

make it a fact, Mr. Speaker. I actually asked around my entire delegation, my entire caucus: Does anyone want to reduce spending on Social Security? Not one person said yes. As a matter of fact, everybody said no.

As a caucus, we have discussed this multiple times, both on the floor and in conference, and we have all unanimously said that we are not going to reduce spending on Social Security.

As a matter of fact, I will challenge anybody who says differently to show me in writing where this secret document exists or where the secret statement exists because I haven't seen it.

I want to take this opportunity to express that just because you say it doesn't make it fact. The fact is that no Republican is talking about reducing spending on Social Security as a caucus.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 84

Resolved, That the following named member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Guest, Chair.

Mr. RESCENTIALER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO COMPOSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 12, as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78, the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with not more than 19 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 8 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 9, DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 76, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House. 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 except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics or their respective designees.

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

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is my good friend, 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. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 provides for consideration of two resolutions under a closed rule. They are H. Con. Res. 9 and H. Res. 76.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying resolutions.

H. Con. Res. 9 is a simple resolution denouncing the horrors of socialism in all forms and opposes the implementation of socialist policy here in the United States.

This resolution should not be controversial. Socialism is a harmful ideology that is opposed to everything the United States stands for. Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin both described and demonstrated how socialism is a transition period between capitalism and communism.

We have seen this time and time again. Socialist ideology creates a concentration of power that leads to communist regimes, totalitarian rule, and brutal dictatorships that deprive their citizens of basic freedoms and human rights.

We have seen the horrors of communism through the tens of millions killed by regimes in China, the Soviet Union, North Korea, Cambodia, and elsewhere, horrors that some of my colleagues across the aisle refused to even condemn yesterday during the Rules Committee hearing on this.

Even today, hundreds of thousands of Russians, Chinese, Cambodians, Koreans, Cubans, and Venezuelans have fled from murderous communist dictatorships and have legally resettled here in the United States. They are a living testament to the barbarity of these socialist regimes and the promise of the American Dream.

It is essential for Congress to condemn the atrocities committed in the name of socialism and prevent any socialist policies from being implemented in the United States.

Additionally, the rule before us provides for consideration H. Res. 76, a resolution that would remove Representative ILHAN OMAR from her seat on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Representative OMAR has a repeated history of making deplorable and despicable anti-Semitic remarks and does not deserve to sit on the committee directly overseeing U.S. international policy, partnerships, and national security.

In fact, the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a Democrat, Representative Eliot Engel, claimed that such comments made by Representative OMAR have "no place in the Foreign Affairs Committee or the House of Representatives."

Compared to the actions taken by my Democratic colleagues last Congress, I think that we Republicans are being incredibly generous in only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Foreign Affairs Committee instead of from all her committee assignments, which we are clearly in our right to do.

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

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am confused, Mr. Speaker, because after months of hearing from Republicans that they want to address bread

and butter issues, that they want to do something about the issues facing everyday people in this country, the issues that we hear about when we go home, we are here instead wasting the time of this body with two useless, stupid, political stunts which are about dividing people, distracting people.

Make no mistake, these are FOX News talking points, Tucker Carlson sound bites, press releases. That is what they are. And the reason why is clear.

When Democrats were in charge, we had one of the most productive Congresses in history. We passed the biggest climate change bill ever. We passed the biggest infrastructure bill since the interstate highways were built. We passed a bipartisan gun violence bill, stood up to greedy corporations, lifted kids out of poverty, and brought jobs and manufacturing back to America.

What are Republicans doing? What are they pushing instead of kitchen-table issues?

Conspiracy theories, nationwide abortion bans, a 30 percent national sales tax on groceries and gas, cuts to Social Security and Medicare, giveaways to billionaire corporations so they can cheat on their taxes; that is the kind of garbage that they are wasting the American people's time on.

H. Con. Res. 9 claims to denounce the horrors of socialism. What is this, the Red Scare?

I have to say, this is about the stupidest bill I have ever seen. Just a stupid, stupid, stupid bill.

Let me just say to my Democratic colleagues, vote however you want on this. It doesn't matter because it does nothing at all.

Oh, it denounces Pol Pot. Of course, we denounce Pol Pot. I have never heard anyone say anything nice about him.

We denounce Stalin. I didn't know that that needed a resolution.

We denounce Kim Jong-Un. Well, not all of us actually, because, in fact, if I remember correctly, it was the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, who said he fell in love with him, who talked about how talented he was, who called him a great leader, who bragged about their chemistry.

Did any of my Republican colleagues speak up when a brutal tyrant named in this resolution was applauded on the world stage by the President of the United States? Did they denounce that?

What is interesting, Mr. Speaker, one name I notice was missing from this list: Vladimir Putin. What is up with that?

I mean, we condemn Lenin and Stalin but not Putin? Is that a Trump thing? Did he put in a call? Seriously, why is Putin left out?

By the way, this isn't just a stupid bill, it is a badly written stupid bill. It lays out all of these awful people and then says, "We are rejecting the implementation of socialist policies in the United States of America."

Nobody, not a single person so far, has been willing to clarify for me what exactly that means, what the hell they are talking about.

Are we talking about public schools here? Fire departments? Roads?

What about Medicare and Social Security?

Republicans have called Medicare and Social Security socialist programs for years.

We would just like a little clarification here, and we got none last night in the Rules Committee. None. We even tried to include an amendment to clarify that the language here does not imply cuts to Social Security and Medicare. Every Republican, every single Republican on the Rules Committee voted "no." There is our answer. There is our answer.

Here is what I think: I think this is about scaring people, and it is about dividing people, and it is about distracting people.

That brings me to our next resolution, which removes our colleague Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR from the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I mean, the hypocrisy here is staggering. It literally takes my breath away.

Congresswoman OMAR has apologized for the things that she said. She said she wants to be an ally in the fight against anti-Semitism. She even voted to condemn anti-Semitism. Every Democrat did, as well.

