

home and tell those people that we represent—I don't care how they vote. All I want them to know is we care about what they have done for us, and we are going to be able to supply them some peace of mind.

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

□ 1245

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is past time for us to help our seniors get timely care. It is past time to help our medical professionals, our doctors, our nurses, and others who are burdened with undue paperwork, to help them spend more time providing care. It is past time for us to move a strong piece of legislation that has strong bipartisan support.

I thank Chairman NEAL and everyone who has helped bring this legislation forward, folks on the Ways and Means Committee, including my colleague Mr. KELLY.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, an incredible piece of work.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 14, 2022.

MR. BLUMENAUER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this important legislation to protect seniors' access to care in the Medicare Advantage program.

As many of you know, I have been a long-time champion of Medicare Advantage, and it's enjoyed tremendous popularity in Oregon. I believe that the way traditional fee-for-service Medicare operates is not sustainable and that Medicare Advantage is one of the tools we can use to demonstrate how we can incentivize value.

But this is only possible when the program operates as intended. I have been deeply concerned about the reports of delays in care, not only from the Inspector General, but from the constituents that come into my office. For patients and their families, being told that you need to wait longer for care that your doctor tells you that you need is incredibly frustrating and frightening. There's no comfort to be found in the fact that your insurance company needs time to decide if your doctor is right. For providers, the burden of prior authorization is immense. And at a time where we consistently hear that our health care workers are facing incredible burnout and are leaving the profession in alarming rates, it's critical that we remove unnecessary processes.

There is no reason that patients should be waiting for medically appropriate care especially when we know that this can lead to worse outcomes. The fundamental promise of Medicare Advantage is undermined when people are delaying care, getting sicker, and ultimately costing Medicare more money.

The legislation we are taking up today is commonsense policy that moves us towards the goals of the program and protects our patients and providers from unnecessary roadblocks to care. I want to commend Congresswoman DelBene for her leadership on this issue and I look forward to supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3173, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 302, PREVENTING A PATRONAGE SYSTEM ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2988, WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8326, ENSURING A FAIR AND ACCURATE CENSUS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1339 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1339

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 302) to impose limits on excepting competitive service positions from the competitive service, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2988) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify and enhance protections for Federal Government whistleblowers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the

Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 3. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution considered pursuant to subsection (b) and amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8326) to amend title 13, United States Code, to improve the operations of the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-64, modified by the amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered

as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 7. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution considered pursuant to subsection (b) and amendments en bloc described in section 8 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as amendments en bloc pursuant to section 8 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 8 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 8. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 9. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. During consideration of H.R. 2988 and H.R. 8326, the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or her designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 11. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, September 16, 2022, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of September 13, 2022, September 14, 2022, September 15, 2022, or September 16, 2022, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

SEC. 12. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of September 30, 2022, relating to a measure making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER), 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. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1339, providing for consideration of three measures: H.R. 302, H.R. 2988, and H.R. 8326, all under structured rules.

For H.R. 302, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, makes in order one amendment, and provides a motion to recommit.

For H.R. 2988 and H.R. 8326, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform for each bill, makes in order four amendments for H.R. 2988 and three amendments for H.R. 8326, and provides en bloc authority for both bills and motions to recommit for both bills.

The rule further provides the majority leader or his designee the ability this week to en bloc requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered from September 13 to September 16.

Lastly, the rule provides same-day authority through September 30 for a measure dealing with continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly today in support of House Resolution 1339, the rule for three crucial bills, each of which will protect an essential institution in American Government and public life that came under serious attack in the previous administration: our

Federal civil service, whistleblowers acting against public corruption, and the Census Bureau. All three bills were marked up and passed by the House Committee on Oversight and Reform.

H.R. 302, the Preventing a Patronage System Act, is a bipartisan bill led by Congressman CONNOLLY of Virginia and Congressman FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. This legislation will insulate our civil service against partisan political interference and ensure that no future President can fire government experts and civil servants simply to replace them with their own political loyalists and sycophants.

The civil service system was created in the 19th century with the explicit purpose of ending the so-called spoils system and ensuring that Federal employees are hired, promoted, and fired based on their qualifications and performance, not their political party connections or the political favors and services they are willing to render to elected officials.

The merit-based Federal workforce exists to effectively implement Federal laws and programs passed by Congress and signed into law by the President and translate those laws and programs into concrete results and benefits for the American people. Professional civil servants, like scientists, engineers, meteorologists, statisticians, economic researchers, and policy analysts must be able to do their jobs and advise government officials and the public based on empirical methods, facts and data, not ideological filters and bars of political correctness, and without fear of retaliation and discharge for political reasons.

But the previous administration attempted to turn our civil service, Mr. Speaker, into a top-down political and ideological party machine, the kind that the original architects of civil service tried to dismantle in the 19th century. In October of 2020, the former President issued Executive Order 13957 to create Schedule F, a sweeping new employment category for career civil servants who work on public policy issues. Schedule F specifically targeted about 50,000 presently nonpartisan policy experts, many of them holding advanced degrees and having served for decades as policy experts across different administrations with Presidents from different political parties.

For these civil servants, Schedule F would have stripped away their rights, their merit-based legal protections, and their professional independence. Civil servants transferred into the new Schedule F could have been fired and replaced at any time for any political or ideological reason or for no reason at all given by a hostile administration. The 50,000 civil servants deemed to be involved in formulating policy could have been swept up in a Schedule F political purge and replaced with unqualified loyalists and flunkies, with potentially catastrophic consequences for national security, the continuity of

governance, and the evenhanded and effective enforcement of Federal laws and programs.

The President already has the opportunity to appoint more than 4,000 political appointees. But Schedule F sought to go much further in radically transforming the civil service into an instrument of the chosen political ends and designs of the President.

Thankfully, President Joe Biden rescinded the order in January 2021. However, several top Republicans have already expressed support for picking up right where the previous administration left off with a new Schedule F.

Our civil servants must be hired based on their merits and then evaluated based on their actual job performance in office, not their political party membership, not their ideological viewpoints, and not their political campaign activism. Indeed, there are already processes in place for evaluating Federal employees' actual job performance, which is why in 2021, more than 10,000 Federal employees were removed from their jobs for not living up to job expectations. That is how you deal with people who are not actually doing their jobs. This bill is precisely about ensuring that civil servants will be evaluated based on their job performance and not the partisan political goals or extracurricular demands of a particular administration.

As a member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, which considered this legislation carefully and reported it favorably and the proud Representative of tens of thousands of Federal workers in Maryland's beautiful Eighth District, I am proud to advance this bill and urge all of my colleagues to support its passage on a bipartisan basis. We have an urgent mandate to protect the historic merit-based civil service and the integrity of the Federal Government against anyone who would turn the clock back more than a century to allow Presidents to convert our Federal workforce in service of agreed-upon Federal laws and programs into an instrument of personal ambition, campaign reelection, or party patronage.

Now, turning to H.R. 2988, the bipartisan Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act of 2021, led by Chairwoman MALONEY. This is another piece of critical legislation in defense of another critical democratic safeguard.

