

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding performance of Central Mountain High School's David Lindsay.

He recently repeated as the State champion in the PA Class 3A tennis singles championship. It takes great skill, tenacity, and determination to be named the champion at this level 2 years in a row.

On May 26 at the Hershey Racquet Club, David completed a back-to-back sweep of the 3A singles championship bracket. He won 6-2 in the final match and remained the best singles player across the Commonwealth.

Madam Speaker, this is an incredible accomplishment for David and the Wildcats. I am proud of the team and David for their monumental season and dedication to the sport. I look forward to seeing what the future holds for David.

Congratulations to David for being the best in the Commonwealth and making the community proud.

#### END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tout the transformational Flexible Services Program in Massachusetts' Medicaid program and to highlight an important upcoming transition that will further strengthen its approach to supporting those experiencing illness, hunger, and homelessness.

Since early 2020, Massachusetts has been providing housing support and nutrition services like medically tailored meals, food prescriptions, kitchen supplies, and nutrition education and counseling to eligible members through MassHealth.

It is also the first of its kind to serve vulnerable household members like children and high-risk pregnant mothers.

Early next year, the program will transition to a new health-related, social needs services framework to better provide supplemental nutrition services to eligible members. Transportation and food delivery costs will be included as a supplemental benefit, currently among the biggest barriers to adequate and affordable nutrition.

I am incredibly proud of Massachusetts' forward-thinking approach to providing nutrition and housing supports to those struggling to make ends meet. I encourage other States to look at this innovative model. Together, we can end hunger now.

#### REMOVING NONCITIZENS FROM EXISTING VOTER ROLLS

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, only Americans should vote in American elections. That is why I rise in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility or SAVE Act, introduced by my friend from Texas (Mr. ROY).

This bill would require States to obtain proof of citizenship, in person, when registering an individual to vote and also requires States to remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls. These proposals are as commonsense as it gets.

Unfortunately, many on the other side disagree. While falsely alleging that the 2016 election was stolen due to foreign election interference, they ignore the very real threat of foreign election interference that currently exists.

Maybe if President Biden didn't hold the door open for more than 9.5 million immigrants to enter our country illegally, this bill wouldn't be necessary. Because he did, it is essential to pass the SAVE Act to uphold the integrity of our elections.

#### CELEBRATING THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF DEPEW

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 130th anniversary of the village of Depew. Named in honor of U.S. Senator Chauncey Depew and incorporated at a time of significant growth and industrialization on July 23, 1894, Depew quickly became a key manufacturing and railroad hub for the city of Buffalo.

Built on the hard work of immigrants hailing from Holland, Ireland, Prussia, Hungary, Ukraine, and Poland, the village thrived, raising generations of hardworking and successful Americans.

Historically known for being a vital manufacturer in the railroad industry, the village continues to be a hub of economic development in western New York, hosting numerous businesses in the logistics, construction, and hospitality industries, among others.

For the thousands of people who live there, Depew is home; a great place to raise a family, start a business, and be a part of a tight-knit community.

It is the kind of place where neighbors look out for each other and where civic engagement is still a core part of daily life.

I congratulate the people of Depew and my friend Mayor Kevin Peterson on the village's 130th anniversary and thank them for their continued contributions to the fabric of western New York.

#### HONORING ROSANELL EATON

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable life and enduring legacy of Rosanell Eaton. She achieved incredible feats, overcoming obstacles and championing voting rights.

Mother Eaton was a trailblazing figure in Franklin County where she was the first African American to register and vote. She rode 8 miles to Louisburg at the age of 21 on a mule to pass a literacy test.

Her work placed her on the State and national stage with her daughter, Armenta, by her side until her passing at 97 years old. She wore many hats and had an infectious smile and loved her church, her faith.

Recently, Michael and Deborah Liter, church members, renovated the building that once served as the local board of elections office at 217 Court Street and named it in her honor.

Mother Eaton's impact was felt far and wide, and she still inspires us. While at the building dedication, the sky became overcast, but the Sun reappeared, and our angel shone upon us.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8281, SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION H.J. RES. 165, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NON-DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8772, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7700, STOP UNAFFORDABLE DISHWASHER STANDARDS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7637, REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1341 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1341

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 House Administration now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided

and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived.

SEC. 4. (a) No amendment to H.R. 8772 shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and pro forma amendments described in section 5 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 5 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 8772 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 6. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 8772 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that

are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1215

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Madam 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported out a rule, House Resolution 1341, providing for the consideration of five measures: H.R. 8281, Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act; H.J. Res. 165, Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”; H.R. 7700, Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act; H.R. 7637, Refrigerator Freedom Act; and H.R. 8772, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2025.

House Resolution 1341 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 8281, the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act; H.J. Res. 165, Providing for congressional disapproval under

chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance”; H.R. 7700, Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act; and H.R. 7637, Refrigerator Freedom Act.

House Resolution 1341 also provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 8772, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2025.

The rule provides one motion to recommit for each measure.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule and look forward to supporting the underlying measures on the House floor later this week. H.R. 8772 supports the House of Representatives and its operations, recommending approximately \$5.5 billion for activities under the legislative branch’s jurisdiction. This includes the support of certain agencies, such as the Library of Congress and the Government Accountability Office.

Each agency listed in this appropriations package provides research and analysis to Congress. The Government Accountability Office, in particular, provides fact-based information and investigates Federal spending and performance. The reports and recommendations of this office are often used by Members of Congress and their staff as the basis for legislative recommendations and the basis for amendments.

My Democratic colleagues admit themselves in the Committee Report that there is no contention with the funding in this package. I hope then, Madam Speaker, that we may be able to pass this bill on a bipartisan basis to support Congress and a continuation of its ability to work on behalf of the American people.

H.R. 7637 and H.R. 7700 prohibit the Department of Energy from issuing, updating, or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators and dishwashers unless the standards are determined by the Department to be technologically feasible, economically justified, unlikely to increase net costs for consumers, and result in a net savings of energy.

Madam Speaker, inflation has taken a toll on every American. Appliance bills may not seem to be ostentatious, but they prioritize the taxpayer’s right to choose how to furnish their homes based on their lifestyle and not this administration’s Green New Deal laundry list.

H.J. Res. 165, introduced by Congresswoman MARY MILLER, prevents a Department of Education rule proposed and finalized under President Biden from taking effect. This rule, if not reversed, would place unfair burdens on schools, colleges, and universities, as well as potentially undermining protections in Federal law for biological women.

We must uphold Title IX for females to have equal access in academic and

athletic settings. For nearly half a century, it has been successful in ensuring that female athletes and scholars have opportunities historically only afforded to their male counterparts. This final rule from the Biden administration counters these efforts and seeks to fundamentally change what might be protected under Title IX. I urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman MILLER's resolution and oppose the Department of Education's rule on this matter.

H.R. 8281 introduced by my fellow Rules Committee member Representative CHIP ROY requires proof of citizenship to vote in Federal elections. This is a commonsense bill, and I hope Members across the aisle can agree to it. The right to vote in our Nation is a privilege, and it is a responsibility given only to American citizens.

Since taking office, the Biden administration has released well over 8 million illegal aliens into the country and over 1.5 million of these have been what are called got-aways. In some places in our country, the District of Columbia included, they allowed non-citizens to vote in local elections. This legislation corrects this trend for elections on the Federal level, requiring States to obtain proof of United States citizenship and identity before votes are cast.

Additionally, this legislation both allows a State to remove noncitizens from existing voter rolls and permits citizens to sue election officials who fail to do so.

Americans' faith in our national elections has declined precipitously over the last two election cycles. To restore that faith, we must work to protect American voters and the integrity of those very elections. Strengthening existing voter ID laws is a certain way to achieve both of these efforts. We owe it to our constituents to restore confidence in their electoral process.

I appreciate the bills brought before us today by my colleagues and all of the effort that has gone into crafting them. We did have a robust debate with witness testimony last night in the Rules Committee. Madam Speaker, I look forward to continuing those discussions here today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Republican Party released their new platform, and I heard Republican pundits saying that this platform was going to be more moderate. I saw reporters even claiming that Republicans were softening their radical, extreme views on abortion and on same-sex marriage. I even saw one Republican Senator on TV yesterday defending the platform and trying to spin it to make Trump sound like a normal, rational, moderate person, which is an impossibility, by the way.

Then I actually read the platform, and it is more of the same old same old. It is more of the same fear-mongering and divisive politics that they have been pushing for years now. They are not kicking MAGA extremism aside; they are doubling down on it.

Talk is cheap around here. Look at their legislation. Look at the bills before us this week. If someone looks at these bills and thinks the Republican Party is normal or rational or moderate, I think they need to get checked out because they are living in a fantasy world. These bills are getting crazier and crazier the longer they are in charge.

Here is the Republican agenda for this week: more attacks on the LGBTQ community; more attacks on immigrants; more attacks on voting rights because they know they can only win if fewer people vote; more attacks on working families; and more giveaways to special interests and billionaire companies.

There is nothing new here. There is just more division, more destruction, and more disarray.

There has been a lot of talk about Project 2025 lately, the Republican plan to dismantle the government, get revenge on their political adversaries, weaponize the White House, and install Trump as a dictator.

The former President recently made a laughable attempt to try to distance himself from its extremism, and what do you know, now Project 2025 is right here on the House floor because it is what Republicans actually believe.

That is what this SAVE Act is about. It is a voter suppression bill that lays the groundwork for them to undermine the next election so they can justify another January 6-style attempt to seize power even if they lose.

They will use this gotcha bill to say Democrats want to give noncitizens the ability to vote in Federal elections. Let me say now: That is a lie. It is a total lie. It is a lie that Democrats are against preventing noncitizens from voting in Federal elections. That is already illegal. What we are against is making it harder for American citizens to vote, and that is what this bill does.

Republicans in this bill want to require all this new documentation for an individual just to register to vote. They say: Well, you can use your passport.

What about someone who can't afford a \$130 passport? What about someone who doesn't have the time to take a day off from work to get their birth certificate? What about someone who recently got married and changed their name so their birth certificate doesn't match their ID?

The Republican answer here is: Too bad. You can't vote.

They are going to disenfranchise millions and millions of people in response to what we know, that there have maybe been a couple dozen cases of voter fraud over the last two decades.

This isn't about voter fraud. Let's be clear. This is not about voter fraud. It is about them trying to cheat in the next election. It is paving the way again for another violent insurrection if their candidate does not succeed.

I should say, Madam Speaker, the key witness in the House Administration Committee on behalf of this bill is one of the architects of Project 2025.

□ 1230

I mean, they are all linked. Let me throw one other thing out there for Members to digest. The chairman of the House Administration Committee, the Republican chairman of the House Administration Committee, I asked him pointblank whether Trump lost the election. He couldn't give me a direct answer. What the hell is wrong with these people?

They are so detached from reality. They are so oblivious to the truth. This is dangerous stuff.

Then, another Project 2025 priority is more giveaways for polluters and attempts to dismantle the entire Federal Government's effort to protect the environment. It is shocking, actually.

They want to take freedom away from women. They want to take freedom away from the LGBTQ+ community. They want to take freedom away from families who want to use IVF, but freedom for fridges? Sign them up. They want freedom for refrigerators and dignity for dishwashers while taking away the rights of actual people. It is sick.

For the record, if somebody wants to keep their 50-year-old refrigerator, go for it. This bill has nothing—nothing—to do with that.

This bill gives billion-dollar companies the ability to cut corners when they make appliances. I guess nothing says freedom to Republicans quite like forcing their constituents to pay more on their electric bills.

Republicans don't want to talk about how extreme they are. The bottom line is, we should want companies to make appliances more efficient. Why? Because it saves consumers more money. The only reason to be against that is to help the big energy companies so they can charge consumers even more.

My Republican friends don't want to talk about how they want to ban abortion nationwide and take away the right to choose in every State. They don't want to talk about how their own members want to ban IVF. They don't want to talk about their obsession with attacking the LGBTQI+ community. They want to turn the clock back on voting rights. The legislation that we are seeing on the floor today is just more of the same.

While Republicans desert the American people in service to Donald Trump, Democrats will remain committed to doing our job: lowering the cost of living, standing up to the special interests of big corporations, protecting the right to vote, and defending the freedom of our constituents. We are

proud to stand on the side of democracy, on the side of the American people, and on the right side of history.

Madam Speaker, this is just an awful rule. I will say more about that later. I urge a strong “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of the President.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am going to yield to Mr. ALFORD here in just a moment, but let me yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of a response.

It is difficult for me to sit here and be lectured about the cost of living by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, 2 years ago in the Rules Committee, when Republicans were in the minority and Democrats were in the majority, we pleaded with the then-majority to not do the American Rescue Plan, to not do the Inflation Reduction Act, and to not engage in all of this vast Federal spending that they had teed up.

The problem was, after the coronavirus infection in December 2020, the economy was basically getting back on its feet. All we had to do was stay out of the way. Instead, \$2 trillion went to the American Rescue Plan and \$4 trillion to the Inflation Reduction Act, with an extremely bloated infrastructure bill.

What happened? The cost of living blew through the roof for the poor and middle class because inflation became so severe.

The people who are supposed to be watching this, like the Chairman of the Fed and the Treasury Secretary, said that inflation is transitory, that we will get a handle on that. We are sitting here now, 18 months later, and they don't have a handle on it.

My colleague talked about the cost of living and talking to his constituents about that. They are still suffering from what Democrats did at the beginning of this administration.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BURGESS for leading this rule debate.

Madam Speaker, as I travel the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Missouri, I get one question repeated often, over and over: What are we going to do to secure our elections? We can pass a lot of laws in Congress, but if we don't secure our elections, we don't have a democracy. We don't have a Republic.

Voters in the Fourth Congressional District of the great State of Missouri

want to make sure that only those who should be voting are voting—one vote, one person, one citizen of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, that is why I rise today in support of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, or SAVE Act, H.R. 8281.

For years, progressive Democrats have falsely claimed that 2016 was stolen because of foreign election interference. Yet, today, they are ignoring the real threat of foreign interference: noncitizens registering and voting in U.S. elections.

The SAVE Act will address this threat head-on by requiring proof of citizenship in order to register to vote. It is pretty simple. It allows State officials to accept a wide variety of documents that will actually make it easier for citizens to register to vote. The bill also ensures that States can access the databases they need to clean up our voter registration rolls and remove noncitizens.

It is very simple, Madam Speaker. If you are not a citizen of the United States of America, you should not be voting in elections in the United States of America, but just like our progressive Democrat friends have defended on this very House floor Marxism, socialism, and open borders, they are opposing this very measure at this time in our Nation's history.

The dirty little secret is that progressive Democrats want to turn the some 12 million illegal aliens that have come into our precious sovereign Nation—because of this failed administration and their lack of ability to stop the illegal immigrants—they want to turn them into voters to secure more power, to make them dependent upon the U.S. Government.

Madam Speaker, we cannot let that happen. We will not let that happen. It is time to secure our border. It is time to secure our elections. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule for the SAVE Act and the act itself. The time is now. We may not have time again.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I don't even know where to begin after all that.

Madam Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the CATO Institute titled: “Noncitizens Don't Illegally Vote in Detectable Numbers.”

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

There was no objection.

[From the Cato Institute, Nov. 25, 2020]  
NONCITIZENS DON'T ILLEGALLY VOTE IN  
DETECTABLE NUMBERS

(By Alex Nowrasteh)

One of the most frequent and less serious criticisms that comes across my desk is that immigration is bad because non-citizens vote illegally in such large numbers that sway elections. A new report by James D. Agresti, pushed by some news outlets, argues that the number of noncitizens who illegally voted in

2020 substantially increased Biden's vote share but did not affect the outcome of the election. It has been illegal for non-citizens to vote for federal elected officials since 1996, so these noncitizen voters would all be breaking federal law. Is the Agresti paper reliable? Are large numbers of noncitizens voting in federal elections to such an extent that several states voted for Biden as a result?

No, but to understand why you have to follow how the Agresti paper arrived at its conclusion. The Agresti report relies on a peer-reviewed academic paper by political scientists Jesse T. Richman, Gulshan A. Chattha, and David C. Earnest that was published in 2014 that estimates the rate at which noncitizens voted for president in 2008. Their paper relies upon responses to the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) for the 2008 election that found a substantial proportion of noncitizens voted in that year. The Agresti paper combined two figures from the Richman, Chattha, and Earnest paper to get their primary estimate that 15.8 percent of noncitizens voted in 2008. Agresti then applies that 15.8 percent rate to the non-citizen population in swing states in 2020 to reach their conclusion.

The big problem, as explained in two succinct pieces, is that non-citizens voting illegally is a small subset of a small population of Americans measured in the CCES survey. In the CCES survey, as in any survey, a certain number of respondents click the wrong box. Thus, some respondents will incorrectly click that they are non-citizens by accident and that they voted. Or they will make any number of other errors. This general problem is called measurement error and it afflicts every survey. These errors are common in surveys, but if it surveys enough people and there isn't a tragic flaw in design that causes large numbers of people to make the same error, then it doesn't matter much for the final result.

“The problem is that the authors focused on a small number of non-citizens in a very large survey that likely accidentally said they were noncitizens who voted when they were really citizens who voted. The CCES survey asked about 20,000 people how they voted and about 19,500 of them said that they were U.S. citizens. Since the CCES is about federal elections, it oversamples citizens who can vote and under sample non-citizens who can't vote. In fact, the number of reported non-citizens in the CCES survey who said they voted in a federal election is just about exactly the number who should have misidentified themselves as non-citizens in such a large survey.”

“This problem arises because the survey was not designed to sample non-citizens, and the non-citizen category in the citizenship question is included for completeness and to identify those respondents who might be non-citizens. We expect that most of that group are in fact non-citizens (85 of 105), but the very low level of misclassification of citizens, who comprise 97.4 percent of the sample, means that we expect that 19 ‘non-citizen’ respondents (16.5 percent of all reported non-citizens) are citizens who are misclassified. And, those misclassified people can readily account for the observed vote among those who reported that they are non-citizens [emphasis added].”

Survey misuse, misdesign, and misinterpretation is a serious problem that we all witnessed right after the 2020 election. This strain of research appears to be another instance of that. There are likely many problems with America's voting system and there is no doubt that a non-zero number of non-citizens illegally voted, but there is no good evidence that noncitizens voted illegally in large enough numbers to actually shift the

outcome of elections or even change the number of electoral votes

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at a press conference on the SAVE Act, the Speaker of the House said: "We all know intuitively that a lot of illegals are voting in Federal elections, but it has not been something that is easily provable. We don't have that number."

Madam Speaker, this body legislates based on facts—at least, it is supposed to—not on intuition. Maybe it is time for House Republicans to get serious about their jobs and stop making laws based off of absurd conspiracy theories.

If my Republican friends want to talk about protecting elections, maybe they ought to start telling the truth about the last election. Let me remind my colleagues that the leader of their party tried to submit fraudulent slates of electors to steal the last election.

That is voter fraud, Madam Speaker. That is what voter fraud looks like.

My friends on the other side of the aisle said not a thing after court after court upheld the fact that we had a free and fair election, but the former President actually submitted fraudulent slates of electors to try to change the results of the last election.

The gentleman from Texas went on about the cost of living and blamed the American Rescue Plan Act and the Inflation Reduction Act. Those bills were passed in the aftermath of a pandemic to save our economy and to save American families from going bankrupt.

Madam Speaker, I remind the gentleman that inflation is coming down faster in the United States than in any other country in the world, but if he is blaming the Inflation Reduction Act and the American Rescue Plan Act for increased high inflation in countries like China and other countries in the world, that is absurd.

Let me just say one other thing because this is the rule that we are talking about here today. Republicans are emboldening our adversaries and abandoning our allies. They held up aid to Ukraine for 9 months, doing irreparable damage to the fight against authoritarianism.

By the way, I should also point out to those who dragged their feet on Ukraine that Russia bombed a children's hospital in Ukraine. Deal with that. Another war crime, yet we had Republicans holding up the Ukraine aid package. The Ukrainians are fighting against authoritarianism.

Speaking of authoritarianism, we have here four more closed rules, four more completely closed rules. Putin would be proud of some of the most authoritarian rules I have ever seen. They must have learned that from their patron saint, Donald Trump.

On the one structured rule here, they made only Republican amendments in order, no bipartisan amendments nor Democratic amendments, even though many of them were rule compliant. Republicans just want to shut this place down. They said "no" to everything.

If this is what my Republican friends consider a fair process, wow. I mean,

we have a bill that we think will disenfranchise millions of American citizens in terms of voting.

The ranking Democrat, Mr. MORELLE, had an amendment that he offered that was totally rule compliant. We ought to at least have that debate. The majority can vote to suppress the vote all they want, but we ought to have that debate and get people on the record. The Republicans of the Rules Committee said no.

What is the majority afraid of? Are Republicans afraid of a little debate on some of these important issues?

We have a different definition of "fair" because this process, once again, makes a mockery of this institution and once again shows the majority's disdain for democracy. The Rules Committee continues to be a place where democracy goes to die.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition not only to this rule but the bills that it advances.

I have to say that I am amazed daily by the debates that I hear in this Chamber and in our committees and outraged that the GOP is using the floor to advance a hateful agenda to take away voting rights and to advance insane legislation.

One week after we celebrated this great Nation's independence, we are here today as they are putting forward legislation to protect our kitchen appliances. That is right, folks. They are running bills on the floor titled the freedom for refrigerators and dignity for dishwashers. I am not making this up. These are the real names of the bills they are running this week.

Apparently, they are more concerned about the freedom of our refrigerators than the freedom to make decisions about our own bodies. They are more concerned about our dishwashers than they are about democracy. They are more concerned about appliances than an autocrat who is seeking reelection and says he wants to be a dictator on day one.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues, honestly, how do they do this with a straight face? Y'all, this ain't normal. This is insane.

Is this the freedom and democracy that our country fought for, arguing for kitchen appliances? Is this what constituents are telling my colleagues? Mine are telling me they are terrified about the future of this country, their families, and their rights. They are asking us to fight to protect LGBTQ+ rights and abortion, address climate change, lower costs, and protect voting rights.

□ 1245

You are over here asking us to vote on a bill to protect the rights of dishwashers and refrigerators. It is insane. I am just at a loss. It is time to wake up. It is time to get to work. It is time to serve the American people because, literally, our democracy depends on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would, once again, like to remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward presumptive nominees for the Office of the President and also to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), who is a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, first, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee and the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule today which includes consideration of my bill, the Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act.

The Biden Department of Energy, pandering to radical environmentalists, is actively working to make life harder for the American people. Under the administration's latest proposed dishwasher efficiency standards rule, the average American family would be stuck with fewer, more expensive appliance options, with no real cost savings over the appliance's lifespan.

By limiting consumer choice and imposing draconian new standards and regulations that make absolutely no sense from either an affordability or energy standpoint, this administration is making life harder for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 7700, and push back on these unaffordable policies that jeopardize access to affordable, reliable consumer products that we all once took for granted.

I am also proud to cosponsor another measure to be considered under this rule, the SAVE Act, which will require proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote in Federal elections. This legislation will ensure that only American citizens decide America's future.

The Democrats' open-border policies have brought nothing but chaos and destruction to our communities as millions and millions of illegal aliens have flooded into this country. The left's refusal to secure our borders is deliberate, and it is a direct threat to our democratic institutions as a growing number of noncitizens are registered to vote and have been found to vote in our local, State, and Federal elections.

By allowing noncitizens to vote, they dilute the voice of every American citizen, undermining what should be a free and fair election.

Enough is enough. We cannot stand by while our borders are overrun and our communities are destroyed. The SAVE Act must be passed to protect the integrity of our elections.

Madam Speaker, our country was built on the principles of freedom, fairness, and justice. This administration's policies are a slap in the face to every immigrant who followed the legal path to citizenship and who respected the rule of law and earned their right to participate in our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the SAVE Act so that we can safeguard our elections, secure our borders, and ensure a brighter future for all Americans.

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

Madam Speaker, sadly, this place is becoming a forum for trivial issues to get debated passionately and important ones not at all. I would say to the gentleman who just spoke that—and he should know this—that it is illegal for noncitizens to vote in Federal elections. It is already the law, but I feel like we have to point that out to my Republican friends.

In listening to the way he spoke with such passion about dishwashers and refrigerators, I feel I need to remind the viewing audience that this is not Home Depot. This is supposed to be the United States Congress where we are supposed to be tackling serious issues that are confronting the American people, and, unfortunately, under this Republican leadership, we never do that.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 12, a bill that would restore the nationwide right for providers to provide abortion care and for patients to receive care.

With bill after bill, House Republicans are letting the American people know who they are. Every opportunity they get they try to inject poison pill riders to ban IVF, to restrict access to abortion care, and to make life harder for the American people. As I have said before, they want to turn back the clock on our rights.

Just look at Project 2025, a dystopian plan for the future of our country crafted by former Trump administration officials. They want to cut your earned benefits. They want to cut school meals, and, yes, end access to abortion care. They even want to take mifepristone off the market completely.

Madam Speaker, we must bring H.R. 12, the Women's Health Protection Act, to the floor to let them know that we will not let them turn back the clock on the American people.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and in strong support of something my constituents are call-

ing about. It is not dishwashers, and it is not refrigerators. It is support for the Women's Health Protection Act which will provide in law the right for Americans to make their own reproductive healthcare decisions.

The rightwing extremists on the Supreme Court who authored the Dobbs decision overturning abortion rights have shown that they will do anything to further their regressive, extreme, and dangerous ideology regardless of the long history of Court precedent.

For almost 50 years, the intensely personal decision about whether or when to bear a child or have an abortion was right where it belongs, with the one who is pregnant.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim to be pro-life, but the policies they support are anything but.

I remember the days before Roe v. Wade when abortions done without medical care could and often did have tragic outcomes, including death. Even before the Dobbs decision, maternal death rates in 2020 were 62 percent higher in States that ban or restrict abortion than in States where it was acceptable.

Restrictive abortion laws also cause infant mortality rates to rise, including in Texas where both infant death rates and the number of babies who died of birth defects have increased since their restrictive law banning abortion as early as 6 weeks went into effect.

A study from Johns Hopkins University found that between 2021 and 2022, the infant mortality rate increased by 8.3 percent in Texas, and that is compared with a 2.2 percent increase nationally. While the death rate of babies 28 days old or younger fell in other States overall, it increased by 5.8 percent in Texas.

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, these laws are not about protecting life. They are about control: controlling the bodies of others and removing their personal freedom to make the decision about whether or when to bear a child.

This will not stop at the State level. At the first opportunity, congressional Republicans will try to enact a nationwide abortion ban to prevent anyone in this country from getting the care they need.

For these reasons and more, we must defeat the previous question so we can pass the very important Women's Health Protection Act to protect the right to abortion and restore the freedoms that the Supreme Court, with support from Republicans, brazenly stripped away.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out, and to bring us back to the discussion at hand, that we are talking about only having American citizens voting in American elections.

We are talking about checking a Department of Energy that has just run roughshod over the rights of working Americans. Let's remember what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me remind people what we are here about, as well, a voter suppression bill, we are here to talk about freedom for household appliances, and we are here to attack the LGBTQ+ community. That is what these bills are all about before us today.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the BBC titled "Project 2025: A wish list for a Trump Presidency, explained."

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

There was no objection.

[From BBC News]

PROJECT 2025: A WISH LIST FOR A TRUMP PRESIDENCY, EXPLAINED

(By Mike Wendling)

President Joe Biden's Democrats are mobilising against a possible governing agenda for Donald Trump if he is elected this November.

The blueprint, called Project 2025 and produced by the conservative Heritage Foundation, is one of several think-tank proposals for Trump's platform.

Over more than 900 pages, it calls for sacking thousands of civil servants, expanding the power of the president, dismantling the Department of Education and other federal agencies, and sweeping tax cuts.

The Heritage Foundation unveiled its agenda in April 2023, and liberal opposition ramped up as former President Trump has taken a lead in polls after President Biden's poor debate performance.

Early this July, Heritage president Kevin Roberts raised the prospect of political violence during a podcast interview.

"We are in the process of the second American revolution, which will remain bloodless if the left allows it to be," Mr Roberts told the War Room podcast, founded by Trump adviser Steve Bannon.

The remarks prompted the Biden campaign to accuse Trump and his allies of "dreaming of a violent revolution to destroy the very idea of America".

The comments have refocused attention on Project 2025.

It is common for Washington think-tanks to propose policy wishlists for potential governments-in-waiting. The liberal Center for American Progress, for example, was dubbed Barack Obama's "ideas factory" during his presidency.

What has Trump said about Project 2025?

In early July, Trump said on his social media platform that he knows "nothing about Project 2025".

"I have no idea who is behind it. I disagree with some of the things they're saying and some of the things they're saying are absolutely ridiculous and abysmal," he wrote.

"Anything they do, I wish them luck, but I have nothing to do with them."

However, several people linked to the project worked in Trump's administration or as allies in his re-election campaign.

Project 2025 director Paul Dans was chief of staff at the Office of Personnel Management under Trump.

Associate director Spencer Chretien was a former special assistant to Trump and associate director of Presidential Personnel.

Adviser Russell Vought worked in Trump's Office of Management and Budget.



What is Project 2025?

The Project 2025 document outlines four main aims: restore the family as the centrepiece of American life; dismantle the administrative state; defend the nation's sovereignty and borders; and secure God-given individual rights to live freely.

It is one of several policy papers for a platform broadly known as Agenda 47—so-called because Trump would be America's 47th president if he won.

Heritage says Project 2025 was written by several former Trump appointees and reflects input from more than 100 conservative organisations.

Here's an outline of several key proposals: Government:

Project 2025 proposes that the entire federal bureaucracy, including independent agencies such as the Department of Justice, be placed under direct presidential control—a controversial idea known as “unitary executive theory”.

In practice, that would streamline decision-making, allowing the president to directly implement policies in a number of areas.

The proposals also call for eliminating job protections for thousands of government-employees, who could then be replaced by political appointees.

The document labels the FBI a “bloated, arrogant, increasingly lawless organization” and calls for drastic overhauls of this and other federal agencies, including eliminating the Department of Education.

Immigration:

Increased funding for a wall on the US-Mexico border—one of Trump's signature proposals in 2016—is proposed in the document.

However, more prominent are the consolidation of various US immigration agencies and a large expansion in their powers.

Other proposals include increasing fees on immigrants and allowing fast-tracked applications for migrants who pay a premium.

EPA—Climate and Economy:

The document proposes slashing federal money for research and investment in renewable energy, and calls for the next president to “stop the war on oil and natural gas”.

Carbon-reduction goals would be replaced by efforts to increase energy production and security.

The paper sets out two competing visions on tariffs, and is divided on whether the next president should try to boost free trade or raise barriers to exports.

But the economic advisers suggest that a second Trump administration should slash corporate and income taxes, abolish the Federal Reserve and even consider a return to gold-backed currency.

Abortion:

Project 2025 does not call for a nationwide abortion ban.

However, it proposes withdrawing the abortion pill mifepristone from the market.

Tech and education:

Under the proposals, pornography would be banned, and tech and telecoms companies that facilitate access to such content would be shut down.

The document calls for school choice and parental control over schools, and takes aim at what it calls “woke propaganda”.

It proposes to eliminate a long list of terms from all laws and federal regulations, including “sexual orientation”, “diversity, equity, and inclusion”, “gender equality”, “abortion” and “reproductive rights”.

Jared Huffman, a Democrat congressman from California, has launched a Stop Project 2025 Task Force.

He described Project 2025 as “a dystopian plot that's already in motion to dismantle our democratic institutions”.

Mr. Huffman said the project would “abolish checks and balances, chip away at church-state separation, and impose a far-right agenda that infringes on basic liberties and violates public will.”

“We need a coordinated strategy to save America and stop this coup before it's too late.”

Heritage has previously said Mr Biden's party was scaremongering with “an unserious, mistake-riddled press release”.

“House Democrats are dedicating taxpayer dollars to launch a smear campaign against the united effort to restore self-governance to everyday Americans,” said Mr. Roberts in early June.

“Under the Biden administration, the federal government has been weaponized against American citizens, our border invaded, and our institutions captured by woke ideology.”

The Heritage Foundation is one of the most influential of a number of think tanks that has produced policy papers designed to guide a possible second Trump presidency.

Since the 1980s, Heritage has produced similar policy documents as part of its Mandate for Leadership series.

Project 2025, backed by a \$22m (£17m) budget, also sets out strategies for implementing policies beginning immediately after the presidential inauguration in January 2025.

In his speeches and on his website, Trump has endorsed a number of ideas included in Project 2025, although his campaign has said the candidate has the final say on policy.

Many of the proposals would face immediate legal challenges if implemented.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this article describes Project 2025, a policy wish list for a second Trump term cooked up by some of Trump's closest allies at the far-right Heritage Foundation. It is chilling. It is a chilling window into what may await us come January should Mr. Trump win.

The items on Project 2025's agenda are straight-up dystopian. They want to take complete control of the Department of Justice and end the independence of all Federal agencies. They want to take mifepristone off the market which would amount to a virtual nationwide ban. They want to slash efforts to combat climate change, implement inhumane border policies and fire thousands of government employees.

I am just scratching the surface here. You can read it for yourself, Madam Speaker. I urge people to download it and to read all the information on it.

If that wasn't horrifying enough, the architects of this atrocious Project 2025 are also threatening political violence to all who oppose them.

Just last week, Kevin Roberts, the president of The Heritage Foundation, said that the second American Revolution will remain bloodless if the left allows it to be.

Madam Speaker, Donald Trump literally incited an insurrection to stay in power. He claimed he would be a dictator on day one of his second term, and the Supreme Court just granted him full immunity for acts committed while in office.

Is anyone here stupid enough to believe he won't act on these threats?

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from

New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico, the Chair would, once again and, hopefully, for the last time, remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities towards presumptive nominees for the Office of the President.

Mr. McGOVERN. I didn't think I was.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the House Republicans' bills would give freedom to refrigerators but restrict freedom for American citizens to vote.

Last week we marched in parades and celebrated our Nation's 248th birthday. Democracy and elections are at the core of that celebration. However, this week, Republicans welcomed us back to Washington with a bill that chips away at Americans' most sacred right, the right to vote.

This bill is consistent with Project 2025, the extreme Republicans' blueprint they want to implement in a second Trump Presidency. Project 2025 is their proposal to restrict democracy, restrict women's freedoms, and favor the wealthy. Remember that, Madam Speaker. These bills favor the wealthy and corporations over consumers.

Project 2025 would do away with the Department of Education and destroy Social Security.

The architects of Project 2025 are the same people who served as experts for the bill we are hearing this week. We don't need to wonder if these extreme proposals could become a reality because the Republicans are showing us that when they are in charge they will go after our freedoms, our voting, and our planet.

Rather than celebrate the record-high turnout of our last Presidential election in 2020, the Republicans' SAVE Act, which is actually a voter restriction act, would decrease voting access for Americans citizens.

Republicans don't like mail-in and absentee voting, so they go after that.

If this bill becomes law, a recently married woman who changed her last name couldn't use her birth certificate to register to vote because her name would no longer match. If this bill becomes law, a military ID—imagine that—a military ID would not be enough for that servicemember to vote. Our men and women sacrifice so much. They risk their lives. Why would Republicans make it harder for them to vote?

Perhaps it is because military servicemembers voted in bigger numbers for President Biden than Trump than they had expected.

If that wasn't enough, their voter suppression bill would also make it more difficult for Native Americans to vote. They would not accept Tribal IDs. Imagine, the first Americans being restricted from their ability to vote.

I believe that they are going after the very communities that voted

against Trump last November with these bills.

But, wait, Madam Speaker, that is not enough. Once again, Republican bills favor big corporations over consumers. Republicans want to roll back popular energy efficiency standards because they favor the richest corporations. While the Nation swelters and the heat kills, Republicans ignore the climate change only to protect their biggest benefactors. They don't care about saving folks money on their energy bills.

Sadly, it doesn't end there.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. At a time when women demand that we have reproductive freedoms, Republicans instead brought us a bill to give refrigerators freedom. Republicans say that it is overreach to regulate home appliances, but they will regulate women's bodies. We say no, we are against these bills. We are against Project 2025. We urge Americans to see what they are doing and what they intend to do.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purposes of a response.

First off, on Project 2025, this is the work of a think tank. Here is a news flash for everyone: There are think tanks in Washington, D.C. There are a lot of them. There are right-leaning think tanks. There are left-leaning think tanks.

In fact, one of the more frightening left-leaning think tanks is Center for American Progress. The head of the Center for American Progress is now ensconced in the White House as the Domestic Policy Advisor to the Biden administration. Members shouldn't pretend that there aren't think tanks on the left just as think tanks exist on the right. Their purpose is to provide information to legislators, House Members and Senators, and sometimes to inform legislation.

The issue keeps coming up about freedom. Let's talk about freedom for just a moment.

What about the freedom for the parents who were targeted by the Biden Department of Justice for voicing their concern about their children at a school board meeting?

What about the freedom of the Jewish students who are being violently targeted on college campuses and whose mere existence is so offensive to the radical, pro-Hamas left?

What about the freedom for homeowners in my State on the southern border who cannot safely leave their homes because, in May alone, there were over 170,000 illegal immigrant encounters, including 350 members on the terrorist watch list, at least 350 that were apprehended. There is no telling how many more came across undetected and undeterred.

Let's talk about freedom of the American families who are working to put food on their tables, create opportunities for their families, but the economy of the Biden administration is crushing them.

Let's talk about freedom of citizens of our country who want to have a vote in secure elections and want to have confidence in our systems. This bill today will provide that confidence.

My colleagues support freedom, but it seems that their idea of freedom is reserved for those whose expression of it aligns with their values and their agenda. Nevertheless, the question that is before us today is not do we all share the same views on what constitutes good policy; but, rather, did we provide for consideration of these measures in a manner that is consistent with the rules and precedents of the House?

I believe we did our duty and responsibility at the Rules Committee to advance these measures to the House floor, where our colleagues can decide whether or not to support them on their merits.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I respond to the gentleman from Texas by saying: When Democrats speak of freedom, we are talking about freedom for people, not for dishwashers.

The gentleman raised the issue of Project 2025 as somehow it is the product of some distant think tank.

Madam Speaker, I would include in the RECORD a list of all the former Trump administration officials who are architects of this atrocious document.

I also point out for the record that the key witness in the House Administration Committee on this horrific voter suppression bill is one of the co-architects of Project 2025.

The gentleman tried to take a swipe at the Center for American Progress. I think they actually have good ideas, but the Center for American Progress doesn't want to install Joe Biden as a dictator, unlike what Project 2025 wants to do with regard to Trump.

Madam Speaker, we know that there is a lot that we can do when you have competent leadership in control. Look at the last Congress when the Democrats were in charge. We invested to rebuild our neglected infrastructure of airports, roads, bridges, and ports in our communities.

Many of my Republican friends voted against it, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take bows and issue press releases when the majority gets the money and a project is happening in their district.

We brought manufacturing back to the United States, passing the Chips and Science Act to drive innovation and create good-paying jobs. We made the largest investment in climate, protecting our water and our air. We strengthened our supply chains and set up new programs to support minority

businesses. We ensured that our veterans got healthcare that they earned during their service.

I would say to my friends: It is possible for us to deliver for the American people, though I haven't seen much of it yet this year. All we have done is vote on bills that destroy and dismantle progress, that further polarize this country. Now the far-right fringe are forcing us in a way that we are plummeting toward a costly government shutdown in an effort to get their extreme agenda through.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Hill titled: "Democrats deliver as Republicans dither."

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

There was no objection.

[From the Hill, Jan. 13, 2023]

DEMOCRATS DELIVER AS REPUBLICANS DITHER  
(By Debbie Cox Bultan, Opinion Contributor)

For the first time in a century, the House of Representatives failed to elect a Speaker on the first ballot, or even on the tenth, as Republicans were held hostage by a small group of extremists within their own party. Republicans ultimately found the votes needed in the 15th round, after tempers flared and concerns grew about the power that extreme members potentially would have in the new Congress. This kind of spectacle is the opposite of what Americans want to see.

In November's election, voters clearly rejected extremist candidates, opting instead for leaders such as Gov.-elect Josh Shapiro in Pennsylvania and Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson in Michigan, who ran on platforms promising to solve problems and better meet the needs of constituents. "Chaos agents" and 2020-election deniers lost in major statewide races across the country. Now, in return for voters' trust, Democrats must continue to deliver on issues that matter to ordinary Americans and show that we are the party that can deliver for our constituents.

Washington, it appears, is headed for two years of gridlock. This heightens the importance of state and local leaders, who must play a critical role through their work by putting forth innovative policies and by making the most of federal investments, including in infrastructure, housing and a clean-energy economy. Here's how:

First and foremost, state and local leaders must stay focused on issues that matter to voters. They have a tremendous opportunity to do so and to show the value of Democrats' approach to government, by making wise use of investments approved by Congress and signed into law by President Biden over the past two years.

The American Rescue Plan, for example, did more than just save scores of small businesses that were struggling to recover from the COVID pandemic. State and local leaders are using the funding to bolster child care initiatives in Columbus, Ohio, and expand broadband access in Brownsville, Texas. In Kansas City, Mo., local leaders are using that funding to address the issues of homelessness and affordable housing.

Similarly, school districts across the Nation will be transitioning from diesel-fueled school buses to electric ones through funding from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The demand for electric buses was so overwhelming that the Environmental Protection Agency doubled the amount of funding available at the end of last year, to nearly \$1 billion. Cleaner buses mean cleaner air



for the children and neighborhoods, as well as long-term financial savings for school districts.

There is the potential for thousands more projects across the nation to repair aging roads and bridges, and huge opportunities to grow a clean-energy economy that is sustainable and pays well. Plus, thousands of high-paying jobs will be created through the CHIPS and Science Act, an initiative to bring high-tech manufacturing back to American cities and towns.

Though the federal laws were largely pushed by Democrats, folks in red, purple, and blue states also reap the benefits. Increasing broadband access is not an issue of the political left or right but an American issue. The same can be said of safe bridges, access to affordable child care, quality education, and protecting our planet for future generations.

In addition, elected leaders must maintain focus on preserving and strengthening democracy. This means building upon safeguards to ensure that American elections continue to be safe from interference and malfeasance; expanding access to voting, both in-person and by mail; and fighting against anti-democratic and anti-voting legislation.

While Jim Crow-type voter discrimination tactics may appear to be in the rearview mirror, the North Carolina Supreme Court ruled in December 2022 that a GOP-backed voting law “was motivated by a racially discriminatory purpose,” adding that the law was “formulated with an impermissible intent to discriminate against African American voters.” Voting rights underpin all other rights in a functioning democracy. While some may seek to suppress the voices of Black and brown Americans, Democrats must continue to listen and heed the voices of all voters.

Finally, Democrats cannot be distracted by fights that don't matter to their constituents. Rather than comment on the chaos in the House, state and local leaders should use every opportunity to show constituents what a functioning governing body can deliver in terms of good-paying jobs, affordable child care, and access to fast, reliable internet connections. After all, this is what voters have demanded.

Much success over the past two years came from local elected officials working with state officials, who together work with federal officials to bring positive change to communities. This is what happens when those who believe in government—who believe in democracy—work together for the betterment of us all.

Democrats can—and must—continue that work for the next two years. By being beholden to extreme members of their party, it seems that Republicans in Washington may continue to deliver nothing but turmoil.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, I am. Are you prepared to take notes?

Mr. McGOVERN. Okay. I will give you copies of what I am saying so you can have them.

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

Madam Speaker, at the end of the day, it is not just about the legislation here. It is about two competing visions for America.

Democrats want an economy that lifts all people up. We are fighting for workers. We want opportunities for kids, success for families, and dignity for seniors. We want democracy to be secure at home and around the world. We have a vision of a better future and an idea of how to get there.

The bills today show, once again, that Republicans are more interested in division and taking us backward and turning back the clock on reproductive freedom, on voting rights, on lowering prices, on holding big corporations accountable. On all these things and more, the majority wants to drag us back. That is what their party now stands for. That is why we are wasting time with more misguided MAGA junk instead of working together to get things done for the American people.

I know those who are watching this debate maybe think this is a little bit strange, the topics that we are talking about here today. I think my Republican friends are confused what House they are in.

Again, they are not in Home Depot. They are in the House of Representatives. We ought to be debating big issues. We ought to be moving this country forward. Instead, we are dealing with this garbage. This is a waste of time. It is a waste of time.

I get it. Republicans are beholden to the most extreme elements of their Conference, but we could actually find common ground and get stuff done. We don't have to agree on everything to agree on something. Surely there are some things we can agree on that we have in common that we can move forward to help move this country in the right direction.

Instead, it is all the same old same old. Every bill that comes to the floor has all these anti-abortion riders, anti-LGBTQ riders, anti-everything-that-is-good riders. This has to stop. This has to stop. We can do better.

Again, I respectfully suggest to the chairman of the Rules Committee that one of the ways we could do better is that the gentleman can open up the debates a little bit more. We have four completely closed rules and no opportunity for any amendments. There is one structured rule, and only Republican amendments are made in order. All of the bipartisan and Democratic amendments, totally rule compliant, were shut out.

That is not the way to find common ground. That is not the way to move legislation forward in the way where it will eventually become law. We can do better. We have to do better. If not, I

will say the American people in November, I think, will make a different choice, and we will be able to get back on the right track.

Madam Speaker, again, I wish we were doing something more substantive here today other than talking about refrigerators and dishwashers. I wish we were doing something more positive other than trying to repress the vote in this country, but it is what it is.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote down this rule, to open up this House, and to reject these awful, awful garbage bills.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I agree with the ranking member. We don't have to agree on everything to agree on something. In fact, 81 percent of the Rules Committee measures passed in this Congress have garnered bipartisan votes on the underlying measures for final passage.

We do keep hearing the points made on the other side that the legislation on the SAVE Act is not necessary and that noncitizen voting is already illegal. It is also illegal to simply walk across the border into this country without the proper authorization, and yet it happens every single day.

Noncitizens registering to vote is not a hypothetical. In 2019, Pennsylvania admitted that it had inadvertently allowed over 10,000 noncitizens to register to vote. Texas found nearly 100,000 noncitizen registrations. I think 100,000 would cause a significant impact on a Federal election.

In 2020, when Illinois implemented automatic voter registration, more than 500 noncitizens were accidentally registered to vote.

As of May 2023, the Virginia Department of Election Officials have removed over 1,400 registrants from its official voter registration rolls with a reported reason for removal due to noncitizen status. Of those noncitizens who were removed, 335 individuals had cast a ballot in Virginia elections over the previous 4 years. In total, these noncitizens cast over 800 ballots.

To the question as to whether or not these offenses were prosecuted, in response to inquiries, the Virginia Attorney General's Office said that it had no prosecution records related to this illegal voting even though voting illegally is a class C felony in Virginia. The SAVE Act is really essential to close those loopholes.

I do find it sometimes perplexing when I hear the arguments on the other side that purportedly Democrats are here in defense of democracy and somehow Republicans are opposed to democracy. I will remind my friends on the other side of the House that it is not us who are attempting to undo the

votes of millions of Democrats nationwide to remove the nominee of their party from their ballot.

Madam Speaker, America is in a state of crisis. The southern border is wide open. Americans are paying for it with their lives. The Biden administration has turned its efforts to change protections under Title IX. I reiterate that, with the number of illegal aliens who have entered our country since President Biden took office, we should almost wish for a border czar in a situation like this.

There have been over 7 million encounters with illegal aliens at our southern border, and the number of got-aways has increased by 390 percent. Americans are losing their lives. This is not just theoretical. Americans are losing their lives due to this administration's failure to protect our sovereignty.

I have said it here on the House floor before. Let me repeat it now: Jocelyn Nungaray, Rachel Morin, Laken Riley, Alex Wise, Lizbeth Medina, Melissa Powell, Riordan Powell, and Travis Wolfe are just a few of those names who were taken from their families by this crisis at the southern border. How many more Americans will have to be named before the Biden administration acts?

House Republicans do have a solution. We passed it last May. H.R. 2 would be instrumental in securing the southern border and dissuading the abuse of our immigration system, providing funding to hire and train more Border Patrol agents, and hold Secretary Mayorkas and President Biden accountable for their inability to protect the American people.

Certainly, my colleagues would not oppose Mr. ROY's good-faith measure to ensure that those who come to this country illegally are not able to vote illegally. The right to vote in America is fundamental to what it means to be American. By ensuring that only American citizens are taking part in this tradition, we can safeguard the integrity of our electoral system and guarantee that the right to vote does not lose its importance.

Your vote matters. My vote matters. It is an extension of our voice. It is our participation in this country, our right to speak for what policies we want to see enacted and what leaders we want to see in office. It is important to protect this right as it is important to secure our southern border.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to support this rule and support the underlying measures. I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1341 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the

consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 12) to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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. 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 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO) 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 1341; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1341, 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.R. 8281, SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 165, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "NON-DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8772, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7700, STOP UNAFFORDABLE DISHWASHER STANDARDS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7637, REFRIGERATOR FREEDOM ACT

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. 1341) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 165) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance"; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8772) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7700) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for dishwashers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7637) to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing or enforcing energy conservation standards for refrigerators, refrigerator-freezers, and freezers that are not cost-effective or technologically feasible, and for other purposes, 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 194, nays 186, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—194

Adersholt	Armstrong	Banks
Alford	Bacon	Barr
Allen	Baird	Bean (FL)
Amodei	Balderson	Bentz