You know who voted "no"? Twenty-three Republicans. Twenty-three Republicans voted against condemning anti-Semitism. Maybe the gentleman can explain whether or not they should be removed from their committees.

Then we gave our colleagues on the Rules Committee the chance to add an amendment to their socialism resolution condemning the mass murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazis, also known as the National Socialist German Workers' Party.

Guess what? They all voted "no." They all voted "no." Oh my God. Wow.

I keep hearing this both sides stuff, trying to make false equivalencies, saying the Democrats opened the door to removing her. Give me a break.

Congresswoman OMAR never posted a video pretending to kill another Member of Congress. She never advocated putting a bullet in the head of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. She never had dinner with Neo-Nazis Nick Fuentes and Kanye West. She never spoke at a white supremacy conference. She never said that she would have won January 6 because she was armed. No, those are things Republicans have done and have said.

I will ask again, why aren't those Members being removed, too?

Please, to my friends on the other side, please spare us the absurd comparisons and lectures about anti-Semitism. Republicans refuse to condemn anti-Semitism. Republicans refused to add an amendment condemning Nazis to this socialism resolution. Republicans have been silent while members

of their Conference say things that are blatantly anti-Semitic and appear beside Holocaust deniers and bigots.

These are awful, awful bills designed to divide and distract people. I get it. I mean, I get why. I would want to divide and distract people, too, if my agenda was as extreme as the agenda that the Speaker of the House is now advocating for.

They have spent their entire time in power so far pushing for higher gas prices, higher middle-class taxes, higher inflation, and higher drug costs. They are screwing working families, screwing poor people, and using stupid BS like this to distract from their plans to reward billionaire corporations and hurt working families.

In the middle of it all, they are threatening to trigger a default if we don't cut Social Security and Medicare. We can waste all the time in the world on these resolutions—and on the socialist resolution, again, I don't even care. This is such a waste of time. People can vote any way they want. I have just made it a habit to always vote "no" on stupid bills. This is a waste of our time and a waste of the American people's time.

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

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

I remind my good friend from Massachusetts that I don't think you will find anybody on this side of the aisle or in this Chamber that is more of a hawk on Russia than me, and I would gladly condemn Vladimir Putin. Let's not forget, Putin is a Communist. This is a man who started his career as a KGB agent, so this resolution clearly covers Vladimir Putin. We all condemn him.

Additionally, I remind the gentleman that the first time I ever spoke on the House floor—I waited weeks to speak as a freshman. The first time I spoke, though, was on anti-Semitism. I spoke to condemn the shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Squirrel Hill, Pennsylvania. I remind my friends across the aisle that we have been mischaracterized by some of the comments that were just said.

But let's talk about who won't condemn socialists. We had a ranking member, Democratic ranking member in the Rules Committee hearing yesterday who was given the chance to condemn. She would not do it. She was given a chance to condemn Putin, would not do it; a chance to condemn Pol Pot, wouldn't do it; and a litany of other socialists and Communists. I just remind my friend from across the aisle that Members on his side refuse to condemn socialists and Communist dictators.

I find it rich that there is a question over the definition of socialism. Remember, for the last 2 years, my friends across the aisle couldn't even define the term "woman." We had that rigmarole where they couldn't define "woman" and refused to acknowledge

science, that there were different sexes. Now they split hairs between the difference between socialism and communism? It is absolutely laughable.

Let's just define "socialism," since we are here having this debate. Socialism is a political and economic theory of social organization which advocates that means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned by the community as a whole, and it is not me saying that socialism leads to communism. That is Marx saying that. That is Lenin saying that. Part of their entire theory was you had a transition period between capitalism and communism. That transition period they called, again, Lenin and Marx, they called that socialism. Let's be very clear what we are talking about. Let's not play games with language, especially when you can't even define incredibly basic terms that even kindergarten students could define.

Let's talk about what Representative OMAR has said, talking about that because I think it is important to put this in context.

In February of 2019 Representative OMAR tweeted, "It's all about the Benjamins baby" in reference to American support for Israel. She said that AIPAC was buying U.S. Representatives. House Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the entire Democratic leadership actually condemned Representative OMAR for these anti-Semitic comments.

Then, again, just to show this is a pattern, this isn't some one-off incident: February 27, 2019, she doubled down on her stance at a forum in Washington, D.C., when she said, "I want to talk about the political influence in this country that says it is okay for people to push for allegiance to a foreign country."

Clearly, she is going back to the trope that Jewish Americans have a dual loyalty between the United States and Israel. That offended Chairman Eliot Engel, who at the time was the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and he said, "It is unacceptable and deeply offensive to call into question the loyalty of fellow American citizens because of their political views, including support for the U.S.-Israel relationship. We all take the same oath. Worse, Representative OMAR's comments leveled that charge by invoking a vile anti-Semitic slur." Again, that is not me saying that. That is a former Democratic chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Further, in March 2019, Representative OMAR trivialized the terrorist attacks of September 11 that killed just about 3,000 U.S. citizens by describing it as, "Some people did something." Her words.

In 2021, a few months before the death of 13 servicemembers during the botched withdrawal from Afghanistan, Representative OMAR compared servicemembers of the United States and the Israel Defense Forces to terrorist groups like Hamas and the Taliban. She tweeted, "We have seen unthinkable

atrocities committed by the U.S., Hamas, Israel, Afghanistan, and the Taliban."

To think that a Representative here in this body would equate the Israel Defense Forces and American servicemembers to Hamas and the Taliban speaks volumes. It is unacceptable. That person should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representative OMAR's Democratic colleagues sent a statement asking her to clarify those remarks because it was offensive and misguided. Again, the words of my colleagues across the aisle about Representative ILHAN OMAR's words, and she refused to apologize.

In May of 2021, Representative OMAR accused Israel of committing war crimes following days of conflict between Israel and Hamas, where Hamas was launching rockets into Israel that saw thousands of missiles fired indiscriminately at Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, killing civilians. She described Israel's defensive posture as war crimes, saying nothing about the terrorist attacks of Hamas.

So spare me the false outrage over her comments. She has proven time and time again that she should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to bring up H. Con. Res. 9, denouncing the horrors of socialism.

Why am I bringing this resolution to the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

Because young people in America are being brainwashed by the news media and academia into believing that socialism is an economic model for the greater good of all Americans. The problem is that they are falling for it. They are believing it.

Here is the proof: Almost 40 percent of Gen Z and millennials think "The Communist Manifesto," written by Karl Marx, the father of Marxism, is a better defense of freedom and equality than the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, one of the creators of the American experiment, American exceptionalism, and the document which gave birth to the most prosperous and resilient democracy in the history of the world, ours, the United States of America.

Worse yet, a recent poll shows that 40 percent of Americans of all ages, not only the youth, 40 percent believe that socialism is good, while 33 percent of them say that they are likely to support a member of the Democratic Socialists of America, the organization that has shaped the ideology of many of our colleagues with the poison of neo-Marxism. If you go to the Democratic Socialists of America website, you will read their neo-Marxist positions with pride.

□ 1245

I represent the 27th District in Florida, the city of Miami, a bastion of

hundreds of thousands of Cubans, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans who have fled, who have escaped from the despicable horrors that you cannot imagine produced by that ideology.

So why did the Venezuelans flee? Well, because Venezuela—why would they do that, if Venezuela has almost 20 percent of the world's oil? In other words, that means the largest reserves of oil in the world. The Venezuelans have more oil than the Saudis in Saudi Arabia. In the 1950s and 1960s, they had the same GDP as Germany. Now, inflation is 156 percent a year, the third largest in the world.

The average Venezuelan has lost 15 pounds for lack of food. In the last 20 years, over 7 million Venezuelans have escaped the democratic socialist paradise to anywhere they could go. That is more people than have fled the violence in Syria. So that indicates that socialism is more devastating than a civil war.

Another country who has lost everything is Nicaragua. In the 1970s, it was the breadbasket of Central America. Then the Sandinistas arrived, Daniel Ortega took power under the guidance of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He expropriated almost 30,000 properties in a few years. Right now, their citizens are poorer than they were in 1977. Ortega promised democratic socialism but delivered a dictatorship.

In the last Presidential election, seven people dared to run for President, and he put them all in jail. Still today, they are either under house arrest or in jail.

Every socialist is a dictator in disguise.

In Cuba, after 60 years of living the socialist paradise, the average Cuban, 70 percent of Cubans eat only once a day. The average Cubans makes \$23 a month. That is 40 cents a day. And the retirees, the seniors, make \$12.

Cuba, in 1960, had the highest per capita income in the hemisphere, and it was comparable to Italy. We know that because there is hunger—hunger is a very powerful motivator.

So today, Cubans by the thousands throw themselves to the sharks in the Straits of Florida looking for freedom and hoping to get to the district that I represent on this floor. That is just in this hemisphere.

In China, 55 million died. In Cambodia, 1 million. In the USSR, 10 million froze to death in the Gulags.

Socialists are in the business of power, and it only takes one generation to believe their false promise and lose their freedom. It is a lie that socialism will solve your problems, economic or social.

Democratic socialism is socialism, and socialism is always socialism.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this evil ideology take hold in this country. We are in the United States, the stronghold of freedom. That is why we must pass this resolution.

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

I listen to this debate, and I get more and more confused.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that Vladimir Putin was not put on this list because he is a Communist, yet the gentleman mentioned communism several times.

The gentlewoman just talked about the Communist Manifesto, and I am looking at the list of people that are mentioned. Among them is Pol Pot, who I think everybody believes was viewed as a Communist.

So again, I am trying to figure out why wasn't Putin included on this list. Did somebody get a call from the Mar-a-Lago prison line that you couldn't put Putin on this list? I don't quite get it.

Again, I am also just stunned that last night, I mean, we offered the Gottheimer amendment. The language basically said that fascism led to the murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazi regime.

Everybody on the Republican side voted "no."

Again, we asked for some clarification on really what the guts of the bill were, which is the resolved clause.

What are you talking about? What policies are you against here in the United States? We asked to make the Takano amendment in order, which would have basically said that Social Security and Medicare would be exempt from any cuts if this was not what the intention was. Every one of the Republicans—every one of them—voted "no."

There was a gentleman who just came down on the floor saying, "I don't know why everybody is saying Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare."

You know why? Because of what happened last night in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, last night in the Committee on Rules, the Democrats offered an amendment that would clarify that any opposition to socialist policy implementation in the United States does not include existing Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

My Republican colleagues voted against it. We want to give them a second chance to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to include this important amendment and give every Member on the floor the opportunity to clarify that existing Federal programs like Social Security and Medicare are not under attack by this new Congress. Forgive us if we are concerned by rhetoric from many Members on the other side of the aisle past and present, give us pause.

Republicans have called Social Security a socialist program. I remember when Newt Gingrich wanted Medicare to wither on the vine.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is the bedrock of our Nation's social safety net. Since its inception, it has lifted millions of our seniors out of poverty. Protecting the benefits it and other programs provide, should be a priority for this Congress. As my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying for our Nation's bills, we on the Democratic side are going to remain unified in doing everything we can to protect these important programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the amendment sponsor, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to rise today to offer an amendment which was a clarifying amendment, which would have clarified what the resolution before us today meant by the words "socialist" and "socialism."

None of us have any objection to, in fact, embrace the whereas clauses that we condemn egregious examples of totalitarian authoritarianism and the excesses thereof. But we are very concerned about what the resolved clause means and the way "socialism" is defined. There are many ways to look at socialism.

My amendment simply was to clarify that the implementation of any opposition of socialist policy in the United States does not include Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

But you know what? Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules last night blocked my amendment. The rejection of my amendment sends a clear message to the American people under this Republican majority.

Social Security and Medicare and veterans benefits are not safe because they construe those to be socialist programs.

This resolution being considered today is really ridiculous. It dishonestly conflates any effort to improve the lives of Americans with the violence of totalitarian Communist regimes. Without my amendment, it could only be read as an attack on Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits.

The programs my amendment specifies helps veterans receive healthcare, aid struggling families who have fallen on hard times, and support millions of Americans by ensuring they receive the benefits they have spent their life working and paying for.

Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and efforts to end veteran homelessness are programs every Member of this body should be proud to support. But instead, my colleagues on the other side have spent years attempting to undermine and dismantle them, and they are doing it again with this so-called resolution. This so-called anti-socialism resolution is simply the latest volley in an assault that goes back decades.

Despite these attacks, the programs my amendment defends are overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Americans know that these policies work. They are practical. They are beyond ideology. They are simply common sense. The people want us to join together to bolster and expand them, not to denigrate and defund them and play stupid games to distract and propose red herring amendments such as this to get us off the track of working for the American people.

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

We all know why we are here today. We are here to condemn socialism. Let's not play games. We know what socialism is.

Despite knowing what socialism and communism is, you are going to see Democrat after Democrat come down here on the floor and refuse to vote to condemn socialism and communism.

Let's talk about what that means. Mao Zedong, in the socialist revolution in China, you had 55 million people starve to death in the wake of famine and devastation caused by the so-called Great Leap Forward in China.

You are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Let's talk about Joseph Stalin. By the way, a history lesson: FDR, a Democrat, would refer to Joseph Stalin as "Uncle Joe" when he was trying to make this ruthless thug more palatable to the American people.

Again, a Democrat praising Joseph Stalin; but I digress.

Under Stalin, tens of millions died in the Bolshevik revolution.

At least 10 million people were sent to the Gulags in the USSR; and millions starved to death in Ukraine due to forced famine. Pol Pot eliminated one-fourth of the population in Cambodia.

Again, you are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Due to socialist and totalitarian policies, over 75 percent of Venezuelans currently live in poverty. Only 3 percent of Venezuelans consider themselves food secure. This was the largest GDP in South America before Chavez took over, and now they are literally eating their pet dogs to stop starvation.

Marxist socialist policies and communism regimes are responsible for hundreds of millions of deaths worldwide. Again, my Democratic colleagues

will come to this floor later today and refuse to condemn it. It is truly astounding.

Mr. Speaker, 3.5 million have starved to death in North Korea just since the 1990s alone. In the current Communist regime in Cuba, the government continues to repress and punish virtually all forms of dissent and public criticism as Cubans endure the worst economic crisis seen in decades.

Again, Democrats will come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

During Castro's rule, thousands of Cubans have been incarcerated in abysmal prisons; thousands more were harassed and intimidated; and entire generations were denied basic freedoms.

Again, my Democratic colleagues, some of them will refuse to condemn that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), my good friend.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of confusion today, a lot of bewilderment, a lot of dismay from my friends on the other side of the aisle on exactly why we are here today.

I am here to tell you it is a shame we have to be here today, that we have to publicly put everyone on record to denounce socialism. I rise today in somber support of this resolution, a resolution to denounce the evils, the horrors of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, this is a somber issue because our Nation was founded on the principles of liberty and freedom, enshrined in our founding documents as the thesis of our very Nation.

However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here have made light of the horrors of socialism and at times have advocated for this radical ideology to the point that the youth of our Nation have been deceived.

□ 1300

They have begun falling away from the true ideals of the freedoms on which our Nation was founded, that being liberty and democracy.

Let me clear up some of this confusion for our good friends: This cannot happen. We can never let it happen again.

Socialism has created famine, mass murders, and the killing of over 100 million humans around the world.

Many of the worst crimes in history were committed by socialist ideologues: Stalin, Mao Zedong, Castro, Kim Jong-un, and Maduro.

Yes, I am here today to tell you that we also condemn categorically any form of socialism, including Vladimir Putin.

This history cannot be forgotten, as socialist regimes have indefinitely led to the destruction of personal liberties and are still a constant threat.

Future generations must be taught. They must understand the horrors of socialism.

So, we stand here today. It is a shame we have to be here to do this, to

teach this lesson, to denounce the horrors of socialism, and to protect the freedoms of our great Nation and take a stand for personal liberty.

Our young people have been led astray. Our Nation has been blinded to some degree, and it is time to lift the scales off those blind eyes. It is time that every American take a stand.

It is time to tell the truth. The truth is the only thing that matters, and the truth is that socialism is evil.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a strange debate. I am glad the gentleman said that he personally condemns Vladimir Putin, but it still doesn't explain why Putin is not on this list.

I mean, if everybody condemns Vladimir Putin, then why isn't he on this list? There are other communists on this list. If we are going to condemn communism, fine, but communism isn't mentioned in this resolution.

People were talking about supporting capitalism, and capitalism isn't even mentioned in this resolution.

This is a stupid resolution that was written poorly to begin with.

Again, I would say to my colleagues that we gave you an opportunity to expand the list to include the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which is the Nazis, who are responsible for the killing of 6 million Jews, and everybody voted "no" on the Republican side. I just can't get my head around why that was such a controversial addition.

This is an interesting back and forth on history. By the way, when I go home, people are not bringing up Stalin and Lenin and Pol Pot all the time. They are bringing up Putin, and they are concerned about what he is doing in Ukraine.

Maybe the reason Putin is not on this list is because the other side of the aisle is divided in their support to help protect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. Maybe that is what we are going to see coming down the road, in terms of budget cuts.

I include in the RECORD a piece by Roll Call titled: "House GOP overlooks internal anti-Semitism, points at Democrats."

[From Roll Call, Dec. 1, 2022]

HOUSE GOP OVERLOOKS INTERNAL
ANTISEMITISM, POINTS AT DEMOCRATS
(By Rachel Oswald)

House Republican leaders on Capitol Hill are declining to condemn and punish antisemitism within their own party, preferring instead to argue that Democrats have the prejudice problem.

