

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1745

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3843, MERGER FILING FEE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2022; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7780, MENTAL HEALTH MATTERS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 3969, PAVA PROGRAM INCLUSION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1396

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3843) to promote antitrust enforcement and protect competition through adjusting premerger filing fees, and increasing antitrust enforcement resources. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-66 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) 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. 7780) to support the behavioral needs of students and youth, invest in the school-based behavioral health workforce, and ensure access to mental health and substance use disorder benefits. 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 Education and Labor 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 Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-67 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. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered 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. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. 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. 3. During consideration of H.R. 7780, the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his 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. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 3969) to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and for other purposes. 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 House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from October 3, 2022, through November 11, 2022, the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved.

SEC. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 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. 8. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 10. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, September 30, 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 28, 2022, September 29, 2022, or September 30, 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.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), 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. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1396, providing for consideration of three measures.

First, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7780 under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and makes in order two amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3843 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a motion to recommit.

Third, the rule provides for consideration of S. 3969 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration and a motion to commit.

The rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered on September 28 to September 30. This authority lasts through September 30, 2022.

Lastly, the rule provides standard recess instructions from October 3 to November 11.

Mr. Speaker, an average of 18 young Americans took their own lives every

day in 2020. When children take their own lives, families and communities are left broken. This includes the community of Moorhead, Minnesota, which faced the devastating loss of 13-year old Horizon Middle School student Jacoby Blake to suicide just last year.

These sad stories happen all over this country in all of our districts. Mental health disorders, as a whole, are a common cause of death. It is estimated by CDC that 8 million deaths worldwide, which represents about 14.3 of total annual deaths, are attributable to mental disorders.

Even before the pandemic, the unmet mental and behavioral health needs of young people, students, and teachers, were a serious problem.

In talking with teachers in the district I represent in the East Bay of the San Francisco Bay area, it is clear that this problem has become a crisis. Teachers, administrators, and parents, often tell me that dealing with their students and their children's and their own mental and behavioral health challenges is among the most difficult things they deal with every day.

The data, unfortunately, backs up these stories. Teachers are saying, just last year, almost half of the students experienced persistent sadness or hopelessness, and nearly 20 percent seriously considered suicide.

Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Almost one in four American children have considered suicide in the last 2 years.

At the same time, 27 percent of teachers reported symptoms of depression, which is significantly higher than average adults, and those numbers have been growing.

Despite these warning signs, over 60 percent of children experiencing major depression do not receive any form of mental health treatment, and only 22 percent of teachers reported receiving emotional support from their school, their school district, or professional staff.

This is at a time when investments in the National Institute of Mental Health is discovering exponential information about how our brains work, how they cognitively develop, and the danger to trauma.

We are not getting this information out to the people who need it the most. We know that when people get treatment, they succeed. They overcome their difficulties.

As a Nation, we are underinvesting in the resources our students need, and our communities, our parents, our teachers, our administrators, to stay healthy, to succeed in school, and retain talented teachers and professionals and make sure that future Americans grow and are ready to carry on the legacy that we have inherited from former generations.

While the School Social Work Association of America recommends a ratio of 250 students per social worker, not one single State meets this recommended ratio. The national average is 2,106 of students per social worker;

2,106, as opposed to the recommended average of 250.

I am proud this week that the House is advancing my legislation, the Mental Health Matters Act, to confront this crisis head on, to give communities and parents and teachers the resources they need.

This bill was drafted with the needs of students, parents, and teachers in mind and is the product of months of careful consideration about how Congress can best respond to our Nation's mental health crisis.

This legislation before us would expand the school-based mental and behavioral health workforce, promote accessibility for students with disabilities, provide resources to address trauma in young children, and strengthen the ability of Americans with employer-sponsored insurance to access mental health and substance use disorder treatments they are statutorily entitled to.

From my discussions with mental health professionals over the years and research that has informed this legislation, it is clear that failure to address these challenges at a young age can harm performance at school and work and lead to ever worsening mental and behavioral health outcomes later in life for individuals and for our country.

□ 1800

Anxiety and reading disorders co-occur in approximately 25 percent of students. For individuals whose reading challenges persist into adulthood, there is a greater likelihood of depression, low self-esteem, and difficulty in social functioning.

To break this cycle, a provision I authored would help Head Start agencies implement evidence-based interventions to improve the health of children and staff.

While investment is needed for greater access to school-based mental health and behavioral health, individuals and families with employer-sponsored health insurance must also have robust access to treatment outside of school.

Some insurers, unfortunately, have placed arbitrary coverage limits on mental and behavioral health care, making it hard for patients to access treatment in the same way they would for physical ailments. This legislation makes great strides in the fight for mental health parity so that families can focus more on staying healthy and less on battling insurers for coverage.

Mental health and suicide prevention are deeply personal issues for me, having lost my own father to suicide almost 34 years ago. In advancing this bill, it is my hope that we can prevent many families from having to experience what mine went through several decades ago.

Also included in today's rule is the Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act. This bipartisan bill would increase the filing fee that large corporations must pay the Federal Trade Commission in order to conduct a merger.

A recent surge in merger filings has placed a strain on the FTC's resources, and updating the fee schedule will help the agency cope with its many demands.

Finally, we will also consider the PAVA Program Inclusion Act under the rule. This Senate-passed legislation would help ensure that all programs designed to help voters with disabilities can access Federal funds regardless of their location.

Unfortunately, programs designed to help individuals with disabilities vote who are Native Americans or who live in the Northern Mariana Islands are not currently able to access the Protection and Advocacy for Voting Access funds in the same manner as other Federal programs. The PAVA Program Inclusion Act will fix this injustice, and passing this bill will send it to President Biden's desk to be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great opportunity this week to make transformative investments in our Nation's future and our mental health and pass other commonsense legislation.

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

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

We are here to debate the rule providing for consideration of three bills: H.R. 7780, Mental Health Matters Act; H.R. 3843, Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act; and S. 3969, Protection and Advocacy for Voting Access, or PAVA, Program Inclusion Act.

H.R. 3843 would increase funding to the Federal Trade Commission without justification or restrictions on that funding. This is the same agency that, through its strategic plan for the next 4 years, removed a longstanding clause that states the agency will not unduly burden legitimate business activity.

In the coming term, the Supreme Court will hear a case as to whether the FTC is mission creeping beyond the bounds of its constitutional authority. The FTC, through its initiatives in antitrust enforcement, has taken an increasing liberal view of its traditional focus on protecting consumers from fraud and ensuring businesses have clear rules to follow and is instead moving toward an interpretation of reshaping the American economy through enforcement action.

In the Committee on the Judiciary, my colleagues offered amendments to put limitations on this funding.

Mr. ROY offered an amendment to prohibit appropriated funds from being used to promote critical race theory and one to require funds to be used to enforce antitrust laws as defined in the Clayton Act.

Mr. FITZGERALD offered one to prohibit funds from being used for non-enforcement activities.

Mr. BISHOP offered one to limit the scope of the bill to only apply to mergers involving large technology companies.

All of these failed on party lines, and I can't understand why, unless my colleagues on the left want to encourage the FTC to get involved in issues outside of its purview. The FTC is out of control under this administration and cannot be trusted with these additional resources.