Whistleblowers are a great American institution and an important mechanism for guaranteeing the integrity of government. Our protection of whistleblowers reflects the fact that in our system of government, we have checks and balances all the way down. An individual Federal employee can hold even the most powerful government officials accountable to the rule of law, which binds all of us. Whistleblowers in American history have exposed self-dealing, bribery, kickbacks, sweetheart contracts, lost and stolen Federal property, national security failures, crimi-

nal coverups, other political corruption, war crimes, rape and sexual harassment in the military, major public health violations, episodes of environmental and toxic contamination, and the systematic waste or pilfering of taxpayer dollars.

This bill will improve current protections for whistleblowers by clearly prohibiting retaliatory investigations and other actions against Federal employees who share information with Congress, the House of Representatives, or the Senate, or with their supervisor. The bill limits the public disclosure of the identity of whistleblowers and extends whistleblower protections to new categories of Federal officers and employees, including Public Health Service workers and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's commissioned officers.

The bill also contains provisions to ensure a timely and fair procedure for whistleblowers facing discrimination and retaliation. Currently, the backlog at the Merit Systems Protection Board means that some whistleblowers may wait years for a hearing to be scheduled on their claims. This bill grants whistleblowers access to a jury trial in Federal district court if the Merit Systems Protection Board does not render a timely decision in their case.

Whistleblowers are integral to government transparency and accountability in our country. I strongly support this bill to ensure whistleblowers can come forward without fear of reprisal or punishment.

The last bill before us, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8326, the Ensuring a Fair and Accurate Census Act, also led by Chairwoman MALONEY, will protect the Census Bureau against future efforts at political interference, and it will ensure the Bureau's independence in the performance of its essential duties.

The Census is a constitutional mandate and imperative. The U.S. Constitution requires an actual enumeration of the whole number of persons in the country for apportioning Representatives among the States and Congress. The Census is an expression of the original principle that democracy must rest on the Jeffersonian idea of the consent of the governed. And, therefore, we need to know everyone who is here and part of the sovereign people of the Nation. The Census determines congressional apportionment of House seats and the allocation of trillions of dollars of Federal spending. Even many businesses in the private sector rely on Census Bureau statistics to guide their decisions.

The previous administration's spectacular contempt for our constitutional system was on full display during its many efforts to interfere with the 2020 Census for purposes of political gain. The effort to complete a comprehensive and effective Census was undermined at every turn by efforts such as the unlawful plot to add the citizenship question to the short form, which was struck down by the Supreme

Court, or the installation of a record-breaking number of highly partisan political appointees to the ranks of the Bureau's leadership. The reforms contained in the Ensuring a Fair and Accurate Census Act will safeguard the integrity of the Census count against this type of sinister political interference in the many years to come.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and my good friend from Maryland for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration for three pieces of legislation that are laser-focused on a President who has not been in office for almost 2 years now.

Meanwhile, yesterday's CPI reading came in higher than expected, registering an 8.3 percent year-over-year increase. That is another 40-year high, literally the highest in my lifetime.

It is abundantly clear that Democrats are focused on their efforts of political gamesmanship, hoping to distract the American people from the absolute failures of the Biden administration.

Let's just go through these bills. The first bill, H.R. 302, makes it even harder for the President to remove insubordinate Federal employees in policymaking roles. All this legislation accomplishes is further shielding unelected career bureaucrats from accountability to the American voter, who are footing the bill for their salary. The Federal Government should be responsive to the voters and their elected Representatives, not the whims and the ideological leanings of unelected bureaucrats.

Additionally, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2988, the Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act. Let me start by just saying that the need to protect whistleblowers is one of the most bipartisan points of agreement in Congress. However, this legislation does nothing to protect actual whistleblowers. There is a significant difference lost in this bill between retaliation against legitimate whistleblowers and the consequences in response to unacceptable actions taken by a government employee.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8326, Ensuring a Fair and Accurate Census Act. Yet, this bill does everything but ensure a fair and accurate Census. Specifically, H.R. 8326 provides the director of the Census Bureau with unprecedented power and authority to make all operational, statistical, and technical decisions for the Census.

Further, this bill constrains the ability of future Censuses to include critical questions, including a citizenship question, ensuring that future Censuses will be unfair and inaccurate.

Instead of focusing on real-life issues facing everyday Americans, House

Democrats this week are focusing on three bills that are completely irrelevant to the multiple crises created by Joe Biden's policies.

In fact, two of these bills have already passed in the House this Congress in larger packages. The failed policies of the far left and the Biden administration have plunged our economy into a recession. And, yes, it is a recession. They have stolen wages from the American workforce, they have destroyed seniors' retirement savings, and they have left families with the highest food prices since 1979. Let me repeat that. Grocery prices surged 13 percent in August, the largest increase in over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of Americans say that inflation is the most important issue facing the country, but you wouldn't know it by the bills the Democrats are prioritizing and running on the floor this week.

I think it is time my Democratic colleagues listened to the people and work with Republicans on real economic solutions, rather than doubling down on these dangerous, reckless, out-of-control spending and far-left policy bills, the same policies that have created the crises that we are now facing.

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

□ 1315

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear my good friend from Pennsylvania make his presentation. I was surprised that he described these three bills as completely irrelevant, given that one is about protecting the integrity of the Federal civil service, a force of more than 2 million people who are doing the work of the American people in the National Park Service, the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and so on.

I don't know what is completely irrelevant about that. Nor do I understand what is completely irrelevant about protecting the rights and our encouragement of Federal workers to be whistleblowers when there is massive waste, fraud, abuse, or exploitation taking place with the taxpayers' money. That is an essential purpose of government.

We have a government that is an instrument of the will of the people, and we have a lot of public policies that are being enforced, but we want to make sure that they are being enforced correctly and that the people's taxpayer moneys are being respected.

The whistleblowers are helping us do that in blowing the whistle on hundreds of millions of dollars of waste, corruption, and abuse that have taken place. Why we would turn a blind eye to that and describe it as completely irrelevant is beyond me.

Of course, the Census is foundational to the workings of American democracy, and we want to prevent precisely

the kind of political finger-pointing all over the Census Bureau and our laws that we saw in the last administration.

I am just curious whether the gentleman really believes that if the current President suggested that we take 40,000 or 50,000 Federal workers who presently have civil service protection and put them directly under his control for political appointment, he would think that is a good idea because our legislation will prevent any President in the future from doing that, including this Democratic President, any future Democratic Presidents, any future Republican Presidents or Independents or anyone else.

We don't think that is a good idea, and I can't believe that my good friend from Pennsylvania would just be agnostic as to that proposition.

Let me just say, finally, about the whole question of what is relevant and what is irrelevant, it seems like all we are hearing from the other side is embodied in the big statement coming out of the Senate from Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, saying it is time for a national Federal ban on abortion that could even be exceeded by the States.

Now, originally, they said: Well, *Roe v. Wade* is settled precedent, and we accept that.

Then, they packed the Court with their Justices, who were determined, hellbent, on overturning *Roe v. Wade*, and they did it.

Then, we heard from our friends across the aisle: Well, this is a matter for the States. Let the States decide.

Now, we hear from our colleagues in Congress that, no, they want a national criminal ban on the right of women to make their own decisions about their health, their families, their careers, and their futures.

Then, they will even allow States to go beyond that to completely ban abortion, which is, of course, the essential pro-life position which we have heard from our colleagues across the aisle. That is what they are focused on.

Meantime, the President signed, this week, the Inflation Reduction Act, which will dramatically lower healthcare costs for tens of millions of Americans and, finally, overturn the Republican ban on the government negotiating in the Medicare program with Big Pharma for lower prescription drug prices.

We are actually making progress. They want to drag everyone into their insatiable efforts to ban the right to abortion in America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will double down on the comment that these bills are irrelevant. They are absolutely irrelevant in that two of them are superfluous. One has already passed. One passed in an amendment to the NDAA, and the other one is an unprecedented grant of authority to the Census, which is com-

pletely inappropriate. So, yes, these bills, I would argue, are irrelevant.

Do you know who would think they are irrelevant? Any person you talk to on the street. If you go up to somebody filling up their gas tank, and you ask them about these three bills, these are irrelevant to their lives. They are worried about the price of gas.

If you ask somebody at a grocery store who is trying to feed a family about these bills, these bills are irrelevant to their grocery bill.

If you are talking about real wages and fighting the loss of wages and inflation, these bills are irrelevant to that. A lot of blue-collar workers want wages to increase like they did under the last administration, not decrease like they are today.

So, yes, these bills are absolutely irrelevant to everyday Americans.

But let's just talk about the high cost of inflation. Inflation is the top concern reported by businesses and voters alike. However, instead of working to lower costs for businesses and workers, the SEC proposed burdensome new rules requiring businesses to disclose extensive climate-related data and additional climate risks.

That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 8589, which would prohibit the SEC's woke climate rule from ever moving forward.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Kentucky (Mr. BARR), my good friend, to explain the amendment.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) for yielding.

I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider Representative FRENCH HILL's H.R. 8589 to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from trading its independence and statutory authority away in the name of alarmist climate advocacy.

The proposed climate change rule from the Securities and Exchange Commission will further crush our fragile economy, and struggling families will ultimately pay the price.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the Consumer Price Index numbers for the month of August. As has been mentioned already today, CPI surged to 8.3 percent, above projections, still a 40-year high, showing that this inflation crisis is not going away anytime soon.

Americans are paying more for everything, and rising prices continue to wreak havoc on farmers, middle-class families, and small businesses struggling to stay afloat all across America.

Of course, Democrats' overspending for the last year and a half has produced excess demand, pushing up prices, but no amount of Fed tightening can fix the inflationary supply-demand mismatch without also addressing the supply side.

At the heart of this inflation crisis is the Biden administration's war on American energy production. This policy of deliberately constraining the supply of energy is taking its toll on the American people. According to a Penn Wharton study, inflation reduced the purchasing power of American households by approximately \$6,000 last year. That is like taking an entire paycheck away for an entire month for every American household.

Real earnings, hourly earnings, dropped 2.8 percent over the year in August. Wages are down because of this inflation crisis. Credit card debt is up. It hit an all-time high last month.

One in six American households are now behind paying their electricity bills and in danger of losing their utility services altogether, with natural gas prices up 30 percent since last July. Effectively, electricity prices are now up 15 percent, a 14-year high.

When Joe Biden took office, the average price of gasoline was \$2.36 per gallon. Today, the average gas price in America is \$3.72 per gallon, and stubbornly, diesel prices are much, much higher. That goes into everything: transportation, manufacturing, farmers having to fill up the tank on their tractors. All of that is passed on at the retail point of sale. In less than 2 years, America has gone from energy dominant to energy desperate.

Mr. Speaker, ground zero for the Biden administration's war on American energy is the weaponization of financial regulation and the politicization of access to capital.

What do I mean by this? We all know that the Biden administration killed the Keystone XL pipeline and other critical energy infrastructure projects. We know that they are frustrating the construction of new refineries. We know that they have held up 4,400 drilling permits. But ground zero is the weaponization of financial regulation to deny American energy the access to the capital that they need to invest in a very capital-intensive business.

Throughout the executive branch, at the Treasury Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Reserve, the OCC, and other financial regulators, Biden has installed or nominated unelected climate alarmists and given them free rein to attack American energy businesses, all in the name of climate change.

The sad irony, Mr. Speaker, is that if we want to innovate and actually solve climate change, we wouldn't be denying American energy companies and

the scientists there access to financing. We would be giving them more financing to innovate and to solve the problem the American way, through free enterprise and innovation. One of these radical nominees even called for bankrupting American fossil fuel companies.

Perhaps the most dangerous regulation issued by the Biden administration to destroy American energy is the SEC's climate risk disclosure rule proposed in March. This 534-page monstrosity marks the transformation of the SEC from an independent agency dedicated to investor protection to an unaccountable and politicized bureaucracy intent on advancing radical environmental and social policy over which it has neither expertise nor jurisdiction.

This proposed rule is totally disconnected from the longstanding investor-driven materiality standard and will politicize the agency and reduce its credibility by hurting investors, elevating nonpecuniary factors above financial returns, and steering retail investors into lower performing, higher fee, and less-diversified ESG investments.

As a reminder, Mr. Speaker, the statutory mission of the SEC is to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation. This is not about protecting investors. It is about hurting investors. It is not about capital formation. It is about capital destruction. It is definitively not to reduce carbon emissions or solve climate change, but the SEC is wading into environmental policy debates like climate change with its top-down, government-directed, one-size-fits-all mandatory environmental, social, and governance disclosure regulation, or ESG.

SEC Chair Gary Gensler claims that the requirements in the proposal are material because institutional investors are demanding this information. But according to a study conducted by the University of Chicago and FINRA, only 21 percent of surveyed retail investors in this country even knew what ESG stands for.

The fact of the matter is, retail investors are not demanding this information. They want returns, not politics, guiding their retirement and college savings.

What do retail investors really care about? Yesterday's bloodbath in the stock market when the Dow plummeted by over 1,000 points in a single day, the worst drop since June 2020.

That tells me what investors actually want, Mr. Speaker, and it is returns. They need returns. They don't need an inflationary environment that is eating away their purchasing power and rising interest rates because of it that result in turmoil in the financial markets, destroying retirement savings.

ESG funds are hurting American investors. They are tech-heavy, and in a market where tech stocks are in a mas-

sive sell-off and are vastly underperforming non-ESG funds that contain investments in energy, who are the losers? Retail investors who are unwittingly invested in and overexposed to ESG. On top of that, ESG funds charge 43 percent higher fees than non-ESG funds.

In short, the government is redirecting capital away from energy, and it is costing retail investors, which include teachers, police officers, and other ordinary Americans saving for retirement, extraordinary amounts of money.

But, today, Congress can actually do something to protect investors. I am leading this previous question that would amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 8589, legislation offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend, to stop this SEC rule in its tracks before it causes more damage to retail investors and to Americans struggling to keep up with unsustainable energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans will keep pushing for America to get back to basics. We need to deliver economic relief to the American people to alleviate the pain of inflation. To do that, we need to unleash the supply side. That means more, not less, financing of American energy to lower the price at the pump, to reduce the cost of heating your home.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we need financial advisers to get back to the basics of investing. That means diversified portfolios that include American energy, not just tech, because the point of investing your hard-earned money isn't to further a political agenda or some far-left view of America that some woke asset manager on Wall Street thinks. Instead, it is to generate a financial return that will enable you to send your kid to college, ensure you can live a comfortable life in retirement, or pursue some other aspect of your American Dream.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is about capital formation. It is about giving heroic American energy companies access to the capital and the financing that they need, not only to make energy affordable and reliable for the American people but to make America competitive in the global economy.

It is for all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join me in supporting this previous question.

□ 1330

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues tempt me to wander afield from what we have come here to talk about since they want to talk about seemingly everything else. So let me try to respond to a few of the points that have just been lobbed in our direction.

First, they seem to want to assign responsibility to the President of the United States for the inflation rate. But then, surely, they will assign responsibility to the President of the

United States for the unemployment rate, which now stands at around 3.5 percent, the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years. You have got to go back a half century to find the kind of job situation that President Biden has brought to the United States of America.

Last week, we learned that payroll employment is up by 315,000 in the month of August alone. Since President Biden came into office, we have added 668,000 manufacturing jobs.

Now, it is true the President has been fighting inflation ever since he got into office. Why?

Well, the economy started to come roaring back—not just in America, but all over the world in the wake of the pandemic. So we saw a tremendous demand with broken supply chains. So what happens under the law of supply and demand? The prices go up. But, unlike our colleagues who seem to want to chortle about it and use it as a campaign talking point, President Biden and the Democrats have been acting to bring inflation down. Every single day.

Yesterday's Consumer Price Index data showed continued progress in bringing global inflation down here in the U.S. economy. Gas prices are down an average of \$1.30 a gallon since the beginning of the summer. Price increases slowed at the grocery store this month. Still too high. But real wages went up again for a second month in a row, giving hardworking families more breathing room.

It is amazing to me that some of the time has been delegated to one of our distinguished colleagues who seem to want to blame these global economic conditions arising from COVID-19 and the pandemic and broken supply chains, as well as Vladimir Putin's filthy imperialist war in Ukraine, which fortunately, the people of Ukraine, with the support of a lot of people in this body—but not everybody—is starting to win. And we have seen dramatic reversal of fortune in that war as the democratic forces are beating Vladimir Putin and the autocrats in Russia.

But in any event, we just heard someone who wanted to blame all of these global economic conditions on an SEC regulation, which we are not here to discuss and, therefore, unfortunately, I can't address. I might agree with the gentleman, for all I know. It has nothing to do with the legislation before us, and it is hard for me to believe that that is the source of inflation around the world or the unemployment, which now is practically at the bottom level that we have ever seen in over a century.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, back to the point at hand, I thought we were going to be distracted with Republican calls to ban abortion across the country. Well, the polls must be teaching them something because I am not hearing about abortion today.

For many years, all I heard from them was abortion is murder, and the

millions of persons who are being murdered by abortion. They demanded the overthrow of Roe v. Wade, and they got their way.

Yesterday, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM introduced legislation for a national criminal ban on abortion. But, of course, the so-called pro-life forces want to go further in the States and ban it completely. A lot of them don't even want to allow exceptions for rape or incest.

I thought our colleagues were going to explain what their position really is. I would invite them to do so as long as they don't want to talk about the legislation before us today.

Why don't they tell us what their position on abortion is, because America wants to know.

I think their position has changed somewhat. They are singing a somewhat different tune since the people of Kansas, by 20 points, destroyed their anti-choice agenda, and explained to them in numerical terms that the people of America are on the side of freedom and the rights of women and men and families to make their own decisions and not to have those decisions be made by LINDSEY GRAHAM, one Senator, who yesterday pronounced that he chose 15 weeks as the right point to criminalize abortion. He chose that himself.

What is their position now? America wants to know. What is their position?

Do they support a national criminal ban on abortion? Are they going to allow any exceptions for rape or incest? What is their position on it, if they don't want to talk about the legislation at hand?

Meantime, the Democrats continue to fight for lower drug prices, for a record, unprecedented, historic investment in renewable energy.

We are addressing the problems of the future. At the same time, we are defending the integrity of the Federal civil service and our workforce, which was compromised and abused in so many ways by the last administration.

We are defending the rights of whistleblowers to tell the truth about what is taking place in terms of political and public corruption and not to have to face retaliation from their supervisors. We are defending the institutions of democracy, including the Census, against all of the kinds of machinations and corruption and political abuse that we saw in the last administration.

We are glad that the Supreme Court struck down their last interference with the Census by trying to paste questions outside of the rule of law on the short form. This legislation is designed to protect the integrity of the Census along with the civil service, along with the whistleblowers.

But as long as my dear colleagues and friends don't want to talk about the legislation at hand, please clarify for America what their plan is to take away the health rights of American women and their families. Are they

supporting the plan we heard yesterday announced by LINDSEY GRAHAM for a nationwide Federal criminal ban?

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for just a few points in rebuttal.

Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that inflation is a global issue, like somehow it is not Biden's fault and the fault of far-left Democrats—which it is.

The reason why this is a global issue—and remind my friends on the other side of the aisle—is because we are the world's largest GDP. We also just happen to be the world's reserve currency.

So, of course, when we have inflation, the world will have it. That is just economics. So it is amazing how the principles of economics are just cherry-picked to make points. But I would remind my colleagues of those two facts. In short, we are exporting the inflation.

Now, as far as what we are doing to cause the inflation, well, it is pretty simple. We have injected trillions of dollars into the economy. That causes inflation. And then to double down on the failed policy, Joe Biden unilaterally, and I would argue unconstitutionally, canceled the debt of a swath of college students so you now have even more liquidity in the market because of them.

And the sick irony here is that the guy that is driving the pickup truck, the guy that went to school to be a plumber, an HVAC repairman, that guy is now subsidizing the lawyer who is driving to his downtown job in a BMW. That is what is so perverse about what is happening.

Now let's just talk about gas prices.

My colleague and my friend from Maryland said gas prices are down. Yeah, they are down from like a week ago; they are not down from January 2021 when they were less than \$2.50 a gallon. So let's continue to move that goalpost.

You can't argue that gas prices are up. Americans know gas prices are up. They are feeling the pain at the pump. They are also feeling it in the higher cost of all energy and food.

Finally, blaming Putin on gas prices and issues. Yeah, Putin is partially to blame, but who encouraged Putin to invade Ukraine? That would be Joe Biden by his surrender of Afghanistan.

Let me be clear that any weakness on the foreign stage is an indication of aggression. When Joe Biden showed weakness by abandoning the Bagram Air Base, by leaving our allies on the ground to predations of the Taliban, that was weakness, and Putin seized on that to invade Ukraine.

Instead of giving the Ukrainians the MiGs they needed, the proper military supplies they needed, we decided to go halfway. Joe Biden didn't fully commit. Now we have a protracted war in Ukraine, which is going to lead to a humanitarian crisis not only in Central

Europe but all across Africa, for example, and higher energy prices here.

Mr. Speaker, but that is all traced back to Biden being weak on foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to my friend from Maryland on some of the specific points that he made in rebuttal to my opposition to the previous question.

The gentleman says that we don't want to talk about the underlying bills.

What Republicans want to talk about is what the American people are worried about, which is rising prices. What we are focused on is opposing a previous question so that we could actually go and consider legislation that would actually help improve the record inflation, 40-year-high inflation that Americans are suffering with.

What we are talking about is how we are going to lower the pain at the pump and lower the cost of heating your home, which is at a 15-year high in America right now. That is what Republicans want to talk about; what the American people actually care about right now.

The gentleman says that, Oh, unemployment is down.

Let me tell you the statistic that matters.

It is the fact that we have 12 million unfilled jobs in America because the Democrats' spending spree has paid Americans to not go to work, because employers in my district and every district around the country can't find labor.

The supply-demand mismatch that has produced this inflation crisis is the result of fiscal policy errors. It is the result of a war on American energy constraining the supply of energy. It is because of excessive spending that has discouraged people to return to the labor force.

So we have excess demand from overspending, and we have constrained labor supply and constrained energy supply, which is impounded into everything and results in higher retail prices.

The gentleman says that, Oh, don't look here; don't look at us; don't look at the Biden administration's war on energy and labor supply. No, it is not that. It is not the Fed that continued to keep interest rates too low for too long and flooded our money supply at a time when all of these fiscal policy errors were going on. No, it is not that. It is global inflation.

Well, why is it, then, in March of 2021, at the precise time that this Congress passed the American recovery plan, \$2 trillion of unpaid-for spending, why is it then that U.S. inflation rates became untethered from global price increases? That is what happened, in synchronicity with their legislation.

Mr. Speaker, finally, he blames Vladimir Putin.

Gas prices on the day Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine were the highest in 40 years. Inflation was over 8 percent on the CPI, the highest in 40 years, the highest since 1981 on the day Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine.

This is not about Vladimir Putin. It is about Americans not producing energy anymore.

And why do we want this particular legislation, the legislation to block the SEC's climate disclosure rule? Because we need more financing of American energy.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue to my friend from Maryland, also, if the obsession on the other side with the climate, if that is the concern, if that is why we have this SEC rule, if that is why we have weaponized financial regulators to go after the American energy sector and redirect capital and financing away from the American energy sector, if that is the solution to climate change, I want the gentleman to explain that to me. Because the best scientists in the world working on the issue of carbon capturing, carbon sequestration, and harnessing the carbon cycle, they work at American energy companies.

The answer to climate change is not to centralize power in Washington and add a thousand pages to the Federal Register. That will not change the weather. What will solve climate change is to solve that problem the American way. The American way is through innovation, technology, and science, and that means robust, free enterprise. That means more, not less capital formation. That means more financing of American energy, more financing of innovation. That is the Republican solution to climate.

It is also the Republican solution to our energy crisis and our inflation crisis. That is what we are focused on, not these bills that the American people don't care about.

We are focused on lowering prices at the grocery store and at the pump and financing American competitiveness, American innovation, and American know-how.

That is what we want to do.

□ 1345

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished gentleman from Kentucky purported to speak for what Americans are worried about. Undoubtedly, many Americans are worried about inflation, which is why this administration has been taking strong action not just to get jobs for everybody who wants a job and good jobs and union jobs for people, but also to bring inflation down.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a New York Times article titled "U.S. Gas Prices Have Fallen for 91 Straight Days, a Relief for Consumers."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 2022]

U.S. GAS PRICES HAVE FALLEN FOR 91 STRAIGHT DAYS, A RELIEF FOR CONSUMERS
(By Isabella Simonetti)

The price of gasoline continues to fall steadily, easing pressure on American con-

sumers as the cost of filling a tank continued to tumble from record levels reached earlier in the summer.

Gas prices fell 10.6 percent in August, which helped moderate still-sky-high inflation, Tuesday's Consumer Price Index report showed.

The energy index, which tracks gasoline and electricity among other energy sources, dropped 5 percent last month, as electricity and natural gas prices rose.

After peaking at \$5.02 in June, gasoline prices have dropped for 91 straight days, and the national average stood at just over \$3.70 a gallon on Tuesday, data from AAA show. But analysts point to a few reasons this streak of declines is unlikely to continue.

Because they're determined by oil prices, gasoline prices are also susceptible to a wide range of challenges, like hurricanes that knock out drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and efforts to punish Russia for its invasion of Ukraine by curbing its ability to sell crude on the global market.

While gas prices are down, the overall energy index still remains up 23.8 percent over the 12 months that ended in August. Electricity prices alone jumped 15.8 percent, representing the largest 12-month increase since August 1981, the inflation report said. The jump in electricity prices is largely attributable to the high cost of natural gas, said Laura Rosner-Warburton, an economist at MacroPolicy Perspectives.

As winter approaches, other fuel prices could influence inflation data. The cost of heating a home with natural gas, the most common source of home-heating fuel in the United States, is expected to jump more than 25 percent from last year, to \$952 for the six months from October through March, according to the National Energy Assistance Directors Association.

"You would expect that a hard winter could create a significant increase in demand in price of natural gas," said Bryan Benoit, U.S. national managing partner of energy at Grant Thornton. "And then of course all of this is further exacerbated by what's going on with the war in the Ukraine."

Mr. RASKIN. I want to talk about some of the other things that Americans are worried about since my colleague purported to speak for Americans because I saw a poll recently saying that Americans are worried about the attack on democracy and voting rights.

Part of that may be the fact that some of our colleagues seem to be ambivalent about whether or not to denounce the rampant violence that was unleashed against this institution, this body, on January 6, 2021, when thousands of rioters came and attacked our officers, wounding and injuring more than 150 of them, breaking their jaws, their necks, lost fingers, strokes, heart attacks, concussions, and contusions. And, of course, the former President says that his mob actually greeted the police with hugs and kisses.

Some of our colleagues shamefully have followed the former President in trying to whitewash the worst episode of domestic mass insurrectionary violence ever unleashed on the Capitol of the United States with an attack on the Vice President, Mike Pence. We heard those words, "Hang Mike Pence. Hang Mike Pence," bouncing off of the walls of the Capitol and against the Congress of the United States.

So, yes, people are worried about the state of our democracy with so many members of the GOP following Donald Trump in not only his terrible big lie, the first time we have ever seen that in American history, but also the big lie encompassing this mob violence and this insurrection against the Government of the United States.

Do you know what else Americans are worried about, Mr. Speaker? Americans are now worried about State politicians and Federal politicians trampling the rights of women. For more than a half century, women have had a right to make their most intimate procreative and reproductive decisions with their families, with their husbands, with their partners, with their ministers, and with their church leaders.

Then, they gerrymandered the Supreme Court. They kept Merrick Garland off the Supreme Court by not even giving him a hearing over on the Senate side.

Then, what do you know, Mr. Speaker? They followed what the RNC was asking for in all of their platforms for all of these years: Overturn Roe v. Wade. They overturned Roe v. Wade.

Then, we heard from our colleagues: Well, we just want the States to decide.

But, yesterday, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM unveiled what the real plan is: a nationwide criminal ban on abortion, and if they can go further in the States, they will go further in the States.

We have Republican proposals all over America to completely ban abortion from the moment of conception, which is the pro-life orthodoxy, which is life begins at conception.

We heard it in the Judiciary Committee. We have heard it in the Oversight and Reform Committee. We have been hearing it for years. But now they have fallen strangely and demurely silent. Why is that? Part of it is because of the good people of Kansas, who showed them just where America is on this.

America is a country committed to individual freedom and the rights of the people to make their own decisions and not having busybody, theocrat politicians in State capitals telling them how to make their own decisions about their careers, about their lives, about their families, and about their healthcare—and certainly not allowing LINDSEY GRAHAM to dictate to the women of America what their destiny will be.

They won't say a word about it. They will talk about an SEC regulation nobody heard of that we are not here to talk about today. They will blame Joe Biden for global inflation. They will blame Joe Biden for Vladimir Putin's filthy, imperialist invasion of Ukraine.

I hear them denouncing Joe Biden. They won't denounce Vladimir Putin for 1 second.

I would happily yield 1 minute if they would denounce Vladimir Putin, but they won't do it. We have heard people

over on their side cheerleading for Vladimir Putin. I heard the gentlewoman from Georgia say: Russia wins.

Guess what? Russia doesn't win. The people of Ukraine are winning today, and the people of America are with the people of Ukraine. We are on the side of democrats, small d democrats, all over the world against the autocrats like Putin, against the theocrats like people who would dictate to the women of America their own health decisions.

We are against the tyrants, the bullies, and the despots. We are against Presidents who get into office and try to dictate the political decisionmaking of individual members of the workforce and try to push their ideological program into the government. We are for defending whistleblowers; we are for defending the Census; and we are for defending democratic institutions in America.

I am just shocked that I hear from my good friend from Pennsylvania, someone I like and someone I trust, that he actually is defending Putin against Biden and blaming Joe Biden for Putin's long-running plan to invade Ukraine. That is a remarkable thing to me, and I hope we can have that clarified.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I let my good friend from Maryland know that I like him, too, and I would certainly clarify the remarks on Putin.

I will denounce Putin right now. Remember, I was the one calling in the beginning of this conflict for a no-fly zone to be established led by the United States. I don't think there is anybody more hawkish on Russia and the Ukraine issue than myself on this side of the aisle. So, to say that I was up here defending Putin is ludicrous.

We, of course, needed to beat Putin. We should have been much more engaged from the beginning of this conflict, not just to send a message to the Russians but to send a message to the Iranians and a message to the Chinese vis-a-vis Taiwan. But I could go on.

I would say it is a total mischaracterization of my position to say that I am up here saying good things about dictator Putin.

I remind my friend from Maryland about the history of this building. In 1814, it was literally burned to the ground. In the seventies, Puerto Rican separatists stormed in and detonated a bomb. So, let's just get the historical context in place.

As far as denouncing violence, everyone on this side of the aisle has denounced political violence consistently. The inconsistency is from my friends from across the other side of the aisle who cherry-pick when they denounce political violence.

I remember that during the entire summer of 2020, my friends across the aisle treated the destructive BLM and

antifa protests that caused \$2 billion worth of damage, they treated those protesters with kid gloves. You had the current Vice President paying the bail for the protesters. You had the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, saying: "The whole point of protesting is to make people uncomfortable. . . . To folks who complain protest demands make others uncomfortable, that is the point." Those are the words of the Democrats, not of us. We could go on.

Chris Cuomo, CNN host: "Please, show me where it says protesters are supposed to be polite and peaceful." The last time I checked, that was a Democrat.

New York BLM cofounder Hawk Newsome said in response to Eric Adams trying to put plainclothes police officers on the street: "There will be riots; there will be fire; and there will be bloodshed."

It sounds to me that the political violence and the support for the rhetoric that is coming to support political violence and upheaval are coming from one side of the aisle, the Democrat side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for more rebuttal.

Mr. BARR. We may have found a point of bipartisan agreement that we all dislike Vladimir Putin. But one of the main reasons why Vladimir Putin was able to invade Ukraine was the removal of deterrence: unilaterally waiving sanctions on Nord Stream 2, refusing to respond for a full year of a buildup, inviting aggression by retreating from Afghanistan, and signaling to our allies that we are not coming to help you. That might be one of the reasons why we have a problem with Vladimir Putin right now.

To the gentleman from Maryland's argument that we are just purporting to speak for all Americans, we are the Representatives of the American people, and we are their only voice in this Chamber. I am not purporting to speak for Americans. I am telling you what my constituents in Kentucky are telling me.

Charlie from Fleming County says that he can't afford to fill up his tractor as a farmer because diesel prices are where they are. He says: I don't know where they get their numbers in Washington, Congressman, but it feels three times 8 percent on the CPI.

Lorna from Mount Sterling, Kentucky, owns a floral business, a Main Street small business, and everything costs more. She said: This is not the America I know.

Then, Jamie, who is a mom of two kids, she goes to get baby formula. She goes to the grocery, and she can't afford groceries. She tries to fill up her car to take her kids on errands, and she can't afford it.

This is not purporting to speak for the American people. These are the American people, and they are suffering because this administration will not fix the supply side.

They raise taxes on businesses, which discourages business investment and capital expenditures that we need to fix the supply bottlenecks. They raise prices at the pump by declaring war on American energy production by weaponizing financial regulation. They refuse to take actions that actually will solve the supply problem by encouraging people to go back to work.

We don't need to be discouraging people from going back to work. We need to fill those 12 million unfilled jobs right now by encouraging productivity and American people going back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can go to some legislation that would actually help lower prices, what the American people do care about, not what they purport to care about, what they tell us they care about, and that is lowering prices.

This bill would help us do that because it would unlock the financing we need to make America energy dominant once again and lower prices across the board.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the CPI just released yesterday shows that prices have increased 8.3 percent from August of last year. Real wages are down 2.8 percent. The cost of electricity has skyrocketed 15.8 percent. That is the most since 1981, the most since I was alive.

As of August, nearly one quarter of all Americans reported forgoing basic needs like food and medicine just to be able to afford their energy bill. This number will only get worse because we are going to face even higher costs to heat our homes this winter, with natural gas prices nearing a 14-year high.

Yet, Democrats want to focus their efforts on, again, I would call it, irrelevant legislation that has already passed the House. It will not provide any relief to American workers and American families.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and to vote "no" on the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky spoke about what his constituents are interested in. Apparently, they are interested only in the question of inflation.

My constituents are interested in that and are satisfied about the fact that we have had more than 90 days of decline in gas prices and that this administration is fighting to reduce inflation, including with the Inflation Reduction Act, which dramatically reduces healthcare costs, saying that nobody will have to spend more than \$35

a month on insulin—no diabetic in America—and no one in the Medicare program will have to spend more than \$2,000 a year on prescription drugs, generally.

How is that for getting inflation down?

But that is not all they care about. They care about women's right to choose and the GOP assault on the freedoms of the people, something which our colleagues maintain their demure and uncharacteristic circumspect silence about today. They didn't want to talk about this new GOP plan to ban abortion all across America. That is what we heard yesterday from Senator GRAHAM about his plan for America.

My constituents want freedom in America. They want democracy in voting rights. They don't want to see violence unleashed against the Capitol of the United States, against school boards, against State capitols, or any of the political violence we have seen from whatever source. I am happy to denounce all of it.

I wish my colleagues would denounce political violence when it comes to our very doors, when it enters this Chamber, rather than playing follow the leader with the former President who has disgraced himself as the first President in U.S. history to be impeached twice and continues to be embroiled in all the political corruption investigations all over the country, as it has been shown that he egged on armed protesters to come to try to attack this body, to drive Vice President Pence out of the body, and to drive us out of the body, as well, interfering with a Federal proceeding.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1339

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 13. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8589) to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from finalizing the proposed rule titled "The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors". All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommitt.

SEC. 14. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8589.

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

□ 1400

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). 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. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

En bloc motion to suspend the rules, if offered; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 884;

H.R. 5774;

S. 2293; and

S. 442.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 206, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

YEAS—213

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

Swalwell Trahan
Takano Trone
Thompson (CA) Underwood
Thompson (MS) Vargas
Titus Veasey
Tlaib Velázquez
Tonko Wasserman
Torres (CA) Schultz
Torres (NY) Waters

NAYS—206

Aderholt Garbarino
Allen Garcia (CA)
Amodei Gibbs
Armstrong Gimenez
Arrington Gohmert
Babin Gonzales, Tony
Bacon Gonzalez (OH)
Baird Good (VA)
Balderson Gooden (TX)
Banks Gosar
Barr Granger
Bentz Graves (LA)
Bergman Graves (MO)
Bice (OK) Green (TN)
Biggs Greene (GA)
Bilirakis Griffith
Bishop (NC) Grothman
Boebert Guest
Bost Guthrie
Brady Harris
Brooks Harshbarger
Buchanan Hartzler
Buck Hern
Bucshon Herrell
Burchett Hice (GA)
Burgess Higgins (LA)
Calvert Hill
Cammack Hinson
Carey Hollingsworth
Carl Hudson
Carter (GA) Huizenga
Carter (TX) Issa
Cawthorn Jackson
Chabot Jacobs (NY)
Cline Johnson (LA)
Cloud Johnson (OH)
Clyde Johnson (SD)
Cole Jordan
Comer Joyce (OH)
Conway Joyce (PA)
Crawford Katko
Crenshaw Keller
Curtis Kelly (MS)
Davidson Kelly (PA)
Davis, Rodney Kim (CA)
DesJarlais Kinzinger
Diaz-Balart Kustoff
Donalds LaHood
Duncan LaMalfa
Dunn Lamborn
Ellzey Latta
Emmer LaTurner
Estes Lesko
Fallon Letlow
Feenstra Long
Ferguson Loudermilk
Finstad Lucas
Fischbach Luetkemeyer
Fitzgerald Mace
Fitzpatrick Malliotakis
Fleischmann Mann
Flood Massie
Flores Mast
Foxy McCarthy
Franklin, C. McCaul
Scott McClain
Fulcher McClintock
Gaetz McHenry
Gallagher McKinley

NOT VOTING—13

Allred Nadler
Budd Pascrell
Cheney Rose
Herrera Beutler Salazar
Mfume Sewell

□ 1441

Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. CAWTHORN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BOURDEAUX changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon) Johnson (TX)
Barragán (Jeffries)
Williams (GA) Jones (Beyer)
Wilson (FL) Kirkpatrick
Yarmuth (Pallone)
Bass (Correa) Rice (NY)
Bush (Bowman) (Deutch)
Cárdenas Lawrence
(Correa) (Beatty)
Conway Lawson (FL)
(Valadao) (Evans)
DeSaulnier Levin (MI)
(Beyer) (Correa)
Dingell (Kuster) McEachin
Fallon (Nehls) (Beyer)
Gaetz (Cawthorn) Miller (WV) (Kim)
Higgins (NY) Moore (WI)
(Pallone) (Beyer)

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—219

Adams Doggett
Aguilar Doyle, Michael
Auchincloss F.
Axne Escobar
Barragán Eshoo
Bass Espaillet
Beatty Evans
Bera Fletcher
Beyer Foster
Bishop (GA) Frankel, Lois
Blumenauer Gallego
Blunt Rochester Garamendi
Bonamici Garcia (IL)
Bourdeaux Garcia (TX)
Bowman Golden
Boyle, Brendan Gomez
F. Gonzalez,
Vicente
Brown (MD) Gottheimer
Brown (OH) Green, Al (TX)
Brownley Grijalva
Bush Harder (CA)
Bustos Mrvan
Butterfield Murphy (FL)
Cárdenas Nadler
Carson Himes
Carter (LA) Horsford
Cartwright Hoyer
Case Huffman
Casten Jackson Lee
Castor (FL) Jacobs (CA)
Castro (TX) Jayapal
Cherfilus- Jeffries
McCormick Johnson (GA)
Chu Johnson (TX)
Cielline Jones
Clark (MA) Kahele
Clarke (NY) Kaptur
Cleaver Keating
Clyburn Kelly (IL)
Cohen Khanna
Connolly Kildee
Cooper Kilmer
Correa Kim (NJ)
Costa Kind
Courtney Kirkpatrick
Craig Krishnamoorthi
Crow Kuster
Cuellar Lamb
Davids (KS) Langevin
Davis, Danny K. Larsen (WA)
Dean Larson (CT)
DeFazio Lawrence
DeGette Lawson (FL)
DeLauro Lee (CA)
DeBene Lee (NV)
Demings Leger Fernandez
DeSaulnier Levin (CA)
Deutch Levin (MI)
Dingell Lieu

Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Velázquez
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan

NAYS—209

Garcia (CA) Meuser
Gibbs Miller (IL)
Gimenez Miller (WV)
Gohmert Miller-Meeks
Gonzales, Tony Moolenaar
Gonzalez (OH) Mooney
Good (VA) Moore (AL)
Gooden (TX) Moore (UT)
Gosar Mullin
Granger Murphy (NC)
Graves (LA) Nehls
Graves (MO) Newhouse
Green (TN) Norman
Greene (GA) Obernolte
Griffith Owens
Grothman Palazzo
Guest Palmer
Guthrie Pence
Harris Perry
Harshbarger Pfluger
Hartzler Posey
Hern Reschenthaler
Herrell Rice (SC)
Herrera Beutler Rodgers (WA)
Hice (GA) Rogers (AL)
Higgins (LA) Rogers (KY)
Hill Rosendale
Hinson Rouzer
Roy
Hudson Rutherford
Huizenga Salazar
Issa Scalise
Jackson Schweikert
Chabot Jacobs (NY) Scott, Austin
Cline Johnson (LA) Sempolinski
Cloud Johnson (OH) Sessions
Clyde Johnson (SD) Simpson
Cole Jordan Smith (MO)
Comer Joyce (OH) Smith (NE)
Conway Joyce (PA) Smith (NJ)
Crawford Katko Smucker
Crenshaw Keller Spartz
Curtis Kelly (MS) Stauber
Davidson Kelly (PA) Steel
Davis, Rodney Kim (CA) Stefanik
DesJarlais Kinzinger Steil
Diaz-Balart Kustoff Steube
Donalds LaHood Stewart
Duncan LaMalfa Taylor
Dunn Lamborn Tenney
Ellzey Latta Thompson (PA)
Emmer LaTurner Tiffany
Estes Lesko Timmons
Fallon Letlow Turner
Feenstra Long Upton
Ferguson Loudermilk Valadao
Finstad Lucas Van Drew
Fischbach Luetkemeyer Van Dyne
Fitzgerald Mace Wagner
Fitzpatrick Malliotakis Walberg
Fleischmann Mann Waltz
Flood Massie Weber (TX)
Flores Mast Webster (FL)
Foxy McCarthy Wenstrup
Franklin, C. McCaul Westernman
Scott McClain Williams (TX)
Fulcher McClintock Wilson (SC)
Gaetz McHenry Wittman
Gallagher McKinley Womack
Garbarino Meijer Zeldin

NOT VOTING—4

Allred Cheney
Budd Rose

□ 1458

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Jones (Beyer)	Rice (NY)
Barragan (Correa)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	(Deutch)
Bass (Correa)	Lawrence (Beatty)	Schiff (Deutch)
Bush (Bowman)	Lawson (FL)	Schrader (Correa)
Cárdenas (Correa)	(Evans)	Scott (VA)
Conway (Valadao)	Levin (MI)	(Beyer)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)	(Correa)	Scott, Austin (Cammack)
Dingell (Kuster)	McEachin (Beyer)	Stansbury (Pallone)
Fallon (Nehls)	Miller (WV) (Kim (CA))	Stevens (Kuster)
Gaetz (Cawthorn)	Moore (WI)	Tlaib (Bowman)
Higgins (NY)	(Beyer)	Upton (Katko)
(Pallone)	Newman (Beyer)	Wexton (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	Payne (Pallone)	
(Jeffries)	Pingree (Kuster)	

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES
AND PASS CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 11 of House Resolution 1339, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bills: H.R. 1468, S. 4205, H.R. 7939, H.R. 7846, H.R. 7735, H.R. 5916, H.R. 8260, and H.R. 5865.

The Clerk read the title of the bills. The text of the bills are as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION REAL
ESTATE LEASING AUTHORITY REVOCATION ACT
H.R. 1468

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Securities and Exchange Commission Real Estate Leasing Authority Revocation Act”.

SEC. 2. LEASING OF SPACE FOR SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 3304 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **LEASING OF SPACE FOR SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Securities and Exchange Commission may not lease general purpose office space. The Administrator may lease such space for the Securities and Exchange Commission under section 585 and this chapter.”.

(b) **LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) may not be construed to invalidate or otherwise affect a lease entered into by the Securities and Exchange Commission before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT LEASING AUTHORITIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the review described in subsection (b).

(b) **REVIEW.**—The Comptroller General shall complete a review under which the Comptroller General shall update the 2016 report of the Comptroller General (GAO-16-648) with a specific focus on the following:

(1) Updating the information included in Appendix II: Federal Entities That Reported Having Independent Leasing Authority for Domestic Offices and Warehouses of such report.

(2) Determining to what extent Federal entities with independent leasing authorities have had such authorities rescinded or amended and the number and amount of office and warehouse space such entities lease.

(3) Determining to what extent have agencies with independent leasing authority utilized the

General Services Administration for leasing, including utilization of delegation of authority.

(4) Identifying progress made on implementing the recommendations in such report.

PLANNING FOR ANIMAL WELLNESS ACT
S. 4205

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Planning for Animal Wellness Act” or the “PAW Act”.

SEC. 2. WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) **WORKING GROUP.**—The term “working group” means the advisory working group established under subsection (b).

(b) **WORKING GROUP.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall establish an advisory working group.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The working group shall consist of—

(1) not less than 2 representatives of State governments with experience in animal emergency management;

(2) not less than 2 representatives of local governments with experience in animal emergency management;

(3) not less than 2 representatives from academia;

(4) not less than 2 veterinary experts;

(5) not less than 2 representatives from nonprofit organizations working to address the needs of households pets and service animals in emergencies or disasters;

(6) representatives from the Federal Animal Emergency Management Working Group; and

(7) any other members determined necessary by the Administrator.

(d) **DUTIES.**—The working group shall—

(1) encourage and foster collaborative efforts among individuals and entities working to address the needs of household pets, service and assistance animals, and captive animals, as appropriate, in emergency and disaster preparedness, response, and recovery; and

(2) review best practices and Federal guidance, as of the date of enactment of this Act, on congregate and noncongregate sheltering and evacuation planning relating to the needs of household pets, service and assistance animals, and captive animals, as appropriate, in emergency and disaster preparedness, response, and recovery.

(e) **NO COMPENSATION.**—The members of the working group shall serve on the working group on a voluntary basis.

(f) **GUIDANCE DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group shall determine whether the best practices and Federal guidance described in subsection (d)(2) are sufficient.

(g) **NEW GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 540 days after the date of enactment of this Act, if the Administrator, in consultation with the working group, determines that the best practices and Federal guidance described in subsection (d)(2) are insufficient, the Administrator, in consultation with the working group, shall publish updated Federal guidance.

(h) **SUNSET.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the working group shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **EXTENSION.**—The Administrator may extend the date described in paragraph (1) if the Administrator determines an extension is appropriate.

STUDENT VETERAN EMERGENCY RELIEF ACT OF
2022

H.R. 7939

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Student Veteran Emergency Relief Act of 2022”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Educational assistance benefits during emergency situations.

Sec. 3. Extension of time limitations for use of entitlement.

Sec. 4. Extension of payment of vocational rehabilitation subsistence allowances.

Sec. 5. Payment of work-study allowances during emergency situations.

Sec. 6. Payment of allowances to veterans enrolled in educational institutions closed for emergency situations.

Sec. 7. Apprenticeship or on-job training requirements.

Sec. 8. Prohibition of charge to entitlement of students unable to pursue a program of education due to an emergency situation.

Sec. 9. Department of Veterans Affairs approval of certain study-abroad programs.

Sec. 10. Eligibility for educational assistance under Department of Veterans Affairs Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of certain individuals who receive sole survivorship discharges.

Sec. 11. Uniform application for Department of Veterans Affairs approval of courses of education.

Sec. 12. Notice requirements for Department of Veterans Affairs education surveys.

Sec. 13. Exception to requirement to submit verification of enrollment of certain individuals.

Sec. 14. Expansion of eligibility for self-employment assistance under veteran readiness and employment program.

Sec. 15. Possible definitions of certain terms relating to educational assistance.

Sec. 16. Department of Veterans Affairs loan fees.

Sec. 17. Termination of certain consumer contracts by servicemembers and dependents who enter into contracts after receiving military orders for permanent change of station but then receive stop movement orders due to an emergency situation.

Sec. 18. Residence for tax purposes.

Sec. 19. Portability of professional licenses of members of the uniformed services and their spouses.

Sec. 20. Determination of budgetary effects.

SEC. 2. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS DURING EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 36 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subchapters I and II as subchapters II and III, respectively; and

(2) by inserting before subchapter II, as so redesignated, the following new subchapter:”.

“SUBCHAPTER I—EMERGENCY
SITUATIONS**“§ 3601. Definition of emergency situation**

“In this chapter, the term ‘emergency situation’ means a situation that—