This comes amid the rise and mainstreaming of antisemitic rhetoric in the United States in recent months, including by major entertainers and top athletes, not to mention a sharp uptick in the last year of assaults on American Jews. Hate speech, threats and violence against American Jews are at their highest documented level in decades.

The issue came into focus in the last week after former President Donald Trump welcomed to his Mar-a-Lago club in Florida for

dinner the well-known white power leader and antisemite Nicholas Fuentes, an organizer and speaker at many "Stop the Steal" protests after the 2020 presidential election.

"Anyone who engages in antisemitic tropes or makes antisemitic remarks should face the consequences of his or her actions. It's not enough to just call out someone on the other side of the aisle when it meets your political aims," Jonathan Greenblatt, CEO of the Anti-Defamation League, said in a statement. "Frankly, what we need to see more of, is leaders of both parties standing up to antisemitism within their own ranks."

Some Republican leaders like Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky denounced Trump's dinner with Fuentes while others, such as House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy of California, offered milder criticism.

"I don't think anybody should be spending any time with Nick Fuentes. He has no place in this Republican Party," said McCarthy to reporters outside the White House on Tuesday. He went on to defend Trump, claiming the former president was ignorant of Fuentes' well-known racist and antisemitic views when he had him over for dinner.

At the same breaking-bread affair, Trump also hosted the hip-hop superstar Kanye West, who now goes by Ye and drew national scorn in recent weeks for verbal attacks on Jews on social media.

"I condemn his [Fuentes'] ideology. It has no place in society at all," said McCarthy, who is struggling to lock down the votes he needs from his caucus to become the next House speaker in January. Like other Republicans, McCarthy has stopped short of directly saying Trump has supported antisemitism with his actions.

In part to boost support for his candidacy with the conservative House Freedom Caucus, McCarthy has promised if he becomes speaker he will hold a House floor vote to remove Rep. Ilhan Omar, D-Minn., from the Foreign Affairs Committee. As a freshman lawmaker in 2019, Omar was roundly criticized for comments that elevated common antisemitic tropes about dual loyalty and Jewish influence over American politics.

Notably, however, House Democratic leaders led the criticism of Omar and she apologized. Though there have been other moments of tension in the ensuing years between Omar and the House's Jewish Democrats over her criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, she hasn't repeated the antisemitic tropes she made in early 2019.

The expected next chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Michael McCaul, said he would likely support Omar's removal from the panel.

"The Foreign Affairs Committee has always been very pro-Israel, pro-Jewish, and I don't think she's a perfect fit," the Texas Republican said on Tuesday.

Omar in a statement rebuked McCarthy and House Republican leaders.

"Whether it is Marjorie Taylor Greene holding a gun next to my head in campaign ads or Donald Trump threatening to 'send me back' to my country . . . this constant stream of hate has led to hundreds of death threats and credible plots against me and my family," she said of Taylor Greene.

"Instead of doing anything to address the open hostility towards religious minorities in his party, McCarthy is now lifting up people like Marjorie Taylor Greene, Emmer and so many others," Omar said. "If he cared about addressing the rise in hate, he would apologize and make sure others in his party apologized."

In contrast to Omar, some House Republicans haven't apologized, repeating antisemitic conspiracy theories and amplifying Holocaust deniers—including in the last year.

'KEEPING THAT PROMISE'

McCarthy indicated he sees removing Omar from the panel as fair play for the treatment Taylor Greene and Gosar received from House Democrats. . . .

"Last year, I promised that when I became Speaker, I would remove Rep. Ilhan Omar from the House Foreign Affairs Committee based on her repeated antisemitic and anti-American remarks. I'm keeping that promise," McCarthy said in a Nov. 19 Twitter post.

Gosar was also removed from his committee assignments a little over a year ago as punishment for circulating an animated video depicting him killing Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y. . . .

Though he reportedly privately reprimanded Gosar for publicizing the video, McCarthy didn't support taking away his committee assignments, nor did the rest of the GOP House caucus save for two members.

Rep. Tom Emmer, R-Minn., who earlier this month won a contested caucus election for the position of majority whip in the next Congress, made a similar reference in a letter he sent as National Republican Congressional Committee chairman that accused Bloomberg, Soros and Steyer of having "bought" control of Congress for Democrats.

"One of the most popular unfortunately antisemitic tropes is the idea that Jews are pulling the strings," said Rabbi Jill Jacobs, the executive director of T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights.

"People aren't expected to know everything about antisemitism, but when something gets called out the right response is, 'Thank you for letting me know. I didn't know that. I won't do that again.' We have not seen that from McCarthy and others. We have just seen deflecting and rejecting," she added.

And Rep. Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., the No. 3 House Republican, this year ran a series of Facebook ads through her campaign committee that accused Democrats of supporting citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants in order to "overthrow our current electorate and create a permanent liberal majority."

HATE AND VIOLENCE

That phrasing echoes the "great replacement theory," a far-right idea that is itself rooted in antisemitic tropes.

"When you look at white nationalist online chatter, it's very much all about this supposed Jewish plot. We saw it in the person who murdered Jews in a synagogue in Pittsburgh," said Jacobs, referring to the 2018 antisemitic terrorist attack at the Tree of Life synagogue that killed 11 people. "His rationale was that Jews were bringing in refugees to destroy America."

Antisemitism has been rising among both the far right and the far left, although experts said it is the far right that is statistically more likely to commit violent acts against Jews.

Last year, the Anti-Defamation League, which tracks and condemns antisemitism, documented 2,717 antisemitic incidents in the United States, a 34 percent increase over the prior year and the highest number recorded since the organization began its monitoring work in 1979. That figure included 88 incidents of violent assault, a 167 percent increase from 2020.