H.R. 7780 misses the mark. Republicans are committed to addressing the mental health crisis facing young people in the country. Unfortunately, this bill is another one-size-fits-all proposal that fails to provide local leaders with the flexibility they need to address the unique problems they face. Republicans support mental health parity, but this bill will actually do the opposite. It opens insurers and employers to lawsuits when they voluntarily offer to provide mental health care benefits.

As with so many bills promoted by the majority this Congress, provisions of this bill ban arbitration clauses, class action waivers, and representation waivers, discouraging other means of settling disputes and pushing creating even more bottlenecks in our judicial system.

During markup, Republicans offered an alternative bill that streamlined existing programs, helped the needs on the ground, helped all students in need regardless of where their school is, and included important accountability metrics. I wish we were discussing that bill here today. Unfortunately, this and every other Republican amendment is effectively blocked from discussion under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I oppose the rule and ask Members to do the same.

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

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

I appreciate the comments from my friend.

Just on the mental health part, we did have hearings in the subcommittee I am proud to chair, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions. We have had ongoing discussions with both the ranking member of that subcommittee and the ranking member of the full committee, so I think this is to be continued.

I would say on the mental health part of the rule, the urgency is right now, as I outlined in my opening comments. It is something we will have to continue to work with and hopefully will in good faith because all of these issues are on mental health, particularly for young people. I have agreed in my conversations with my friends, the ranking members, Ms. FOXX and Mr. ALLEN, and I look forward to continuing that. I think there is a real urgency on that.

On the trust, I respectfully disagree. Given the level of inequality in this country right now, I think it is really important that we support competition in the marketplace, and the Federal Trade Commission needs the resources to make sure that that happens.

The PAVA bill obviously has bipartisan support.

On all of these bills, I am anxious to get them off the floor today as a rule and look forward to seeing the continued debate tomorrow on the specific bills and the outcome of those bills.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this rule and will vote "no."

I am a supporter of all three bills covered by this rule as they were originally introduced. I am even the cosponsor of Representative NEGUSE's bill to increase filing fees. However, very unfortunately, this rule advances a modified version of that bill. It tacks on provisions from Representative BUCK's antitrust enforcement venue bill, and these antitrust venue provisions are unwise public policy.

I vocally opposed them during the Committee on the Judiciary markup and have dutifully kept my leadership apprised of my opposition to them since that time.

Despite proponents trying to sell these venue provisions as non-controversial, I am far from the only Member with concerns.

Furthermore, in a highly unusual move, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts wrote to Congress outlining their serious concerns with these venue policy provisions. Opposition also comes in letters from the Progressive Policy Institute and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Proponents argue that State attorneys general are in favor. Well, I understand it was sold to them as a non-controversial provision. Of course, they would be in favor. It makes life easier for them. It doesn't address the very serious issues outlined by the Administrative Office of the Courts, and it doesn't make this good, wise policy.

So, very reluctantly, I will vote "no." I would gladly support today's rule if these venue provisions were not tacked onto the other good bills.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letters from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Progressive Policy Institute, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF  
THE UNITED STATES COURTS,  
Washington, DC, July 19, 2021.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I write regarding H.R. 3460, the "State Antitrust Enforcement Venue Act of 2021," which was ordered reported as amended by the Committee on the Judiciary on June 24, 2021. Neither the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("Panel") nor any of the relevant committees of the Judicial Conference of the United States ("Conference") have had the opportunity to analyze this bill thoroughly. Considering its potential impact on the federal Judiciary and the efficient administration of justice, I offer for your consideration the fol-

lowing initial observations. These comments are neither expressions of support for, nor opposition to the bill. Nevertheless, I hope they are helpful and note that pending a more in-depth analysis, by both the Panel and the relevant Conference committees, additional comments may be submitted.

#### BACKGROUND

Section 1407 was enacted in 1968, in the wake of a large multidistrict antitrust litigation involving alleged conspiracies to divide businesses and fix prices in multiple product lines of electrical equipment. That litigation encompassed more than a thousand actions in numerous federal judicial districts brought, in large part, by public utilities against virtually every manufacturer of electrical equipment. The sudden influx of civil antitrust actions led to the creation of ad hoc procedures to coordinate the litigation before a smaller number of judges to eliminate duplicative discovery and pretrial proceedings.

Section 1407 was intended to serve as a permanent solution to the problem that large multidistrict litigations pose to the federal Judiciary's ability to administer its civil docket efficiently and justly. The statute created a panel of seven circuit and district judges, no two of whom shall be from the same circuit, which is authorized to transfer civil actions involving one or more common questions of fact and pending in different districts to a single district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings. See 28 U.S.C. §1407(a). To distinguish from other forms of transfer and consolidation, transfer for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings under Section 1407 is referred to as "centralization." The Panel may transfer actions for centralized pretrial proceedings only if it determines that transfer will be for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions. Id. Civil actions transferred to multidistrict litigation (MDL) proceedings are remanded by the Panel at the conclusion of pretrial proceedings to their transferor districts (i.e., trial is conducted in the district of original filing), unless the actions were terminated during the course of pretrial proceedings. Id.

Over the past fifty years, MDLs have encompassed a wide variety of civil litigation in the federal courts, but antitrust litigations have always constituted a core category of cases subject to centralization. Section 1407 contains one exception with respect to antitrust MDLs—enforcement actions by the United States arising under the federal antitrust laws are not subject to transfer under Section 1407. See 28 U.S.C. §1407(g). Congress has amended Section 1407 only once. As part of the Hart Scott Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, Congress added subsection (h), which authorizes the Panel to consolidate and transfer any action brought under 15 U.S.C. §15c (i.e., State *parens patriae* actions) for both pretrial purposes and trial. See 28 U.S.C. §1407(h).

#### CONCERNS

H.R. 3460 would amend 28 U.S.C. §1407 to limit the Panel's ability to centralize civil actions brought by States under the antitrust laws of the United States and delete the subsection added by the Hart Scott Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976. Congress to date has never amended Section 1407 to restrict the Panel's ability to centralize civil actions. Doing so in this instance raises several concerns that merit Congress's consideration.

H.R. 3460 May Negatively Impact the Efficiency and Conduct of Antitrust MDLs

Restricting the Panel's ability to centralize State antitrust actions could negatively impact the efficiency and conduct of

antitrust MDLs. When the Panel centralizes actions under Section 1407, it considers whether centralization will enhance convenience and efficiency with respect to the parties, witnesses, and the federal Judiciary as a whole—the Panel does not limit its consideration to the impact on any one party in isolation. In general, MDL litigation is most efficient when all related actions are centralized before a single judge. Doing so minimizes the potential for duplicative discovery and motion practice, eliminates the potential for inconsistent pretrial schedules or rulings, and conserves the resources of the parties, counsel, and the Judiciary. To the extent there are actions with different legal issues or concerns, the MDL judge can formulate a pretrial program that allows pretrial proceedings with respect to any non-common issues to proceed concurrently with pretrial proceedings on common issues (for example, by creating a separate discovery or motion track for certain actions). This ensures that pretrial proceedings will be conducted in a streamlined manner leading to a just and expeditious resolution of all actions to the overall benefit of the parties.

