

Management Council. I am proud to support and fight in Congress for Rhode Island's fishermen, and I encourage everyone to try the best seafood in America, which is Rhode Island seafood.

HONORING JUDGE FRANCES SECKINGER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Judge Frances Seckinger, who passed away on March 2. I might also note that it is appropriate on International Women's Day to honor a great judge.

Judge Seckinger served in the judicial system when she was elected as a probate judge in Effingham County in 1977. That election sparked the beginning of a long and fruitful career in public service until her retirement in 2008. It is also important to note that Judge Seckinger's election made her the first female to hold an elected position in the Effingham County Judicial System.

Outside of her public service, Judge Seckinger was a faithful attendee of Springfield United Methodist Church, and she enjoyed hobbies such as crocheting blankets for friends and family. Judge Seckinger's selfless career of community service and her love for family and others should serve as an inspiration for all of us.

My condolences go out to Judge Seckinger's family, and I hope they know how grateful I am for her years of service.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 205

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mrs. McClellan (to rank immediately after Mr. Davis of North Carolina).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Schneider.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mrs. McClellan (to rank immediately after Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania).

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Panetta (to rank immediately after Mr. Doggett).

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 21, SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 21 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative McCaul of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GAETZ of Florida or their respective designees; and that the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. 1546, shall not apply to H. Con. Res. 20.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 140, PROTECTING SPEECH FROM GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 27, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; AND S. 619, COVID-19 ORIGIN ACT OF 2023

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 199

Resolved, That 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. 140) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit Federal employees from advocating for censorship of viewpoints in their official capacity, 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 Accountability 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 Accountability now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-1. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 619) to require the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information relating to the origin of COVID-19, 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 Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply to a concurrent resolution introduced during the first session of the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress pursuant to

section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544) with respect to Syria.

SEC. 5. If a veto message is laid before the House on House Joint Resolution 30, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of March 23, 2023; and on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the pending resolution with an amendment that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 4 of the resolution and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is amended.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and reported House Resolution 199, providing for consideration of three measures: H.R. 140, H.J. Res. 27, and S. 619.

The rule provides for H.R. 140 to be considered under a structured rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 27 under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

□ 1230

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of S. 619, under closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Finally, the rule postpones the vote on a potential veto message from the

President on H.J. Res. 30 until the legislative day of March 23.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding me time.

I thank our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with us on that unanimous consent, which I think is important. It is important for us to have a full debate and a full airing of the use of war powers in the United States.

As James Madison pointed out, it was critically important that we put that power in Congress. We should have this debate. If we are going to have troops in Syria, this body, this House of Representatives, this Congress ought to speak to it; and we shouldn't hide behind a 2001 authorization of the use of military force and not update that authorization of the use of military force.

I am not here to say whether we should or should not be in Syria. I am here to say that Congress should speak to it. We should debate it. We should decide. We should have an actual conversation in this body, on this floor, when we are going to place our men and women in uniform in harm's way. That is the point that we should be considering.

I very much believe that the gentleman from Florida has brought something forward using privileged tools that we have here in the body, and that we should take that under consideration. We should support the resolution the gentleman has brought forward, and if we have concerns, we should then have a debate, a full-throated debate, about the use of military force and our men and women in uniform in Syria.

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

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule for three bills.

First, let me just say, this is an awful rule; and I don't want to hear my Republican colleagues talk about fairness or openness ever again. We got lecture after lecture about how they wanted to be more open and more inclusive.

Well, guess what? So far, in this Congress, 22 of the 26 rules have been completely closed. I mean, there are more closed rules in this rule than Democratic amendments made in order.

Speaker McCarthy promised he would open things up, but he has locked things down more than ever.

My colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) said that he joined the Rules Committee to be our conscience. So I would ask him, I mean, does he think this is okay?

Madam Speaker, 43 of 44 amendments submitted by Democrats were blocked by his majority; is that right? Is that the openness that we were promised by his Speaker?

The bottom line is the last time Republicans controlled the House they

had more closed rules than any other time in the history of our country, and they are on track to beating their own record.

Our first bill today, considered under a closed rule, is S. 619, the COVID-19 Origin Act of 2023.

I think I speak for everyone when I say that we all want to know how COVID started. But I also want to point out, for the RECORD, that Donald Trump was President when COVID started, not Joe Biden.

Donald Trump said: "China has been working very hard to contain the coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well." Joe Biden didn't say that.

What Joe Biden actually did do is he ordered this investigation, and thanks to his investigation and the work of the intelligence community, we now have a report that gives us some answers.

The gentleman from Kentucky says, Democrats all believe this was a conspiracy theory. Yet, strangely enough, it was a Democratic President who told the intelligence community to look into the origins of COVID. So I am just a bit confused here as to his logic.

I will quickly mention two other bills. H.J. Res 27, also considered under a closed rule, seeks to roll back a majority of the protections on rivers, lakes, and streams that have been implemented since the creation of the Clean Water Act.

I find it particularly ironic that Republicans go to East Palestine, Ohio, saying, we stand with you, we are with you, while here in Congress, they are passing a bill that makes it easier for the company that dumped toxic waste into their rivers to get off scot-free.

Finally, we have H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, which does not protect free speech from government interference. In fact, it seeks to expand the First Amendment to include Vladimir Putin and the Chinese Communist Party, while telling America's own Federal law enforcement agencies that they are now forbidden from even notifying social media companies of attempts by Russia and the CCP to spread propaganda.

But there is one more thing I want to bring up today, Madam Speaker, and it is not in this rule, but it is just as important and consequential for our democracy.

On Monday of this week, FOX News aired an offensive, dishonest, shameful representation about what happened on January 6, 2021. For nearly an hour, Tucker Carlson said that January 6 was not, in fact, a violent attack on American democracy. In fact, he said it was not an attack at all.

He called it a peaceful sightseeing day; downplayed what happened; tried to sanitize and gloss over the first responders who were attacked and died; called the people attacking our Capitol Police officers meek; ran interference

for a racist mob that came into these Halls that day to overturn an election.

I am furious because I was here that day. I was literally in this room. I was one of the last ones off the House floor. I sat in the Speaker's chair that day. I saw how close we came to disaster, and I don't need Tucker Carlson or anyone else to tell me what happened that day.

I am not just furious for me; I am furious for the people he lied to. I am furious for the memory of the officers he insulted. I am furious for the police officers who were beaten and injured that day. I am furious for the staff who thought that they were going to die.

January 6 was an attack on our democracy, and now Tucker Carlson has chosen to side with the enemies of democracy.

But what is most alarming about all of this, what is most dangerous, is that he was aided and abetted by Republican Speaker of the House KEVIN MCCARTHY.

I have to say, this is a new low. Speaker MCCARTHY's treacherous decision to coordinate with Tucker Carlson to deliberately distort what happened that day is beyond the pale; and the worst part is the blatant lying.

On November 21, 2020, Carlson said in a private text that lies about voter fraud were shockingly reckless and called the very conspiracy theories he was promoting on the air as insane and absurd to his colleagues.

He called those propagating the big lie dangerous as hell. He knew that claims the election was stolen were dangerous lies.

But instead of owning up to the truth, he went on TV, and with zero respect for his viewers and for the people of this country, zero respect for the truth, zero respect for our democracy, he sold those dangerous lies to the American people. He should be ashamed.

Speaker MCCARTHY's disgraceful decision to help him spread these lies will forever be a stain on this institution.

So my question for the Speaker is: Was it worth it?

Was the backroom deal with the far right to help Tucker Carlson lie about what happened that day worth the damage done to our democracy?

Was it worth insulting the memory of the law enforcement officers who died defending this building and what it symbolizes?

The family of fallen Officer Brian Sicknick doesn't think so. I want to enter their full statement into the RECORD today, but our rules prevent me from doing that. So let me just read a part of it here:

"The Sicknick family is outraged at the ongoing attack on our family by the unscrupulous and outright sleazy so-called news network of FOX News who will do the bidding of Trump or any of his sycophant followers, no matter what damage is done to the families of the fallen, the officers who put their lives on the line, and all who suffered on January 6 due to the lies started by

Trump and spread by sleaze-slinging outlets like FOX."

They go on to say: "Every time the pain of that day seems to have ebbed a bit, organizations like FOX rip our wounds wide open again and we are frankly sick of it."