In New York City last month, police arrested two young men, one of whom said he ran a white supremacist Twitter group and had been posting threats to imminently shoot up a synagogue. According to news reports, the duo appeared to have recently been gathering weapons and ammunition for the thwarted terrorist attack.

Democrats and progressives are still divided over how to calibrate criticism from their side of the aisle about the Israeli government's human rights abuses of the Palestinians without crossing the line into antisemitic tropes.

"To fight antisemitism, you really need people from across the political spectrum. If you look at the violence against Jews in the last three or four years, it mostly comes from the extreme right. But if you know anything about antisemitism you know that it could someday come from other parts of society," said Ira Forman, a former special envoy to monitor and combat antisemitism in the Obama administration. "Democrats should be calling out Democrats and liberals and Republicans ought to be calling out conservatives."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Republican leaders have repeatedly declined to condemn and punish antisemitism, hate, and violence pushed by Members within their own party.

Again, I don't care how people voted. This is a meaningless, ridiculous waste of time, but my particular concern with this resolution is not all the whereas clauses. It is the resolved clause.

Many of us are concerned because of the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle because so many of you have referred to Medicare as a socialist program and Social Security as a socialist program.

We asked you last night simply to reassure us, and we had an amendment. You heard the amendment—Mr. TAKANO spoke about it—that none of this has anything to do with Social Security and Medicare. Guess what, everybody? They all voted "no."

That is what our concern is about, and people can say whatever they want on this. I mean, I can't believe, with all that is going on in the world, we are spending a day talking about this, but whatever.

This is the new Republican list of priorities, and there is no wonder why a poll just came out showing that the majority of American people do not share the views, values, and priorities of this current Republican House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear that people in Massachusetts are not talking about communism. Do you know where they are talking about communism? Places like south Florida. Places like Miami.

It is because, unlike those in Massachusetts, they have experienced communism. They have experienced socialism. Ask any Cuban refugee.

That is why you have individuals here like MARIO DIAZ-BALART, like MARIA SALAZAR, like CARLOS GIMENEZ who represent those districts.

This is an issue for a lot of Americans because they never want to see the horrors of socialism and communism here on our shores.

It is not just Cuba. Let's talk about China because my friends across the

aisle always hesitate to criticize and condemn China. It is quite remarkable.

China has deprived 1.4 billion human beings of their fundamental human rights. Since March 2017, China has detained and persecuted 1.8 million Turkic Muslims, the Uyghurs.

They put them in so-called political reeducation camps. We all know what those are. Those are death camps. Those are gulags. The Chinese have them in their western province. The world is silent on it, and my colleagues from across the aisle refuse to condemn socialism.

Those Uyghurs are being held in the western province without due process. They are being forced to engage in labor and forced organ harvesting. They are suffering atrocities like torture, and yet again, my Democrat colleagues will refuse to condemn socialism today.

The CCP hasn't just violated the rights of the Uyghurs in western China. They have also subjugated Tibet.

It used to be a cause celebre for my friends across the aisle to talk about freeing Tibet. When I was growing up in the 1990s, you saw the bumper stickers everywhere. Where is that outrage now from my Democratic colleagues? Why won't they call out China?

In Tibet, the CCP has engaged in severe repression of the Tibetans' unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage and is engaged in gross human rights violations in Tibet, including but not limited to extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture.

Elsewhere, the CCP is widely alleged to be a major harvester and trafficker of forcibly acquired organs. Organ harvesting targets minorities, including the Falun Gong, Uyghurs, Tibetan Muslims, and Christians in China.

Yet, where is the outrage from my friends across the aisle? Why won't they condemn socialism here today on the House floor?

The CCP attempts to eliminate minority peoples through forced abortion and sterilization. Where is the outrage from across the aisle?

There are 30 million more men in China than women due to forced abortions and the one-child policy, the result of Big Government socialism. Yet, again, my friends across the aisle will refuse to condemn socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK), my good friend and a good doctor.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why there is some confusion. I understand why we can get distracted by foreign nations and communism, which most of us agree is a bad thing.

What I think is enlightening, though, is how we opened. What was stated, in my understanding or recollection, was that it was just said that the last Democratic-controlled Congress was the most effective and productive in recent history, which you just agreed to.

The standard that the statement was made and measured by, though, shows

why we are having this discussion, why my Democratic colleagues are confused.

They equate record spending, record debt, and unprecedented control by government over private business as success. That is why they are confused about what this bill is about and why it is germane.

They do not understand what socialism is or, worse, don't recognize that their policies are in direct support of socialist leanings. Their policies have continuously placed government in a position to control businesses, picking winners and losers, deciding what is moral and immoral, and continue to advance the idea that government somehow should have been empowered to solve the very problems that it created.

To clear up things and create less confusion, we are trying to counter a movement that is moving toward something we have never been, a socialist nation.

We are a unique government created by the people, for the people, empowered to protect, not to provide for, and not to determine the outcome of people's endeavors.

We are uniquely positioned to benefit our citizens by empowering them, not through more government. I believe that we the people are far more valuable than we the government. That is why we speak against bigger government and socialism.

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

To the gentleman who just spoke, who talked about record debt, yes, we worry about that, as well. I would remind him that 25 percent of this Nation's debt was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

Let me repeat that: A quarter of our Nation's debt in all of our history was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

If increasing debt is the standard where you say a President failed, then there is no question that the previous President, Mr. Trump, was a miserable failure.

Let me say to my colleague from Pennsylvania who brought up China—again, I am having trouble following this debate. I will not be lectured by anybody on commitment to human rights in China. I co-chaired the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. I co-chair the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

I authored the bill, the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, by the way, which died in a Republican Senate. We managed to get it passed in a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate.

I have passed major legislation on behalf of the Tibetan people.

By the way, this is all happening now under President Xi of China. I am looking in this resolution, and there is no mention of President Xi.

We are debating issues that aren't even in this resolution. I mean, this is nuts.

