

passion for boating, restoring his Jeep, and his craftsmanship as a builder. His love knew no bounds, evident in his role as a devoted husband to Mary Ellen; father to Anthony, Christopher, and Victoria; grandfather to Jackson, Ali May, Annaleigh, Anthony, and Evelyn; and as a good friend.

As we honor Anthony's memory, let us remember his kindness, generosity, and steadfast dedication to his loved ones and community. Though he may have left us, his spirit lives on in the hearts of all those who were fortunate enough to know him. May we carry forward his legacy of compassion and service as we bid farewell to a beloved friend. I will miss Anthony, as I know so many others will, too.

#### CONGRATULATING SHERIFF E.W. VIAR, JR., ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mr. GOOD of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of former Amherst County Sheriff E.W. Viar, Jr.

Sheriff Viar completed almost 40 years of service in law enforcement, including 8 years as the sheriff of Amherst County. He led many successful public safety initiatives, including expanding the K-9 program, using drone technology, and ensuring that there were school resource officers in every school to protect our students.

Through his diligence and dedication to public service, Sheriff Viar worked tirelessly to create a safe county for all Amherst residents. I thank Sheriff Viar for his extensive career of service in law enforcement, and I wish him the very best in his retirement.

Sheriff Viar is an example of the courage and bravery demonstrated by each member of law enforcement who selflessly works every day to keep our communities safe. I am honored to represent those like Sheriff Viar serving in law enforcement in Virginia's Fifth District, and I thank them for their continued commitment and sacrifice.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 615, PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2925, MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3195, SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST RESTORATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 764, TRUST THE SCIENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3397, WESTERN ECONOMIC SECURITY TODAY ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6285, ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE ACT OF 2023; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6090, ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2023

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1173 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 1173

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. The respective amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in each such bill shall be considered as adopted. Each such bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 615) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 3195) to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 764) to require the Secretary of the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of

debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3397) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-32 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the

Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), 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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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 gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, we are here to debate the rule providing for consideration of six bills to support our natural resources, public lands, and outdoor recreation.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources and provides each bill one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of the Antisemitism Awareness Act under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on the Judiciary and one motion to recommit.

□ 1015

First and foremost, House Republicans stand with Israel and are horrified by the increase in harassment on college campuses toward Israel and its allies. For years, Jewish college students have faced increasing anti-Semitism, and since October 7 there has been an over 300 percent increase in incidents on campuses.

Students are supposed to be protected from harassment, but it has been made abundantly clear that the leaders of these institutions are not going to do anything to stop it. Instead, they are allowing large-scale harassment to reign, forcing Jewish students to stay home.

Since these institutions refuse to protect their students, it is time for Congress to take action. H.R. 6090 clearly defines anti-Semitism according to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition. This will empower universities to take clear steps to keep Jewish students safe and respond to hostile, hateful speech not protected under the First Amendment.

Additionally, the bills under this rule protect domestic energy production; reverse the Biden administration's stop to push mineral production in my home State of Minnesota; and, finally, delist the gray wolf from the endangered species list. I am proud to stand in support of these today.

The gray wolf is an ESA success story. Its numbers in most of the country are thriving to the point where they have become a menace across much of northern Minnesota. The only reason it has not been delisted as yet is because there are a handful of activist groups and judges that would like to keep it listed forever. Rather than pushing for radical environmental activism, we should be celebrating the fact that the ESA achieved its goal and gratefully turn management and conservation efforts back to the States.

Madam Speaker, America is home to a wealth of natural resources, but this administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to wage war on domestic production. From energy in Alaska to minerals in Minnesota, the bills under this rule empower our domestic producers.

H.R. 6285 reverses Biden's decision to ban oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, supporting energy independence, good-paying jobs, lower fuel prices, and economic security that comes with it.

H.R. 3397 will ensure rural economies across the West maintain access to public lands for grazing, energy and mineral development, recreation, and timber production.

H.R. 615 upholds State wildlife management authority to protect against baseless claims that traditional lead fishing tackle and ammunition should be restricted.

H.R. 2925 would ensure responsible mineral development can continue on Federal lands. It unlocks mining projects across Western States, returning to the past 100 years of precedence and removing uncertainty created by the Rosemont decision from the Ninth Circuit.

H.R. 3195 helps the United States meet the rise in demand for critical minerals across the world by unlocking access to critical minerals in Minnesota. The Biden administration is leaving America at a disadvantage while adversaries, like China, work to expand their global influence. We cannot let this happen. We can be both good stewards of our public lands and take advantage of the many resources they provide.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

America was blessed by our creator with natural beauty and an abundance of natural resources—from grazing to farmlands, to minerals, fossil fuels, solar and wind—so we could feed our families and fuel our progress.

We owe the American people, and most importantly, our children and grandchildren a duty to protect those resources so they are available for fu-

ture generations and Americans are not left with public lands that have been degraded, mines that have been depleted, and profits shipped off to foreign corporations.

We owe a duty to those who love the forests and rivers in Minnesota or the rangeland in the Southwest to protect it and allow its use for recreation, grazing, and extraction.

The Natural Resources bills that Republicans have made in order with this rule fail to protect America's blessed creation for future generations. The bills would eliminate environmental protections and increase mining corporations' ability to take public lands from the American people for free.