That is what Speaker MCCARTHY is doing here. It is sick. It is indefensible. Frankly, I find it disgusting.

So when the hell will House Republicans stand up here and say this is wrong?

At least some Senate Republicans, to their credit, have actually denounced Carlson's lies.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY said: "I was here. It was not peaceful. It was an abomination."

Senator THOM TILLIS says: Tucker's depiction was B.S. He called it indefensible.

Senator MITT ROMNEY says: "You can't hide the truth by selectively picking a few minutes out of tapes and saying this is what went on. It's so absurd. It's nonsense. It's a very dangerous thing to do. . . ."

But all we get out of this side of the Capitol is deafening silence; and every moment House Republicans do not come out and condemn these evil lies, more damage is done to the fabric of our democracy because, mark my words, January 6 will happen again if we do not correct the record and tell the truth about what happened that day.

It was an attempt to overthrow the government of the United States, based on lies spread by the former President of the United States. So for the sake of this institution, for the sake of the country, it is time to tell the truth.

For my Republican colleagues, it is time for you to condemn these lies.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation, H.R. 140, which went through regular order, which was marked up in the Oversight and Reform Committee, where Democrats had copious opportunities to offer amendments and to change the bill, as did Republicans.

H.R. 140 is called the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, and would prohibit Federal employees from using their official authority to censor a private entity, including outside of normal duty hours or away from an employee's normal duty post.

Under President Biden, administration officials and Federal bureaucrats have abused their positions, authority, and influence to encourage censorship and erode Americans' First Amendment rights.

Recently released reports have uncovered efforts by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Homeland Security, and other government

agencies to pressure social media companies and internet providers to censor and remove speech posted on social media platforms.

Advocates for this censorship flag certain posts and users as spreading misinformation on various topics, including COVID-19, racial justice, and the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Executives at Facebook and Twitter have admitted that prior to the 2020 Presidential election, after a warning from the FBI, they censored the sharing of news regarding Hunter Biden's laptop leak, which has since been proven true. It was not a Russian disinformation campaign.

Even former White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki, during a July 2021 press briefing, called on Facebook to ban specific accounts from its platform.

Congress should recognize that the biggest spreader of misinformation over the last several years, whether it has been about elections or about COVID, has been the Federal Government.

The censorship must stop. Congress must restore constitutional protections enshrined in the First Amendment.

H.R. 140, and the amendments that are pending votes here as well, are critical to ensure that government officials can never again promote censorship and pressure private entities to suppress Americans' First Amendment rights.

Additionally, the rule before us provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 27, a resolution "providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of Title 5, United States Code, of the rules submitted by the Department of the Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised definition of 'Waters of the United States.'"

It is Groundhog Day again in America. Every time the administration changes, this rule changes.

The Biden administration's new rule would radically redefine the term "Waters of the United States" to expand the Federal Government's authority in regulating bodies of water.

Specifically, Biden's EPA would expand the term to include impoundments of jurisdictional waters, tributaries, adjacent wetlands, and additional waters.

□ 1245

To be clear, what the Biden administration is pushing through here will heap serious burdens on farmers, small businesses, homebuilders, and rural communities across our country.

In 1972, Congress didn't tell the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers: Do whatever you think is necessary to protect water. That is not what the bill said. Yet, that is what they have taken as their directive.

The Clean Water Act was never intended to be applied as broadly as the

Biden administration is proposing. Every Member of Congress should be concerned about the EPA's attempt to expand its authority over individuals' private property and regulate farms and communities, even those which lie far away from any lakes, rivers, or streams and very far away from Washington, D.C.

Congress has the constitutional authority and responsibility to provide oversight and to review regulations issued by the executive branch. If the executive branch promulgates rules that could overstep their authority, as President Biden is doing here, it is vital that we exercise our oversight authority in Congress.

Finally, the rule before us provides for consideration of S. 619, the COVID-19 Origin Act of 2023, which would finally declassify any information relating to potential links between the Wuhan Institute of Virology and the origin of COVID-19.

In 2020, at the height of the pandemic, anyone who spoke out questioning whether COVID-19 might have come from the Wuhan lab in China was denounced as a conspiracy theorist, and their words were labeled as "dangerous misinformation." People were censored online, their accounts were suspended, and their reputations were damaged for questioning the origins of COVID-19.

What is the difference between COVID-19 conspiracy theory and the truth? About 2 years. We have seen them called natural immunity conspiracy theories. We have seen people who said masks don't work called conspiracy theorists. Now, we are finding out that all of those conspiracy theories, so-called, were accurate.

Fast-forward to today. Even the government admits it. The Department of Energy and the FBI have both publicly reported their conclusions that COVID-19 likely emerged as a result of a lab leak from the Wuhan Institute of Virology, a research institute in Wuhan, China, controlled by the People's Republic of China and, ultimately, the Chinese Communist Party.

Was it funded in part by our government? Yes, it was.

This legislation is long overdue and is necessary to expose the truth about the origins of COVID-19. Americans deserve to see the information. President Biden could have released this information at any point. It could have been released a year ago. It could be released today without this resolution. But this resolution is important because the President has not released this information. The last Congress, led by Speaker PELOSI, could have voted to do what we are doing here today. But no, they wanted it to remain hidden from the American public. I fear the Federal Government has been involved in a coverup about the origins of COVID-19 because they are afraid of being exposed as culpable in the creation of the disease at the center of the pandemic.

To my colleague's point about the videos that were released on Monday, I think the other side of the aisle is out of touch and out of step with the American public on this.

A recent poll by Rasmussen showed that 81 percent of likely voters believe that all of the tapes should be released. The Democrats had 2 years to release these tapes. But 81 percent of voters believe that.

Is that just Republicans? No.

Madam Speaker, 86 percent of Republicans and 78 percent of Democrats—they are out of step with their own party—believe that these videotapes should be released because Americans deserve to know the truth and the defendants in these trials deserve to have the evidence they need to present their defense.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a USA Today piece titled: "Fact check: COVID-19 vaccines primarily designed to prevent serious illness, death."

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

There was no objection.

[From USA TODAY, Jan. 21, 2022]

FACT CHECK: COVID-19 VACCINES PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO PREVENT SERIOUS ILLNESS, DEATH

(By Valerie Paviionis)

As the omicron variant surges across the world and the United States logs case numbers near and over 1 million per day, the virus is prompting scientists to develop new treatments and government officials to fight to curb the spread.

While the Biden administration continues to urge Americans to get vaccinated, a Jan. 10 Facebook post claims that Dr. Rochelle Walensky, director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, said vaccines can't prevent COVID-19 transmission. Other sites have shared the same claim, linking Walensky's words back to an interview with CNN in August 2021.

"Our vaccines are working exceptionally well," Walensky said to CNN's Wolf Blitzer in the interview. "They continue to work well for delta, with regard to severe illness and death—they prevent it. But what they can't do anymore is prevent transmission."

Though Walensky did say these words on CNN, the original interview was aired in early August, not recently. And while it's true vaccines can't entirely halt transmission, experts say they do reduce it—and reduce the chances of hospitalization and death—as USA TODAY previously reported.

USA TODAY reached out to the original poster of the claim for comment.

Various websites have written about the same claim, amassing thousands of interactions on Facebook.

VACCINE EFFECTS DEPEND ON SEVERAL FACTORS

In an email, Walensky spokesperson Kathleen Conley wrote that in August 2021—when the interview originally ran—the delta variant was the dominant variant in the United States.

Experts at that time said it was clear the vaccines provided protection.

"Vaccines provide significant protection from 'getting it'—infection—and 'spreading it'—transmission—even against the delta variant," a professor of immunobiology and molecular, cellular and developmental biology at Yale University, told USA TODAY in November.

However, Conley noted data did show vaccines were "less effective at preventing infections and transmission with Delta than with previous other variants." Omicron has proven even more difficult to contain.

While mRNA vaccines—produced by Pfizer and Moderna—continue to offer some level of protection against transmission of omicron, other vaccines—such as Johnson & Johnson, Sinopharm and AstraZeneca—offer "almost no defense," according to a Dec. 19, 2021, report by the New York Times.

Other factors beyond variant type, vaccination type and booster status can also influence whether or not a person contracts COVID-19.

Dr. David Dowdy, associate professor of epidemiology at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said it's difficult to succinctly explain the vaccines' nuanced effects on transmission.