I do want to get back to the other bill, the bill that my colleagues are bringing to take Representative ILHAN OMAR off the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I read in some of the publications that, to get votes, the Republican leaders apparently promised some of their Republican Members who were concerned about this process that there would be some due process put in place.

I include in the RECORD the statement released yesterday by Representative SPARTZ about what supposedly is in this resolution.

[Press Release, Jan. 31, 2023]

SPARTZ ISSUES STATEMENT ON OMAR: I WILL SUPPORT RESOLUTION WITH EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER RULES AND DUE PROCESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, Rep. Spartz issued the statement below on the resolution to remove Rep. Omar from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

"I appreciate Speaker McCarthy's willingness to address legitimate concerns and add due process language to our resolution. Deliberation and debate are vital for our institution, not top-down approaches," Spartz said. "The rule of law, freedom of speech, and due process are fundamental to our Constitutional Republic. Our founding fathers understood that pure democracy is dangerous and can lead to the tyranny of majority, mob rule and dictatorship. As to my fellow conservatives, I think setting a precedent of allowing an appeal process for the Speaker's and majority-party removal decisions is particularly important to freedom-loving legislators who usually are on the receiving end of issues like this."

Mr. MCGOVERN. The statement touts due process language that was supposedly added to the resolution. I have to admit, I am completely lost here.

There is nothing—let me repeat that, nothing; one more time, nothing—in this resolution that provides due process.

Don't take my word for it. I have a nice quote here for people to follow along with me. There is a quote in Politico today: "The whereas clause added merely references an existing process and in no way begins an appeal procedure or guarantees her committee seat will be reconsidered. It is non-binding and not actionable."

That is according to a senior GOP aide in a comment that they made to Politico. To whoever that senior GOP aide is, let me just say thank you for your candor. I think it is appreciated.

To people like the gentlewoman from Indiana and others who somehow think that they negotiated some sort of due process here, you didn't get anything. If you think you did, then you are a cheap date.

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

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate the long list of reasons that these resolutions are a waste of time. Quite

frankly, they are an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Let me be clear: The socialism resolution is useless. It does nothing. It does not matter. Who the hell cares how anybody votes on it?

We are here for one reason, and we are here for one reason only. My Republican colleagues are pushing an extreme far-right agenda that benefits the rich and powerful and screws over working families and everyone else.

They are not paying attention to the problems of everyday people, and that is clear based on the recent polling that has come out that shows just how out of touch they are with where people are at all around this country.

They are not paying attention to the kitchen table issues that people anguish over every night. I can assure you, and I don't care what part of the country you come from, people aren't sitting around the table talking about Pol Pot.

Anyway, that is what my Republican friends think is a national priority. I mean, we are talking about socialism in this resolution, but we are not talking about a definition or what it is. Are we talking about public schools? Are we talking about roads? Are we talking about Social Security?

I mean, give me a break. We have been hearing this stuff for decades and decades, Republicans saying Democrats want socialism. It is always some big, scary takeover that is just over the horizon that everyone needs to be afraid of.

□ 1315

When you don't have any good issues on your side and fear is all you have, that is what you run with, I guess. That is the Republican playbook.

You know what is funny is that the same Republicans who decry anything that government does as socialism never seem to have a problem when it comes to huge handouts for billionaire corporations. They want socialism for the rich but capitalism for the poor.

Call me crazy, but here is what I think: This resolution is not about socialism. It is about scaring people. It is about dividing people and, quite frankly, I think, based on what happened in the Rules Committee last night, it is about setting the stage to go after the social safety net in this country, which includes Social Security and Medicare.

If that wasn't the case, why in the world would my Republican friends not allow a clarifying amendment to make it clear that that was not the intent? They all voted "no."

When it comes to Congresswoman OMAR, a good Congresswoman who fights hard for her district and for her values, this isn't about punishing her for anything she said. It is about scoring political points.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would be condemning the folks on your side who dine with Holocaust deniers and appear at white supremacy rallies.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would have accepted our amendment to condemn the Nazis who slaughtered 6 million Jews during World War II; and every one of them voted “no.”

So please spare us the false equivalence. This is total BS, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

This is, really, a sad day for this Chamber. With all that needs to be done, with all that needs to be done, this is the priority. This is the priority, and, I should add for good measure, all of this is being brought to you under closed rules.

All the amendments that were offered, all the suggestions that were brought on this and other bills by Democrats and Republicans, were all ruled out of order. Some of this is non-controversial stuff, all closed.

The issue with Congresswoman OMAR was brought to the Rules Committee as an emergency. An emergency? Really? I don't get it.

You shouldn't be surprised because the last time the Republicans were in charge they brought a bill to the floor as an emergency to deal with cheese curd, so I get it. Everything is an emergency, especially when it comes to messaging and making political statements.

But look, we have to get back to the people's business, Mr. Speaker. We have to get back to focusing on kitchen-table issues, the stuff that people worry about every night. This is not it. This is not it.

I really regret that we are wasting this time on these poorly crafted bills that do nothing to help anybody in this country.

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

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

Just in the spirit of rebuttal, I would like to address some of the comments made by my friend across the aisle.

The spending under President Trump; there was spending under President Trump.

But you know what? He also had a pandemic, a pandemic that we haven't seen in the last 100 years.

So where is the excuse for the \$1.7 trillion that was just rammed through?

You want to talk about closed rules, things not going through regular order?

That \$1.7 trillion was rammed through. It was architected—didn't even go through the Senate Appropriations Committee. It was rammed through by two Senators that are no longer here who had zero accountability to the American public.

What about Build Back Better? Where is the excuse for that?

All Build Back Better did was increase inflation, hurt workers who have wages that aren't keeping pace with inflation.

What about the Inflation Reduction Act? Where is the excuse for that and why we had rampant spending there?

There is no excuse for it.

Let's talk about China. To paraphrase Marcus Aurelius, it is not about one's words; it is about their deeds.