Let me repeat that because Americans may not know that right now mining corporations—those big, profitable mining corporations—do not pay a dime in royalties when they take Americans' gold, silver, copper, or other precious minerals.

That takes me to H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act. The 1872 mining law that we operate under now is old. It needs updating. It gives away our public resources for free. In the arid West, it allows mining companies to use as much precious water as they want and doesn't require those big corporations to fully clean up after themselves.

Last week, I visited the Pecos Watershed, a vital resource for northern New Mexico communities and a river that flows to Texas. In that watershed, a foreign company had mined, polluted, and abandoned the people and the river that I visited.

We need to protect this type of land with these kinds of water resources, but H.R. 2925 would actually make it harder to protect this and other watersheds. It favors the biggest mining corporations and, even worse, favors foreign corporations.

We all know there is a long history of bad actors exploiting, misusing, and abusing their mining claims. H.R. 2925 would give away our Federal lands to these bad actors. Under the Republicans' proposal, corporations with the money could put four sticks in the ground, pay a fee, and then claim that land for mining without even proving the existence of minerals. The Republican proposal would also loosen restrictions so these corporations, even those based in countries like China or Russia, could more easily exploit American natural resources for free.

Why would Republicans work on a bipartisan basis to ban China from mining American data with TikTok but then be okay with China mining American natural resources for free?

In the Rules Committee, I introduced an amendment to prohibit our adversaries, like China, from taking our public lands and minerals. Sadly, every Republican on the Rules Committee voted against making in order these amendments to prevent foreign adversaries from accessing these valuable American resources.

I also introduced an amendment that would require mining corporations to make sure our waterways are not contaminated. Republicans blocked that, too.

Our current 150-year-old mining laws are not equipped for today's environmental challenges, but Republicans' response is to make it easier, not harder, for these greedy mining corporations to take what they want and leave their messes behind.

As if that weren't enough, this rule also makes in order what we should call the no public use on public lands act. This bill would overturn a new Bureau of Land Management rule that finally recognizes conservation and public land management as a value on par with other uses.

The BLM rule does not change their existing land management processes. BLM will continue to allow grazing, drilling, and other extraction on managed lands. What it does do is allow BLM to also include the important goal of conservation of the public lands as they consider new applications for Americans' public lands.

I might remind my Republican colleagues that they are turning their back on a great legacy, a great Republican legacy, from the Clean Water Act, the EPA, and the words of that great Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who said: "Conservation is a great moral issue, for it involves the patriotic duty of ensuring the safety and continuance of the Nation."

This patriotic goal of conservation and preservation is vital so our grandchildren can one day see the beauty that the West holds, and farmers and ranchers agree. They and other stewards of our land actively engaged with the Biden administration in the development of this rule. Congress should listen to the science and the stewards of this land on this issue instead of trying to dictate what is best for the West from D.C.

We should also continue President Biden's policy of ensuring our energy independence and security, all while growing American industry. I must also point out that the Biden BLM rule explicitly prevents foreign entities from holding conservation or mitigation leases, something that I might remember and remind our Republicans they were unwilling to do with regards to mining.

The rule also allows a bill that ignores science and would prevent regulation of lead-based tackle and ammunition. Didn't we learn our lesson with leaded gasoline and its harmful effects on people and the environment? Apparently not. Lead is poison.

We all have heard of and sometimes seen the death of bald eagles and other magnificent birds who have consumed even the smallest amount of lead buckshot or fragmented lead ammo. Lead finds its way onto hunters' and anglers' tables, too. One study found that there were lead fragments in 34 percent of ground venison burgers. Do you want your children to consume lead?

Every year, I make tamales for Christmas, and as my family has done for generations, we use wild game—deer, elk, and antelope—that has been hunted in New Mexico. We are grateful for lead-free ammunition because we don't want to poison ourselves or our environment.

This rule also makes in order a bill to undo the Biden administration's work to protect one of the world's most fragile and significant ecosystems, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In recent years we have seen record amounts of oil and gas production in the United States. We are the top producer of oil in the world right now. We can do that while also preserving the beautiful lands that make "America the Beautiful" the right song to sing.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to address the issue of anti-Semitism not just on college campuses but also across the country since October 7. Let me be clear: Anti-Semitism and hate in any form is simply unacceptable anywhere in our country. This rise in hatred across the United States should be a wake-up call for our democracy.

However, last fall, House Republicans proposed a 25 percent budget cut to the office that is actively investigating incidents of anti-Semitism on campuses. If you care about anti-Semitism, why do you take away the resources from the office that is prosecuting those kinds of claims?

Well, yesterday we got an answer why. My Republican Rules Committee colleague, Representative MASSIE, was very honest describing what this bill really is about when he said: "Everybody has introduced almost at this point a bill to deal with something along these lines since October 7. None of them actually get to anything real. I think it is a political ping-pong game, of course. We"—meaning Republicans—"get to serve every time, and a lot of these"—meaning resolutions like this—"are just political traps. I call them sticky traps designed to split the Democratic Party and get them stuck in the sticky trap."