A vaccine might protect you from a passing interaction with someone at a grocery store, but it may not prevent infection from someone you live with and share air with for several hours a day.

"It gets very easy to misconstrue," Dowdy said. "If someone asks, do vaccines prevent infection, and you have to give a yes or no answer, then the answer is no, they're not a perfect blockade. But do the vaccines offer some protection against infection? The answer is yes."

VACCINES STILL PROTECT AGAINST SERIOUS DISEASE

While vaccinations don't offer perfect protection against the transmission of COVID-19, experts still urge people to get vaccinated.

According to Conley, COVID-19 vaccination remains effective against hospitalization and death caused by the virus. Getting a booster, she added, further decreases these risks, and the CDC continues to recommend that Americans receive vaccines and boosters.

Dr. Chris Beyrer, professor of public health and human rights at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said both the mRNA and J&J vaccines were never designed to prevent infection entirely.

It's "very hard", he said, to prevent infection via an injected vaccine when you're dealing with a virus that enters the body through the nose and mouth. Instead, the vaccine trials were designed to study reduction in serious illness, hospitalization and death. All three vaccines were highly effective by this measure, Beyrer said.

"People who say, well, why would I take it if it doesn't prevent me from getting infected?" Beyrer said. "You have to remember that having a COVID-19 infection can be everything from completely asymptomatic . . . to a head-cold-like symptoms or full flu-like symptoms, all the way to death. So what the vaccines are doing is really dramatically increasing the likelihood that you will have mild infection. And that's incredibly important."

A CDC study released Jan. 21 showed booster shots of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines were 90 percent effective at preventing hospitalizations from the omicron variant.

OUR RATING: MISSING CONTEXT

Because it can be misleading without additional information, we rate MISSING CONTEXT the claim that the CDC director says vaccines can't prevent transmission of

COVID-19. While vaccines do not offer 100 protection against COVID-19 infection, they can still partially defend against infection. Vaccines remain effective at protecting from COVID-19-caused serious illness, hospitalization and death.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an AP News article titled: "Ex-Twitter execs deny pressure to block Hunter Biden story."

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

There was no objection.

[From the AP News, Feb. 8, 2023]

EX-TWITTER EXECES DENY PRESSURE TO BLOCK HUNTER BIDEN STORY

(By Farnoush Amiri and Barbara Ortutay)

WASHINGTON (AP).—House Republicans are expected to question former Twitter executives about the platform's handling of reporting on Hunter Biden, the president's son, fulfilling a party promise to investigate what they have long asserted is anti-conservative bias at social media companies.

Three former executives will be appearing Wednesday before the House Oversight and Accountability Committee to testify for the first time about the company's decision in the weeks before the 2020 election to initially block from Twitter a New York Post article about the contents of a laptop belonging to Hunter Biden.

The witnesses Republicans subpoenaed to testify are Vijaya Gadde, Twitter's former chief legal officer; James Baker, the company's former deputy general counsel; and Yoel Roth, former head of safety and integrity.

Democrats have a witness of their own, Anika Collier Navaroli, a former employee with Twitter's content moderation team. She testified last year to the House committee that investigated the Capitol riot about Twitter's preferential treatment of Donald Trump until the then-president was banned from Twitter two years ago.

The hearing is the GOP's opening act into what lawmakers promise will be a widespread investigation into President Joe Biden and his family, with the tech companies another prominent target of their oversight efforts.

"Americans deserve answers about this attack on the First Amendment and why Big Tech and the Swamp colluded to censor this information about the Biden family selling access for profit," Rep. James Comer of Kentucky, the committee chairman, said in a statement announcing the hearing.

The New York Post first reported in October 2020, weeks before the presidential election, that it had received from Trump's personal lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, a copy of a hard drive from a laptop that Hunter Biden had dropped off 18 months earlier at a Delaware computer repair shop and never retrieved. Twitter blocked people from sharing links to the story for several days.

Months later, Twitter's then-CEO, Jack Dorsey, called the company's communications around the Post article "not great." He added that blocking the article's URL with "zero context" around why it was blocked was "unacceptable."

The newspaper story was greeted at the time with skepticism due to questions about the laptop's origins, including Giuliani's involvement, and because top officials in the Trump administration had already warned that Russia was working to denigrate Joe Biden before the White House election.

The Kremlin had interfered in the 2016 race by hacking Democratic emails that were

subsequently leaked, and fears that Russia would meddle again in the 2020 race were widespread across Washington.

Just last week, lawyers for the younger Biden asked the Justice Department to investigate people who say they accessed his personal data. But they did not acknowledge that that data came from a laptop that Hunter Biden is purported to have dropped off at a computer repair shop.

The issue was also reignited recently after Elon Musk took over Twitter as CEO and began to release a slew of company information to independent journalists, what he has called the "Twitter Files."

The documents and data largely show internal debates among employees over the decision to temporarily censor the story about Hunter Biden. The tweet threads lacked substantial evidence of a targeted influence campaign from Democrats or the FBI, which has denied any involvement in Twitter's decision-making.

Nonetheless, Comer and other Republicans have used the Post story, which has not been independently verified by The Associated Press, as the basis for what they say is another example of the Biden family's "influence peddling."

One of the witnesses on Wednesday, Baker, is expected to be the target of even more Republican scrutiny.

Baker was the FBI's general counsel during the opening of two of the bureau's most consequential investigations in history: the Hillary Clinton investigation and a separate inquiry into potential coordination between Russia and Trump's 2016 presidential campaign. Republicans have long criticized the FBI's handling of both investigations.

For Democrats, Navaroli is expected to counter the GOP argument by testifying about how Twitter allowed Trump's tweets despite the misinformation they sometimes contained.

Navaroli testified to the Jan. 6 committee last year that Twitter executives often tolerated Trump's posts despite them including false statements and violations of the company's own rules because executives knew the platform was his "favorite and most-used . . . and enjoyed having that sort of power."

The Jan. 6 committee used Navaroli's testimony in one of its public hearings last summer but did not identify her by name.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Twitter itself is saying the government isn't telling them to suppress anything. This is yet, unfortunately, just another Republican conspiracy theory.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "Trump officials roll back Obama oil train safety rule."

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

There was no objection.

[From The Hill, Sept. 24, 2018]

TRUMP OFFICIALS ROLL BACK OBAMA OIL TRAIN SAFETY RULE

(By Timothy Cama)

The Trump administration on Monday repealed a mandate that would have required trains carrying crude oil to use special brakes with new technology.

The Department of Transportation's Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) said it undertook a congressionally mandated analysis of the provision in a 2015 regulation under which oil trains would have had to use electronically controlled pneumatic (ECP) brakes.

"The Department [of Transportation] determined that the expected benefits, including safety benefits, of implementing ECP brake system requirements do not exceed the associated costs of equipping tank cars with ECP brake systems, and therefore are not economically justified," PHMSA said.

The mandate to phase out traditional air brakes for crude oil use was part of a comprehensive rule that the Obama administration wrote in 2015 to try to improve the safety of crude oil trains.

Transporting crude oil by rail has increased dramatically in recent years due to a boost in domestic and Canadian oil production. But with the increased traffic have come major crashes and explosions, like one in 2013 in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec, that killed 47, one in 2013 in North Dakota and one in Oregon in 2016.

The rule was mainly meant to implement a new design for tank cars that carry crude, with new requirements for metal thickness and fire protection. The brake mandate and speed limits were also in the new regulation.

The brake requirement was a top target for the railroad and oil industries in pushing back against parts of the 2015 rule.

Congress, in the bipartisan Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2016, told the PHMSA to conduct a new cost-benefit analysis of the brake provision. If the costs outweighed the benefits, the PHMSA was required to repeal it.

"Despite the additional testing and modeling, we still believe that there is insufficient data demonstrating that ECP braking systems provide a demonstrable increase in safety over other more widely used braking systems," the American Petroleum Institute told the PHMSA after it proposed Monday's action in December.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on February 3, 2023, a train with 38 cars derailed in East Palestine, Ohio, and the full devastating aftermath of that tragedy is ongoing. The affected community needs answers and change to make sure that something like this does not happen again.

The Trump administration rolled back train safety rules. Now, Republicans want to make it easier for polluters to pollute. They put a chemical industry lobbyist in charge of the EPA office in charge of chemical safety. I mean, you can't make this stuff up. They rolled back regulations on train brakes, and they reduced rail inspections.

I just want to say one thing to my colleague from Kentucky. I have no problem with releasing all the tapes, but that is not what happened. The Speaker of the House selectively and carefully released them to one person, to one news agency, who then deliberately cherry-picked things to advance a distortion of what happened that day, an insult to the people who work here, an insult to the Capitol Police officers who were injured that day. That is not transparency. That is propaganda. That is deliberately distorting a horrific event in which this Capitol was attacked, our democracy was attacked. So, please, give me a break.

Madam Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and

strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts in the program.

Madam 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Social Security and Medicare are the bedrocks of our Nation's social safety net. Yet, as my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills, these programs are under threat.

Despite recent rhetoric to the contrary, Republicans claim that they won't cut Social Security and Medicare benefits. Well, Madam Speaker, today, Democrats are yet again giving Republicans another chance to back up that claim with action by providing them a chance to reassure the American people not just with their words, but with their votes. Today, they can vote unequivocally that they will not cut these vital programs. Anything short of that is an empty promise.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alaska (Mrs. PELTOLA), to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. PELTOLA. Madam Speaker, with enactment of the Social Security Act in 1935, this country promised Americans that if they worked hard and contributed to the program to support others, when they retire or become disabled or lose a spouse, they will be taken care of, too.

Social Security helps us provide for retirees but also disabled workers, widows and widowers, spouses, and children.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt claimed that Social Security would "promote the common welfare and the economic stability of the Nation," and it has.

Social Security has kept millions of seniors out of poverty and continues to do so. Today, Social Security provides monthly checks to more than 65 million beneficiaries who rely on it for food and other necessities.

For over 85 years now, trusting in the promise of Social Security, millions of Americans have worked hard, paying into the program out of every single paycheck for decades.

In 2019, Social Security had helped 31,146 Alaskans stay out of poverty. A report from a few years ago found that without Social Security the elderly poverty rate in Alaska would have increased from 7.6 percent to 28 percent. As of 2021, over 110,000 Alaskans were receiving monthly Social Security benefits, including 84,796 who are 65 and older. In total, that is over 13 percent of Alaskan residents.

I was raised, as I think many others were, with the value of treating elders with great deference and respect, to

care for them as they have cared for us. I can think of no better way to do that than to ensure that they have a safe and secure retirement. Simply, this program reflects our values. All Americans deserve to retire with dignity.

We must support our senior citizens by strengthening Social Security and not slashing it. We need to protect and expand Social Security.

Despite the many demonstrated successes of the Social Security program, there have been no benefit increases to the program in over 50 years. I hear from many Alaskans back home who are scared that they will not receive the Social Security benefits they have worked so hard for all their lives.

Alaskans worry that the checks they depend on will suddenly disappear, and they have no plan B. They count on receiving this earned benefit that they rely on to pay for essentials like heating. My own monthly heating bill in my hometown of Bethel, Alaska, is over \$1,000 a month, and my understanding is that is a low bill.

People do not deserve to live with this kind of uncertainty and insecurity. That is why safeguarding and reforming Social Security must be a priority for this Congress.

Social Security was a solemn promise made to Americans by its government in full faith and credit. I commit to protecting this promise for Alaska and all Americans and implore my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, which provides consideration for three important pieces of legislation to restore trust and certainty for millions of Americans.

Specifically, I will highlight H.J. Res. 27, which would provide for congressional disapproval of the Biden administration's overreaching new Waters of the United States, or WOTUS, rule that threatens the livelihoods and survival of our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

The Biden EPA's new reinterpretation of WOTUS is a complete rejection of the Clean Water Act's decades-long, broadly accepted jurisdiction. The new rule gives the Federal Government sweeping authority over private lands and unleashes the Federal regulatory machine on private property owners, over bodies of water as small as ditches, low spots, and ephemeral drainages. And God forbid, if a farmer is perceived to have violated the EPA's vague new WOTUS regulatory framework, they could find themselves tangled in years of expensive litigation and red tape threatening their very survival as an operation.

Now, my district in western New York, in the Southern Tier, has over 800 dairy operations. These are generational farms with deep roots in our surrounding communities. My farmers, as in the case with farmers across this

country, are deeply worried about how the Biden EPA's new WOTUS rule will impact the long-term survival of their operations.

Our farmers should be focused on production and growing and maintaining their operations, not hiring outside, expensive consultants to help them navigate a maze of new burdensome government regulations. They shouldn't be worried about whether farming a certain part of their land will lead to thousands, hundreds of thousands, or even millions of dollars in penalties, enough to put these family farms out of business. But under the Biden administration, sadly, this is just considered the cost of doing business.

Now, some might say I am speaking in hyperbole. But we have seen this play out before in 2015. We saw what an overly broad interpretation of WOTUS meant to our farmers, many of whom suffered devastating fines from an overzealous Obama-era EPA for having the audacity to manage and farm their own private lands.

So the question before us with this resolution isn't how to best regulate a pond versus a stream or a low spot. It isn't how far we should turn the dial up on regulation, forward or backward, so as to not inflict too much pain on rural America. It is a question of whether we stand for the long-term survival of American agriculture and domestic food security or whether we are willing to regulate the American farmer out of business and out of existence.

Congress has a duty to review and oppose this radical interpretation of WOTUS. I strongly support the rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, I don't want to be lectured about farms and our farmers. I represent a district with thousands of farms in it.

The bottom line is my farmers care about things like clean water. They care about the environment because they know that contaminated water can contaminate the food supply, among other things. My farmers are worried about climate change and the impact it is having on their ability to grow crops.

I don't want to be lectured about farms or what farmers want. I don't know of any farmer who wants to create a situation where polluters are basically not held accountable for the pollution they cause.

Think about what happened in East Palestine, Ohio. Is it the position of the Republicans that the railroad should not be required to pay for the damage that they have done, that the community should assume those costs, or the Federal Government? I don't know who should pay for it. The farmers should pay for that? Come on.

We can hear a lot about, "This does X, Y, and Z," when we know it is an exaggeration.

Putting that aside, I will say for the record that I represent a lot of farmers. I talk to my farmers all the time. I do farm tours every single year. What they talk to me about is making sure that we have a clean environment, that they have access to clean water, and that we actually start paying attention to climate change, which is destroying their ability to be profitable and to be able to thrive.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article in the New York Post titled: "10 myths told by COVID experts—and now debunked," by Marty Makary, a professor at Johns Hopkins School of Medicine.

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

There was no objection.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 27, 2023]

10 MYTHS TOLD BY COVID EXPERTS—AND NOW DEBUNKED

(By Marty Makary)

In the past few weeks, a series of analyses published by highly respected researchers have exposed a truth about public health officials during COVID:

Much of the time, they were wrong.

To be clear, public health officials were not wrong for making recommendations based on what was known at the time.

That's understandable. You go with the data you have.

No, they were wrong because they refused to change their directives in the face of new evidence.

When a study did not support their policies, they dismissed it and censored opposing opinions.

At the same time, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention weaponized research itself by putting out its own flawed studies in its own non-peer-reviewed medical journal, MMWR.

In the final analysis, public health officials actively propagated misinformation that ruined lives and forever damaged public trust in the medical profession.

Here are 10 ways they misled Americans:

MISINFORMATION #1: NATURAL IMMUNITY OFFERS LITTLE PROTECTION COMPARED TO VACCINATED IMMUNITY

A Lancet study looked at 65 major studies in 19 countries on natural immunity. The researchers concluded that natural immunity was at least as effective as the primary COVID vaccine series.

Public health officials downplayed concerns about vaccine-induced myocarditis—or inflammation of the heart muscle.

In fact, the scientific data was there all along—from 160 studies, despite the findings of these studies violating Facebook's "misinformation" policy.

Since the Athenian plague of 430 BC, it has been observed that those who recovered after infection were protected against severe disease if reinfectd.

That was also the observation of nearly every practicing physician during the first 18 months of the COVID pandemic.

Most Americans who were fired for not having the COVID vaccine already had antibodies that effectively neutralized the virus, but they were antibodies that the government did not recognize.

MISINFORMATION #2: MASKS PREVENT COVID TRANSMISSION

Cochran Reviews are considered the most authoritative and independent assessment of the evidence in medicine.

And one published last month by a highly respected Oxford research team found that masks had no significant impact on COVID transmission.

When asked about this definitive review, CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky downplayed it, arguing that it was flawed because it focused on randomized controlled studies.

A study recently found that masks didn't have much of an effect on preventing COVID-19 transmission.

But that was the greatest strength of the review. Randomized studies are considered the gold standard of medical evidence.

If all the energy used by public health officials to mask toddlers could have been channeled to reduce child obesity by encouraging outdoor activities, we would be better off.

MISINFORMATION #3: SCHOOL CLOSURES REDUCE COVID TRANSMISSION

The CDC ignored the European experience of keeping schools open, most without mask mandates.

Transmission rates were no different, evidenced by studies conducted in Spain and Sweden.

MISINFORMATION #4: MYOCARDITIS FROM THE VACCINE IS LESS COMMON THAN FROM THE INFECTION

Public health officials downplayed concerns about vaccine-induced myocarditis—or inflammation of the heart muscle.

They cited poorly designed studies that under-captured complication rates. A flurry of well-designed studies said the opposite.

We now know that myocarditis is six to 28 times more common after the COVID vaccine than after the infection among 16- to 24-year-old males.

Tens of thousands of children likely got myocarditis, mostly subclinical, from a COVID vaccine they did not need because they were entirely healthy or because they already had COVID.

MISINFORMATION #5: YOUNG PEOPLE BENEFIT FROM A VACCINE BOOSTER

Boosters reduced hospitalizations in older, high-risk Americans.

But the evidence was never there that they lower COVID mortality in young, healthy people.

That's probably why the CDC chose not to publish its data on hospitalization rates among boosted Americans under 50, when it published the same rates for those over 50.

Ultimately, White House pressure to recommend boosters for all was so intense that the FDA's two top vaccine experts left the agency in protest, writing scathing articles on how the data did not support boosters for young people.

MISINFORMATION #6: VACCINE MANDATES INCREASED VACCINATION RATES

President Biden and other officials demanded that unvaccinated workers, regardless of their risk or natural immunity, be fired.

They demanded that soldiers be dishonorably discharged and nurses be laid off in the middle of a staffing crisis.

The mandate was based on the theory that vaccination reduced transmission rates—a notion later proven to be false.

But after the broad recognition that vaccination does not reduce transmission, the mandates persisted, and still do to this day.

A recent study from George Mason University details how vaccine mandates in nine major U.S. cities had no impact on vaccination rates.

They also had no impact on COVID transmission rates.

MISINFORMATION #7: COVID ORIGINATING FROM THE WUHAN LAB IS A CONSPIRACY THEORY

Google admitted to suppressing searches of "lab leak" during the pandemic.

Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health, claimed (and still does) he didn't believe the virus came from a lab.

Ultimately, overwhelming circumstantial evidence points to a lab leak origin—the same origin suggested to Dr. Anthony Fauci by two very prominent virologists in a January 2020 meeting he assembled at the beginning of the pandemic.

According to documents obtained by Bret Baier of Fox News, they told Fauci and Collins that the virus may have been manipulated and originated in the lab, but then suddenly changed their tune in public comments days after meeting with the NIH officials.

The virologists were later awarded nearly \$9 million from Fauci's agency.

The theory that COVID-19 originated from a Chinese lab in Wuhan proved to be true.

MISINFORMATION #8: IT WAS IMPORTANT TO GET THE SECOND VACCINE DOSE THREE OR FOUR WEEKS AFTER THE FIRST DOSE

Data were clear in the spring of 2021, just months after the vaccine rollout, that spacing the vaccine out by three months reduces complication rates and increases immunity.

Spacing out vaccines would have also saved more lives when Americans were rationing a limited vaccine supply at the height of the epidemic.

MISINFORMATION #9: DATA ON THE BIVALENT VACCINE IS 'CRYSTAL CLEAR'

Dr. Ashish Jha famously said this, despite the bivalent vaccine being approved using data from eight mice.

To date, there has never been a randomized controlled trial of the bivalent vaccine. In my opinion, the data are crystal clear that young people should not get the bivalent vaccine.

It would have also spared many children myocarditis.

MISINFORMATION #10: ONE IN FIVE PEOPLE GET LONG COVID

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention claims that 20% of COVID infections can result in long COVID.

But a UK study found that only 3% of COVID patients had residual symptoms lasting 12 weeks. What explains the disparity?

It's often normal to experience mild fatigue or weakness for weeks after being sick and inactive and not eating well.

Calling these cases long COVID is the medicalization of ordinary life.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention claims that 20% of COVID infections can result in long COVID, but other studies say differently.

What's most amazing about all the misinformation conveyed by CDC and public health officials is that there have been no apologies for holding on to their recommendations for so long after the data became apparent that they were dead wrong.

Public health officials said "you must" when the correct answer should have been "we're not sure."

Early on, in the absence of good data, public health officials chose a path of stem paternalism.

Today, they are in denial of a mountain of strong studies showing that they were wrong.

At minimum, the CDC should come clean and the FDA should add a warning label to COVID vaccines, clearly stating what is now known.

A mea culpa by those who led us astray would be a first step to rebuilding trust.

Marty Makary MD, MPH is a professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and author of "The Price We Pay."

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, in this article that I have just referenced, misinformation No. 7 was that "COVID originating from the Wuhan lab is a conspiracy theory." It is not. I think we are going to find that out when this resolution passes, and I expect a lot of Democrat support for the resolution. It passed by unanimous consent in the Senate.

"Google admitted to suppressing searches of 'lab leak' during the pandemic. Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health, claimed, and still does, he didn't believe the virus came from a lab."

"Ultimately, overwhelming circumstantial evidence points to a lab leak origin, the same origin suggested to Dr. Anthony Fauci by two very prominent virologists in a January 2020 meeting he assembled at the beginning of the pandemic. According to documents obtained by Bret Baier of FOX News, they told Fauci and Collins that the virus may have been manipulated and originated in the lab, but then suddenly changed their tune in public comments days after meeting with the NIH officials. The virologists were later awarded nearly \$9 million from Fauci's agency."

Maybe this is why we are not getting the truth yet. We will get the truth if this rule passes and the subsequent S. 619 passes here in the House. I think it is very important.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I don't think there is any controversy over the bill to make as much of the classified report unclassified that is possible. There is no controversy over that.

I want to make sure that people understand who is responsible for actually doing the investigation. It was Joe Biden, not the previous President.

I want people to remember what the previous President said. On January 24, 2020, Donald Trump said: "China has been working very hard to contain the coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American people, I want to thank President Xi." Really?

On February 7, 2020, Trump said: "I just spoke to President Xi last night, and, you know, we are working on the problem, the virus. It is a very tough situation, but I think he is going to handle it. I think he has handled it really well. We are helping wherever we can."

On February 7, he said: "Just had a long and very good conversation by phone with President Xi of China. He is strong, sharp, and powerfully focused on leading the counterattack on the coronavirus. He feels they are doing

very well, even building hospitals in a matter of only days. . . . Great discipline is taking place in China, as President Xi strongly leads what will be a very successful operation. We are working closely with China to help."

Then he also said: "Late last night, I had a very good talk with President Xi, and we talked about—mostly about the coronavirus. They are working really hard, and I think they are doing a very professional job. They are in touch with the world organization—CDC also. We are working together, but World Health is working with them. CDC is working with them. I had a great conversation last night with President Xi. It is a tough situation. I think they are doing a very good job."

Then he said on February 10: "I think China is very, you know, professionally run, in the sense that they have everything under control," Trump said. "I really believe they are going to have it under control fairly soon. You know, in April, supposedly, it dies with the hotter weather, and that is a beautiful date to look forward to. But China, I can tell you, is working very hard."

On February 13: "I think they have handled it professionally, and I think they are extremely capable. And I think President Xi is extremely capable, and I hope that it is going to be resolved."

On February 23, President Trump said: "I think President Xi is working very, very hard. I spoke to him. He is working very hard. I think he is doing a very good job. It is a big problem, but President Xi loves his country. He is working very hard to solve the problem, and he will solve the problem. Okay?"

Then, on February 29, he said: "China seems to be making tremendous progress. Their numbers are way down. . . . I think our relationship with China is very good. We just did a big trade deal. We are starting on another trade deal with China, a very big one, and we have been working very closely. They have been talking to our people. We have been talking to their people, having to do with the virus."

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from Politico titled: "15 times Trump praised China as coronavirus was spreading across the globe."

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

There was no objection.

[Politico, Apr. 15, 2020]

15 TIMES TRUMP PRAISED CHINA AS CORONAVIRUS WAS SPREADING ACROSS THE GLOBE

(By Myah Ward)

The president has lambasted the WHO for accepting Beijing's assurances about the outbreak, but he repeated them, as well.

President Donald Trump yanked U.S. funding for the World Health Organization on Tuesday, complaining that the United Nations public health agency was overly deferential to China and had put too much faith in Beijing's assertions that it had the

coronavirus outbreak there was under control.

"Had the WHO done its job to get medical experts into China to objectively assess the situation on the ground and to call out China's lack of transparency, the outbreak could have been contained at its source with very little death," the president said Tuesday. "Instead, the W.H.O. willingly took China's assurances to face value."

Trump, however, echoed many of those same assurances regarding China and its response to the virus throughout January and February, as the unique coronavirus began to infiltrate countries around the world. Just days before the U.S. recorded its first death from Covid-19, Trump touted China's government for its transparency and hard work to defeat the coronavirus that causes the illness.

POLITICO has compiled a list of 15 times the president hailed China for its push to prevent a pandemic in the early months of 2020—an effort that ultimately failed:

Jan. 22, Twitter:

"One of the many great things about our just signed giant Trade Deal with China is that it will bring both the USA & China closer together in so many other ways. Terrific working with President Xi, a man who truly loves his country. Much more to come."

Jan. 24, Twitter:

"China has been working very hard to contain the Coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American People, I want to thank President Xi."

Jan. 29, Remarks at signing ceremony for the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement:

"And, honestly, I think, as tough as this negotiation was, I think our relationship with China now might be the best it's been in a long, long time. And now it's reciprocal. Before, we were being ripped off badly. Now we have a reciprocal relationship, maybe even better than reciprocal for us."

Jan. 30, Fox News interview:

"China is not in great shape right now, unfortunately. But they're working very hard. We'll see what happens. But we're working very closely with China and other countries."

Feb. 7, Remarks at North Carolina Opportunity Now Summit in Charlotte, N.C.:

"I just spoke to President Xi last night, and, you know, we're working on the—the problem, the virus. It's a—it's a very tough situation. But I think he's going to handle it. I think he's handled it really well. We're helping wherever we can."

Feb. 7, Twitter:

"Just had a long and very good conversation by phone with President Xi of China. He is strong, sharp and powerfully focused on leading the counterattack on the Coronavirus. He feels they are doing very well, even building hospitals in a matter of only days. . . . Great discipline is taking place in China, as President Xi strongly leads what will be a very successful operation. We are working closely with China to help."

Feb. 7, Remarks before Marine One departure:

"Late last night, I had a very good talk with President Xi, and we talked about—mostly about the coronavirus. They're working really hard, and I think they are doing a very professional job. They're in touch with World—the World—World Organization. CDC also. We're working together. But World Health is working with them. CDC is working with them. I had a great conversation last night with President Xi. It's a tough situation. I think they're doing a very good job."

Feb. 10, Fox Business interview:

"I think China is very, you know, professionally run in the sense that they have everything under control," Trump said. "I really believe they are going to have it under control fairly soon. You know in April, supposedly, it dies with the hotter weather. And that's a beautiful date to look forward to. But China I can tell you is working very hard."

Feb. 10, campaign rally in Manchester, N.H.:

"I spoke with President Xi, and they're working very, very hard. And I think it's all going to work out fine."

Feb. 13, Fox News interview:

"I think they've handled it professionally and I think they're extremely capable and I think President Xi is extremely capable and I hope that it's going to be resolved."

Feb. 18, remarks before Air Force One departure:

"I think President Xi is working very hard. As you know, I spoke with him recently. He's working really hard. It's a tough problem. I think he's going to do—look, I've seen them build hospitals in a short period of time. I really believe he wants to get that done, and he wants to get it done fast. Yes, I think he's doing it very professionally."

Feb. 23, remarks before Marine One departure:

"I think President Xi is working very, very hard. I spoke to him. He's working very hard. I think he's doing a very good job. It's a big problem. But President Xi loves his country. He's working very hard to solve the problem, and he will solve the problem. OK?"

Feb. 26, remarks at a business roundtable in New Delhi, India:

"China is working very, very hard. I have spoken to President Xi, and they're working very hard. And if you know anything about him, I think he'll be in pretty good shape. They're—they've had a rough patch, and I think right now they have it—it looks like they're getting it under control more and more. They're getting it more and more under control."

Feb. 27, Coronavirus Task Force press conference:

"I spoke with President Xi. We had a great talk. He's working very hard, I have to say. He's working very, very hard. And if you can count on the reports coming out of China, that spread has gone down quite a bit. The infection seems to have gone down over the last two days. As opposed to getting larger, it's actually gotten smaller."

Feb. 29, Coronavirus Task Force press conference:

"China seems to be making tremendous progress. Their numbers are way down. . . . I think our relationship with China is very good. We just did a big trade deal. We're starting on another trade deal with China—a very big one. And we've been working very closely. They've been talking to our people, we've been talking to their people, having to do with the virus."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I remind my Republican colleagues that the leader of their own party repeatedly applauded China during the peak of the pandemic.

The bottom line is that we should all be grateful that we have a President now that has actually launched an investigation to get to the bottom of this.

Today, hopefully, we will, in a bipartisan way, vote to make as much of that investigation declassified as possible.

Let's not forget the history here. Let's not forget who was praising Chi-

na's reaction to the coronavirus because I think it is important that we keep that in mind, especially listening to some of the rhetoric coming from the other side.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, although it is not the subject of today's resolution or any of the bills covered by this resolution, the Democrats just can't avoid talking about the release of the January 6 videos. They keep going back to it during this debate.

Madam Speaker, I would remind them that 78 percent of Democrats out in America support the release of all of these videos.

The fact that they are apoplectic about the few minutes of video that Tucker Carlson released on Monday shows that Tucker Carlson is over the target. For 2 years, they have been selectively releasing information and videos to set a narrative. In just a few minutes, the entire narrative was challenged—might I say it collapsed under the scrutiny, under the review of just a few minutes of undoctored video that came from this body.

I applaud Tucker Carlson for releasing that. The American people are right. If the Democrats are so upset that only a few of these videos were released, I would remind them that they were able to release these at any point in the past.

Moving on to something that is the subject of this resolution, I want to talk about the repeal of Joe Biden's 2023 WOTUS ruling, the waters of the U.S. ruling. Like I said before, it is "Groundhog Day" again.

Under President Bush, we had one set of rules that farmers, homebuilders, and landowners came to understand. They were a little hard to comply with because every division of the Army Corps of Engineers might interpret them differently, or different States would interpret them differently, or different bureaucrats at the EPA would interpret them differently.

Then, Obama came along with a rule to expand the definition of waters of the U.S., and then Trump came into office and the rules changed again. Now, Biden is here trying, once again, to change the rules on what are the waters of the U.S.

The farmers and homebuilders I talk to don't say they don't want any regulations. Nobody in this body has said no regulation is what we want.

The question is, give us clear, precise, understandable regulations we can follow that do not change. Frankly, those should be written by Congress. They shouldn't be made up by every administration that comes into power. Yet, that is what we are doing, or that is what has happened.

Today, we are talking about repealing those onerous changes and unclear changes. For instance, Susan Bodine testified in front of the Transportation

and Infrastructure Committee this year on this topic, and she talked about the significant nexus test that they apply in WOTUS 2023, waters of the U.S. To support expanded jurisdiction under this rule, the agencies now claim that isolated water can affect the biological integrity of navigable water.

What does that mean? If you have a puddle of water that a bird lands in and drinks from and takes some seeds or some larvae, and when it drinks and flies to a river and deposits it in its bird droppings, or maybe as it flies over the river and it doesn't even visit the river, if there is any kind of biological connection—and as we have found, everything is biologically connected on this planet. If there is any biological connection that they can establish between a puddle of water on your property and a navigable water, then they say, this is now covered under waters of the U.S. This is ridiculous.

The only certainty that our farmers and our landowners are going to get from Biden's 2023 WOTUS rule is the certainty that if a raindrop has fallen on your property, a government agent will show up someday and tell you what you can and can't do with that property under this rule.

That is why it is important for us to repeal that, and that is why this resolution is so important.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this is the second time the gentleman has said that all the tapes of what happened on January 6 were released. Maybe he can tell us where the general public can find them. How do they get access to them?

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I said that the other side could have released them.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman said that all the tapes had been released. The only person who got the tapes was a political hack at FOX News who used them to distort the reality and the truth and to insult the service of the people who work up here, including our Capitol Police officers.

I am for releasing as much as can be released so long as it doesn't violate any security protocols. Let's listen to what the U.S. Capitol Police chief said in response to Tucker Carlson's coverage of January 6. He said: "Last night, an opinion program aired commentary that was filled with offensive and misleading conclusions about the January 6 attack. The opinion program never reached out to the department to provide accurate context."

"One false allegation is that our officers helped the rioters and acted as

'tour guides.' This is outrageous and false. The department stands by the officers in the video that was shown last night. I don't have to remind you how outnumbered our officers were on January 6. Those officers did their best to use deescalation tactics to try to talk rioters into getting each other to leave the building.

"The program conveniently cherry-picked from the calmer moments of our 41,000 hours of video. The commentary fails to provide context about the chaos and violence that happened before or during these less tense moments.

"Finally, the most disturbing accusation from last night was that our late friend and colleague Brian Sicknick's death had nothing to do with his heroic actions on January 6. The department maintains, as anyone with common sense would, that had Officer Sicknick not fought valiantly for hours on the day he was violently assaulted, Officer Sicknick would not have died the next day.

"As some people select from 41,000 hours of video clips that seemingly support the narrative they want to push, those of you who were here on January 6, those of you who were in the fight, those of you who ensured that no Member of Congress was hurt, those of you who contributed to the effort to allow this country's legislative process to continue know firsthand what actually happened."

I would just simply say, Madam Speaker, if we want to make sure that we do not see another January 6 ever again occur in our country's future, then we all ought to speak with one voice, condemn what happened that day, and characterize it for what it was: an attack on our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

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

Madam Speaker, I surely didn't expect this to turn into a debate on the January 6 videotapes or to hear the Democrats propose that it sounds like they are in favor of all of the tapes being released instead of just some of them.

I think if the gentleman would review the transcript, and I could be wrong, but I think he will find out that I said Tucker Carlson only released a few minutes of that, and those few minutes were able to destroy the narrative that had been constructed over 2 years.

But if the gentleman cares to answer a question, then maybe we have come to some bipartisan agreement that all of the tapes should be released.

Madam Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman when he speaks next if he would speak to that topic and if he would be in favor of releasing all of the tapes instead of releasing them partially.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, when the gentleman says that what Tucker Carlson aired somehow destroyed the narrative, I mean, give me a break, he is essentially basically saying what happened on January 6 conforms with what Tucker Carlson said. It is offensive to everybody who was here that day. It is offensive to the staff, and it is offensive to the Capitol Police officers. It is offensive to everybody.

Madam Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that what I said before was that I favored releasing tapes so long as they did not—it is my personal opinion—so long as they do not at all compromise any security. That is what I said.

But it is so sad to be on this House floor after what happened on that day and to hear Members of Congress basically try to cover up the horrendous atrocity that occurred that day, the attack on our democracy. It is shameful.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, what is just as revealing as what we are debating this week is what we are not talking about.

We are now 3 months into the Republican majority. They haven't passed a single bill into law yet, and, in fact, rather than debating things that people care about, we are spending week after week passing bills that are designed to get Facebook likes and retweets instead of making an actual difference with the people back home.

Three out of four Americans say that the Republicans in Congress do not have the right agenda.

Madam Speaker, if you want proof that they are right, then look no further than what so much of today's debate was focused on.

Democrats passed bills to bring jobs back from China and take on Putin's war of aggression. Republicans are passing bills to make it easier for Russia and China to spread their propaganda here in the United States.

Democrats passed laws holding polluters accountable, took action to get rid of lead pipes and clean up our rivers and lakes. Republicans are passing bills to protect the polluters that dump toxic chemicals into our water.

The American people expect more. They expect us to pass bills that actually matter to our families. Democrats have been putting people over politics to do it. We get stuff done while Republicans are chasing down the approval of the hyper online far right that spends

all their time on Twitter trying to own the libs.

So that is why I am asking my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question so we can get this House on record as saying that we are going to protect Social Security and Medicare.

Finally, Madam Speaker, again, the idea that the leadership on the Republican side was complicit with FOX News and with Tucker Carlson to spread lies and distortions about what happened on January 6 and to insult the service of the brave men and women who protect this building and all of us who are in it is unconscionable.

It would be so refreshing for Republicans to join us in condemning the distortions that were on FOX News. It is stunning to me that we can't get any of them to condemn. Some of them—their Senate counterparts—did, and I praise them for it. But the silence here is deafening, and it is offensive. It is offensive.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it is somewhat serendipitous, but in the context of this debate on a rule about other bills, it seems we have come to some agreement, it appears to me, with the American people, 81 percent of whom believe that all of the tapes should be released. It seems as if we have come to some agreement that we all would be better off if we get to the bottom of the truth and all of the truth comes out and all of the tapes come out so that no one side can distort what actually happened that day, and then let the American people decide.

So in the interest of transparency and in the interest of getting back to the subject matter at hand, which are three bills covered by this rule, I want to talk about S. 619, which is so important. It is transparency, and it is the transparency that the American people deserve. It passed by unanimous consent in the Senate. Even though it seems like there is some opposition on the other side, I suspect we are going to get a lot of votes from Democrats on S. 619.

I think it is important to go on the record for elected Representatives to say whether or not they believe their constituents are entitled to the truth which our government possesses or at least information that they possess that would help somebody come to a conclusion of what the origins of this virus were and did they come from Wuhan.

The President could do this at any time. He could have done it at any time in the past 2 years. He hasn't done it. It is time to put him on the spot and say: You either veto this or you release that information that you have withheld from the American public for 2 years, which is too long. I suspect we could overcome his veto.

Next, Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the Waters of the U.S. rule.

Why is this timely?

Because on March 20 this goes into effect. That is why it is so urgent to repeal the 2023 Waters of the U.S. rule.

These are laws.

Were they written by lawmakers?

No. Our Founding Fathers created three branches of government. We have the executive branch which enforces laws, we have the judicial branch which resolves disputes, and we have the legislative branch which is supposed to make the laws. Yet, here we sit abdicating that authority and that responsibility. You can delegate authority, but you can't delegate responsibility, Madam Speaker.

We have a responsibility to the American people to make sure that these laws are concise, that they don't change on the whim of an executive who gets in the White House, that they are not onerous, that they have their intended effect, and that they are applied uniformly across the country.

Yet we have abdicated that responsibility. But we will take that responsibility back by the passage of this rule and the subsequent legislation to repeal the WOTUS, Waters of the United States 2023, by Joe Biden. We, the American people, deserve that.

Finally, I will close by talking about H.R. 140. This is a bill that went through regular order. What a wonderful thing. We have talked about it so much. It is a bill that covers one topic only. We have talked about that so much. Here we are, and we even have a chance—even though it was amended in the committee—to amend it here on the floor to perfect it even more for Members and by Members who aren't members of that committee.

Are these amendments that are not germane?

Are these the kind of amendments that the American people hate where Members offer an amendment and then they stick something into a bill that is completely unrelated to it?

No. Every one of these amendments is germane to this bill. We have made sure of that in the Rules Committee. The gentleman serves on the Rules Committee, and he had plenty of time to voice his concerns there.

So we have a lot of amendments that are great. I think they will improve the bill. But what is most important is that people have a chance to have their point made and to get a vote on this.

Finally, I will talk about what H.R. 140 would fix. It would fix this loophole that they think they have constructed that allows the Federal Government to violate the Constitution.

Obviously, Federal agents can't take away our First Amendment rights, and, obviously, the Constitution wasn't meant to bind social media companies. It was meant to bind the administration.

What we have is a loophole where the administration leans on a social media company that they are paying money

to. Millions of dollars have gone to these social media companies from the CDC and from the FBI.

So when they say:

Would you pretty please ban this user?

Or:

Would you pretty please take down these posts? There is a whole series of these posts.

The government doesn't get in line. They have a back door that they can trot to every day and submit lists of people whom they think should be banned because they don't like what they have said.

This is dangerous to our Republic. If the other side wants to call it a democracy, then it is dangerous to the democracy. But this is a republic.