Let's talk about the deeds of my friends across the aisle. Three years ago or so, my good friend, the Speaker of the House, put together—he wanted to put together a select committee on China, and he was strung along by my friends across the aisle.

Finally, the Speaker had to move forward on his own as the minority Republican leader to put together the China Task Force. I was privileged to be on the China Task Force. You know how many Democrats were on that task force? Exactly zero. Zero Democrats joined that task force.

So it is quite amazing how I hear that the Democrats want to condemn China; but when they had the chance to have a select committee to address the threat of China, they won't go along with. When they had the chance to join a task force explicitly put together to combat China and their malign influences on the world, zero of them joined that task force. So spare me the talk on China. We have seen how you treated China.

Let's talk about definitions; playing these silly games that we can't define “socialism” and “communism.” We are all educated. We all know what socialism is. We all know what communism is. So spare me the fact that “socialism” isn't defined in this bill.

This is especially rich from the party, my friends across the aisle who, for the last 2 years, couldn't even define basic terms like what is a woman. That is not just me saying that.

Let's talk about Justice Brown Jackson. She was asked during confirmation to define a woman; and you know what her response was? “No, I can't.”

So the party that can't define a woman now wants to sit here and say that we can't define “socialism” and “communism.” We all know what this is.

Let's talk about, lastly, Representative ILHAN OMAR and due process. I know there was a display put up regarding due process.

It is quite amazing how my friends across the aisle have now discovered the principle of due process after 4 years—I'm sorry—2 years of one-party rule here in Washington, D.C., 2 years where due process wasn't followed at all.

Where was the due process for my good friend from Georgia when she was removed from all her committees? Again, that is all her committees. We are only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Where was the due process for my good friend, Dr. Gosar, when he was removed, again, from all his committees?

There wasn't one Democrat who stood up and talked about due process. But miraculously, now we have found due process when the Republicans are removing somebody from a committee,

one committee, for anti-Semitic remarks, and a pattern of anti-Semitic remarks for that.

But let's just go back and talk about socialism. Let me be clear. Socialism must never take root in America. President Trump himself said America will never be a socialist Nation. These are words we should all rally around. We should all support that.

But for too long, Democrats have fought this far-left authoritarian agenda, regardless of the regimes across the globe that commit acts of violence and oppression against their own people in its name.

Experiments with socialism have led to painful human tragedy. We are talking about starvation, imprisonment, imprisonment without due process, I might add, and mass murder.

Capitalism has lifted more people out of poverty than any other system. It is capitalism that is the way out of poverty, not socialism, not communism.

Two hundred years ago, at the birth of capitalism, there were only about 600 million people in the world who were not living in extreme poverty. Today, due to the advance of capitalism, there are more than 6.5 billion people who are not living in extreme poverty. It was free-market capitalism that led the way here, not government-controlled socialism.

Since 1970, the percentage of the world's population living on the equivalent of less than \$1 a day has fallen by more than 80 percent. Instead of millions starving to death due to socialism and communism, capitalism has pulled hundreds of millions of people out of despair.

Socialism and anti-Semitism have absolutely no place in America.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 83

Strike the first section after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, 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 Financial Services or their respective designees.

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: “Page 3, line 4, add at the end the following:

“For purposes of the previous sentence, the term ‘socialism’ does not include existing

Federal programs and policies such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.”.”

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 83; and

Adoption of House Resolution 83, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 9, DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM AND H. RES. 76, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 207, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—207

Adams	Blumenauer	Carbajal
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Alfred	Bonamici	Carson
Auchincloss	Bowman	Carter (LA)
Balint	Boyle (PA)	Cartwright
Barragán	Brown	Casas
Beatty	Brownley	Case
Bera	Budzinski	Casten
Beyer	Bush	Castor (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Caraveo	Castro (TX)

Cerfilus-	Jacobs	Pingree
McCormick	Jayapal	Pocan
Chu	Jeffries	Porter
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clark (MA)	Kamlager-Dove	Ramirez
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Raskin
Cleaver	Keating	Ross
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Connolly	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Correa	Kildee	Ryan
Costa	Kilmer	Salinas
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Sánchez
Craig	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Crockett	Kuster	Scanlon
Crow	Landsman	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Scholten
Davis (NC)	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Dean (PA)	Lee (PA)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Scott, David
DeLauro	Levin	Sewell
DelBene	Lieu	Sherman
Deluzio	Lofgren	Sherrill
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Slotkin
Dingell	Magaziner	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Manning	Sorensen
Escobar	Matsui	Soto
Eshoo	McBath	Spanberger
Espallat	McCollum	Stansbury
Evans	McGarvey	Stanton
Fletcher	McGovern	Stevens
Foster	Meeks	Strickland
Foushee	Menendez	Swalwell
Frankel, Lois	Meng	Sykes
Frost	Mfume	Takano
Gallego	Moore (WI)	Thamendar
Garamendi	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Garcia (TX)	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)
Garcia, Robert	Moulton	Titus
Golden (ME)	Mrvan	Tlaib
Goldman (NY)	Mullin	Tokuda
Gomez	Nadler	Tonko
Gonzalez,	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Vicente	Neal	Torres (NY)
Gottheimer	Neguse	Trahan
Green, Al (TX)	Nickel	Trone
Grijalva	Norcross	Underwood
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Hayes	Omar	Vasquez
Higgins (NY)	Pallone	Veasey
Himes	Panetta	Velázquez
Horsford	Pappas	Wasserman
Houlahan	Pascarella	Schultz
Hoyer	Payne	Waters
Hoyle (OR)	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Peltola	Wexton
Ivey	Perez	Wild
Jackson (IL)	Peters	Williams (GA)
Jackson (NC)	Phillips	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Carey	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Cohen	Pence	Steube
Garcia (IL)	Petterson	

□ 1355

Mses. CRAIG, JAYAPAL, Messrs. PETERS, LARSON of Connecticut, and CORREA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FRY, CRAWFORD, and CALVERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 209, not voting 7, as follows: