

not only weather the storm of today's issues but all that follow them as well.

We remember that we are all Americans, and it is our collective pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness which unites us together. May the Constitution continue to remind us of this for generations to come.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF JOHN DAVID SOUTHER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I woke up to bad news. One of my friends, JD Souther, also known as John David Souther, a great singer, songwriter, and an actor to boot, passed away yesterday in New Mexico at the age of 78.

JD wrote a lot of songs that the Eagles did and that Linda Ronstadt covered, and he performed some of them too. He did "New Kid in Town." When I was elected to Congress, he came to Memphis with Jackson Browne to do what I considered probably the greatest fundraiser in history. It was a small house with a living room that had a little area above it, and the two of them did an hour concert for the few people they could cram into that living room.

JD sang "New Kid in Town" about me saying that I am going to be the new kid in town in Congress and great expectations are thought of me. I think about that a lot.

When I got elected, JD called me, and he said: STEVE, you are going to the show.

Well, the show is major league parlance for going to the major leagues, and we were both baseball fans.

He was just a great guy. He was smart as hell. He is in the Songwriters Hall of Fame. He had a great voice and was so respected by musicians.

I kind of got him from Warren Zevon. He was my pal, and Warren kind of helped him to me.

Warren was dying, and he said: STEVE, I have got a friend who is moving to Nashville, and you all should be friends.

When I met him in Nashville, he said: I need to get something out of this, and I want to get married. Can you marry me?

I could do marriages, and I married him at Burt Stein's house. Rodney Crowell was the only witness. The marriage didn't take, but I did the best job I could.

JD was my friend and a great American songwriter. He will be missed.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3724, ACCREDITATION FOR COLLEGE EXCELLENCE ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4790, GUIDING UNIFORM AND RESPONSIBLE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS AND INFORMATION LIMITS ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5179, ANTI-BDS LABELING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5339, ROLL BACK ESG TO INCREASE RETIREMENT EARNINGS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5717, NO BAILOUT FOR SANCTUARY CITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7909, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN BY ILLEGAL ALIENS ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 136, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "MULTIPOLLUTANT EMISSIONS STANDARDS FOR MODEL YEARS 2027 AND LATER LIGHT-DUTY AND MEDIUM-DUTY VEHICLES"

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1455

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3724) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit recognized accrediting agencies and associations from requiring, encouraging, or coercing institutions of higher education to meet any political litmus test or violate any right protected by the Constitution as a condition of accreditation. 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-49 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may

be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4790) to amend the Federal securities laws with respect to the materiality of disclosure requirements, to establish the Public Company Advisory Committee, and for other purposes. 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-48, modified by the amendment printed in part B 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 Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5179) to require the maintenance of the country of origin markings for imported goods produced in the West Bank or Gaza, 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 Ways and Means 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 Ways and Means 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. 5339) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to specify requirements concerning the consideration of pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors, and for other purposes. 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 Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-50 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 Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. 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. 5717) to provide that sanctuary jurisdictions that provide benefits to aliens who are present in the United States without lawful status under the immigration laws are ineligible for Federal funds intended to benefit such aliens. 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 the Judiciary 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. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7909) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who have been convicted of or who have committed sex offenses or domestic violence are inadmissible and deportable. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-47 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 136) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection

Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles". 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN) be allowed to manage the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. 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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, H. Res. 1455, providing for the House's consideration of seven pieces of legislation.

First, the rule provides for H.R. 3724, the End Woke Higher Education Act, to be considered under a structured rule.

Second, the rule provides for H.R. 4790, the Prioritizing Economic Growth Over Woke Policies Act, under a closed rule.

Third, the rule provides for H.R. 5339, the Protecting Americans' Investments from Woke Policies Act, under a closed rule.

Fourth, the rule provides for H.R. 5179, the Anti-BDS Labeling Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides for H.R. 7909, the Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act, and H.R. 5717, the No Bailouts for Sanctuary Cities Act.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying legislation, beginning with H.R. 3724, the End Woke Higher Education Act.

As a Member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, we have spent countless hours addressing the serious issues within higher education under the Biden administration, where activism is often prioritized and differing viewpoints are silenced.

These conversations have become increasingly necessary, as we have seen waves of anti-Semitic protests where students are supporting terrorist organizations, and these protests are sweeping the Nation.

Too many institutions of higher education have cowered to the mob of protesters, often compromising the safety and well-being of their students. Freedom of speech is under attack on our campuses nationwide, and it is our students who are paying the price.

This mindset weakens what has historically been the strength of America: free-flowing and open debate at our institutions of learning. We must not let campus activists, woke faculty, and partisan administrators turn post-secondary education into DEI indoctrination camps. Denying speech undermines the very fabric of the Nation and is against everything our Founders intended.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad this legislation includes my Students Bill of Rights Act of 2024, which aims to address the erosion of First Amendment rights faced by students, and provides protections for academic freedom and expression.

Our students should never feel afraid to express their point of view or fear retribution or negative consequences for their future.

This woke mind virus doesn't stop there, which brings me to H.R. 5339, the Protecting American Investments from Woke Policies Act. It protects the retirement savings of workers, retirees, and their families by rolling back woke ESG requirements that have nothing to do with the bottom line.

The bill ensures that financial institutions are focused on maximizing returns in retirement plans rather than advancing the Biden-Harris administration's radical agenda at the expense of American workers. Forcing often underperforming and relatively high-risk investments on our seniors is not what they are asking us to do in this Chamber.

In this spirit, I am glad the bill includes one of my pieces of legislation, the Retirement Proxy Protection Act. The bill ensures that fiduciaries prioritize economic interests of plan beneficiaries when voting on shareholder proposals.

Finally, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 4790, a comprehensive bill package targeting unelected bureaucrats.

Time and time again, this administration has prioritized, again, an ESG agenda and initiatives that are against the well-being of workers and American businesses.

Democrat-appointed bureaucrats are attempting to use regulation to create climate and social policy in our financial markets, ultimately raising costs and limiting growth.

This legislation aims to stop unnecessary political reporting requirements for companies, make Federal regulators more transparent, and reduce the SEC's power over shareholders.

I am proud that another one of my bills, the No Expensive, Stifling Governance Act, or No ESG Act, is included as part of this package.

I will also touch on a bill brought forward by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA), my friend, H.R. 5717, the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill. Despite the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 clearly stating that no restrictions can be placed on communication between local or State authorities and Federal immigration officials about someone's immigration status, many cities still choose not to comply.

□ 1230

We have known for years that sanctuary cities create incredible challenges for Federal law enforcement, and in doing so, public safety is endangered.

Let's take Aurora, Colorado, for example. They are experiencing unprecedented gang violence due to a neighboring sanctuary city.

We also know that the Biden-Harris administration has been a master class in how to not handle border security. This administration has totally failed, alongside the sanctuary cities, in enforcing our immigration laws because the crime that finds a home in a sanctuary city spreads to other jurisdictions.

If sanctuary cities choose to operate this way and endanger their own communities, neighboring communities, and, ultimately, the entire Nation, then they must be forced to balance their irresponsible choices with the loss of other Federal support. It is pretty simple: If you fail to comply with the law, you should not expect support.

Our constituents understand and also demand that their tax dollars not support sanctuary cities that actively undermine their public safety and our immigration law.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 136 to push back on EPA overregulation, H.R. 5179 to end anti-Israel boycotts, and H.R. 7909, the Violence Against Women Act, which would crack down on crime caused by the Biden-Harris administration's open-border policies.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to consideration of these important bills, and I urge the passage of this rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back on the House floor with the gentlewoman from Indiana. It is great to be with her, and so far, she is allowing me to actually speak and hasn't called for me to be silenced.

The last time we debated, I stated an uncomfortable fact about he who shall not be named and the gentlewoman had

me silenced, had my words stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You just have to love that, Mr. Speaker. The party of free speech that rails against woke this and cancel culture that, and calls us snowflakes, can't handle it when someone comes down here and tells the truth. They try to silence the people they disagree with. It is really quite stunning.

Here is more of the truth, and let's see if I am allowed to talk this time.

Mr. Speaker, under Republican control, the House of Representatives has become a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all. What we are dealing with today is a bunch of weird, whacky, poorly drafted culture war nonsense.

This is all just a waste of time. These bills aren't going anywhere. It is not even political theater. It is theater of the absurd.

The government shuts down in a few days, and instead of actually working with Democrats to keep the lights on, instead of actually doing something to fix the problems that the American people want us to fix, my Republican friends are doing nothing.

The roof is on fire, and instead of calling 911, they are sweeping the floors. I mean, it is beyond nuts.

Last night in the Rules Committee, during our hearing on this rule, I had some Republican Members telling me they didn't like my tone. They didn't like the fact that I said we don't share the same values.

I am sorry I hurt people's feelings, Mr. Speaker, but the truth is the truth. We don't all believe in the same things. When it comes to my friends on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber, we really don't share the same values. I know many of my friends on the Republican side are nice and good people, but their ideas are not nice and are not good.

Let me just give you a couple of examples.

Democrats want to make sure that our kids go to college and get a good education that prepares them for the workforce, and instead of working with us, Republicans go on and on about woke this and woke that in our schools.

Apparently, anyone who wants to teach facts is woke nowadays. They want colleges to stop being "woke," even though they can't quite define what that even means. It is all political BS, Mr. Speaker.

Here is another example. Democrats actually want an economy that works for everyone, and thanks to the Biden-Harris administration, we are fighting to grow the economy from the bottom up and the middle out, but not Republicans. They are talking about woke economic policies.

I don't even know what they are talking about or what they mean, but do you want to know what people back home talk to me about? They are asking me: Why are Republicans trying to

cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires? Why are Republicans trying to go after Social Security and Medicare?

Another example, Mr. Speaker, is that Democrats actually care about strengthening and protecting the Violence Against Women Act, but not Republicans. A majority of their Conference voted against extending the Violence Against Women Act. Let me say that again: A majority of their Conference voted against extending the Violence Against Women Act.

Now, they have the nerve to come down here and talk about violence against women and use it as part of their sick ploy to go after immigrants. Give me a break. Their bill is so poorly written that it could hurt survivors of domestic violence.

I could go right down the list. It is obvious to me that, at some point, the RNC talking points went out to everybody, and those talking points said woke, woke, woke. Now, we have to waste time on this trash.

It is just another week of the GOP circus. As I have said before, calling this a clown show is an insult to actual working clowns.

Most of all, it is an insult to the American people for Republicans to use these hallowed Halls and to spend hours and hours of time this week on these absurd, awful bills. Again, none of them are going anywhere.

The reason to be in Congress is to help people. That means putting people over politics. It means not caving in to the most extreme members of your party. It means getting stuff done, which is a radical idea.

None of these bills, as I said, are going anywhere. Yet, here we are, playing these absurd, ridiculous games.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my colleague and the chair of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here is because the average family of four is paying over \$17,000 more per year thanks to the policies of the Biden-Harris administration and their allies in Congress. In 3½ years, their policies and regulations have been unleashed into every aspect of our lives.

For example, on top of that \$17,000 more that American families are having to pay each year, now the Biden-Harris administration's EPA expects that family to cough up another \$10,000 for an electric vehicle. The House Republicans today will repeal this ridiculous regulation with the passage of a joint resolution under this rule.

It is not just consumer goods that are more expensive. Retirement is increasingly out of reach because of the Biden-Harris administration and their policies and what they have injected into our capital markets and retirement plans. The American family will not care how much their retirement fund

promoted ESG or DEI when they need to push off their retirement for years under this economy.

House Republicans will refocus the financial markets and retirement funds away from politics and toward maximizing investment returns. Maximizing shareholder value seems like a concept that everyone should be for.

Finally, I will touch on two important pieces of legislation under this rule that are affecting Texans, the first of which is the Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act. This bill makes it crystal clear in U.S. law that illegal aliens who commit domestic violence are both deportable and inadmissible in this country.

We have a border czar. You wouldn't know it because of what has been happening, but we have a border czar. We have a Secretary of Homeland Security who has refused to take the actions necessary to protect American citizens. Why they have neglected American citizens, I cannot tell you. Perhaps the Democrats can tell you.

Mr. Speaker, even individuals who commit domestic crimes should be deportable and inadmissible to the country.

Another bill ensures that lax enforcement of immigration law, which has become the hallmark of the Biden-Harris administration, does not extend to criminal domestic conduct.

Speaking of lax enforcement, the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act makes it crystal clear that no State or local government that made a conscious choice to disregard Federal immigration law will receive Federal funds to do so.

Sanctuary cities perpetuate the crisis at our border, a crisis that my State knows all too well. The No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act ensures that taxpayers won't be on the hook for the conscious choices of sanctuary cities.

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

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the chairman of the Rules Committee, but let me just state for the record that nothing he talked about will be at all impacted by any of the stuff that we are talking about here today. None of these bills are going anywhere.

If you want to pass legislation to address some of the issues that were raised, maybe we ought to work in a bipartisan way. Maybe it ought not to be "my way or the highway."

These aren't serious pieces of legislation. These are press releases. Let's all be honest with the American people about that. This is not serious legislating. We haven't done serious legislating here in a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I will zoom in a little bit on this Congress in general. I just mentioned that this is the most dysfunctional Congress in history. If anyone wants proof, look no further than this resolution: five more closed rules that allow zero amendments to come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, for folks who don't know, a closed rule means no amend-

ments. It means: Take it or leave it. If you have a good idea and want to improve a bill, too bad.

This is how they govern in Russia and China, and that is what the Republicans are turning this place into.

With these five closed rules they are bringing to the floor today, Republicans are breaking their own record for shutting down debate. With today's vote, there will be 106 closed rules in this Congress—106. This is now officially the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, what gets me is that my friends on the other side have been totally fooled. They were tricked by their own leadership, first by Speaker McCarthy and now Speaker Johnson.

The gentlewoman from Indiana and her colleagues on the Rules Committee were promised a more open process. They were told the Rules Committee was going to be different, more open, would have more regular order and more amendments, and more debate.

Speaker McCarthy was even blackmailed into putting members of the Freedom Caucus on the Rules Committee to guarantee a more open process, but apparently, it didn't matter because he totally broke his promise, and now Speaker Johnson is shredding it.

During the first 9 months under Speaker Johnson, we saw 64 closed rules, even more than the 42 closed rules we saw under Speaker McCarthy. They traded a bad Speaker for an even worse one. Republican leaders have blocked 5,799 amendments from even coming to the floor. Mr. Speaker, 5,799 amendments have been blocked from coming to the floor by the Republican majority.

By the way, they are not just Democratic amendments. They blocked Republican, bipartisan, and Democratic amendments. They blocked an amendment to disrupt the smuggling of U.S. firearms across the Mexican border. They blocked an amendment to combat fentanyl trafficking at ports of entry.

Holy hell, Mr. Speaker, they even blocked my amendment to protect food for seniors who participate in the Meals on Wheels program. They have even blocked over half of their own Republican Members' amendments.

Let me say that again. Most Republican amendments have been blocked by this Congress. These amendments have been prevented from even seeing the light of day or getting a debate on the House floor. There have been 98 amendments that Rules Committee Republicans had either authored or supported that have been blocked by their own majority.

When you are on the Rules Committee, you like to have a little juice, but 98 of your amendments, Republican amendments, have been blocked by your own party. That is almost 100 amendments, and that is just Rules Republicans.

I am sure they would have loved to have had the opportunity to debate

their amendments on the floor. If Rules Committee Republicans can't get amendments, how the hell do you think the rest of us are doing?

Republicans said they wanted an open process in this Congress. They want an open process, my foot, Mr. Speaker.

Under this majority, the Rules Committee has become a place where democracy goes to die. Their Members should be outraged with the Speaker and this leadership just as much as Democrats should be. Again, 106 completely closed rules blocked all amendments—a shameful statistic, an all-time authoritarian high set under this Republican majority.

□ 1245

Let's look at the results. Look at what they have to show for it. Republicans had the most unproductive Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, 26 days we went without a Speaker because they were fighting with each other. Weeks were wasted with failed rule votes while they argued among themselves instead of negotiating with Democrats.

There were broken promises on the appropriation process where they kicked the can down the road with another failed CR, bringing us to the brink of catastrophic debt default and then asking Democrats to bail them out. Mr. Speaker, 10 months of passing no legislation through the Rules Committee that ever became law.

I congratulate my friends. In addition to being the most incompetent, dysfunctional, unproductive Congress in American history, they now have also presided over the most closed Congress in American history. Well done, well done, and they are not done yet. We have to live through 3 more months of this. God help us.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I note that what my colleague, the ranking member, does not note is that this House has passed under Republican leadership more than 300 bills out of the House of Representatives with 92 percent bipartisan support. Many of these bills go to the Democrat-controlled Senate where they die.

The ranking member also likes to criticize this majority when he knows full well just last Congress when he was chair, the Rules Committee was no bastion of an open process.

For the record, here are some statistics that might help paint a better picture and provide context for the cherry-picked numbers the Member rattled off.

It is true there have been more closed rules, but this majority has reported nearly twice the amount of bills in the last Congress. Considered as a percentage, this majority has reported fewer closed rules than when he had the gavel.

Even more, over a third of the closed rules were because no amendments

were offered, making the rule closed by definition.

Not considering those closed rules brings us still at roughly the same rate as a percentage of closed rules from the last Congress but with significantly more bills offered.

I also remind this body that the previous Congress saw the use and abuse of partisan en bloc amendment votes, which created omnibus-style amendments designed to defeat Republican, or tough amendments, and had the practical effect of stifling the Republican minority.

Even with this procedural atrocity, the ranking member still can't claim a higher ground on making minority amendments in order.

We also needed to keep up with the onslaught of regulations from the Biden-Harris administration that they have unleashed on the American people from unelected bureaucrats.

We have considered numerous disapproval resolutions, which traditionally are carried closed because of how they are written. The ranking member carried on this tradition when he had the gavel.

While the ranking member wants to talk about how we are stifling Democrat amendments, this majority has actually made more minority amendments in order as a percentage than the previous Congress when he was calling the shots.

While the ranking member shakes his finger at the majority for the way this Congress has gone, I point out that he understands the unique difficulties and the tough decisions the Rules Committee is tasked with in moving the majority's agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank and appreciate Mrs. HOUCHIN for putting forward these bills.

I am glad there are citizens up here listening to the two different points of view. We are totally different.

Some of the things that you said in Rules yesterday, Mr. MCGOVERN, the last 3—well, 4 years under the Biden, czar Harris administration have wrecked this country.

You mentioned yesterday, and I brought this up in Rules, empathy for children. Where is the empathy for the 300,000 that this administration is letting in this country unaccompanied, God knows what is happening to them, of the 15 million that are coming in here? How is that working for America?

How is it working for America when you are taking the side of the criminal and putting handcuffs on the policemen through your defund police activity?

The actions of this administration on tax cuts—tax, tax, tax. You want the Federal Government to tell these people where to spend their money. We are not having it.

The reason the amendments aren't made in order, they are dumb. Some of

them are good, but most of them are dumb, and they are antifreedom is the best word I can say.

I rise today in support of the rule to provide consideration for bills that combat the administration's woke policies that you are forcing on businesses.

I am thrilled the rule contained a package of financial service bills. You are right; we shouldn't have to protect them. It should be common sense, but it is not from the Democratic Party.

This package includes my bill, the Businesses Over Activists Act. As Republicans, we believe in limited government letting us spend our money and not letting unelected bureaucrats spend our money.

Under the Exchange Act, the ability of the Securities and Exchange Commission to oversee proxy solicitation is very limited.

Every regulation has been weaponized against the very businesses that are paying the taxes to support this country.

As far as my particular bill, Congress never granted the SEC authority to make it mandatory for companies to include shareholder proposals in their corporate proxy statements.

This legislation reaffirms the proper role of the SEC and ensures that it cannot exceed its authority by compelling companies to include certain shareholder proposals against their will.

A lot of things we are having to combat is per the Constitution that you are wanting to do away with. We believe in the Constitution. We believe in freedom. We believe in limited government.

This package of bills spells this out and protects our God-given rights that we shouldn't have to fight for that your party is wanting to do away with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I reiterate what the gentleman from South Carolina just said. We have different viewpoints and different values.

I am sorry that he feels he lives in a wrecked country. I don't believe that. I think the United States of America is the greatest country on this planet, and I am proud to serve in Congress to try to help the people of this country. I would never refer to this country as a "wrecked country."

Again, the gentleman who just spoke, I thought when he was appointed to the Rules Committee, he was appointed to make sure that we had a more open process.

I regret to inform the gentleman that 106 closed rules slipped by him this Congress. I appreciate him standing in the breach.

By the way, when he refers to all the amendments that were rejected as being dumb, 50 percent of them were Republican amendments.

I think 27 of your amendments were denied. I wouldn't classify them as dumb, even though I may disagree with the intent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a list of the 106 closed rules issued by the Republican majority in the 118th Congress.

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

There was no objection.

LIST OF CLOSED RULES, 118TH CONGRESS

1. H. Res. 5, H.R. 23—Family and Small Business Taxpayer Protection Act;
2. H. Res. 5, H.R. 29—Border Safety and Security Act of 2023;
3. H. Res. 5, H.R. 22—Protecting America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve from China Act;
4. H. Res. 5, H.R. 27—Prosecutors Need to Prosecute Act;
5. H. Res. 5, H.R. 28—Illegal Alien NICS Alert Act;
6. H. Res. 5, H.R. 7—No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2023;
7. H. Res. 5, H.R. 26—Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act;
8. H. Res. 5, H. Res. 11—Establishing the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party;
9. H. Res. 5, H. Res. 12—Establishing a Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government as a select investigative subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;
10. H. Res. 5, H. Con. Res. 5—Expressing support for the Nation's law enforcement agencies and condemning any efforts to defend or dismantle law enforcement agencies;
11. H. Res. 5, H. Con. Res. 3—Expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches;
12. H. Res. 75, H.J. Res. 7—Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020;
13. H. Res. 75, H.R. 139—Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems (SHOW UP) Act of 2023;
14. H. Res. 75, H.R. 382—Pandemic is Over Act;
15. H. Res. 75, H.R. 497—Freedom for Health Care Workers Act;
16. H. Res. 83, H. Con. Res. 9—Denouncing the horrors of socialism;
17. H. Res. 83, H. Res. 76—Removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House;
18. H. Res. 97, H.J. Res. 24—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022;
19. H. Res. 97, H.J. Res. 26—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022;
20. H. Res. 166, H.J. Res. 30—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Prudence and Loyalty in Selecting Plan Investments and Exercising Shareholder Rights";
21. H. Res. 199, S. 619—COVID-19 Origin Act of 2023;
22. H. Res. 199, H.J. Res. 27—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States'";
23. H. Res. 298, H.J. Res. 42—Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022;

24. H. Res. 327, H.R. 2811—Limit, Save, Grow Act of 2023;

25. H. Res. 327, H.J. Res. 39—Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Commerce relating to “Procedures Covering Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Estimated Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414”;

26. H. Res. 383, H.R. 2—Secure the Border Act of 2023;

27. H. Res. 383, H.R. 1163—Protecting Taxpayers and Victims of Unemployment Fraud Act;

28. H. Res. 429, H.J. Res. 45—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans”;

29. H. Res. 429, H.J. Res. 11—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards”;

30. H. Res. 456, H.R. 3746—Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023;

31. H. Res. 495, H.J. Res. 44—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives relating to “Factoring Criteria for Firearms with Attached ‘Stabilizing Braces’”;

32. H. Res. 524, H. Res. 461—Condemning the use of elementary and secondary school facilities to provide shelter for aliens who are not admitted to the United States;

H. Res. 614, S.J. Res. 9—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, USC, of the rule submitted by the USFWS relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status With Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment”;

34. H. Res. 614, S.J. Res. 24—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Northern Long-Eared Bat”;

35. H. Res. 680, H.R. 1435—Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act;

36. H. Res. 681, H.R. 1435—Preserving Choice in Vehicle Purchases Act;

37. H. Res. 699, H. Res. 684—Condemning the actions of Governor of New Mexico, Michelle Lujan Grisham, for subverting the Second Amendment to the Constitution and depriving the citizens of New Mexico of their right to bear arms;

38. H. Res. 699, H.R. 5525—Continuing Appropriations and Border Security Enhancement Act, 2024;

39. H. Res. 712, H. Res. 684—Condemning the actions of Governor of New Mexico, Michelle Lujan Grisham, for subverting the Second Amendment to the Constitution and depriving the citizens of New Mexico of their right to bear arms;

40. H. Res. 730, H.R. 5692—Ukraine Security Assistance and Oversight Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024;

41. H. Res. 741, H.R. 5525—Continuing Appropriations and Border Security Enhancement Act, 2024;

42. H. Res. 756, H.R. 4364—Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2024;

43. H. Res. 838, H.R. 6126—Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024;

44. H. Res. 869, H. R. 5961—No Funds for Iranian Terrorism Act;

45. H. Res. 891, S.J. Res. 32—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of

title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B);

46. H. Res. 906, H.J. Res. 88—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to Improving Income Driven Repayment for the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program and the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program;

47. H. Res. 922, H.R. 357—Ensuring Accountability in Agency Rulemaking Act;

48. H. Res. 947, S.J. Res. 38—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to “Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers”;

49. H. Res. 947, H.J. Res. 98—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to “Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status”;

50. H. Res. 969, H.R. 6914—Pregnant Students’ Rights Act;

51. H. Res. 969, H.R. 6918—Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act;

52. H. Res. 969, H. Res. 957—Denouncing the Biden administration’s open-borders policies, condemning the national security and public safety crisis along the southwest border, and urging President Biden to end his administration’s open-borders policies;

53. H. Res. 994, H.R. 7160—SALT Marriage Penalty Elimination Act;

54. H. Res. 994, H. Res. 987—Denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, and for other purposes;

55. H. Res. 996, H. Res. 863—Impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors;

56. H. Res. 1009, H. R. 7176—Unlocking our Domestic LNG Potential Act of 2024;

57. H. Res. 1052, H.R. 7511—Laken Riley Act;

58. H. Res. 1071, H. Res. 1065—Denouncing the Biden administration’s immigration policies;

59. H. Res. 1085, H.R. 6009—Restoring American Energy Dominance Act;

60. H. Res. 1085, H.R. 1121—Protecting American Energy Production Act;

61. H. Res. 1085, H.R. 1023—To repeal section 134 of the Clean Air Act, relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund. [Cutting Green Corruption and Taxes Act];

62. H. Res. 1085, H. Con. Res. 86—Expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy;

63. H. Res. 1085, H. Res. 987—Denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, and for other purposes;

64. H. Res. 1125, H.R. 529—Extending Limits of U.S. Customs Waters Act;

65. H. Res. 1125, H. Res. 1112—Denouncing the Biden administration’s immigration policies;

66. H. Res. 1125, H. Res. 1117—Opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza;

67. H. Res. 1137, H.R. 529—Extending Limits of U.S. Customs Waters Act;

68. H. Res. 1137, H. Res. 1112—Denouncing the Biden administration’s immigration policies;

69. H. Res. 1137, H. Res. 1117—Opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza;

70. H. Res. 1149, H.R. 6323—Iran Counterterrorism Act of 2023;

71. H. Res. 1149, H. Res. 1143—Condemning Iran’s unprecedented drone and missile attack on Israel;

72. H. Res. 1149, H.R. 4691—Iran Sanctions Relief Review Act of 2023;

73. H. Res. 1149, H.R. 5947—To provide for the rescission of certain waivers and licenses relating to Iran, and for other purposes;

74. H. Res. 1149, H.R. 6046—Standing Against Houthi Aggression Act;

75. H. Res. 1160, H.R. 8034—Israel Security Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2024;

76. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 3397—Western Economic Security Today Act of 2024;

77. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 3195—Superior National Forest Restoration Act;

78. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 2925—Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024;

79. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 615—Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023;

80. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 764—Trust the Science Act;

81. H. Res. 1173, H.R. 6090—Antisemitism Awareness Act of 2023;

82. H. Res. 1194, H.R. 7109—Equal Representation Act;

83. H. Res. 1194, H.J. Res. 109—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121;

84. H. Res. 1194, H.R. 2925—Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024;

85. H. Res. 1227, H.R. 354—LEOSA Reform Act;

86. H. Res. 1227, H.R. 7530—CRIMES Act of 2024;

87. H. Res. 1227, H.R. 7581—Improving Law Enforcement Officer Safety and Wellness Through Data Act of 2024;

88. H. Res. 1227, H. Res. 1210—Condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result;

89. H. Res. 1227, H. Res. 1213—A resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers;

90. H. Res. 1227, H.R. 8369—Israel Security Assistance Support Act;

91. H. Res. 1243, H.R. 192—To prohibit individuals who are not citizens from voting in elections in the District of Columbia;

92. H. Res. 1269, H.R. 8282—To impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies;

93. H. Res. 1287, H. Res. 1292—Report to accompany the Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find United States Attorney General Merrick B. Garland in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Committee on the Judiciary;

94. H. Res. 1341, H.R. 8281—Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act;

95. H. Res. 1341, 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;

96. H. Res. 1341, H.R. 7700—Stop Unaffordable Dishwasher Standards Act;

97. H. Res. 1341, H.R. 7637—Refrigerator Freedom Act;

98. H. Res. 1376, H. Res. 1371—Strongly condemning the Biden Administration and its Border Czar, Kamala Harris’s, failure to secure the United States border;

99. H. Res. 1430, H.R. 9494—Continuing Appropriations and Other Measures;

100. H. Res. 1430, H.R. 7980—End Chinese Dominance of Electric Vehicles in America Act;

101. H. Res. 1430, H.R. 9456—Protecting American Agriculture from Foreign Adversaries Act of 2024;

102. H. Res. 1455, H.R. 4790—Prioritizing Economic Growth Over Woke Policies Act;

103. H. Res. 1455, H.R. 5179—Anti-BDS Labeling Act;

104. H. Res. 1455, H.R. 5339—Protecting Americans' Investments from Woke Policies Act;

105. H. Res. 1455, H.R. 7909—Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act; and

106. H. Res. 1455, H.J. Res. 136—Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles".

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, beneath all these statistics about closed rules are actual ideas that are being blocked from being debated on the House floor.

These are thoughtful proposals that Members have worked hard to develop, ideas to help actual people, and they deserved a debate in an up-or-down vote.

They are proposals like this: An amendment to disrupt the smuggling of U.S. guns across the Mexico border to help cartels, an amendment authorizing funding for DHS to combat fentanyl trafficking at our ports of entry, and an amendment to prevent cuts to Meals on Wheels.

Those are home-delivered meals to seniors, Mr. Speaker, and that was my amendment, by the way, so I can assure you that it was a very, very good idea.

They even blocked an amendment to provide postpartum mental health information to pregnant students, and that was a Republican amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans haven't just blocked amendments by reporting out closed rules. Their structured rules, the rules that allowed a few amendments, have also continually blocked thoughtful, rule-complied amendments.

They seem especially focused on blocking Democratic ideas from a debate in an up-or-down vote on the floor. A quarter of their structured rules—get this—blocked all Democratic amendments.

Now, let me quickly just list a few ideas that Republicans were either too afraid to debate or couldn't spare 10 minutes for consideration on the House floor: An amendment to protect children from getting asthma; amendments to ensure the regulation of dark money in politics, and to prevent corrupt pay-to-play political donation deals with Federal contractors; and an amendment to provide cancer screenings to Federal firefighters as part of their DOD annual physicals, when we know they are exposed to cancer-causing chemicals as part of their jobs. There is simply no excuse for this, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5717, the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act.

I do have to comment that the ranking member and I sit on the Rules Committee, and the ranking member and I were there last night, and we are here again on the floor together today, and all I hear is complaining.

I don't hear alternatives. I hear about how bad the amendment process is, that their amendments aren't made in order, but I haven't heard them really talk about the alternatives.

What are they proposing?

Are there alternatives to what we are doing?

What would they do differently? Instead, we hear complaining.

I do want to talk about H.R. 5717. This bill prohibits funds to any sanctuary State or sanctuary city if those funds are being used to benefit illegal immigrants.

That seems like common sense to me and to my constituents. We should not spend American tax dollars to help States and cities that are violating U.S. law so they can turn around and dole out those dollars to illegal immigrants; sometimes those benefits are even more generous than those our own citizens receive.

I do want to correct something that Ranking Member NADLER said last night in the Rules Committee. He said that this bill could prohibit Federal funds like COPS grants and Byrne-JAG Grants from going to law enforcement officers.

I want to state this clearly. That is just not true. Not only are police departments not qualifying jurisdictions under this bill, but the bill applies only to funds being used to provide benefits to illegal immigrants. Let me tell you. Using funds to arrest and detain illegal immigrants is not to their benefit, nor is it part of this bill.

This is just an attempt to distract from the fact that the Biden-Harris administration has created chaos in communities across this country.

Yet, rather than help hardworking Americans, they want to take your tax dollars to pay for free flights, free cell phones, and free hotel stays. This bill puts an end to this waste of our taxpayer dollars.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, I was confused when she said, you don't offer alternatives. That is what amendments are. They are alternative ideas.

I just went through a list of some of the alternatives we wanted to offer dealing with firefighters and cancer screening, dealing with children with asthma, and dealing with making sure senior citizens have adequate access to nutrition. Those are alternatives. Those are ideas.

My friends, unfortunately, are in control of this place, so they get to bring the bills to the Rules Committee.

We try to present alternatives through the amendment process, but here is another alternative. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 16, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2023.

Mr. Speaker, the bigoted hatred that we are seeing directed at immigrants in Ohio and across the country is sickening. According to research done by the Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism, there has been a rise in conspiracy theories that stigmatize minorities and promote hatred of ethnically diverse communities.

Get this. Politicians' use of bigoted rhetoric can also play a role in hate crime incidents. It is sad, but to be frank, we didn't need researchers to tell us this.

We can see and we can hear it from the Republican Party every single day, and it does a grave disservice to the Dreamers, to TPS holders, and to DACA recipients in this country who only know America as their home.

These are taxpayers, small business owners, educators, and critical parts of our communities. Dreamers were brought to the United States as children through no fault of their own, and it is past time to grant them the pathway to citizenship that they rightly deserve.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. There is a lot of work that needs to be done to fix our broken immigration system and secure our border, but unlike the messaging bills before us this week, this is a bill that actually does something, and it is actually bipartisan. It sends the message that we are sick of the vitriol and hate crimes against this community and that we value their many contributions that make this country a better place.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), a great leader, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, we are only 12 days away from a potential government shutdown, and yet here we are debating yet another slate of unserious Republican policies, so-called antiwoke bills.

Instead of prioritizing legislation to improve the lives of the American people, they are set on wasting our time with political games.

Instead of working on a bipartisan appropriations process with Democrats to keep our government open, the Republican Party is focused on pushing elements of Trump's Project 2025, a blueprint for a radical and draconian

restructuring of our country that includes eliminating many of our freedoms.

They show us over and over that their party is gripped by troubling extremism. Their incessant dangerous rhetoric about immigrants is but one example of this extremism.

My Democratic colleagues and I remain focused and committed to real solutions that improve our country and our economy, which is why if we defeat the previous question, we will come together to pass meaningful, life-changing legislation, like the American Dream and Promise Act, a common-sense bill that has bipartisan support.

Despite high public support for Dreamers, who were brought to the country as children and are proud to call the United States home, Dreamers had the rug pulled out from under them in 2017 when former President Donald Trump abruptly terminated the DACA program. Since then, Dreamers and their families have been caught up in a court battle, not just for the fate of the program but for their future.

The American Dream and Promise Act could put an end to years of fear and uncertainty for Dreamers as well as TPS and DED recipients and countless mixed-status families who dread the day their loved one may no longer be here.

This bill is a vital step toward providing dignity, stability, and security for those individuals who for years have contributed to our communities, our economy, and our American story.

I urge my colleagues to use our limited time here in Washington, D.C., on real solutions. Help us defeat the previous question so we can instead do real work that makes a real impact, like the American Dream and Promise Act.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA), who will also speak on the importance of defeating the previous question.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week we find ourselves confronted with a series of bills brought by our Republican colleagues that are not only misguided but also villainize immigrant communities.

These proposals attempt to further criminalize those who are seeking a better life and threaten to withhold essential Federal funds from cities like Chicago that have policies designed to support the inclusion, safety, and justice of all regardless of immigration status.

Victims of domestic violence will be even more fearful of coming forward if they fear being reported to immigration authorities.

Let me be clear: Our immigration system is broken, and simply doubling down on punitive measures will not solve the problem. We need comprehensive solutions that recognize the humanity of those seeking refuge and opportunity in this great Nation.

Instead of fostering an environment of understanding and compassion, these bills promote fear and division.

That brings me to a crucial piece of legislation that deserves our immediate attention, the Dream and Promise Act. This bill is a beacon of hope for Dreamers and those with temporary protective status, providing them with a pathway to citizenship.

These young people, many of whom have known no other country but ours, are an integral part of our communities and our economy. They are students, teachers, healthcare workers, and leaders who contribute to our Nation's prosperity. It is time that we acknowledge their contributions and ensure that they can live without fear of deportation.

By prioritizing the Dream and Promise Act, we can send a clear message that we value the lives and aspirations of those who call America home.

I urge my colleagues to reject harmful immigration bills on the floor this week and instead join me in championing the Dream and Promise Act.

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

The other side of the aisle won't even deport violent criminals. That is against the very safety of American citizens. In New York City, under Bill de Blasio, they passed a series of sanctuary city policies between 2014 and 2018 that prohibit the New York Police Department and correction and probation departments from cooperating with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents except under very limited circumstances.

However, now, more than 100,000 migrants have passed through New York City since the spring of 2022, and 58,000 still remain in the city's care. Current Mayor Eric Adams and the Governor of New York, Kathy Hochul, have said: "We don't have capacity."

For years, ICE has warned that sanctuary cities create a public safety threat, and they are one of the biggest impediments to public safety efforts. However, under the Biden and Harris administration, the crisis at the southern border has only worsened the consequences of sanctuary policies and made enforcing current immigration laws even more difficult.

H.R. 5717, despite mischaracterizations from my friends on the other side of the aisle, creates an incentive for local jurisdictions to cooperate with Federal immigration officials by prohibiting Federal funds from being used to provide sanctuary for illegal aliens going to sanctuary jurisdictions. Under current law, it creates a perverse incentive for sanctuary cities to willingly flout the law.

H.R. 5717 holds sanctuary cities accountable for exacerbating the Biden-Harris border crisis and flouting Federal immigration law by prohibiting the use of taxpayer dollars to fund housing, healthcare costs, and other benefits for illegal immigrants in such municipalities.

Taxpayers who are at risk due to the border crisis should not be funding local governments not interested in upholding the rule of law. No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities corrects these perverse incentives and ensures that taxpayers are not on the hook for this lawlessness.

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

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

You have got to love when Republicans try to talk tough about immigration reform. I just want to remind my colleagues that one of the most conservative Senators in the United States Senate is from Oklahoma. He wrote a comprehensive immigration reform bill that has some very tough provisions in it. Their standard-bearer, the man who I cannot name on the floor for fear that my words will be taken down, told Republicans to not allow it to come to the floor for debate or a vote.

They would rather have a campaign issue than to solve a problem. I mean, let that sink in. Let that sink in.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from the National Institute of Justice titled: "Undocumented Immigrant Offending Rate Lower Than U.S.-born Citizen Rate."

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

There was no objection.

[From the National Institute of Justice, Sept. 12, 2024]

UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANT OFFENDING RATE LOWER THAN U.S.-BORN CITIZEN RATE

Analysis of Texas arrest records indicates a consistent trend across violent, drug, property, and traffic offenses between 2012 and 2018.

An NIJ-funded study examining data from the Texas Department of Public Safety estimated the rate at which undocumented immigrants are arrested for committing crimes. The study found that undocumented immigrants are arrested at less than half the rate of native-born U.S. citizens for violent and drug crimes and a quarter the rate of native-born citizens for property crimes.

The question of how often undocumented immigrants commit crimes is not easy to answer. Most previous research on crime commission by immigrant populations has been unable to differentiate undocumented immigrants from documented immigrants. As a result, most studies treat all immigrants as a uniform group, regardless of whether they are in the country legally.

The estimates in this study come from Texas criminal records that include the immigration status of everyone arrested in the state from 2012 to 2018. These data enabled researchers to separate arrests for crimes committed by undocumented immigrants from those committed by documented immigrants and native-born U.S. citizens. (For more detail on the study's data sources and methodology, see the sidebar "What Makes the Texas Data Unique?")

The researchers tracked these three groups' arrest rates across seven years (2012–2018) and examined specific types of crime, including homicides and other violent crimes. They used these arrest rates as proxies for the rates of crime commission for the

three groups. It should be noted that arrest is a commonly used, but imperfect measure of crime that in part reflects law enforcement activity rather than actual offending rates.

During this time, undocumented immigrants had the lowest offending rates overall for both total felony crime (see exhibit 1) and violent felony crime (see exhibit 2) compared to other groups. U.S.-born citizens had the highest offending rates overall for most crime types, with documented immigrants generally falling between the other two groups.

Exhibit 1. Total felony crime offending rates in Texas for U.S.-born citizens, documented immigrants, and undocumented immigrants

Exhibit 2. Violent felony crime offending rates in Texas for U.S.-born citizens, documented immigrants, and undocumented immigrants

Researchers also looked specifically at homicide arrest trends. These rates tend to fluctuate more than the overall violent crime arrest rates because murders are relatively rare compared to other crimes. In addition, a large share of homicides go unsolved. Still, undocumented immigrants had the lowest homicide arrest rates throughout the entire study period, averaging less than half the rate at which U.S.-born citizens were arrested for homicide. (The homicide rate for documented immigrants fluctuated. Sometimes it was higher than the rate for U.S.-born citizens and sometimes it was lower.)

Every other violent and property crime type the researchers examined followed the same general pattern. The offending rates of undocumented immigrants were consistently lower than both U.S.-born citizens and documented immigrants for assault, sexual assault, robbery, burglary, theft, and arson

For drug offenses, too, undocumented immigrants were less than half as likely to be arrested as native-born U.S. citizens. Moreover, the drug crime arrest rate for the undocumented population held steady throughout the seven years of data, while the rate for native-born citizens increased almost 30% during that time. As a result, undocumented immigrants had a smaller share of arrests for drug crimes in 2018 than they had in 2012.

Finally, the researchers conducted statistical tests to determine whether the share of crimes committed by undocumented immigrants had increased for any offense types between 2012 and 2018. They concluded, "There is no evidence that the prevalence of undocumented immigrant crime has grown for any category." As with drug offenses, evidence suggests the share of property and traffic crimes committed by undocumented immigrants decreased or remained close to constant throughout the period.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, all day long, Republicans spout hateful rhetoric about undocumented immigration and crime because they want us to be scared and they want to divide us, but their claims are simply not rooted in truth. In fact, undocumented immigrants are less likely, not more, than U.S.-born citizens to commit crimes, including violent crime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article by the CATO Institute titled: "Sanctuary Jurisdictions in Florida Do Not Have Higher Crime Rates."

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

There was no objection.

[From the CATO Institute, Mar. 29, 2019]

SANCTUARY JURISDICTIONS IN FLORIDA DO NOT HAVE HIGHER CRIME RATES

(By Alex Nowrasteh and Andrew C. Forrester)

Florida state Senator Joe Gruters (R-Sarasota) introduced a bill (SB 168) earlier this year to ban so-called sanctuary jurisdictions in Florida and require local governments to cooperate fully with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). A sanctuary jurisdiction is any state or local government that has a policy to comply with fewer than 100 percent of ICE detainers, which are ICE requests for the local government to release an arrested or imprisoned person into ICE custody for deportation. Local and state governments still prosecute illegal immigrants for crimes in sanctuary jurisdictions, but they only turn some illegal immigrants over to ICE and uniformly if they are charged with or convicted of serious crimes.

The complaint over sanctuary jurisdictions is that they result in increased crime, but the limited research on the topic finds no increase in crime in sanctuary jurisdictions relative to non-sanctuary jurisdictions. Regardless, the methods employed in that paper, the potential for sample selection bias, and the poor quality of national crime data have impeded research into how sanctuary jurisdictions impact crime.

Regardless, we decided to do our best in looking at how sanctuary jurisdiction policies affect crime in Florida. According to the Center for Immigration Studies, Clay and Alachua counties in Florida will not honor ICE detainers without a judicial order or a criminal warrant and their policies were enacted in December 2014 and September 2015, respectively.

To compare whether the adoption of anti-detainer sanctuary policies had an impact on crime in Alachua and Clay Counties, we draw on crime data from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Return A file. The Return A is the gold standard in crime data in the economics and criminal justice literature. Since these data are provided at the reporting agency level, we aggregate the crime counts up to the county-year level to reflect the extent of geographic coverage for each anti-detainer policy. As a basis for comparison, we identify counties neighboring Alachua and Clay as counterfactual counties using the county adjacency file from the National Bureau for Economic Research. We then compute county crime rates per 100,000 to compare crime rates across counties. For illustrative purposes, we compute an "adjacent counties" counterfactual crime rate as the sum of all crimes in surrounding counties normalized by their combined population.

Figure 1 shows that the crime rates in Clay and Alachua counties have fallen just like in their neighboring counties, except for Baker County, from 2010 through 2017. If sanctuary policies in Clay and Alachua counties affected crime rates, there is no obvious indication of that in Figure 1.

Figure 2 displays the crime rates in Alachua County relative to its neighboring counties before after the sanctuary policy was enacted. The crime rates were roughly parallel before the enactment of the sanctuary policy and stayed parallel afterward, meaning that the change in policy likely had no effect on crime rates. The results look nearly identical if trends in property or violent crime rates are compared separately.

Figure 3 displays the crime rates in Clay County relative to neighboring counties. The crime rates were roughly parallel before Clay County enacted its sanctuary policy and remained roughly parallel afterward. Again, it looks as if the enactment of a sanctuary policy in Clay County had no effect on

crime. More time after the enactment of the sanctuary policies and more rigorous statistical methods are required to fully analyze these effects for both Clay and Alachua Counties, but Figures 2 and 3 are convincing on their own. The results look nearly identical if trends in property or violent crime rates are compared separately.

The small numbers of non-citizens in Alachua and Clay counties could explain why there was no effect on crime. In 2017, only 5.2 percent of Alachua County's population were non-citizens and 2.5 percent of Clay County's population were non-citizens. In different jurisdictions like Miami Dade County, where 23.3 percent of the population were non-citizens in 2017, the effect of sanctuary city policies might be different although there is no evidence of that during the brief period when it had a sanctuary policy.

SB 168 was originally paired with a bill that would have mandated E-Verify on the state level. E-Verify is a government electronic eligibility for employment verification system where employers run the identity information of new hires against government databases to see if they are legally able to work. The goal of E-Verify is to exclude illegal immigrants from the workforce. E-Verify doesn't work well, but it looks to have increased crime in Arizona when that state government mandated it for all new hire. Although SB 168 will have no effect on crime in Florida, at least the legislature ditched its effort to mandate E-Verify as that may well have increased crime.

Florida currently has only two sanctuary jurisdictions according to the Center for Immigration Studies and is unlikely to have many more in coming years. Furthermore, crime rates in those counties did not rise relative to neighboring counties after they adopted their sanctuary policies. The effect of sanctuary policies on local crime rates is a subject screaming for more research, but the evidence so far shows that sanctuary policies don't affect crime in Florida.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence, none, either in Florida or in the rest of the country that sanctuary cities result in more crime. There is none, zero. However, that won't matter to Republicans because they are unmoved by the facts.

Mr. Speaker, earlier I listed some examples of ideas that Republicans blocked from even being considered on the floor. Here are a few more. I just want people to appreciate this.

An amendment that would protect access to IVF for Federal employees, they blocked it.

They blocked an amendment to require a study for Tribal consultations before enactment of an oil and gas bill that could affect their subsistence resources.

An amendment to make critical targeted investments in small-town police departments for the recruitment, retention, mental health support, and training they need to protect themselves and their communities, they blocked that, too.

They blocked an amendment to ensure continued access to emergency care for pregnant servicewomen at military treatment facilities.

Maybe Republicans don't believe in IVF or any of these other ideas, but they can just vote "no." Why block these ideas from even being debated unless they are afraid they would pass?

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to close yet. There may be someone else.

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

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

I want to get back to this extraordinary closed House. I just want everybody to appreciate how awful this process is.

Here are yet more examples of ideas that were too scary, too revolutionary, too controversial to even be debated on the House floor, according to this Republican majority:

An amendment to provide grants to organizations that are helping to transition servicemembers to civilian life, including job recruitment training, they blocked that. I mean, what are they thinking? Who does that?

They blocked an amendment to ensure that students with dietary restrictions like lactose intolerance can have an alternative to whole milk at lunch. Is lactose intolerance now woke? I mean, I don't get it. That was blocked.

They blocked an amendment to ensure that a bill wouldn't cause our domestic energy prices to increase.

I ask, again, what is the majority afraid of? I mean, we have our differences. We ought to have substantive debate on the floor and then have votes. I am willing to bet there are some thoughtful Republicans who would support some of these amendments that I mentioned here.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

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

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

We have heard a lot about wokeness here today, but I want to focus on the woke Democratic ideas that Republicans have blocked in this record-breaking closed Congress. I mean, ideas like protecting IVF, fighting fentanyl trafficking, and making sure lactose-intolerant students have something nutritious to drink at lunch. Wow. I mean, that those ideas are woke is crazy.

There have been 106 closed rules. That is a big number, a record-breaking number, but much more important is what that number represents. These ideas and all the other blocked amendments I highlighted would have helped everyday Americans. Is that woke? Is it woke to try and keep kids from getting asthma, to provide job training to veterans? To provide cancer screenings to firefighters, is that woke?

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what my Republican colleagues are afraid of.

Maybe they are afraid to vote "no." Maybe they are afraid to vote "yes." This is Congress, Mr. Speaker. We are here to take hard votes. This record-breaking number of closed rules is a disservice to the people the Republicans represent.

Mr. Speaker, while Republicans want to talk about being woke, I wish instead that they would wake the hell up and do the people's business. For example, I don't know, maybe pass a bill to prevent a government shutdown. What we are doing today is merely a political exercise. Their obsession with trying to inject politics and culture wars into everything is getting really old, almost as old as the Presidential nominee.

Let me just say I love this place, and I love all the different things that we have been called on to do. I will just say this, Mr. Speaker: I want everybody to join with me and let's end this. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

□ 1315

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

Despite what my colleagues on the left have to say, the American people know that the Biden-Harris administration has been a relentless, woke assault on the American economy, the education system, and even Americans' retirement accounts.

The American people know the Biden-Harris administration has resulted in crippling inflation, a wide-open border, decreasing public safety, and increasing drug overdose deaths.

With the bills before us today, we continue to deliver for the American people. House Republicans are fighting at every turn to secure our borders, restore our economy, and protect free speech and free markets.

The Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act and the No Bailout for Sanctuary Cities Act are commonsense bills that would immediately make our communities safer, something the Biden-Harris administration has repeatedly failed to do. I would hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle would support these important bills.

I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1455 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 16) to authorize the cancellation of removal

and adjustment of status of certain aliens, 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 recommend.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 16.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOLINARO) at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1455;

Adoption of House Resolution 1455, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

S. 1146;

H.R. 9076;

H.R. 7213; and

H.R. 1513.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute and 2-minute votes.