I thank Mr. MASSIE for his refreshing honesty and candor, but if we wanted to actually do something real, we could. Rather than doing a sticky trap, we could take up my colleague Congresswoman MANNING's bipartisan bill, H.R. 7921, the Countering Anti-Semitism Act, which would designate a senior official at the Department of Education to counter anti-Semitism on college campuses, among many other solutions that are also based on Biden's policy regarding attacking anti-Semitism. If we want to deal with anti-Semitism on college campuses, I suggest a bill with real solutions is a good place to start.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, it is good to know that my Democratic colleague would rather children in Congo mine for cobalt than to create American jobs here and put in place environmental safeguards. I thank my colleague for putting that on the record.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the rule to bring my Anti-Semitism Awareness Act to the floor. I thank Chairman BURGESS, Chairman JORDAN, Leader SCALISE, and Speaker JOHNSON for their support for consideration of this bill and their leadership in combating anti-Semitism on college campuses.

What is happening on college campuses right now is horrifying. We have seen folks at these encampments telling Jews to go back to Poland, as if they weren't kicked out of their homes, murdered in cold blood, and sent to death camps less than a century ago. The leader of the protest at Columbia called for death to Zionists. There was a sign at George Washington calling for a final solution, which was the name of Hitler's plan to exterminate Jews. People are shouting that they are Hamas and calling for the burning of Tel Aviv to the ground. They chant for intifada and "from the river to the sea."

These are not peaceful protesters expressing their constitutional right to free speech. These are illegal encampments where demonstrators engage in harassment and urge violence against Jewish students, Jewish Americans, the U.S. Government, the Israeli Government, and more.

I unequivocally condemn the college administrators who haven't acted to quell these encampments and who have enabled their campuses to become unsafe environments for Jewish students.

At the Federal level, we must give the Department of Education the tools to identify and prosecute any anti-Semitic hate crimes committed and hold college administrators accountable for refusing to address anti-Semitism on their campuses.

This legislation defines anti-Semitism using the IHRA working definition and its contemporary examples so that there can be no confusion or interpretation when it comes to the heinous act of discrimination and violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. It has broad bipartisan support in the House and Senate and 59 cosponsors in the House, including over a dozen Democrats.

This is not about dividing Democrats. This has broad bipartisan support. If there are people in your Conference who embrace anti-Semitism, that is not our fault. That is something you should be rooting out.

When people engage in harassment or bullying of Jewish individuals, where they justify the killing of Jews or use blood libel or hold Jews collectively responsible for actions of the Israeli Government, that is anti-Semitic. There is no question about it.

It is unfortunate that we need to clarify that these actions are anti-Semitic, but it makes this bill that much more necessary. What is happening at Columbia, Yale, UCLA, and so many other schools is reprehensible and alarming, but it cannot be discouraging.

We must act so that the anti-Semitism on college campuses stops immediately. Our country's antidiscrimination laws must work for all of us, including Jewish students.

My Democratic colleagues are tripping all over themselves because of electoral politics. They are worried about votes in Michigan and Minnesota and trying to placate a pro-Hamas element of their party, people who are parroting Hamas talking points.

Literally, when I was at Columbia University last Wednesday with Speaker JOHNSON, Hamas endorsed the protesters on the campus grounds, saying that they are the future leaders of America. If those are the future leaders of America, God help us.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, we should be very clear: Charlottesville was wrong. January 6 was wrong. Taking over a courthouse in Portland was wrong. Burning down a police station in Minneapolis was wrong. Breaking in and seizing control of the library at Columbia University is wrong.

Let's call it all out and stop being a bunch of cowards. Anti-Semitism needs to be rooted out, and any Member who votes against this bill should hang their head in shame.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, how dare the party of Donald Trump and MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE come down here and lecture Democrats about anti-Semitism. Remember, the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, dines with Holocaust deniers and said there were "fine people on both sides" at a rally where white supremacists chanted: "Jews will not replace us." Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE appeared on stage at a white nationalist rally alongside a Holocaust denier. She tweeted anti-Semitic videos and talks about Jewish space lasers.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from POLITICO titled: "Donald Trump dined with white nationalist, Holocaust denier Nick Fuentes."

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

There was no objection.

[From POLITICO, Nov. 25, 2022]

DONALD TRUMP DINED WITH WHITE NATIONALIST, HOLOCAUST DENIER NICK FUENTES

(By Meridith McGraw)

Former President Donald Trump hosted white nationalist and antisemite Nick

Fuentes at his Mar-a-Lago resort in Palm Beach on Tuesday night, according to multiple people familiar with the event.

Fuentes, who frequently posts racist content in addition to Holocaust revisionism, was brought as a guest of rapper Kanye West, who now goes by Ye.

In a post to his social media site, Trump confirmed the gathering.

"This past week, Kanye West called me to have dinner at Mar-a-Lago," he wrote "Shortly thereafter, he unexpectedly showed up with three of his friends, whom I knew nothing about. We had dinner on Tuesday evening with many members present on the back patio. The dinner was quick and uneventful. They then left for the airport."

However eventful, the dinner reflects a remarkable moment in an extremely early 2024 campaign cycle: the frontrunner for the Republican presidential nomination breaking bread with a man who frequently posts racist content and Holocaust revisionism, brought there by a rapper who is launching his own presidential campaign under the shadow of his own antisemitic remarks.

"If it was any other party, breaking bread with Nick Fuentes would be instantly disqualifying for Trump," said Democratic National Committee spokesperson Ammar Moussa. "The most extreme views have found a home in today's MAGA Republican party."

In a statement, the White House said, "Bigotry, hate, and antisemitism have absolutely no place in America—including at Mar-a-Lago. Holocaust denial is repugnant and dangerous, and it must be forcefully condemned."

It underscores how few guardrails currently exist within the former president's political operation, with few aides there to screen guests or advise against and manage such gatherings.

Indeed, after POLITICO first reported the sighting of Fuentes at Trump's club, people in Trump's orbit denied the former president met with Fuentes at all. Only later was it revealed that he not only met with Fuentes but dined with him.

Karen Giorno, a former Trump strategist who is also now working for West's 2024 campaign, confirmed to POLITICO that she was also at the dinner with Trump, West and Fuentes.

Fuentes, who was present at the Charlottesville "Unite the Right" rally in 2017, has made a series of offensive and racist statements on his shows including that Trump was wrong to disavow white supremacy. He has been removed from YouTube and other social media sites. Trump's dinner with Fuentes comes just one week after the former president announced he is seeking reelection, and soon after West publicly made a series of antisemitic comments that cost him millions in endorsement deals.

In a separate statement, Trump denied knowing who Fuentes was, stating that the "dinner meeting was intended to be Kanye and me only, but he arrived with a guest whom I had never met and knew nothing about." Both that statement and the Truth Social post did not include a denunciation of West's or Fuentes' recent comments.

West discussed the dinner in a video titled "Mar-a-lago debrief," which he posted to Twitter. In it, he said that Trump was "impressed by Fuentes" because "unlike so many of the lawyers and so many people that he was left with on his 2020 campaign, he's actually a loyalist."

West went on to say he told Trump, "Why when you had the chance, did you not free the January sixers? And I came to him as someone who loves Trump."

And I said, 'Go and get Corey [Lewandowski] back, go and get these people

that the media tried to cancel and told you to step away from.'" The video includes photos of former advisers including Giorno and Roger Stone, and also conspiracy theorist Alex Jones.

Describing the event to Milo Yiannopoulos, a far-right provocateur who he hired to help with his campaign, West said that he also asked Trump to be his running mate in 2024, and said that Trump was "screaming" at him during the dinner, and that the former president called his ex-wife profanities.

"When Trump started basically screaming at me at the table, telling me I was going to lose. I mean, has that ever worked for anyone in history? I'm like, whoa, whoa, hold on, hold on Trump, you're talking to Ye," West said.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Atlantic titled: "Trump Defends White-Nationalist Protesters: 'Some Very Fine People on Both Sides.'"

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

There was no objection.

[From the Atlantic, Aug. 15, 2017]

TRUMP DEFENDS WHITE-NATIONALIST PROTESTERS: 'SOME VERY FINE PEOPLE ON BOTH SIDES'

(By Rosie Gray)

President Trump defended the white nationalists who protested in Charlottesville on Tuesday, saying they included "some very fine people," while expressing sympathy for their demonstration against the removal of a statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee. It was a strikingly different message from the prepared statement he had delivered on Monday, and a reversion to his initial response over the weekend.

Speaking in the lobby of Trump Tower at what had been billed as a statement on infrastructure, a combative Trump defended his slowness to condemn white nationalists and neo-Nazis after the melee in central Virginia, which ended in the death of one woman and injuries to dozens of others, and compared the tearing down of Confederate monuments to the hypothetical removal of monuments to the Founding Fathers. He also said that counterprotesters deserve an equal amount of blame for the violence.

"What about the alt-left that came charging at, as you say, at the alt-right?" Trump said. "Do they have any semblance of guilt?"

"I've condemned neo-Nazis. I've condemned many different groups. But not all of those people were neo-Nazis, believe me," he said.

"You had many people in that group other than neo-Nazis and white nationalists," Trump said. "The press has treated them absolutely unfairly."

"You also had some very fine people on both sides," he said.

The Unite the Right rally that sparked the violence in Charlottesville featured several leading names in the white-nationalist alt-right movement, and also attracted people displaying Nazi symbols. As they walked down the street, the white-nationalist protesters chanted "blood and soil," the English translation of a Nazi slogan. One of the men seen marching with the fascist group American Vanguard, James A. Fields, is charged with deliberately ramming a car into a crowd of counterprotesters, killing 32-year-old counterprotester Heather Heyer.

Trump on Tuesday made an explicit comparison between Confederate generals and Founding Fathers such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. "Many of

those people were there to protest the taking down of the statue of Robert E. Lee,” Trump said. “This week, it is Robert E. Lee. And I notice that Stonewall Jackson is coming down. I wonder, is it George Washington next? And is it Thomas Jefferson the week after? You know, you have to ask yourself, where does it stop?”

The substance of Trump’s unscripted remarks hewed more closely to his initial reaction to Charlottesville on Saturday, when he blamed “many sides” for what happened. On Monday, after two days of relentless criticism, Trump gave a stronger statement, saying “racism is evil” and specifically condemning white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, and neo-Nazis. Speaking to reporters shortly afterward, white nationalist Richard Spencer told reporters he didn’t see Trump’s remarks as a condemnation of his movement.

Tuesday’s appearance made it even clearer that those words had been forced on the president. Throughout his campaign, he was reluctant to disavow the white nationalists who have formed a vocal segment of his supporters. Asked if he had spoken to Heyer’s family in the days since her death, Trump said “we will be reaching out.”