Excepting State antitrust actions from centralization can only increase the number of actions (and, hence, the number of independent parties and courts) outside the ambit of the MDL. Related actions that cannot be centralized can introduce case management difficulties into the MDL. Parties and courts in actions pending outside the MDL may (either actively or inadvertently) undermine attempts to coordinate and streamline discovery and pretrial practice in the litigation. For instance, such actions may be subject to different pretrial schedules, parties and witnesses might be subject to duplicative discovery, and the courts might issue inconsistent pretrial rulings pertaining to the same parties. It also is possible that substantively inconsistent rulings could issue—such as with respect to market definition or which standard of review (per se or rule of reason) applies to a given case. Given the nationwide scope of these antitrust litigations, such inconsistent rulings may complicate proceedings and sow confusion not only among the courts and parties, but also in the marketplace.

#### H.R. 3460 May Result in Inefficient Judicial Administration of Antitrust Litigation

Apart from the general impact on efficiency caused by increasing the number of actions that cannot be centralized, there could be particular inefficiencies created by excepting State antitrust actions from centralization. States are, in many ways, similar to private antitrust plaintiffs. For instance, States may sue because they have suffered a direct antitrust injury (e.g., if the State directly purchased a product subject to an alleged price fixing conspiracy). Along with their claims under the federal antitrust laws, States may also include claims brought under state antitrust law for “indirect” antitrust damages not permitted under federal antitrust law. Both types of claims are substantially similar to those presented by private plaintiffs asserting antitrust injury as direct or indirect purchasers. As such, these type of State antitrust claims will present factual and legal issues that are similar or identical to those presented by the claims of the private plaintiffs. These common claims generally will be most efficiently litigated in a centralized proceeding. Notably, similar claims by the United States for civil damages due to injury to the government itself are not excluded from centralization under Section 1407. See 28 U.S.C. §1407(g) (stating that the exemption for claims brought by the United States as a complainant under the antitrust laws “shall not include section

4A of the Act of October 15, 1914, as added July 7, 1955 (69 Stat. 282; 15 U.S.C. 15a)).

In addition, States may bring federal antitrust claims on behalf of their citizens who have suffered harm due to the alleged anti-competitive conduct (parens patriae actions). Those citizens may be class members in private antitrust actions. Indeed, Section 4C of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. §15c, imposes on State parens patriae actions notice and opt out requirements akin to those for private class actions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Courts also are statutorily obligated to exclude from any award in a parens patriae action any amounts that duplicate awards in private actions. See 15 U.S.C. §15c(a)(1). A single MDL judge usually will be best positioned to coordinate state and private litigations.

#### H.R. 3460 Could Adversely Affect the Interest of States

Excluding State antitrust actions from MDL proceedings could adversely affect the interests of the States. While States might gain greater autonomy with respect to their individual actions, they would lose much of their ability to participate in and influence the centralized proceedings. Collaboration between private plaintiffs and State Attorneys General also may be reduced, particularly if the States retain outside counsel to prosecute their antitrust claims. Such counsel may have attorneys’ fees or other incentives inconsistent with close coordination with the MDL. This could result (absent coordination between the different courts) in competing pretrial schedules and inconsistent orders that complicate the management and adjudication of both the State antitrust action and the MDL.

#### H.R. 3460 Could Undermine the Panel’s Efforts to Enhance Coordination with Federal Antitrust Litigation

Excluding State antitrust actions from centralization could undermine the Panel’s efforts to facilitate coordination and cooperation between private antitrust litigation and antitrust actions brought by the United States. Where there is a federal enforcement action or investigation that cannot be included in a given antitrust MDL, the Panel often will centralize the MDL in the court where the federal antitrust action or grand jury proceedings are pending to facilitate any appropriate and necessary coordination with the private actions. By multiplying the number of actions excluded from centralization under Section 1407, the proposed legislation might eliminate this alternative means of facilitating coordination with respect to litigations involving both federal and state antitrust actions.

#### CONCLUSION

Thank you for considering these comments. We request that the Committees of the Judicial Conference and the Panel have the opportunity to conduct more in-depth analysis of the legislation before any further consideration by Congress.

Sincerely,

ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF,  
Director.

PROGRESSIVE POLICY INSTITUTE (PPI)  
September 26, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.  
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCARTHY,  
AND LEADER HOYER: State enforcement of

antitrust law plays a key role in protecting consumer welfare in the face of corporate monopolies. However, the national nature of our economy means that, in many cases, consumers across state lines are buying the same products and services. H.R. 3460, the State Antitrust Enforcement Venue Act, retreats from the national nature of many markets by attempting to refocus antitrust law on a state-by-state basis. It makes this shift by preventing venue transfers for antitrust cases brought by state attorneys general in favor of a system where states can bring antitrust claims against companies with more control over the venue in which these cases are carried out. A major change such as this will have unforeseen consequences in a variety of antitrust situations. It is for this and the following reasons we urge you to oppose H.R. 3460, which is incorporated in the House Rules Committee notice hearing for the modified version of H.R. 3843, the Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act.

A July 2021 letter from the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts explains the ways in which the bill would reduce efficiency in the American judicial system. It highlights that currently under 28 U.S. Code §1407 similar civil cases in different districts are consolidated by the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation, which then transfers the case to a single district. This can be requested by the defendant and the intent is to minimize duplicative processes and prevent inconsistent rulings.

By discarding this means for centralization through the passage of H.R. 3460, the processes through which states approach antitrust cases is fundamentally changed. As is pointed out by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, efficiency is compromised, as courts will need to separately engage in similar discovery and pretrial proceedings in different venues, even in cases where it would conserve the time of the court and taxpayer money to carry out in a single district.

Additional concerns lie in the potential for politically motivated judicial consequences associated with the bill. The bill’s elimination of the consolidation process for antitrust cases brought under 15 U.S.C. §15c will give rise to a reality where different states could simultaneously pursue their own separate antitrust actions against the same companies across various federal courts. As such, state attorneys generals may harass companies that are politically unpopular in a particular state or region.

Creating a fragmented and inefficient antitrust system is not the optimal remedy for potential corporate antitrust violations. We urge you to oppose H.R. 3460, the State Antitrust Enforcement Venue Act, and avoid the unintended consequences that may come with it.

Sincerely,

Progressive Policy Institute (PPI), Center for New Liberalism (CNL), Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), Blackstone Valley Chamber of Commerce, South Shore Chamber of Commerce, Council Bluffs Chamber of Commerce, Lawsuit Reform Alliance of New York, Florida State Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, September 27, 2022.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly opposes in its current form H.R. 3843, the “Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act of 2022,” because it would stymie legitimate business transactions across sectors and industries, create needless new bureaucracy, and spur unwarranted litigation. The

Chamber will consider including votes related to this legislation in our "How They Voted" scorecard.

The egregious provisions of the bill include:

**Venue.** While no longer retroactive as it was in previous drafts of the bill, the Multi District Litigation (MDL) provisions could force firms into simultaneously defending against private litigants, the federal government, and various states in dozens of different courtrooms around the country. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts indicates that such legislation could harm MDL participants more generally by harming judicial efficiency and administration and hamper coordination of state and federal enforcement actions with MDLs. Moreover, these problems would be compounded when states employ private, outside contingency fee attorneys to maximize profits through litigation, rather than to protect consumers or competition.

**Transparency and Fees.** Only a handful of the thousands of mergers filed each year present potential competition concerns. Yet, the agencies have refused to meet the statutory deadlines for process and accountability under the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act. Rather, regulators issue notice letters to firms that essentially dare companies to close mergers at the risk of future action. It is unacceptable to engage in abusive procedural gimmicks. Congress should not raise merger fees while the agencies are currently engaging in process violations.

**Foreign Subsidy Notification Provision.** Despite efforts to improve the subsidy notification provisions, they remain un-administrable. The legislation provides no clear definition as to what constitutes a subsidy, there is no definition as to what qualifies as a "country of concern," and the disclosure of subsidies has zero bearing on merger review and the merger standard under the law. Subsidies involved in how a deal is financed are not a concern under the antitrust laws, and concerns tied to subsidies the merging parties have received will not result in the government successfully blocking the merger as a remedy to predatory pricing concerns.

The Chamber urges you to oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

EVAN JENKINS,  
Senior Vice President,  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I always say that I respect and admire my friend from the San Francisco Bay Area. Sometimes, we disagree.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, Big Tech is crushing competition and crushing conservative speech. H.R. 3843 contains three important measures that will help America with Big Tech.

The first gives State attorneys general the ability to file their lawsuits and keep those lawsuits in their States. The 48 State attorneys general have asked Congress to move this bill forward. It received broad bipartisan support in the Committee on the Judiciary.

The second is a bill that Senator HAWLEY and our colleague, Congressman FITZGERALD, have supported. It basically prohibits China from buying small high-tech companies so that they can steal our innovation.

The third bill that is combined with H.R. 3843 raises filing fees. Make no mistake, there are controls on these filing fees. They have to be appropriated for the FTC by the Appropriations Committee. That is a control. The Appropriations Committee, I hope, will be under Republican control in the next Congress, and it will be controlled so that nobody in the FTC is using these funds in an inappropriate way, other than reviewing the mergers at issue.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Senator CRUZ has said it absolutely correctly: The greatest threat to democracy in this country is Big Tech.

Senator LEE, Senator COTTON, and Senator GRASSLEY support the House version of this bill because it is a conservative bill, a bipartisan bill, and a bill that will help America deal with Big Tech. I hope my colleagues will support H.R. 3843.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the names and correspondence of several organizations I will mention just briefly. These are 40 different organizations that have written to Congress in support of H.R. 3843, the Merger Filing Fee Modernization Act.

Amongst them are Accountable Tech, American Trust Institute, American Family Voices, Artist Rights Alliance, Center for Democracy and Technology, Center for Digital Democracy, Common Sense Media, Consumer Action, Consumer Reports, Free Press Action, Open Markets Institute, Our Revolution, the Service Employees International Union, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the Writers Guild of America West, amongst others. We have covered a broad group here.

These organizations include:

Accountable Tech, American Antitrust Institute, American Economic Liberties Project, American Family Voices, Artist Rights Alliance, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO, Athena, Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment, Center for Democracy & Technology, Center for Digital Democracy, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Common Sense Media, Consumer Action.

Consumer Reports, Demand Progress, Demos, Economic Security Project Action, Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), Farm Action Fund, Fight for the Future, Free Press Action, Future of Music Coalition, Institute for Local Self-Reliance, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, National Grocers Association, New York Communities for Change.

Open Markets Institute, Our Revolution, P Street/Progressive Change Campaign Committee, People's Parity Project, Public Citizen, Public Knowledge, Revolving Door Project, Service Employees International Union, The Democratic Coalition, The Tech Oversight Project, UltraViolet Action, Writers Guild of America West (WGAW).

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will offer an amendment to the rule allowing for the immediate consideration of H.R. 6184, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, over 100,000 people died from fentanyl overdoses in a 1-year span, according to the CDC. That is a 30 percent increase from the year before.

Fentanyl is now the number one cause of death for Americans ages 18 to 45. I think we can all agree that something must be done to put a stop to this heartbreaking epidemic.

□ 1815

Fentanyl has been temporarily classified as a schedule I substance. This classification strengthens law enforcement's ability to prosecute fentanyl traffickers, and DEA reports that it has acted as an effective deterrent.

The HALT Fentanyl Act would make the schedule I classification permanent and would also promote research by removing regulations and streamlining the research process. We should do everything we possibly can to put an end to the devastation caused by fentanyl in this country, and the HALT Fentanyl Act is one piece of the puzzle that could make a real difference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) to speak further on the amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider my bill, H.R. 6184, the Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act.

Every Member of this body knows someone who has been affected by the drug overdose epidemic plaguing our country.

Recent provisional data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention indicates that during 2021 there were more than 107,000 overdose deaths that occurred in the United States, an increase of nearly 15 percent from the previous year.

These record numbers are due in large part to the increasing presence of fentanyl and fentanyl analogues, which are approximately 100 times more potent than morphine and 50 times more potent than heroin.

Because fentanyl has a proven medical use, it is considered a schedule II narcotic. But illicit derivatives of fentanyl, also called fentanyl analogues or fentanyl-related substances, do not often demonstrate a medical value. Right now they are considered schedule I substances, but only because of a temporary scheduling order which expires on December 31.

My bill aims to curb overdose deaths by permanently scheduling fentanyl analogues as schedule I substances. This will strengthen law enforcement's ability to prosecute fentanyl traffickers and act as a deterrent.

The HALT Fentanyl Act also promotes research by removing barriers to that research. In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we heard there are as many as 4,800 analogues. Our experts at the NIH, the FDA, and other agencies have studied roughly 30 of these 4,800 analogues.

By encouraging research of schedule I substances like fentanyl analogues, we can better understand how these substances work and how we can prevent potentially harmful impacts in the future.

The problem is that if this law expires and doesn't become permanent, those 4,800 analogues are arguably legal—I would submit they are legal—and we have to pass a law on each one of them. The HALT Fentanyl Act makes it so we don't have to do that.

Should we discover that one of those 4,800 or maybe two have a legitimate medical purpose, then we can come back in and consider that, but it is a whole lot easier to figure out what we have already done research on when we have done research on 30 of 4,800 analogues than it is to say, wait a minute, we are going to make all of these legal, and then figure out which ones of them are the most dangerous to the American public. I would submit they are all dangerous and that Congress must pass the HALT Fentanyl Act now.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on and urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately take up H.R. 6184, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis on our southern border greater than we have ever seen due to the policies put in place by the Biden administration. Almost 2½ million migrants have crossed our southern border in fiscal year 2022. In 2021 alone, border officials encountered nearly 2 million illegal immigrants and seized over 11,000 pounds of fentanyl. This is a public health crisis that demands immediate attention.

H.R. 6184, the HALT Fentanyl Act, places fentanyl-related analogues into schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act and establishes a new registration process for schedule I research funding by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The move to permanently schedule fentanyl as schedule I is a necessary tool for the Drug Enforcement Administration to work with other agencies and law enforcement officials to address the threat of illicit fentanyl.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, fentanyl is now the number one cause of death for Americans 18 to 45, surpassing suicide, COVID-19, and car accidents.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard stories about how drug dealers are using social media and apps, like Snapchat,

to infiltrate chats with teens or young kids and sell them these illicit drugs. We have no idea what they are selling and whether or not the drug is laced with fentanyl.

Two Congresses ago, the Energy and Commerce Committee worked hard on the SUPPORT Act to deal with what at the time was called an opiate crisis, but we have moved on from that, and now we have a fentanyl crisis.

This is a different disease. It demands attention at the southern border, it demands attention to the analogues being shipped to Mexico from China, and it demands that our Drug Enforcement Administration have the tools it needs to interrupt this deadly epidemic of drug overdose deaths. One death is too many, and we need to equip our communities to address this issue from the source.

If it has changed so much in 4 years, imagine what it will look like in 10 years if nothing is done now. I urge Members to defeat the previous question so we can immediately take up this important bill.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6184, the HALT Fentanyl Act, and stop the deadly flow of fentanyl into our communities.

The failure of the Biden administration to control the southern border has resulted in record levels of deadly synthetic drugs, like fentanyl, pouring directly into American communities. So far this fiscal year, over 10,000 pounds of fentanyl have been seized at the southern border, with even more slipping through into our country. That is enough fentanyl to kill every American eight times over.

There is little doubt that the surge of drug seizures at our border is closely connected to the surge of drug overdose deaths in the United States. In fact, every 7½ minutes, someone in the United States dies from fentanyl poisoning. Every 7½ minutes. There is an opportunity here for us to work together to help stem the flow of deadly fentanyl and its analogues into our country.

In my home State of Georgia, fentanyl overdose deaths in teens are up 800 percent. 800 percent. Tragic overdoses like this are happening every day all over the country.

Even the CDC reports that fentanyl is now the leading cause of death in the U.S. for adults ages 18 to 45. How can anyone seriously argue that a drug 50 times more potent than heroin that almost always proves to be fatal when ingested should ever be legal?

Despite this crisis, the President did not request a single additional penny for the border crisis or the fentanyl crisis in the funding request for the CR. That is despicable.

Again, these products are manufactured illegally and are largely brought to the United States through the southern border. To save lives, we must secure the border and halt the flow of fentanyl.

I have visited the border several times to see this crisis firsthand. Unfortunately, our President has never visited our southern border. Never been there. Not even once.

With a record-high number of illegal immigrants, smugglers and cartels are using this as an opportunity to traffic more fentanyl substances.

Unfortunately, President Biden and his administration have elected to leave our border wide open, inviting drug traffickers to bring fentanyl substances into the country and distribute it in our streets.

This should not be a partisan issue. Fentanyl does not discriminate. It doesn't care if you are a Republican or a Democrat.

The individuals manufacturing and distributing fentanyl and its analogues are criminal, and they are killing us. This is not an issue that is going away. It is only getting worse every day.

If the President would visit the border, he would be able to talk to the agents firsthand and see for himself just how serious the issue is. Our communities are at risk, and our loved ones are dying. President Biden has ignored this public health crisis for far too long.

It is past time to make this scheduling classification permanent, and I am proud to support the HALT Fentanyl Act to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill, secure the border, stem the tide of the growing fentanyl crisis, and save lives.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD The Washington Post article titled: "U.S. arrests along Mexico border top 2 million a year for first time."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 2022]

U.S. ARRESTS ALONG MEXICO BORDER TOP 2 MILLION A YEAR FOR FIRST TIME

(By Nick Miroff)

U.S. authorities made more than 2 million immigration arrests along the southern border during the past 11 months, marking the first time annual enforcement statistics have exceeded that threshold, according to figures provided by senior Biden administration officials Monday.

In August, U.S. Customs and Border Protection detained 203,598 migrants crossing from Mexico, the latest figures show, putting authorities on pace to tally more than 2.3 million arrests during the government's 2022 fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30. The total, which includes some people apprehended more than once, far exceeds last year's record of more than 1.7 million arrests.

The historic migration wave this year has been driven by soaring numbers of border-crossers from outside Mexico and Central America, the two largest traditional sources of illegal entries. Migrants from Venezuela, Nicaragua and Cuba accounted for more than one-third of those taken into custody along the southern border last month, according to Customs and Border Protection, a 175 percent increase over August 2021.



Biden administration officials blamed the governments of those countries, whose strained relations with Washington severely limit the ability of authorities to send them deportees. Many of the migrants apply for humanitarian protection in the United States and tend to have strong asylum claims.

"Failing communist regimes in Venezuela, Nicaragua, and Cuba are driving a new wave of migration across the Western Hemisphere, including the recent increase in encounters at the southwest U.S. border," Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Chris Magnus, said in a statement. "Those fleeing repressive regimes pose significant challenges for processing and removal," he said, using the official term for deportations.

Biden administration officials continue to insist they are building a "safe, orderly and humane" immigration system while blaming the Trump administration for "dismantling" channels for legal migration.

Critics say Biden administration officials have fallen far short of meeting their refugee admission goals, and the number of migrants who have died this year attempting to cross into the United States is at an all-time high. Scores have drowned in the Rio Grande in recent months, and 53 were killed in June when smugglers in Texas packed migrants into a sweltering tractor trailer with a failing cooling system.

Republican lawmakers blame the record number of crossings on President Biden's reversal of Trump administration border policies. Over the past several months, the Republican governors of Texas and Arizona have sent more than 10,000 migrants on buses to Washington, New York and other northern destinations to put pressure on Democrats by straining relief services in their jurisdictions.

Last week, Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis (R) shipped a planeload of Venezuelans to Martha's Vineyard in Massachusetts, transporting them to a wealthy island enclave with limited services for migrants.

Biden administration officials also say the high border numbers are distorted by repeat crossing attempts by migrants who have been previously arrested. Last month, 22 percent of those taken into custody had a prior arrest in the previous 12 months, the latest figures show.

One factor Biden administration officials blame for the repeat crossings is the Title 42 emergency public health policy, implemented at the start of the pandemic, that allows U.S. agents to rapidly "expel" some migrants back to Mexico. The Biden administration's attempt to phase out Title 42 was blocked in federal court last spring.

The latest figures show the percentage of border-crossers expelled under Title 42 has been falling and remains far lower under Biden than President Donald Trump. About 36 percent of the 203,598 migrant "encounters" resulted in an expulsion last month, down from 83 percent when Biden took office.

Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.), said Monday that the strain on Democratic-run cities will force the administration to see the border surge as a crisis. "Maybe, just maybe, they'll see that what's happening along our border every day is dangerous, unsustainable, and a problem that we need to work on together to address," he said.

Biden officials defending the administration's border record pointed to a decline in the number of Mexican and Central American migrants arrested over the past three months as a sign their enforcement policies are having some success, including efforts to target smuggling organizations in Latin America.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, the numbers don't lie. If the annual num-

ber of apprehensions at the border is set to break records, that means fewer migrants are making it into the country. The notion that Biden is doing nothing is just absolutely not true.

Just secondarily, my good friend and co-chair of the Cancer Survivors Caucus from Georgia, we have a wonderful relationship. On this I agree, but I disagree on the process. As somebody who has spent a lot of time on opioid abuse, and we know that in our experience with people like myself who survived cancer, particularly more painful ones, that is a product when used properly that can bring relief to people, but we know about the abuse. As you said, a lot of that led to fentanyl.

We are against illegal drugs hurting Americans. We want to support effective remedies to that. I would say that one of the most effective things we can do—having had a long experience personally and professionally in behavioral health—is to invest in the kind of bill we have in front of us—with all due respect, with my name on it—to get upstream, so we make sure that people have the resources, evidence-based resources. So it is not as subjective to get the services they need to protect themselves in an, unfortunately, far-too-free market when it comes to the abuse of both legal and illegal drugs.

With all due respect, again, I am happy to work with the gentleman, but I really think, from my perspective, it is an argument to engage in the investment in behavioral health and mental health services. I will still work with the gentleman to make sure people aren't bringing these awful products across our border.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6184, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

Before I begin, I have to address something that was said just now. I am the wife of a first responder. My husband sees these overdoses every single day.

In my community, in just this year, we have apprehended bricks of fentanyl stamped with border cartels' stamps on them. We know it is coming from the border. We know it is being trafficked across, both in trucks at ports of entry but also illegally. We know this to be a fact, and if we do not secure the border this will continue to happen.

I will say, as the wife of a first responder, someone whose husband has continually responded to these calls and is reviving people who have been poisoned by fentanyl, it is not a matter of if he, himself, overdoses, it is when. And that is going to be a very bad day because I think that Members of this Chamber need to be held responsible for the open border policies that this administration continues to allow. But I digress.

Mr. Speaker, 108,000. That is the number of Americans who died from

drug overdoses last year. Of those, more than 80,000 were connected to opioids. The lion's share of those opioid deaths were linked to fentanyl.

Now, it is important that we remember that these numbers are actually people. They are mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, daughters, aunts, uncles. They are people. Not statistics. They are humans. They represent millions of families who will never see their son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father ever again. Millions of people whose families have been shattered and feel helpless, broken, and angry as these horrific substances destroyed their communities and their family.

These thousands of victims represent communities crushed by this epidemic, swept away by the flood of lethal substances that are ripping apart the fabric of our society. These thousands of people lost lay bare the denial, the weakness, and the lack of compassion that this administration and my colleagues across the aisle have shown through their ambivalence toward border security, our Nation's security, as literally tons of fentanyl is trucked and walked across the southern border and into our communities.

A few months ago, a mother from my district cried in my office as she talked about her beautiful daughter, Mackenzie, who died from fentanyl poisoning, not overdosing, poisoning, after taking what she thought was a Xanax. She was 28 years old.

Now, unfortunately, Mackenzie's story is not unique. It is not rare. Her mother, Rebecca, is now dedicating her life to saving mothers across the country from the pain that she has endured from a preventable loss and their daughters from Mackenzie's fate.

□ 1830

To my colleagues on the left, you control this Chamber, so it is up to you to decide. How many more Mackenzies have to die before you will take action?

You can pretend that there is no crisis at the border. We see that. That is evidenced in your remarks. But we know that is a lie. You visit any community in this country, and you will see that it has been ravaged by the death and destruction wrought by fentanyl. You cannot deny it. Your constituents know it. The American people know it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for our colleagues across the aisle to wake up. So I stand here once again, as I did back in March, fighting against the horrors of the opioid epidemic that have a stranglehold on our communities. We once again have an opportunity to take a stand today, not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans and concerned citizens, for those that have lost their lives, but also for those potentially in the future. The families of those who lost deserve this.

Today is an opportunity to act. Today is an opportunity to put people above politics. I commend my friend,

the gentleman from Virginia, for his great work and for sticking with this bill and seeing it across the finish line.

I urge my colleagues, please, think with your hearts, perhaps in vain but with hope, to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately consider this bill, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. McCOLLUM). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would say in brief response that I have great respect, obviously, for our emergency responders. I appreciate what the gentlewoman's husband does for a living and what they have to go through. We all agree that we have to support thoughtful oversight to stop these drugs from getting into the hands of people who it can do great damage.

I have been to the border multiple times, both as a Member of Congress and as a member of the California State Legislature. We have a problem, and it has been a problem through Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, both in State houses in the border States and here in Washington, D.C.

We are not for open borders. We want to stop people being harmed by illicit drugs. So the idea that we are not, I would respectfully say that is not accurate.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, while I want to be in favor of these bills, Republicans are in agreement that the underlying problems these bills seek to solve are valid and warrant our attention. There are serious flaws with these bills as written that must be considered first. H.R. 7780 is a one-size-fits-all strategy that will not help the people on the ground. What a school in Minneapolis needs is not likely what a school in my rural district needs. Furthermore, it pushes people in the courts to settle disputes and discourages other methods of resolution.

H.R. 3843 trusts the FTC with no-strings-attached funding, even though the FTC is becoming increasingly partisan and cannot be trusted with more resources.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I encourage other Members to do the same.

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

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

I will read a few numbers, particularly on the part of the rule that is the Mental Health Matters Act, which I am proud to be the author of with Chairman SCOTT.

Suicide is the second leading cause of death for ages of Americans 10 to 24; second for 12 to 18.

For adolescents, depression, substance abuse, and suicide are extremely

important concerns—an epidemic, I would say—among adolescents age 12 to 17.

In 2018 to 2019, 15.1 percent of young Americans had major depressive episodes; 36.7 had persistent feelings of sadness and hopelessness; 4.1 had a substance abuse disorder; 18 percent seriously considered attempting suicide; 16 percent made a suicide plan; and 10 percent attempted suicide.

Madam Speaker, 10 percent of America's young people have attempted suicide; 2.5 percent made suicide attempts requiring medical treatment.

For all those reasons, the part of the rule that is the Mental Health Matters Act is extremely important to this country. Is it perfect? Of course not, from every perspective of 535 Members of Congress and 435 Members of the House. But the need is too urgent, in my view, to wait. That is why it is so important that not just this rule passes but the bill is passed.

We need to put resources in the FTC with the most income inequality and consolidation of wealth through mergers. Not always in our best interest. It is important that the FTC has the resources it needs to actually enforce the statutes as they currently have.

Madam Speaker, we need to help Americans, and specifically teachers and students, get back to doing what they do best, teaching and learning.

The legislation before us on the rule will help provide the resources to improve mental health outcomes and educational attainment.

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

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1396

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 11. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6184) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6184.

Mr. DESAULNIER. 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 on the resolution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3482.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Amodei	Arrington
Allen	Armstrong	Babin



Bacon	Gohmert	Miller-Meeks	Fletcher	LaHood	Salazar (Waltz)	Ruppersberger	Slotkin	Trahan
Baird	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar	(Pallone)	(Wenstrup)	Sherman	Rush	Smith (WA)	Trone
Balderson	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney	Gimenez	Lawson (FL)	(Garamendi)	Ryan (NY)	Soto	Underwood
Banks	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)	(Malliotakis)	(Evans)	Soto	Ryan (OH)	Spanberger	Vargas
Barr	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)	Gonzalez,	Maloney, Sean	(Wasserman	Sánchez	Speier	Veasey
Bentz	Gosar	Mullin	Vicente	(Jeffries)	Schultz)	Sarbanes	Stansbury	Velázquez
Bergman	Granger	Murphy (NC)	(Garcia (TX))	Mast (Waltz)	Speier (Garcia	Scanlon	Stanton	Wasserman
Bice (OK)	Graves (LA)	Nehls	Gosar (Weber	Mfume (Evans)	(TX))	Schakowsky	Stevens	Schultz
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Newhouse	(TX))	Murphy (FL)	Steel (Oberholte)	Schiff	Strickland	Waters
Bilirakis	Green (TN)	Norman	Herrera Beutler	(Peters)	Steube	Schneider	Suozi	Watson Coleman
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Obernolte	(Valadao)	Newman (Beyer)	(Reschenthaler)	Schrader	Takano	Welch
Boebert	Griffith	Owens	Jacobs (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	(Gomez)	Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Wexton
Bost	Grothman	Palazzo	(Garamendi)	(Neguse)	Swalwell	Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Wild
Brady	Guest	Palmer	Jacobs (NY)	Palazzo	(Gomez)	Scott, David	Titus	Williams (GA)
Brooks	Guthrie	Pence	(Sempolinski)	(Fleischmann)	Titus (Pallone)	Sewell	Tlaib	Wilson (FL)
Buchanan	Harris	Perry	Jayapal	Pfluger (Ellzey)	Torres (NY)	Sherman	Tonko	Yarmuth
Buck	Harshbarger	Pfuger	(Cicilline)	Porter (Neguse)	(Correa)	Sherrill	Torres (CA)	
Bucshon	Hartzler	Posey	Johnson (TX)	Rice (NY)	Upton (Meijer)	Sires	Torres (NY)	
Budd	Hern	Reschenthaler	(Stevens)	(Morelle)	Vargas			
Burchett	Herrell	Rice (SC)	Khanna (Garcia	Rice (SC)	(Garamendi)			
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)	(TX))	(Meijer)	Wagner (Barr)			
Calvert	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)			
Cammack	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)	(Pallone)	(Dean)	(Cicilline)			
Carey	Hill	Rose						
Carl	Hinson	Rosendale						
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Rouzer						
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Roy						
Cawthorn	Huizenga	Rutherford						
Chabot	Issa	Salazar						
Cheney	Jackson	Scalise						
Cline	Jacobs (NY)	Schweikert						
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin						
Clyde	Johnson (OH)	Sempolinski						
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Sessions						
Comer	Jordan	Simpson						
Conway	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)						
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)						
Crenshaw	Katko	Smith (NJ)						
Curtis	Keller	Smucker						
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Spartz						
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Stauber						
DesJarlais	Kim (CA)	Steel						
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Stefanik						
Duncan	LaHood	Steil						
Dunn	LaMalfa	Steube						
Ellzey	Lamborn	Stewart						
Emmer	Latta	Taylor						
Estes	LaTurner	Tenney						
Fallon	Lesko	Thompson (PA)						
Feenstra	Letlow	Tiffany						
Ferguson	Long	Timmons						
Finstad	Loudermilk	Turner						
Fischbach	Luetkemeyer	Upton						
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Van Drew						
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Van Dyne						
Fleischmann	Massie	Wagner						
Flood	Mast	Walberg						
Flores	McCarthy	Waltz						
Foxx	McCaul	Weber (TX)						
Franklin, C.	McClain	Webster (FL)						
Scott	McClintock	Wenstrup						
Fulcher	McHenry	Westerman						
Gaetz	McKinley	Williams (TX)						
Gallagher	Meijer	Wilson (SC)						
Garbarino	Meuser	Wittman						
Garcia (CA)	Miller (IL)	Womack						
Gibbs	Miller (WV)							
Gimenez								

## NOT VOTING—4

Donalds Mace  
Kinzinger Zeldin

□ 1911

Mr. McHENRY, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. KATKO changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, Metal Detectors stopped me. Had I been present, I would have voted “NAY” on rollcall No. 455.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bacon (Stauber)	Carter (TX)	DeFazio
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	(Weber (TX))	(Pallone)
Bowman (Tlaib)	Cawthorn (Nehls)	Demings (Dean)
Brown (MD)	Chu (Beyer)	Deutch
(Trone)	Conway (Wasserman)	(Schultz)
Buchanan	(LaMalfa)	Diaz-Balart
(Bucshon)	Curtis (Moore (UT))	(Reschenthaler)
		Dunn (Cammack)

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.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam 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 217, nays 212, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

## YEAS—217

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

## NAYS—212

Aderholt	Gallagher	Meijer
Allen	Garbarino	Meuser
Amodei	Garcia (CA)	Miller (IL)
Armstrong	Gibbs	Miller (WV)
Arrington	Gimenez	Miller-Meeks
Babin	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Bacon	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Baird	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Balderson	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Barr	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Bentz	Granger	Nehls
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Bice (OK)	Graves (MO)	Norman
Biggs	Green (TN)	Obernolte
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Owens
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Palazzo
Boebert	Grothman	Palmer
Bost	Guest	Pence
Brady	Guthrie	Perry
Brooks	Harris	Pfuger
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Posey
Buck	Hartzler	Reschenthaler
Bucshon	Hern	Rice (SC)
Budd	Herrell	Rodgers (WA)
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Cammack	Hill	Rosendale
Carey	Hinson	Rouzer
Carl	Hollingsworth	Roy
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rutherford
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Salazar
Cawthorn	Issa	Scalise
Chabot	Jackson	Schweikert
Cheney	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)
Correa	Katko	Smucker
Crawford	Keller	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Steel
Davidson	Kim (CA)	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff	Steil
DesJarlais	LaHood	Steube
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Stewart
Donalds	Lamborn	Taylor
Duncan	Latta	Tenney
Dunn	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	Lesko	Tiffany
Emmer	Letlow	Timmons
Estes	Lofgren	Turner
Fallon	Long	Upton
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Valadao
Ferguson	Lucas	Van Drew
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Van Dyne
Fischbach	Mace	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Waltz
Fleischmann	Massie	Weber (TX)
Flood	Mast	Webster (FL)
Flores	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Foxx	McCaul	Westerman
Franklin, C.	McClain	Williams (TX)
Scott	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	McHenry	Wittman
Gaetz	McKinley	Womack

## NOT VOTING—3

Kinzinger Swalwell Zeldin

□ 1925

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

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

Bacon (Staubert)	Gosar (Weber (TX))	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	Herrera Beutler (Valadao)	Pfluger (Ellzey)
Bowman (Tlaib)	Porter (Neguse)	
Brown (MD)	Jacobs (CA)	Rice (NY)
(Trone)	(Garamendi)	(Morelle)
Buchanan	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
(Bucshon)	(Sempolinski)	(Meijer)
Carter (TX)	Jayapal	Ryan (OH)
(Weber (TX))	(Cicilline)	(Dean)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Johnson (TX)	Salazar (Waltz)
Chu (Beyer)	(Stevens)	Sherman
Conway	Khanna (Garcia (TX))	(Garamendi)
(LaMalfa)		Soto
Curtis (Moore)	Kirkpatrick	(Wasserman)
(UT)	(Pallone)	Schultz
DeFazio	LaHood	Speier (Garcia (TX))
(Pallone)	(Wenstrup)	Steel (Oberholte)
Demings (Dean)	Lawson (FL)	(Evans)
Deutch	(Evans)	Steube
(Wasserman)	Mace (Wilson (SC))	(Reschenthaler)
Schultz		Titus (Pallone)
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Torres (NY)
(Reschenthaler)	(Jeffries)	(Correa)
Dunn (Cammack)	Mast (Waltz)	Upton (Meijer)
Fletcher	Mfume (Evans)	Vargas
(Pallone)	Murphy (FL)	(Garamendi)
Gimenez	(Peters)	Wagner (Barr)
(Malliotakis)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez	(Cicilline)
Vicente	(Neguse)	
(Garcia (TX))		

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF AVIATION ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3482) to establish the National Center for the Advancement of Aviation, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 56, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—369

Adams	Bonamici	Cartwright
Aderholt	Bost	Case
Aguilar	Bourdeaux	Casten
Allen	Bowman	Castor (FL)
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Amodei	F.	Cawthorn
Armstrong	Brady	Chabot
Auchincloss	Brown (MD)	Cheney
Axne	Brown (OH)	Cherfilus-
Babin	Brownley	McCormick
Bacon	Buchanan	Chu
Baird	Bucshon	Cicilline
Balderson	Budd	Clark (MA)
Barr	Burgess	Clarke (NY)
Barragán	Bush	Cleaver
Bass	Bustos	Clyburn
Beatty	Butterfield	Cole
Bera	Calvert	Connolly
Bergman	Carbajal	Conway
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cooper
Bice (OK)	Carey	Correa
Bilirakis	Carl	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Carson	Courtney
Blumenauer	Carter (GA)	Craig
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Crawford

Crenshaw	Keller	Pfluger
Crow	Kelly (IL)	Phillips
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Pingree
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Pocan
Davids (KS)	Khanna	Porter
Davis, Danny K.	Kildee	Posey
Davis, Rodney	Kilmer	Pressley
Dean	Kim (CA)	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kim (NJ)	Quigley
DeGette	Kind	Raskin
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Reschenthaler
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Demings	Kuster	Rodgers (WA)
DeSaulnier	Kustoff	Rogers (AL)
Deutch	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Ross
Dingell	Lamb	Rouzer
Doggett	Lamborn	Roybal-Allard
Donalds	Langevin	Ruiz
Doyle, Michael	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
F.	Larson (CT)	Rush
Duncan	Latta	Rutherford
Dunn	LaTurner	Ryan (NY)
Ellzey	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
Emmer	Lawson (FL)	Salazar
Escobar	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Eshoo	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
Espallat	Leger Fernandez	Scanlon
Evans	Lesko	Schakowsky
Feenstra	Letlow	Schiff
Ferguson	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Finstad	Levin (MI)	Schrader
Fischbach	Lieu	Schrier
Fitzgerald	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Fitzpatrick	Long	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Fletcher	Lucas	Sempolinski
Flood	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Flores	Luria	Sherman
Foster	Lynch	Sherrill
Frankel, Lois	Mace	Simpson
Franklin, C.	Malinowski	Sires
Scott	Malliotakis	Slotkin
Gallagher	Maloney,	Smith (MO)
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Smith (NE)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Garbarino	Mann	Smith (WA)
Garcia (CA)	Manning	Soto
Garcia (IL)	Mast	Spanberger
Garcia (TX)	Matsumi	Spartz
Gibbs	McBath	Speier
Gimenez	McCarthy	Stansbury
Golden	McCaul	Stanton
Gomez	McCollum	Staubert
Gonzales, Tony	McEachin	Steel
Gonzalez (OH)	McGovern	Stefanik
Gonzalez,	McHenry	Steil
Vicente	McKinley	Stevens
Gottheimer	Meeks	Stewart
Graves (LA)	Meijer	Strickland
Graves (MO)	Meng	Suozi
Green, Al (TX)	Meuser	Swalwell
Grijalva	Mfume	Takano
Grothman	Miller (WV)	Tenney
Guest	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Guthrie	Mooney	Thompson (MS)
Harder (CA)	Moore (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Hartzler	Moore (UT)	Timmons
Hayes	Moore (WI)	Titus
Herrell	Morelle	Tlaib
Herrera Beutler	Moulton	Tonko
Higgins (LA)	Mryan	Torres (CA)
Higgins (NY)	Mullin	Torres (NY)
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Trahan
Hinson	Murphy (NC)	Trone
Hollingsworth	Nadler	Turner
Horsford	Napolitano	Neal
Houlahan	Neal	Underwood
Hoyer	Neguse	Upton
Hudson	Nehls	Valadao
Huffman	Newhouse	Van Drew
Huizenga	Newman	Van Dwyne
Issa	Norcross	Vargas
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Veasey
Jacobs (CA)	Oberholte	Velazquez
Jacobs (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wagner
Jayapal	Omar	Waltz
Jeffries	Owens	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Palazzo	Schultz
Johnson (LA)	Pallone	Waters
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Watson Coleman
Johnson (SD)	Panetta	Weber (TX)
Johnson (TX)	Pappas	Webster (FL)
Jones	Pascrell	Welch
Joyce (OH)	Payne	Wenstrup
Kahele	Peltola	Westerman
Kaptur	Pence	Wexton
Katko	Perlmutter	Wild
Keating	Peters	

Williams (GA)	Wilson (FL)	Wittman
Williams (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Womack
	NAYS—56	
Arrington	Fox	Massie
Banks	Fulcher	McClain
Bentz	Gaetz	McClintock
Biggs	Gohmert	Miller (IL)
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Boebert	Gooden (TX)	Norman
Brooks	Gosar	Perry
Buck	Granger	Rice (SC)
Burchett	Green (TN)	Rose
Cammack	Greene (GA)	Rosendale
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Roy
Cline	Harris	Scalise
Cloud	Harshbarger	Schweikert
Clyde	Hern	Smucker
Comer	Hice (GA)	Steube
Davidson	Jackson	Taylor
DesJarlais	Jordan	Tiffany
Estes	Joyce (PA)	Walberg
Fallon	Loudermilk	
	NOT VOTING—7	
Cohen	McNerney	Zeldin
Hill	Sewell	
Kinzing	Yarmuth	

□ 1936

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bacon (Staubert)	Gosar (Weber (TX))	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Pfluger (Ellzey)
(Fleischmann)	(Valadao)	Porter (Neguse)
Bowman (Tlaib)	Jacobs (CA)	Rice (NY)
Brown (MD)	(Garamendi)	(Morelle)
(Trone)		
Buchanan	Jacobs (NY)	Rice (SC)
(Bucshon)	(Sempolinski)	(Meijer)
Carter (TX)	Jayapal	Ryan (OH)
(Weber (TX))	(Cicilline)	(Dean)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Johnson (TX)	Salazar (Waltz)
Chu (Beyer)	(Stevens)	Sherman
Conway	Khanna (Garcia (TX))	(Garamendi)
(LaMalfa)		Soto (Wasserman)
Curtis (Moore)	Kirkpatrick	Schultz
(UT)	(Pallone)	Speier (Garcia (TX))
DeFazio	LaHood	Steel (Oberholte)
(Pallone)	(Wenstrup)	Steube
Demings (Dean)	Lawson (FL)	(Reschenthaler)
Deutch	(Evans)	Swalwell
(Wasserman)	Mace (Wilson (SC))	(Gomez)
Schultz		Titus (Pallone)
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Torres (NY)
(Reschenthaler)	(Jeffries)	(Correa)
Dunn (Cammack)	Mast (Waltz)	Upton (Meijer)
Fletcher	Mfume (Evans)	Vargas
(Pallone)	Murphy (FL)	(Garamendi)
Gimenez	(Peters)	Wagner (Barr)
(Malliotakis)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez	(Cicilline)
Vicente	(Neguse)	
(Garcia (TX))		

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE  
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR  
OF H.R. 8137

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 8137, a bill originally introduced by Representative WALORSKI of Indiana, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BOURDEAUX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.