Our government has built an elaborate but constitutionally unsound framework for violating these natural rights.

As we have seen with the Twitter files, they boldly work in close cooperation with private-sector actors who aren't subject to constitutional restrictions imposed on government by our Founders.

But they also claim foreign influence and national security so they can target U.S. citizens with agencies in the government under the military chain of command whose missions are ostensibly directed at foreign actors who have no constitutional rights.

Elected lawmakers be damned, legions of government lawyers create shaky legal scaffolding and ad hoc doctrine to indemnify the actors within our government who eagerly exploit these loopholes.

In this way, government actors can claim everything they do is legal. They have a bunch of lawyers to back them:

Oh, we didn't do anything illegal, it is all legal. Here, look at our doctrine. The lawyers have gone through it, it is all legal.

Here is the problem, Madam Speaker: much of what they do is unconstitutional.

So whose job is it to resolve that difference?

It is actually not the Supreme Court's job. We are entrusted with oversight. We all here swore an oath to the Constitution, and if we know that authorizations that we have made or that funding that we have appropriated has been twisted in a way to get around the Constitution or to drive through a loophole that some lawyers in the administrative branch have created, then it is our obligation—we owe it to the American people, we swore an oath to the Constitution—to fix that—not to make them go to court to get some remedy—but to fix it, to stop it in its tracks.

H.R. 140 with its pending amendments is a good down payment on that promise to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I support this rule, I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 199

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 205, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hill
Alford	Diaz-Balart	Hinson
Allen	Donalds	Houchin
Amodei	Duarte	Hudson
Armstrong	Duncan	Huizenga
Arrington	Dunn (FL)	Hunt
Babin	Edwards	Issa
Bacon	Ellzey	Jackson (TX)
Baird	Emmer	James
Balderson	Estes	Johnson (LA)
Banks	Ezell	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Bean (FL)	Feenstra	Jordan
Bentz	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Finstad	Joyce (PA)
Bice	Fischbach	Kean (NJ)
Biggs	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (NC)	Fleischmann	Kiggans (VA)
Bost	Flood	Kiley
Brecheen	Foxx	Kim (CA)
Buchanan	Franklin, C.	Kustoff
Buck	Scott	LaHood
Bucshon	Fry	LaLota
Burchett	Fulcher	LaMalfa
Burgess	Gaetz	Lamborn
Burlison	Gallagher	Langworthy
Calvert	Garbarino	Latta
Cammack	Garcia, Mike	LaTurner
Carey	Gimenez	Lawler
Carl	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)
Carter (GA)	Good (VA)	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Gooden (TX)	Letlow
Chavez-DeRemer	Gosar	Loudermilk
Ciscomani	Granger	Lucas
Cline	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Cloud	Graves (MO)	Luna
Clyde	Green (TN)	Luttrell
Cole	Greene (GA)	Mace
Collins	Griffith	Malliotakis
Comer	Grothman	Mann
Crane	Guest	Massie
Crawford	Guthrie	Mast
Crenshaw	Hageman	McCauley
Curtis	Harris	McClain
D'Esposito	Harshbarger	McClintock
Davidson	Hern	McCormick
De La Cruz	Higgins (LA)	McHenry

Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey

Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rodgers (AL)
Rodgers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik

Steil
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Boebert
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Hoyer

NOT VOTING—12
Leger Fernandez
Lieu
Phillips
Schrier

Steube
Thompson (PA)
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)

Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rodgers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stewart
Strong

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—205

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert

Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Trahan
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)

Messrs.
KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SALINAS,
WILD, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina,
Mses. BROWN, and WATERS changed
their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. POSEY, GARBARINO, and
BANKS changed their vote from “nay”
to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam
Speaker, had I been present, I would have
voted “yea” on rollcall No. 134.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the adoption of the reso-
lution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. On that, I demand a
recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 216, noes 206,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—216

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foord
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson

Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert

NOES—206

Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Castro (TX)	Kiley	Salazar
Cleaver	Leger Fernandez	Schrier
Estes	Lieu	Steube
Hoyer	Phillips	Weber (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1402

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall No. 135, on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

SYRIA WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 21

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Syria by not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by Representative MCCAUL of Texas, Representative MEEKS of New York, and Representative GAETZ of Florida, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States is not at war with Syria. Rather, the United States is conducting limited but im-

portant counterterrorism operations in Syria against ISIS, formerly known as al-Qaida in Iraq, pursuant to the 2001 counterterrorism AUMF.

Those operations are being reported regularly to Congress, consistent with the War Powers Resolution. They are not new or unique to the Biden administration.

In fact, let me quote President Trump about what we are doing here when he said: "A small presence of United States Armed Forces remains in strategically significant locations in Syria to conduct operations . . . to address continuing terrorist threats emanating from Syria."

"These ongoing operations, which the United States has carried out with the assistance of numerous international partners, have been successful in seriously degrading ISIS capabilities in Syria and Iraq."

When ISIS was at the peak of its power in 2015, it controlled vast territory in Iraq and Syria, which it used to launch attacks in the Middle East and beyond. Those terrorists ruled with medieval brutality. We all remember the graphic videos of ISIS fighters beheading journalists and innocent civilians.

These monsters drew thousands of volunteers to join their ranks in Iraq and Syria and inspired terrorist attacks around the world.

Our U.S. military, working with a global coalition and local forces on the ground, helped to dismantle and destroy this vicious caliphate.

I am proud that our men and women in uniform answered the call to fight this menace, which threatened the United States and the world.

Even though ISIS no longer controls significant territory, there are still tens of thousands of hardened terrorist fighters in Iraq and Syria who are hell-bent on reestablishing their terror state.

In fact, in the last quarter of 2022, ISIS claimed 72 attacks in Iraq and Syria, including several IED attacks.

Thankfully, our small deployment of U.S. servicemembers is remarkably effective at working with local partner forces to achieve results and ensure the enduring and complete defeat of ISIS. Otherwise, these numbers would be much worse.

In 2022, we were involved in 108 partner and 14 unilateral operations, killing 466 ISIS operatives and detaining 215 others.

None of us want our soldiers overseas and in harm's way any longer than is absolutely necessary. I understand that the gentleman from Florida has introduced this resolution in good faith and is well intentioned, and he did it in response to a February 17 operation to kill an ISIS leader, in which four U.S. servicemembers were wounded.

Any injured or killed servicemember is a tragedy. We are eternally grateful for the sacrifice made by our men and women in uniform and their families and never take them for granted.

It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to reassess, on an ongoing basis, whether their deployments and the risk they involve are necessary. In doing that, we must recall President Obama's disastrous decision to prematurely withdraw our troops from Iraq in 2011.

A few short years later, American troops returned to fight the deadly ISIS caliphate, which grew out of the al-Qaida presence that had not been defeated.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Milley, was in Syria just days ago to see our troops and assess the state of our mission. He went there to figure out what value this mission holds for our security. He said: "Unless you support and devote the correct amount of resources to it, things will get worse," and, "If you completely ignore and turn your back, then you are setting the conditions for a resurgence."

That is why I strongly oppose this resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from Syria, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1415

If we withdraw our troops from Syria now, we could see a resurgence of ISIS or another lethal successor in a short time. Withdrawal of this legal, authorized U.S. troop deployment must be based on the total defeat of ISIS.

Let me be clear: Congress' power to declare war is one of our most solemn Article I responsibilities. I understand why some in this Chamber are uncomfortable with using a 22-year-old force authorization for current operations.

I believe that we should be working together, in a bipartisan manner, to have an updated replacement to this AUMF to address the current threat environment, while also keeping Congress engaged with our constitutional responsibilities.

But this resolution does not work to that end. I believe it would call for an artificial withdrawal and it would be a win for the ISIS terrorists committed to our destruction.

The bottom line is: The premise upon this resolution—as the Parliamentarian doesn't make fact-based determinations—the premise of this whole thing is that there is no authorization for troops to be in Syria today. It is just not accurate. In fact, it is wrong. In 2014, the ISIS threat was addressed under the Presidential authority of the 2001 AUMF.

I remember being in the White House with President Trump addressing this crisis, as well, about what to do about Syria, and whether we believe our U.S. troops should remain, in a very small footprint of 900 soldiers, in Syria.

At that time, President Trump made the decision that, under the 2001 AUMF, to keep these troops in country, and I believe that was the correct decision, and I stand by that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.