Trump also addressed swirling rumors about the status of his chief strategist, Steve Bannon, who has come in for another round of speculation this week that his job may be in danger. Trump is reportedly angry about the recent book *Devil’s Bargain*, by the Bloomberg Businessweek writer Joshua Green, which portrays Bannon as the key reason for Trump’s election victory.

The president defended Bannon as having been unfairly attacked as a racist in the press, but declined to say if he still has confidence in him.

“I like Mr. Bannon, he is a friend of mine,” Trump said. “But Mr. Bannon came on very late. You know that. I went through 17 senators, governors, and I won all the primaries. Mr. Bannon came on very much later than that. I like him. He is a good man. He is not a racist, I can tell you that. He is a good person. He actually gets very unfair press in that regard. We’ll see what happens with Mr. Bannon. But he is a good person, and I think the press treats him, frankly, very unfairly.”

The remarks echo what Trump told the New York Post earlier this year during a similar moment of uncertainty about Bannon’s position. “I like Steve, but you have to remember he was not involved in my campaign until very late,” Trump told the Post in April.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to enter into the record, actually, my objection to this absurd attack on Democrats for pointing out that this bill has in the title “anti-Semitism,” but there are problems with it.

We need to address anti-Semitism and look at the root causes. Instead, what are we doing? We are debating codifying a definition that numerous Jewish organizations, including Jewish Action, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and the New Israel Fund, among others, oppose.

The reason these organizations oppose it is because we cannot equate criticism of Israeli policies with anti-Semitism. They are two very different things.

We need to remember that we are constitutionally bound to protect free speech, even, and more importantly, when it is speech with which we do not agree.

Yesterday, for example, in the Rules Committee hearing for this bill, Representative FRY called Prime Minister Netanyahu’s work in Gaza remarkable. He praised it. I personally don’t think it is remarkable that over 35,000 people, most of them children and women, are dead. I don’t think it is remarkable that over 130 hostages are still not home.

Netanyahu is being protested in his own country for these and many other things. I don’t think it is remarkable that 27 kids have already died of malnutrition and that famine is imminent for 1.1 million Gazans.

Saying none of this is anti-Semitic.

I am Catholic with Sephardi heritage, and I think that my love that comes from the teaching and my spirituality calls upon me to talk about these things. That is not anti-Semitic.

That is the worry that these Jewish organizations, ACLU, and others talk about today. If we really want to move forward on combating anti-Semitism, let’s fund the office that investigates and takes action against those colleges that fail to protect their students. Let’s move forward with Congresswoman MANNING’s bipartisan bill, H.R. 7921, the Countering Antisemitism Act.

We should investigate how these issues continue to seep into our schools and communities.

We could do real work to address these root causes. Instead, we’re debating a definition that numerous Jewish organizations, including Jewish Action, The Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and the New Israel Fund, oppose.

The reason these organizations oppose it is because we cannot equate criticism of Israeli policies with anti-Semitism. That is free speech.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee Hearing for this very bill, Representative FRY called Prime Minister Netanyahu’s work during this war “remarkable.”

I don’t think it’s remarkable that over 35,000 people are dead.

I don’t think it’s remarkable that over 130 hostages are still not back home today.

I don’t think it’s remarkable that 27 kids died of malnutrition or that Famine is imminent for 1.1 million Gazans.

Saying all of this could be construed as antisemitic if we adopt the definition we’re debating today.

That is not helping us move forward or address the scourge of antisemitism that’s hurting our students and their families.

To move us forward in the fight against anti-Semitism, we could consider Congresswoman MANNING’s bipartisan bill H.R. 7921, the Countering Antisemitism Act.

This bill would designate a senior official at the Department of Education to counter anti-Semitism on college campuses, among other solutions.

We could increase funding at the Office for Civil Rights so the office has the resources to actually investigate and address antisemitism on college campuses.

If we want to deal with antisemitism on college campuses then I would suggest that these are good places to start.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 17, a

bill to help with pay disparities for women in the workforce and strengthen our economy.

Madam Speaker, rising costs are affecting American families and the American worker, but instead of helping families put more money in their pockets to save for retirement, to send their kids to college, or to simply put food on the table, House Republicans are focused on helping Big Oil and Big Mining corporations.

My colleagues constantly talk about the economic hardship Americans face, but instead of bringing legislation to actually address that, nearly every bill in this rule would create a corporate giveaway at the expense of our public lands.

We see where their real priorities are—with the biggest corporations, foreign corporations, even Chinese corporations—but House Democrats are focused on the American people.

That is why we must bring up H.R. 17, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to address the wage gap for women of this country and make sure families aren’t cheated out of dollars and paychecks that they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in 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 gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, today, Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. They struggle with the high cost of living and wages that are not rising fast enough to keep up. Instead of addressing the real challenges that face American families, my Republican colleagues are wasting time with messaging bills.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle may recall that for a recent continuing resolution, he voted against a billion dollars in aid to Israel. The gentleman from New York voted against a billion-dollar increase in aid to Israel.

If we defeat the previous question, I will bring up H.R. 17, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to ensure women are paid fairly for their work.

On average, a woman still earns only 84 cents for every dollar that a man makes, according to the American Association of University Women. The disparity is even worse for women of color.

The pay gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns.

This is not just a problem for a few years out of a woman's career. It is a systemic disadvantage that compounds over a lifetime. This gap can put women hundreds of thousands of dollars behind in earnings over their careers and, in turn, severely reduce the amount they receive from Social Security, pensions, or investments after their working years are over. That puts more strain on working families and our safety net as a whole to support them in their older years.

Unequal pay is not just an issue of fairness. It is a major economic burden on families across the country.

America is in a cost-of-living crisis for many reasons. Families are living paycheck to paycheck. They can't pay their bills. They can't put food on the table. They can't get the healthcare they need for themselves and their families.

This cost-of-living issue, if you continue to deal with unequal payment for women in our workforce, only adds to economic insecurity.

The pay gap persists because of loopholes in the Equal Pay Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes those loopholes by mandating better data collection, protecting employees against retaliation for discussing wages or salaries, and removing obstacles to lawsuits that challenge systemic discrimination. In short, it gives the Equal Pay Act the teeth that it needs to get the job done.

At the end of the day, it is really this simple: Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. It is true in the House of Representatives, but not true pretty much everywhere else in this country. If we truly believe that, we should act on it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I am disturbed by my colleagues who are shameless enough to argue in favor of anti-Semitism. It is not covered by the First Amendment. It is hateful.

Universities have been rewarding bad behavior and punishing the ones being attacked, who now don't feel safe enough to go to class. This cannot be the norm.

I am disappointed in the universities that are standing by and allowing this and equally disappointed in my colleagues who do not see it as a problem.

Stopping anti-Semitism is not a messaging tactic like the other side implies. Stopping anti-Semitism is something we must do.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, what is really sad for me is that, on both sides of the aisle, we have issues. I think some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle have Russian disinformation, and on the other side of the aisle, it seems that there is a lot of Hamas disinformation. I truly do not understand why it is so hard to just call it out. I digress.

□ 1045

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

Requiring the Department of Education to use the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of anti-Semitism when enforcing Federal anti-discrimination laws will help to protect Jewish students across the country from violence and hate as we see it exploding every single day within our country.

Anti-Semitism has spread like wildfire on college campuses, and it is rearing its ugly head in the wake of Hamas' ruthless attack on Israel.

College students celebrate terrorists who brutally murder innocent civilians as martyrs, and faculty members call Hamas' assault exhilarating.

When I saw a sign at the Columbia protest—if you want to call it a protest—the sign said: “Free Palestine,” and right next to it, it said: final solution.

What does the “final solution” mean, I ask my colleagues across the aisle? I understand it is rhetorical, but you all know what final solution means.

Me being just one of two Jewish Republicans in the House and in the Senate, that means the end of Israel and the Jewish people. That is why that is in the definition of the IHRA, to be abundantly clear.

The abhorrent behavior underscores the clear need for Federal policy to protect Jewish students on these unfriendly campuses.

Usage of the IHRA definition in this context is a key step in calling out anti-Semitism where it is and ensuring anti-Semitic hate crimes on college campuses are properly investigated and prosecuted. College campuses should be safe havens for learning, not nests of hatred.

I urge my colleagues to say enough is enough and to support the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

I will ask my other colleagues on the other side of the aisle just one more time. When you see a sign—and you are Jewish in this country—on a college campus, and you say that being an anti-Zionist is not being an anti-Semite—which being an anti-Zionist is being an anti-Semite, to be very clear—but when you see “final solution,” I think you have a hard time accepting, especially when my family, almost two-thirds of them, were annihilated at Auschwitz.

We came to this country, and now my daughter is going to grow up in this world and look at a sign that says, “final solution?”

I speak for myself. I speak for no one else. It is abhorrent, and you all need to condemn this type of behavior and rhetoric that has consumed our country.

Enough is enough. Please. Just be a human and put your politics and political affiliation aside for a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members on both sides of the aisle to address their re-

marks to the Chair and not to each other in the second person.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make the record clear. Democrats and President Biden have repeatedly and constantly, and not just since October 7, condemned anti-Semitism and taken actual actions to actually address it, and that is the problem with what we are hearing.

As their own Rules Committee member has said it, these are about sticky bills. They are not about getting solutions.

We must remember that most of the bills in the rule today are actually talking about our natural resources and how Republicans want to turn the clock back on the progress that Americans have been demanding for decades to protect our natural beauty but also to protect our natural resources for Americans.

I want to talk a little bit about mining reform, a 1872 mining law that says it all. That law is way too old and needs fixing. Well, how do we make sure we go about fixing it?

The Republicans' proposal is to just give more of it away. It makes it easier for foreign corporations and for big, greedy corporations to take that land, to take those natural resources.

What do Democrats propose? We propose responsible mining reform that allows for critical minerals to be extracted without destroying our environment.

My good friend and ranking member, the former chair of the House Natural Resources Committee, introduced the Clean Energy Minerals Reform Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

That kind of bill would require annual rental payments for claimed public lands, treating mine operators the same way we treat oil and gas or any other ones. Let's make them pay for our resources. They belong to us.

Imagine if the \$300 billion in profits that is going to those foreign corporations went to Americans instead.

We would set a royalty rate of not less than 5 percent and not greater than 8 percent, based on gross income.

We would make sure that there would be a reclamation fund, so when the mining companies go in there and make their mess that there would be a way for us to clean it up.

I can tell you, New Mexico is littered. In Colorado, all the intermountain areas are left with these abandoned mines that leach acid into our rivers and streams and make it so that we cannot hike and camp on those lands.

I have picked up those rocks that when they are exposed to air and water create sulfuric acid, and they leave piles of them.

Those are the things that we must be doing. We must give the Secretary of the Interior the right to protect our public lands, to protect the waters of Minnesota, right, and to protect the waters of this great country.



Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of the rule and in support of H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, introduced by Mr. LAWLER from New York.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas launched a brutal surprise attack on the State of Israel in which 1,200 Israeli citizens lost their lives. This represented the most significant attack on Israel since the Yom Kippur War.

After those attacks, there was a massive increase and an outpouring of hatred toward the State of Israel and an increase in anti-Semitism.

Let's look at the facts. According to data from the Anti-Defamation League, from October 7, 2023, until the end of last year, there were more than 5,204 anti-Semitic incidents tracked by the ADL—more than the whole of 2022 in more than 2 months.

Unfortunately, there has been no greater breeding ground for anti-Semitism than on the campuses of our Nation's colleges and universities.

Jewish parents across my district and across this country are concerned for their children away at college.

Jewish students should feel safe on college campuses. The anti-Semitic actions on college campuses across this country and a muted response from university administrators is absolutely unacceptable.

While I respect the right to free speech as guaranteed by the First Amendment, the situation on campuses across the country has simply gotten out of control.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has not taken the steps needed to adequately protect Jewish students, and I am glad that we, as Congress, are taking this important step.

If colleges and universities are not willing to take the steps necessary to combat anti-Semitism and to protect their own students, we must ensure that there are consequences.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and passage of this bill.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The natural resources bills that we are dealing with here today, as I pointed out, are a great gift to big mining corporations and overturn decades of work by local organizations and by the public in these areas who want to see their lands protected.

What is interesting is Republicans are putting forward these bills, even though the American public and their own constituents are not interested in seeing what they are doing.

While Republicans are helping out the big mining corporation fans, their constituents want the opposite.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article titled: "Analysis: Public Comments Overwhelmingly Support BLM Public Lands Rule."

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

There was no objection.

ANALYSIS: PUBLIC COMMENTS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT BLM PUBLIC LANDS RULE

DENVER.—A new statistical analysis of more than 150,000 public comments finds nearly universal support for the Bureau of Land Management's proposed Conservation and Landscape Health Rule, colloquially known as the Public Lands Rule.

The Center for Western Priorities performed a sentiment analysis on a random sample of 10,000 public comments submitted to regulations.gov as of the morning of July 5, 2023, in the closing hours of a 90-day public comment period.

CWP's analysis found 92 percent of the comments encouraged the Interior Department to adopt the Public Lands Rule as written or strengthen its conservation measures. 4.5 percent of comments encouraged the department to withdraw or significantly weaken the rule. Another 3.5 percent of comments did not express a clear opinion in support or opposition to the rule. The statistical analysis has a margin of error of  $\pm 0.5$  percent.

"This analysis shows overwhelming—though not surprising—levels of support for the Biden administration's conservation agenda," said Jennifer Rokala, executive director at the Center for Western Priorities. "Americans know that public lands are central to the Western way of life, and that they will play a pivotal role in the nation's response to the climate crisis. The support expressed during the comment period shows that the BLM is on the right track to restoring balance across the West."

The analysis used a combination of automated and manual classification of comments to categorize them as primarily "supportive," "opposed," or "neutral" on the proposed rule. The full set of analyzed comments and the toolchain used for the sentiment analysis are available online.

BLM's proposed Public Lands Rule would clarify how land managers across the West implement the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, known as FLPMA. The text of FLPMA's "multiple use" mandate has always placed conservation alongside other uses of public lands, including mining, oil and gas drilling, and grazing. But BLM's implementation of the law has never explicitly treated conservation as one of those uses. The proposed rule would bring BLM's implementation of the law in line with its text and congressional intent by providing guidance on the use of FLPMA's leasing authority to restore or conserve land to help BLM reach its goals. The proposed rule also increases the use of BLM's land health standards across all BLM lands, rather than just rangelands, and clarifies procedures for the identification and designation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), another pillar in the text of FLPMA.

Despite a coordinated industry effort to kill or weaken the proposed rule, CWP's analysis found limited opposition in the public comments, with an estimated 7,000 out of 152,000 comments encouraging BLM to withdraw or weaken the rule. By contrast, an estimated 138,000 comments supported the rule and its goals. The estimated 5,000 comments that were neutral largely encouraged BLM to add specific language around wilderness or wild horses and burros to the rule without

expressing clear support or opposition to the overall goals of the rulemaking.

The sheer number of comments submitted reflect the passion Americans have for public lands. The comments CWP reviewed included coordinated campaigns by conservation and business groups, technical comments from governments and scientists, and even handwritten, heartfelt letters from public lands users.

"The public comments show that congressional attempts to short-circuit this rule are misguided," Rokala added. "The American people aren't falling for the fear-mongering and disinformation coming from the oil and gas industry, even if some members of Congress are. Voters want the Biden administration to restore degraded landscapes while also making sure public lands play a central role in our renewable energy future."

The Bureau of Land Management will review and use the public comments during the next step of the rulemaking process to revise, clarify, and improve the proposed rule. The revised rule would then be reviewed by the White House Office of Management and Budget before being finalized and published in the Federal Register. The revision process could take up to a year to complete.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, that analysis found that the Biden administration's Public Lands Rule received 92 percent of support in public comments.

Madam Speaker, 92 percent of the 150,000 Americans who commented on this rule agreed that the BLM is moving in the right direction by protecting our public lands.

Many of them were farmers, ranchers, and stewards of the land. In fact, one farmer said to me: I recognize how important it is to allow our land to recover so that we can use it in the future for grazing.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the following article titled: "The 2023 Conservation in the West Poll from Colorado College."

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the article can be found here: <https://www.coloradocollege.edu/other/stateoftherockies/conservationinthewest/2023.html>

This survey found that 82 percent of voters across 8 Western States support the conservation of our public lands and waters. Let's listen to the people on the ground.

While Republicans want to mine the beautiful forests of Minnesota, constituents actually want to protect the area from sulfite or copper mining.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article titled: "The Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters 2022 Post-Election Poll."

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the article can be found here: <https://www.savetheboundarywaters.org/sites/default/files/resource-file/Campaign%20To%20Save%20The%20Boundary%20>

Waters%20\_\_\_\_\_%202022%20Post-Election%20Poll%20Results.pdf

Madam Speaker, the poll found over 70 percent of Minnesotans support proposed legislation to permanently protect the boundary waters from risks associated with sulfite or copper mining.

The boundary waters are one of the most visited national recreational areas in the United States. I look forward to going and looking at those lakes and those rivers and those forests and how they are intertwined and how those canoes glide along their surfaces.

Minnesotans know what that beauty looks like, and they want to make sure that the mining that is proposed by the Trump administration—and I might remind people that the Trump administration overturned actions by Obama, so they could give two leases to a Chilean billionaire—a Chilean billionaire, who it so happens, was a landlord of the President's daughter.

These kinds of dealings with foreign corporations, we must say “no” to. Why would Minnesotans want to take their precious natural resources and have them leased so a Chilean billionaire can make even more money?

We are urging our Republican colleagues to listen to their constituents, to listen to the people who are speaking on these issues, to vote against these rules, and to vote against these bills.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, the bills my Republican colleagues have proposed today threaten to overturn regulations put in place to make sure that we are responsible in our use of natural resources.

The Biden administration has worked to reverse many of the Trump-era policies that just help the rich get richer.

For too long, what we have seen in America is the rich keep getting richer, and it appears that Republicans, certain Republicans, but most definitely former President Trump favored the richest corporations.

In turn, I ask my colleagues to think about what our role is here in Congress. I remind my colleagues of these powerful words from the Conference of Bishops.

“We show our respect for the creator by our stewardship of creation. Care for the Earth is not just an Earth Day slogan, it is a requirement of our faith. We are called to protect people and the planet, living our faith in relationship with all of God's creation.”

□ 1100

It is possible to protect the planet and still be a leader in energy. In the last 3 years, the Biden administration has invested over \$18 billion toward Federal, State, local, and Tribal land conservation efforts in all 50 States.

Contrary to what my colleagues claim, the U.S. has had record oil and gas production under the Biden administration. We produced an average of 12.9 million barrels of crude oil, millions more than are coming out of Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Regulations are important. They prevent catastrophic environmental disasters, like the 137 oil spills that occurred during the second year of the Trump administration.

Remember, there will be no more elk to hunt, no more breathtaking lakes reflecting the sunlight to hike to, and no more oil and minerals to drill for if we do not listen to the experts about protecting our lands and waters. Wildlife protections and mining regulations are in place to make sure future generations of Americans can enjoy the same beautiful landscapes and profit off of America's resources.

Finally, I need to remind everybody, we all condemned October 7. We all have condemned Hamas. It is a terrorist organization. However, we have taken up these resolutions over and over again.

Once again, our Republican colleague has spoken the truth when he has said that these are sticky resolutions simply intended to divide the Democrats. Let's not work on division. Let's come together in love and a belief in each of our individual strengths to push back against the hatred that we see and to do it in a manner that is not partisan, that uplifts our morality, that uplifts our empathy for all, and that addresses all the forms of hatred that we see.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

House Republicans trust the American people to be good stewards of the land. The amount of regulations in place under this administration is insulting, and it is economically unsound.

While China and our adversaries are bolstering their capabilities, the Biden administration is tying our hands behind our backs. The bills counter Federal Government overreach, empower producers, and protect our lands. I am proud to stand in support of these bills today.

The gray wolf should be taken off the endangered species list. The American people should be permitted to access the wealth of resources this land provides, and they should be trusted to manage their lands at the State level without the Federal Government breathing down their neck at every turn.

Finally, universities are failing to keep their Jewish students safe, so Congress is taking action.

Those in the Jewish community should know that House Republicans support them and condemn the failed actions of universities to intervene. I am hopeful that H.R. 6090 clarifies the definition of anti-Semitism so that these universities finally run out of ex-

cuses for their inaction. Stopping anti-Semitism is something we must do.

Madam Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1173 OFFERED BY  
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 17) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 17.

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

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

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam 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 subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1130

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW) at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: