoom class that is the base of the Democratic Party, you might be able to afford that. You might just go to two Pilates classes a week instead of four. You may not take that second trip to Europe. You may scale back at Whole Foods. You have that luxury if you are part of the woke Democratic base. But if you are somebody in Pittsburgh who is a retired steel worker that is on a fixed income, this hurts you. You don't have that disposable income. If you are a natural gas driller in Oklahoma that has to drive to a drill site every day to actually produce something, you have to fill your tank with gas. You don't have the option to sit at home and pretend you are working on Zoom. If you are a woman that has to drive, for example, to a diner to work a shift, you don't have the luxury of not doing that. You have to bear the burden of the inflation; again, the inflation that is being caused by the radical left policies of the Democratic Party.

Yet, despite this real economic pain, Democrats continue to want to put billions of dollars in the economy, billions in corporate handouts. They want to undo Republican tax cuts and policies that actually led to the lowest unemployment rates we have had in 50 years.

So, rather than forcing Americans to pay for their radical socialist agenda, my colleagues across the aisle should use the time to work with Republicans on policies that American families will benefit from and allow American companies to actually compete in a global economy. And we can do that all simply by reducing regulation and reducing taxation. And how about we unleash our domestic energy supply?

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my great friend and colleague for the opportunity to engage in a thoughtful conversation about issues where we may agree and we may disagree, but I always appreciate him.

I would just note, though, that all the conversations I have had over the last many, many months about American competitiveness has largely been with my chamber of commerce, with business leaders, CEOs of companies who are desperate that we continue to move forward in repairing the challenges of our microelectronic supply chain. I haven't heard from any Socialists about it. They may have different communication with people, but I have heard from the business community; I have heard from economic drivers; I have heard from innovators; I have heard from entrepreneurs about the need to make this go.

Madam Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank my colleagues who have spoken in support of the rule. I want to thank those who have put this bill before us. Support for this rule showcases a commitment to American leadership in research, manufacturing, and innovation for decades to come. It showcases a commitment to lowering costs for families, creating job opportunities, and building long-term economic stability that will uplift families across this country. It showcases a commitment to investing in regional innovation and leveraging the significant untapped potential that so many communities hold, including my own in Rochester, New York.

We can't afford to wait any longer to make these critical investments. We must join our colleagues in the Senate and show the American people we are committed to taking on China and reestablishing our place on the global stage as a force to be reckoned with.

This is a pivotal moment in our Nation's history. We must meet it head-on and deliver investments that will ensure every family in every community has the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. This legislation will do just that.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1289

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 1290) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that two consecutive quarters of negative growth in gross domestic product, as reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, constitutes a recession. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 1290.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

YEAS—218

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Adams | Escobar | Manning |
| Aguilar | Eshoo | Matsui |
| Allred | Espallat | McBath |
| Auchincloss | Evans | McCollum |
| Axne | Fletcher | McEachin |
| Barragán | Foster | McGovern |
| Bass | Frankel, Lois | McNerney |
| Beatty | Gallago | Meeks |
| Bera | Garamendi | Meng |
| Beyer | Garcia (IL) | Mfume |
| Bishop (GA) | Garcia (TX) | Moore (WI) |
| Blumenauer | Golden | Morelle |
| Blunt Rochester | Gomez | Moulton |
| Bonamici | Gonzalez, | Mrvan |
| Bourdeaux | Vicente | Murphy (FL) |
| Bowman | Gottheimer | Nadler |
| Boyle, Brendan | Green, Al (TX) | Napolitano |
| F. | Grijalva | Neal |
| Brown (MD) | Harder (CA) | Neguse |
| Brown (OH) | Hayes | Newman |
| Brownley | Higgins (NY) | Norcross |
| Bush | Himes | O'Halleran |
| Bustos | Horsford | Ocasio-Cortez |
| Butterfield | Houlihan | Omar |
| Carbajal | Hoyer | Pallone |
| Cárdenas | Huffman | Panetta |
| Carson | Jackson Lee | Pappas |
| Carter (LA) | Jacobs (CA) | Pascarell |
| Cartwright | Jayapal | Payne |
| Case | Jeffries | Perlmutter |
| Casten | Johnson (GA) | Peters |
| Castor (FL) | Johnson (TX) | Phillips |
| Castro (TX) | Jones | Pingree |
| Cherfilus- | Kahele | Pocan |
| McCormick | Kaptur | Porter |
| Chu | Keating | Pressley |
| Cicilline | Kelly (IL) | Price (NC) |
| Clark (MA) | Khanna | Quigley |
| Clarke (NY) | Kildee | Raskin |
| Cleaver | Kilmer | Rice (NY) |
| Clyburn | Kim (NJ) | Ross |
| Cohen | Kind | Roybal-Allard |
| Connolly | Kirkpatrick | Ruiz |
| Cooper | Krishnamoorthi | Ruppersberger |
| Correa | Kuster | Rush |
| Costa | Lamb | Ryan |
| Courtney | Langevin | Sánchez |
| Craig | Larsen (WA) | Sarbanes |
| Crist | Larson (CT) | Scanlon |
| Crow | Lawrence | Schiff |
| Cuellar | Lawson (FL) | Schneider |
| Davids (KS) | Lee (CA) | Schrader |
| Davis, Danny K. | Lee (NV) | Schrier |
| Dean | Leger Fernandez | Scott (VA) |
| DeFazio | Levin (CA) | Scott, David |
| DeGette | Levin (MI) | Sewell |
| DeLauro | Lieu | Sherman |
| DelBene | Lofgren | Sherrill |
| Demings | Lowenthal | Sires |
| DeSaulnier | Luria | Slotkin |
| Deutch | Lynch | Smith (WA) |
| Dingell | Malinowski | Soto |
| Doggett | Maloney, | Spanberger |
| Doyle, Michael | Carolyn B. | Speier |
| F. | Maloney, Sean | Stansbury |

Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib

Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Babin (Weber (TX)) | DeSaulnier (Beyer) | Moore (WI) (Beyer) |
| Bass (Neguse) | Evans (Beyer) | Rice (SC) |
| Blumenauer (Beyer) | Gosar (Gaetz) | (Meijer) |
| Green (TN) | Ruppersberger (Trone) | |
| Bourdeaux (Correa) | Guthrie (Barr) | Rush (Bishop (GA)) |
| Boyle, Brendan F. (Neguse) | Huffman (Neguse) | Sires (Pallone) |
| Brown (MD) (Trone) | Jones (Beyer) | Stevens (Kuster) |
| Bush (Bowman) | Joyce (PA) | Stewart |
| Carter (LA) (Neguse) | Kahle (Correa) | (Crawford) |
| Carter (TX) | Kirkpatrick (Pallone) | Taylor (Weber (TX)) |
| (Weber (TX)) | Levin (MI) (Correa) | Thompson (CA) (Beyer) |
| Cherfilus- | McBath (Bishop (GA)) | Vargas (Correa) |
| McCormick (Neguse) | McNerney (Pallone) | Walorski (Banks) |
| Crist (Wasserman Schultz) | Meeks (Velázquez) | Williams (GA) (Neguse) |
| | | Wilson (SC) (Nor- man) |

Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader

Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—208

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher

Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Hartzler
Hollingsworth

Kinzinger
Schakowsky

□ 1241

Mr. BOST, Mrs. FLORES, and Mr. GARCÍA of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 208, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—216

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Adams | Dean | Kuster |
| Aguilar | DeFazio | Lamb |
| Allred | DeGette | Langevin |
| Auchincloss | DeLauro | Larsen (WA) |
| Axne | DeBene | Larson (CT) |
| Barragán | Demings | Lawrence |
| Bass | DeSaulnier | Lawson (FL) |
| Beatty | Deuch | Lee (CA) |
| Bera | Dingell | Lee (NV) |
| Beyer | Doggett | Leger Fernandez |
| Bishop (GA) | Doyle, Michael | Levin (CA) |
| Blumenauer | F. | Levin (MI) |
| Blunt Rochester | Escobar | Lieu |
| Bonamici | Eshoo | Lofgren |
| Bourdeaux | Espallat | Lowenthal |
| Bowman | Evans | Luria |
| Boyle, Brendan | Fletcher | Lynch |
| F. | Poster | Malinowski |
| Brown (MD) | Gallego | Maloney, |
| Brown (OH) | Garamendi | Carolyn B. |
| Brownley | Garcia (IL) | Maloney, Sean |
| Bush | Garcia (TX) | Manning |
| Bustos | Gomez | Matsui |
| Butterfield | Gonzalez, | McBath |
| Carbajal | Vicente | McCollum |
| Cárdenas | Gottheimer | McEachin |
| Carson | Green, Al (TX) | McGovern |
| Carter (LA) | Grijalva | McNerney |
| Cartwright | Harder (CA) | Meeks |
| Case | Hayes | Meng |
| Casten | Higgins (NY) | Mfume |
| Castor (FL) | Himes | Moore (WI) |
| Castro (TX) | Horsford | Morelle |
| Cherfilus- | Houlahan | Moulton |
| McCormick | Hoyer | Mrvan |
| Chu | Huffman | Murphy (FL) |
| Cicilline | Jackson Lee | Nadler |
| Clark (MA) | Jacobs (CA) | Napolitano |
| Clarke (NY) | Jayapal | Neal |
| Cleaver | Jeffries | Neguse |
| Clyburn | Johnson (GA) | Newman |
| Cohen | Johnson (TX) | Norcross |
| Connolly | Jones | O'Halleran |
| Cooper | Kahale | Ocasio-Cortez |
| Correa | Kaptur | Omar |
| Costa | Keating | Pallone |
| Courtney | Kelly (IL) | Panetta |
| Craig | Kildee | Pappas |
| Crist | Kilmer | Pascarell |
| Crow | Kim (NJ) | Payne |
| Cuellar | Kind | Perlmutter |
| Dauids (KS) | Kirkpatrick | Peters |
| Davis, Danny K. | Krishnamoorthi | Phillips |

NAYS—208

Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Conway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)

Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Aderholt
Curtis

Frankel, Lois
Hartzler

Khanna
Kinzinger

□ 1253

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 403.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Babin (Weber (TX)) | Evans (Beyer) | Moore (WI) (Beyer) |
| Bass (Neguse) | Gosar (Gaetz) | Rice (SC) |
| Blumenauer (Beyer) | Green (TN) | (Meijer) |
| Bourdeaux | (Fleischmann) | Ruppersberger |
| (Correa) | Guthrie (Barr) | (Trone) |
| Boyle, Brendan | Huffman | Rush (Bishop (GA)) |
| F. (Neguse) | (Neguse) | Sires (Pallone) |
| Bush (Bowman) | Jones (Beyer) | Stevens (Kuster) |
| Carter (LA) | Joyce (PA) | Stewart |
| (Neguse) | (Keller) | (Crawford) |
| Carter (TX) | Kahele (Correa) | Taylor (Weber (TX)) |
| (Weber (TX)) | Kirkpatrick (Pallone) | Thompson (CA) (Beyer) |
| Cherfilus- | Levin (MI) | Vargas (Correa) |
| McCormick | (Correa) | Walorski (Banks) |
| (Neguse) | McBath (Bishop (GA)) | Williams (GA) |
| Crist | McNerney | (Neguse) |
| (Wasserman | (Pallone) | Wilson (SC) |
| Schultz) | Meeks | (Norman) |
| DeSaulnier | (Velázquez) | |
| (Beyer) | | |

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Adrian Swann, one of his secretaries.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1289, I call up the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Table of contents.
Sec. 2. References.

DIVISION A—CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Creating helpful incentives to produce semiconductors (CHIPS) for America fund.
Sec. 103. Semiconductor incentives.
Sec. 104. Opportunity and inclusion.
Sec. 105. Additional GAO reporting requirements.
Sec. 106. Appropriations for wireless supply chain innovation.
Sec. 107. Advanced manufacturing investment credit.

DIVISION B—RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Sec. 1000. Table of contents.
Sec. 10001. Short title.
Sec. 10002. Definitions.
Sec. 10003. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
SCIENCE FOR THE FUTURE

Sec. 10101. Mission of the Office of Science.
Sec. 10102. Basic energy sciences program.
Sec. 10103. Biological and environmental research.
Sec. 10104. Advanced scientific computing research program.
Sec. 10105. Fusion energy research.
Sec. 10106. High energy physics program.
Sec. 10107. Nuclear physics program.
Sec. 10108. Science laboratories infrastructure program.
Sec. 10109. Accelerator research and development.
Sec. 10110. Isotope research, development, and production.
Sec. 10111. Increased collaboration with teachers and scientists.
Sec. 10112. High intensity laser research initiative; helium conservation program; Office of Science emerging biological threat preparedness research initiative; midscale instrumentation and research equipment program; authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 10113. Established program to stimulate competitive research.
Sec. 10114. Research security.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE
FUTURE

Sec. 10201. Definitions.
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations
Sec. 10211. Authorization of appropriations.
Subtitle B—Measurement Research
Sec. 10221. Engineering biology and biometrology.
Sec. 10222. Greenhouse gas measurement research.
Sec. 10223. NIST authority for cybersecurity and privacy activities.
Sec. 10224. Software security and authentication.
Sec. 10225. Digital identity management research.
Sec. 10226. Biometrics research and testing.
Sec. 10227. Federal biometric performance standards.
Sec. 10228. Protecting research from cybersecurity theft.
Sec. 10229. Dissemination of resources for research institutions.
Sec. 10230. Advanced communications research.
Sec. 10231. Neutron scattering.
Sec. 10232. Artificial intelligence.
Sec. 10233. Sustainable chemistry research and education.
Sec. 10234. Premise plumbing research.
Sec. 10235. Dr. David Satcher Cybersecurity Education Grant Program.

Subtitle C—General Activities

Sec. 10241. Educational outreach and support for underrepresented communities.
Sec. 10242. Other transactions authority.
Sec. 10243. Report to Congress on collaborations with government agencies.
Sec. 10244. Hiring critical technical experts.
Sec. 10245. International standards development.
Sec. 10246. Standard technical update.
Sec. 10247. GAO study of NIST research security policies and protocols.
Sec. 10248. Standards development organization grants.

Subtitle D—Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership

Sec. 10251. Establishment of expansion awards pilot program as a part of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

Sec. 10252. Update to Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership.
Sec. 10253. National Supply Chain Database.
Sec. 10254. Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership activities.
Sec. 10255. Amendment to the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership relating to institutions of higher education.

Subtitle E—Manufacturing USA Program

Sec. 10261. Supporting geographic diversity.
Sec. 10262. Expanding opportunities through the Manufacturing USA Program.
Sec. 10263. Promoting domestic production of technologies developed under Manufacturing USA Program.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SCIENCE
FOUNDATION FOR THE FUTURE

Subtitle A—Preliminary Matters

Sec. 10301. Sense of Congress.
Sec. 10302. Definitions.
Sec. 10303. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—STEM Education

Sec. 10311. PreK–12 STEM education.
Sec. 10312. Undergraduate STEM education.
Sec. 10313. Graduate STEM education.
Sec. 10314. STEM workforce data.
Sec. 10315. Cyber workforce development research and development.
Sec. 10316. Federal cyber scholarship-for-service program.
Sec. 10317. Cybersecurity workforce data initiative.
Sec. 10318. Microelectronics workforce development activities.
Sec. 10319. Incorporation of art and design into certain STEM education.
Sec. 10320. Mandatory cost-sharing.
Sec. 10321. Programs to address the STEM workforce.

Subtitle C—Broadening Participation

Sec. 10321. Presidential awards for excellence in mathematics and science.
Sec. 10322. Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship program update.
Sec. 10323. NSF Eddie Bernice Johnson INCLUDES Initiative.
Sec. 10324. Broadening participation on major facilities awards.
Sec. 10325. Expanding geographic and institutional diversity in research.
Sec. 10326. Diversity in tech research.
Sec. 10327. Chief Diversity Officer of the NSF.
Sec. 10328. Research and dissemination to increase the participation of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields.
Sec. 10329. Activities to expand STEM opportunities.
Sec. 10330. Intramural emerging research institutions pilot program.

Subtitle D—NSF Research Security

Sec. 10331. Office of Research Security and Policy.
Sec. 10332. Chief of Research Security.
Sec. 10333. Reporting to Congress.
Sec. 10334. Online resource.
Sec. 10335. Research awards.
Sec. 10336. Authorities.
Sec. 10337. Responsible conduct in research training.
Sec. 10338. Research security and integrity information sharing analysis organization.
Sec. 10339. Plan with respect to controlled information and background screening.
Sec. 10339A. Foundation funding to institutions hosting or supporting Confucius Institutes.
Sec. 10339B. Foreign financial support.
Sec. 10339C. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle E—Fundamental Research

Sec. 10341. Broader impacts.