United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023 No. 9

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, January 13, 2023, at 1:30 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 11, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

ISSUES FACING AMERICAN FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect Congress to address the issues they care about, kitchen table issues like being able to afford prescription drugs or get a good-paying job and addressing the gun violence that is plaguing our neighborhoods.

But instead of getting to work for the American people, House Republicans, held hostage by MAGA extremists, spent their first week engaging in power struggles and brawls and political stunts. Instead of lowering costs for American families, they voted to help wealthy tax cheats and greedy corporations avoid paying their fair share of taxes, a move that would raise the Federal deficit by over $100 billion.

Instead of creating better-paying jobs, they launched a new committee to chase down conspiracy theories and settle scores for the disgraced, twice-impeached former President.

Instead of working to make our communities safer, they doubled down on their crusade to criminalize women's healthcare and end reproductive rights across this country. The party that once claimed to stand for family values has no interest in solving the most pressing issues facing American families.

I am disappointed but never discouraged.

No matter what political stunts House Republicans pull, my colleagues and I will remain focused on delivering for the people we represent. We will keep working to create better-paying jobs and opportunities for our children, to lower costs for families, and to make our communities safer.

POLITICAL VIOLENCE IS NEVER THE ANSWER

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, as political violence rises in our country and abroad, our Nation's leaders should be united in condemning political violence in all forms, as well as the vile rhetoric that fuels it.

From Charlottesville to Pittsburgh to El Paso, we have seen the tragic results when lies spill blood and words echo as gunshots. These attacks ripple through communities stealing innocent lives, traumatizing survivors, and inflicting pain on those left behind.

The underlying drivers of domestic violent extremism, antigovernment sentiment, racism, misogyny, and anti-Semitism are constant as threats and attacks move from one community to the next.

We all have a moral responsibility to combat this scourge of hateful rhetoric, to ensure that every American can live free from bigoted speech and hate-fueled violence.

But the resolution presented by Republicans today continues that pattern of stoking grievances and chaos in our communities rather than helping our communities work together to ensure domestic tranquility.

Their resolution is far from a clean condemnation of political violence. By condemning only vandalism and violence against anti-abortion facilities, it gives tacit approval to the far more frequent attacks against abortion clinics and other medical centers disfavored by the radical right.

Political violence is never the answer.

Printed on recycled paper.

I look forward to working with our colleagues across the aisle when they are ready to take seriously the very real threat of political violence, condemning such violence in all forms, rather than using this issue to stir up more division, chaos, and ultimately more violence.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IS IN DIRE STRAITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, our postsecondary education system is in dire straits. Reforms are more necessary now than ever.

To start with, income-driven repayment plans have left millions of borrowers trapped under a mountain of interest. Many of these borrowers have done everything right.

They have been faithful to make their monthly payments, yet years later find they have made little to no progress on their principal. This can be extremely frustrating, especially for those who realize they have already paid back the original cost of the loan. This is the kind of problem that needs to be fixed.

It is critical that we address the structural problems that plague our postsecondary education financing system for the students of tomorrow, but it is also crucial that we address the problems it has caused for the students who have already been harmed today.

That is why House Republicans put in the work and offered a solution that fixes this broken system. That solution begins with the REAL Reforms Act.

This legislation protects the interests of students and taxpayers by providing targeted relief for borrowers currently struggling while implementing lasting reforms to ensure it doesn't happen to future borrowers.

This legislation also implements reforms to simplify the number of repayment options and caps unlimited graduate lending while ensuring college remains accessible and affordable to all Americans, regardless of their financial circumstances.

It also saves taxpayers billions by eliminating runaway forgiveness programs that disproportionately benefit wealthier households.

Together, these reforms will lower the cost of college for students, families, and taxpayers.

In contrast, President Biden's radical student loan bailout will exacerbate tuition inflation while encouraging students to go deeper into debt.

Blanket loan cancellation to the tune of $400 billion and enacting retroactive free college by expanding what were intended to be limited safety nets is fiscally irresponsible and morally indefensible.

Republicans and Democrats agree on the problems, and we must come together to work toward a solution.

For example, everyone agrees that postsecondary education should provide students and taxpayers a positive return on investment.

There is bipartisan consensus that the cost of nonrepayment can no longer fall squarely on taxpayers.

For far too long, colleges have been more focused on getting students in the door and have paid little mind to what happens once they are there or once they leave.

Again, there is bipartisan consensus that this too needs to change. It is time for Congress to come together and fix the mess created by these failed policies.

My Republican colleagues and I stand ready to work with the President and congressional Democrats to do so.

REPUBLICANS STAND FOR LIFE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain undeterred in our mission to protect the sanctity of human life and the rights of the unborn.

Today, we will pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and H. Con. Res. 3, which condemns violence against pro-life institutions and groups. By passing these two pieces of legislation, we are fulfilling the commitment we made to the American people to preserve a future that is built on freedom.

Over the last 2 years, the American people witnessed unprecedented attacks both on the unborn and those who stand for life. Today, we are turning that tide. House Republicans are sending a unified message to the entire country and the world: Our new House majority stands for life.

WATER AND DROUGHT CONDITIONS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the devastating impacts of droughts and floods that have been exacerbated in part by climate change in California but also around the country and around the world.

California is being battered with major storms bringing flooding and high winds across our State. Normally, we need the water but not quite at this level and at this measure.

We need to be taking advantage of the heavy precipitation to shore up our water supplies, to fill our State's critical reservoirs, and recharge our aquifers that have been depleted not only over decades but the last 3 years as a result of extreme drought.

The fact is, California gets most of its moisture, unlike parts of the country, from November to March. If we don't get it then, we don't get it at all.

The acceleration of the cycle of droughts and floods caused by climate change and more demands in California's water system, more people, more needs, have made it more difficult for farmers to put food on America's dinner table. I know. I am a third-generation farmer.

Now, the ongoing storms and floods threaten to damage our crops. California's San Joaquin Valley, which I represent a part of, grows nearly a quarter of the United States' food and has been bearing the brunt of it all.

Since 2019, farmland in California has shrunk by 10 percent, resulting in over 750,000 acres of fallowed land. Nearly 12,000 agriculture jobs were lost statewide, representing a 2.8 percent decline. A total of 1.3 million acres were left unplanted compared to 2019, most of it within the San Joaquin Valley. Sadly, we see that example here. And the surface water deliveries in the valley were cut by nearly 43 percent; a complex State and Federal water system. Zero percent were to agricultural allocations. You can't grow food without water.

Our farmers feed the world, and they can't do that without a reliable water supply. Forty-four percent of California's agriculture is exported.

Last year, Congress enacted the bipartisan infrastructure law, the largest infrastructure investment since the Eisenhower administration. These projects must be accelerated to develop additional water storage and to expand access to water for farmers in the valley and throughout the State.

In these efforts, we secured $1.15 billion for western agriculture water storage, an important first step; $25 million for the San Luis and Delta-Mendota Authority, which increases 130,000 acre-feet of additional water storage; $30 million for Sites Reservoir to pursue off-stream storage that will provide 1.5 million acre-feet of water; $82 million for the Los Vaqueros Reservoir that will expand another 115,000 acre-feet of additional storage; and $15 million to construct the Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir, another 82,000 acre-feet of off-stream storage.

If all of those would be in place today, that would be an additional 2 million acre-feet of additional water supply for California during these flood times. Unfortunately, these projects are not built. We must get about that business.

These investments, along with the ongoing Friant-Kern Canal construction already underway, show that we can and will improve our water system to sustain our future with climate change and other factors.

For decades, sadly, we did not make these investments, and we need to do so to protect our communities and farmland against extreme weather events for our country and for the world.

Water will rival energy in the next 10 years as to whether or not nation-states can live together amicably. It is critical.

Finally, we took a large step by investing in this bipartisan infrastructure. But the flooding that we see here obviously is our current, ongoing problem. Our Federal agencies must work

quickly, and we must use all of the water tools in our water toolbox to prevent future disasters like this from destroying our State and for other water basins, like the Colorado River and the Mississippi River. All of these are known to experience periodic flooding and periodic droughts. We must act now.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF BILL STEINER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Bill Steiner, who devoted his career to making Orange County a better place.

He held many elected positions, serving on the Orange Unified School District school board, the Orange City Council, and the Orange County Board of Supervisors.

However, his true passion was his work for children. Mr. Steiner founded the Orangewood Children's Home in Orange and the Good Samaritan Boy's Home in Corona. He also served on the board of directors for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for over 16 years.

While we miss him dearly, his legacy lives on and his organizations will have an untold impact on countless children.

He is also an active member of the Rotary Club of Orange. In that capacity, Mr. Steiner epitomized the motto ''Service Above Self,'' and we are all better because of his tireless work. We will miss him dearly.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING VILLA PARK'S 61ST BIRTHDAY

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the incorporation date of the city of Villa Park. Villa Park, known as the Hidden Jewel, was incorporated on this day in 1962 but was first settled around 1860.

Despite being the smallest incorporated city in California's 40th District, in both land and population, Villa Park has an outsized impact on our community. It is home to four public schools and is known for its charitable organizations and programs, such as Villa Park Rotary Club, Villa Park Women's League, and the Marine Thanksgiving program.

Villa Park's quiet neighborhoods, tree-lined streets, and low crime rate make the city an excellent place to live.

As your Representative, I am committed to doing all I can to help Villa Park continue to be a haven for families and workers striving toward their American Dream.

Happy 61st birthday, Villa Park.

RECOGNIZING KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Korean American Day.

Since the first Korean immigrants arrived on January 13, 1903, Korean Americans have made their mark from sea to shining sea and have found success in the classroom, workplace, and even right here in Congress to make our Nation a better place.

As one of the first Korean-American women to serve in Congress, and as an immigrant from South Korea, today, I reflect on the sacrifices my family made in the aftermath of the Korean war to have the chance at a better life here in the United States.

I remain grateful for those who came before me and paved the way for someone like me to have a seat at the table, and I will always fight for freedom and opportunity for all Americans.

OPPOSING EXTREME ANTI-ABORTION AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the extreme anti-abortion agenda that my colleagues on the other side are advancing, despite clear opposition across our country.

In November, Mr. Speaker, access to abortion care was on the ballot, and the American people rejected the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe and refused to allow far-right extremists to take away their right to bodily autonomy.

Voters in Vermont, in the Speaker's home State of California, and in my home State of Michigan codified abortion rights in their State constitutions.

Voters in Montana, as well as Kentucky, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's home State, rejected attempts to restrict their access to reproductive freedom. Still, they are advancing a policy agenda to criminalize abortion nationwide with no exceptions for rape or incest.

Let me be clear: Abortion bans impact and endanger the lives of many of our residents, including those who live with disabilities.

We will have many fights ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue to hold the line to push back against the policy violence by those who want to continue to inflict on the American people the extreme right agenda.

We will continue, my colleagues and I, to mobilize and organize a movement to secure reproductive justice across our Nation, and I will continue to fight like hell until abortion rights are restored as the law of the land.

PALESTINIAN HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the only Palestinian American serving in the United States Congress.

I feel a strong responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to humanize the Palestinian people who are living under increasingly oppressive and racist apartheid policies.

2022 was one of the deadliest in memory for Palestinians. Dozens of children were killed by the Government of Israel, and many were targeted. Groups like DCI-Palestine that monitor these killings were targeted.

We cannot look away, Mr. Speaker, and gaslight the oppressive and violent policies toward the Palestinian people, who are experiencing, right now, literally, the taking away of their human dignity and their right to be able to freely live and raise their children without this type of targeting.

We can't keep handing over billions each year to an apartheid state violating human rights. We are dealing with a far-right government there now promising to make things worse.

They are not even hiding it, Mr. Speaker. They are intentionally saying exactly what they are going to continue to do, which is the status quo, again, making it very dangerous for Palestinians to live and thrive.

No person—not one, Palestinian, Israeli, anyone—deserves to suffer or die for who they are, what they believe, or where they were born. The sooner we end unconditional support for Israel's apartheid government, the sooner we can begin making good on that belief.

Today, I am thinking of my Sity, my grandmother, who deserves to have human dignity. She should not be denied of who she is solely because she was born Palestinian, to be able to feel safe and to be able to have human rights.

I am also thinking today, Mr. Speaker, of the Palestinian-American journalist Shireen Abu Akleh and the countless Palestinians who deserved to live but whose lives were cut short.

I thank the Speaker for at least trying to listen and hear from someone who, again, is connected to so many folks on the ground there who deserve to be seen and heard in this Chamber.

RESPONDING TO CALIFORNIA'S WEATHER EMERGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the powerful winter storm systems that are currently impacting my district and much of the State of California.

Rainfall in recent weeks has been several times above average, which, along with severe winds, has had devastating and cascading impacts. This includes flooding in Folsom and Lincoln, avalanches, and mudslides. The Tahoe area and Mono County are currently under avalanche warning. There are localized mudslides occurring in Plumas County.

There have been road closures from downed trees, hundreds of downed trees that have disrupted travel plans; power outages affecting roughly 345,000 Californians, 4,500 people in the Third District; and hundreds of school closures, including all schools in the Lake Tahoe Unified District.

There have also been, tragically, at least 17 deaths in the State, including 5 in the Sacramento area.

I extend my most sincere sympathies to everyone who has been affected, who has been harmed, and whose lives have been disrupted.

I also extend my most heartfelt gratitude to all the first responders who are working tirelessly to mitigate these impacts and to protect life and property.

My office is working to ensure the greatest measure of Federal assistance is available to the affected communities. FEMA has issued an emergency declaration for most counties in California now, including Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, and Yuba.

My office is in constant communication with FEMA, and I have spoken personally to FEMA Regional Administrator Bob Fenton, who briefed me on the State Operations Center in California.

We are also in close contact with local authorities, including members of the boards of supervisors in affected counties, and continue to closely monitor developments as more storms are expected.

Mr. Speaker, California now finds itself in both a flood emergency and a drought emergency at the same time. That absurdity underscores a fundamental failure of governance.

Citizens are told to take shorter showers. Farmers are told to fallow their fields. All the while, they watch water flow abundantly into the ocean. An estimated 8 billion gallons of water from these storms will flow into the ocean in the Los Angeles Basin alone.

Cycles of wetness and dryness are nothing new to our State. Joan Didion, in 1977, wrote: ''California summers were characterized by the coughing in the pipes that meant the well was dry, and California winters by all-night watches on rivers about to crest.''

Yet, since that time, we have done little to build the storage capacity that is needed to stabilize our water supply. That is why I am cosponsoring the WATER for California Act to expand our storage capacity. We must also strengthen our flood defenses to be better prepared for extreme weather events in the future.

Our focus right now is on the days ahead. These storms are impacting different areas very differently, so it is important to be closely attuned to the advisories of your local government.

On my website, we have a comprehensive emergency contacts document that constituents in affected areas can access for resources and phone numbers. You can find that at kiley.house.gov.

WE CAN'T GO BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the women of Congress come to the floor one by one by one to tell their personal stories about abortion. I am a very private person, and I just couldn't do it. I didn't want to relive the most painful time in my entire life.

But, yesterday, I read these startling statistics about my State, yes, the great State of Florida, the beautiful Sunshine State with all the beaches and the theme parks and the immigrant-rich communities, my Florida, my State.

If abortion is banned nationwide, Florida will be the most impacted State, seeing maternal deaths increase by 29 percent. That is the mother.

The Nation will see a 24 percent increase in maternal deaths, with a disproportionate 39 percent rise in maternal mortality for Black women.

All I ever wanted since I was a little girl was plenty of children that I could love and cuddle and raise to greatness. That was the school principal in me even back then.

So, after getting married in 1968, I would soon become a mother-to-be. It was the joy of my life. I was ecstatic. My husband was walking on the clouds. My husband and I would touch my stomach all the time just to feel the movement of our baby boy and the glory of a life growing inside of me. It was amazing.

Then, at 7 months, the baby stopped moving. He was soon pronounced dead right inside of my womb, and the doctor was prohibited, by law, from inducing labor.

I had to learn how, first of all, to handle the immense grief that comes with losing a child and the fact that the corpse of that child was still within me.

I cried every night and all day. My little body was wretched with pain, weakness, and frailty. I lost 50 pounds. I would crawl into a fetal position in my mother's lap most of the day and in my husband's most of the night.

I beg you, I plead with you, we can't go back. Lord have mercy, please have mercy on women like me.

I almost died. As the days became weeks and the weeks became months, the baby began to disintegrate, and the flesh from the corpse began to spill into my bloodstream. I was at risk for toxic shock. Poison was flowing through my grief-stricken little body.

At 8½ months, I went into labor, hard, painful labor, and what was left of the baby Wilson boy was born. Oh, what a day. Oh, what pain. Oh, what grief. Oh, what despair. Oh, what suffering.

After 3 days, I left the maternity ward in a wheelchair emptyhanded, no baby, nothing. I watched other mothers and families celebrate their newborns while I grieved and cried.

We had a small graveside burial for baby boy Wilson, and the doctors were so afraid that I would also have had to have a graveside burial.

Do not take us back to the days before Roe v. Wade. Everyone who needs reproductive healthcare is different. Abortion does not only apply to women who have decided for themselves they are not ready to have a child. Abortion affects women who are at risk of facing medical emergencies, life-altering emergencies, and death.

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, let the women march on and on till victory is won.

You cannot put young, childbearing women at risk because of a group of ludicrous, hateful, majority male Congressmen, who have no idea what it feels to even bear the pain of childbirth or even have the courage to carry a child for 9 months and who take pride in monitoring women's vaginas.

How dare you. How dare you. How dare you.

May God help you find it in your heart to hear my story and never wish that kind of pain and grief that I experienced on another living soul.

Praise God from whom all blessings flow.

SECURING A BETTER FUTURE FOR GENERATIONS TO COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer perspective on the purpose and mission of this 118th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to speak here on the House floor for the first time. I am the first nuclear submarine veteran to serve in the United States House of Representatives in the last 50 years, and only the second in our Nation's history.

One particular submarine patrol, we pulled into Pearl Harbor to take World War II veterans out to sea with us for the day. By naval tradition, we stood at attention and saluted the USS *Arizona* as we passed by. One part of the experience we shared with these veterans was to demonstrate the tremendous pressure of the ocean.

In the control room with the periscopes, we would tie a string from one side of the hole to the other, about the width of this rostrum behind me. Our submarine's hole is made of high-strength steel to keep the water out and the crew safe. On the surface, this string would be taut like a guitar string and would sit about a foot off the deck. But as we submerged our boat, the pressure of the sea would compress the hole and that string would begin to droop. By the time we reached many hundreds of feet below the ocean, that string would lay flat on the deck. The incredible pressure of the ocean visible for everyone to see.

Now, like that submarine that I served on, America is under tremendous pressure. And like that string sitting on the deck, we can all see it. It is inflation. It is the border. It is the lawlessness of our Federal agencies. It is clear that our Nation is in trouble.

The failed policies of the current administration are only taking us deeper and deeper. Now, with a Republican

majority led by Speaker MCCARTHY, we have the leadership for this critical moment in time.

In 1963, the nuclear submarine, the USS *Thresher*, was conducting engineering trials off of Cape Cod when they encountered an engineering problem. The crew was able to bring the boat to within 100 feet of the surface, but they lost their battle as the submarine descended below what is called ''the crush depth,'' all hands were lost.

Americans have voted for a Republican majority in this House to reverse the policies of the current administration and to start to relieve the pressure that is all around us. The commitment to America is exactly that plan for exactly that purpose—to unite this Chamber and to lead America back to safer waters.

A typical submarine crew would be about a quarter of the number of seats in this Chamber. Imagine for a moment that many people together in a steel tube, hundreds of feet below the ocean for months at a time. I have spent 500 days at sea, and I can tell you that after so many days not everyone on the boat is going to like each other. The thing about submarines is there is no easy way off. No matter what we think of each other at the end of the journey, we arrive in the same place together.

Let's talk about where we want to end up. For starters, when something is broken on the submarine you don't scuttle the boat with the crew aboard. You keep fighting to fix what is broken, triaging critical systems, and getting the boat to a safe depth. That is exactly what we witnessed last week as we chose Speaker MCCARTHY. He has been chosen to restore faith in this Chamber and unite our party.

Freedom is a fragile thing. We saw that under Democrats' one party rule. A strong Republican Conference is key to securing a better future for our children, our grandchildren, and for generations to come.

RESTORING NORMALCY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Restoring Normalcy in America Act.

In a little over a week, we will be 3 years past the first recorded case of COVID–19 in the United States, and over 2 years since the COVID–19 vaccine has been available, thanks to the rapid development under Operation Warp Speed.

Despite the time elapsed, President Biden and his administration continue to prolong the pandemic—promoting policies that are destroying our economy, burdening small businesses, and hurting Kansas families.

Just yesterday, the NFIB announced that their Small Business Optimism Index declined 2.1 points in December, making it the 12th consecutive month below their 49-year average.

The December jobs report was the worst of 2022 and the worst during the entirety of the Biden administration so far. With out-of-control spending in the name of COVID relief, rampant inflation has made real average hourly earnings fall 1.9 percent since last year, the 20th month in a row that inflation has outpaced wage growth following the implementation of the so-called American Rescue Plan in March of 2021.

While Washington was under total Democrat control, President Biden increased Federal spending, continued lockdown procedures for far past their effectiveness, and held the country hostage until his self-chosen vaccination rates were reached. Receiving the vaccine is a choice, a choice made with careful consideration between a person and their doctor; not an action that can be forced by the Federal Government.

When the Biden administration failed to achieve their vaccination goals, they forced through unconstitutional vaccine mandates. We are currently experiencing near historic lows of COVID hospitalizations and 41 States have ended their states of emergency.

Yet, the Biden administration has decided to extend the COVID–19 public health emergency—despite in September President Biden stating that the pandemic is over. The continuation of the public health emergency significantly strains State and Federal budgets when we are already combating inflation and rising prices.

These actions by President Biden and the administration have hurt the American people and stunted our recovery. It is long past due that Washington is accountable for persistent pandemic restrictions placed on the Kansans I represent.

The legislation I am introducing today holds the Federal Government responsible and is a step toward restoring normalcy through five objectives of research, accountability, process, access, and restoration.

The American people deserve answers from the Federal Government on the effectiveness of the forced Biden administration COVID–19 policies. My bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct research on the effectiveness of vaccines and current treatments, the rate of transmission of COVID throughout the public health emergency, and more importantly, an investigation into the origins of COVID–19.

We also need accountability. Over the past several years, trillions have been allocated to combat COVID–19. To ensure that taxpayer dollars are not being wasted, my legislation would audit the Federal agencies that received COVID–19 funds, and whatever finances can be recouped should be returned to Treasury.

Returning to our standard processes is also critical. In the early stages of the pandemic, using the Emergency Use Authorization, the EUA, was necessary to develop vaccines and treatments. Now, with years of information and time, we should return to the normal approval process.

This bill ends the use of EUAs for COVID vaccines and treatments and requires any vaccines or treatments without full FDA approval to go through the process like any other medication or vaccination.

The choice to be vaccinated is personal, and whether it be for religious or medical reasons, vaccination status should not be the cause for discrimination and access.

My bill strengthens personal freedoms by preventing businesses from prohibiting entry or refusing service based solely on COVID vaccination status.

Lastly, my legislation reverses the damage done by President Biden's destructive, unconstitutional vaccine mandates and brings restoration to the individuals harmed. Any servicemember or Federal employee fired or discharged due to failure to comply to Biden's vaccine mandate will be reinstated with their record expunged of this incident.

The Restoring Normalcy in America Act provides the American people with answers and accountability for how this administration has prolonged the COVID–19 pandemic and works to reverse some of the damaging policies that have been put in place.

PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania kicked off one of my favorite events: the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

For more than a century, 170 years, farmers have gathered each January at the Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. This week-long event is the largest indoor agricultural exposition in the Nation, showcasing more than 6,000 animals, nearly 12,000 exhibits, and more than half a million visitors.

Each year, I host a listening session at the farm show, and we cover a range of topics during the public forum, from raising awareness about agriculture education to hearing very real concerns from our farmers, ranchers, producers, processors, and many more key rural stakeholders. This year, the listening session will take place on Friday, January 13.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show brings together so many different agriculture advocates from all different corners of the industry. It is an event like no other. I am very proud that this takes place in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show provides an atmosphere for everyone to walk through, observe, and educate

themselves about different areas of agriculture, the Commonwealth's largest industry, which brings nearly $6.9 billion annually in agricultural cash receipts. Almost half a million jobs are tied to the industry, which positively impacts all Pennsylvanians.

Undoubtedly, one of the most popular attractions of the Pennsylvania Farm Show is the food court. Located in the Expo Hall and Main Hall of the complex, the food court offers visitors a variety of Pennsylvania products, which generates income to support the nonprofit Pennsylvania Agricultural Commodity Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, more than a century ago, the first Pennsylvania Farm Show was a 3-day exhibit. Today, the event is a week-long celebration of how the agriculture industry touches our lives every day. Proudly, this event draws visitors from across the country to highlight everything our State has to offer when it comes to agriculture.

I have been hosting this listening session as a Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District for 13 years. Like every year, I am looking forward to hearing directly from the backbone of our Nation, the hardworking men and women of American agriculture.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show goes through this Saturday, January 14. Like I said, we look forward to 3 o'clock in the banquet hall to be hosting this year's listening session on Friday, January 13. I certainly invite and encourage my colleagues and actually anyone that would like to join us for this event.

It is 24 acres under roof, almost a million square feet. It represents not just Pennsylvania's number one industry, but agriculture is the industry that touches the lives of American families more times a day than any other.

CONDEMNING RECENT ATTACKS ON PRO-LIFE FACILITIES, GROUPS, AND CHURCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 3, condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

New York is home to so many compassionate and committed pro-life pregnancy centers, such as CompassCare in Amherst, New York, and CareNet Centers dotted around New York State.

Pro-life pregnancy centers across our State and our country provide women with critical care, such as free pregnancy tests, pre-natal care, referrals, education, mentoring, and material support, including diapers, car seats, and clothing. They also provide love and support to these women in a time of need. From 2016 to 2020, these pregnancy centers saved over 800,000 lives by providing a compassionate alternative to abortion.

Tragically, on June 7, 2022, a CompassCare facility in western New York was maliciously firebombed by a violent anti-abortion group called Jane's Revenge. The perpetrators left graffiti: ''Jane was here.'' Those responsible have still not been held accountable.

Unfortunately, this was not an isolated incident. Over 100 pro-life facilities and churches were attacked in 2022 alone.

I was honored to join CompassCare's CEO, Reverend Jim Harden, and the CompassCare team at its reopening just a few months after the violent attack. As Reverend Harden said best, CompassCare now has 21st century telehealth tools to compete head-on with the billion-dollar abortion empire by reaching and serving every woman in America.

□ 1045

Pro-life pregnancy centers play a key role in helping pregnant women all across the country, but Democrat leadership has been silent on the unprecedented amount of violence leveled against these compassionate advocates for life. House Republicans are united in our condemnation of the political violence these wonderful caregivers and those who choose life have always faced.

I am proud to support H. Con. Res. 3, condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches; and I will not back down to violent extremists.

SAVING LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I guess the opportunity to serve in the United States Congress with a little over 10,000 Members over the decades, and for the years of service that I have been given this privilege, and at the decision of my constituents allows me to look over the landscape of the journey that we have taken.

I was here when medical procedures for parents who wanted nothing more than a healthy baby were then characterized as a criminal act and called partial-birth abortion when a mother had to make a decision with her God, her doctor, and her family.

I remember the hearings in the Judiciary Committee where mothers were crying because of the medical procedure that was necessary to save their life.

We have now come full circle, and the extremists want to again demonize parents who are desperate—desperate for a healthy child.

I have seen this before: extremist views criminalizing a medical choice that has to be made, criminalizing abortion from east to west and north to south. I will not have it.

I know that this is a most personal decision and one that families do not want to make. But as a person of faith, I believe it should be that woman, that family, that God, and that doctor.

So, unfortunately, today we will have the effort to criminalize these actions of doctors. You see, Mr. Speaker, I come from a State where the State legislature and Governor passed a bounty hunter bill to go after doctors and nurses who would be giving medical care to innocent women and to individuals who were seeking that care.

How outrageous in a constitutional democracy, Mr. Speaker, that you want to injure people and you want to undermine doctors and undermine nurses. What an outrage that, again, this extremist agenda continues.

Yet, in the face of a 13-year-old being shot to death in the District of Columbia with a gun, the guns are rampaging across America, guns of a 6-year-old who shot a teacher; mass murders are more extensive in this last year, 2022, than ever, there is not a real effort to ensure that guns are not proliferating in the hands of those who should not get them, guns that should actually have penalties for those who do not store it; penalties for manufacturers who do not indicate, label, and insist that the guns be stored; or, in fact, the universal background check that has not been able to be passed. These are things that could save lives of living individuals who are now at the brunt end of gun violence.

Yes, putting guns in the hands of people who should not have them, having better mental health services and red flag laws. But the way the bill was written, you have to opt in. States like Texas will not opt into a red flag law to protect people. And all I see in my area is—not because police are not working as hard as they can—domestic violence with guns day after day after day and week after week because guns are in the hands of the wrong people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say there is a lot of good work we can do together, there is a lot of good work that Democrats have done. We are seeing it in the bipartisan infrastructure bill and dealing with climate change which is evident by the tragedy that is happening to our friends in California.

But I am glad to stand up here today and announce something really good that today, because of Democrats, the Social Security recipients will have an 8.7 percent increase in their COLA. I will go home over the weekend and over the days and into Martin Luther King celebrations where he believed in lifting the least of those and be able to say to those Social Security recipients: You got an 8.7 percent increase in your COLA because of Democrats and President Biden.

We intend to do things and to be active on behalf of the American people. We intend to cure problems and not make problems. We intend to help our schoolchildren, help our teachers, help our nurses, help our doctors, and help those senior citizens whom I see in the

senior citizen community centers saying: When are we going to get the ability to have a cost of living so that we can live because we have been the ones who have helped build this Nation?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues and the administration to be unafraid of moving forward on H.R. 40.

Isn't it time that we assess the impact of slavery in this country?

Over 200 years it has never been addressed. It has never been addressed. H.R. 40 needs to pass on the issue of studying slavery and developing reparation proposals.

RECOGNIZING THE BEST OF THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the city of Charleston in South Carolina's First Congressional District.

For the 10th consecutive year, the Holy City has been recognized as the best city to visit in the United States by Travel and Leisure magazine.

It is easy to see why. Charleston's tremendous natural beauty, rich history, and friendly faces make it a magnet to visitors from across the country.

To quote Travel & Leisure's article: ''The city expresses the perfect balance of Southern charm, knockout food and drinks, and walkability.''

When they say drinks, they mean some of the best cocktails in the South.

I want to commend our tourism and hospitality industry, our mayor, and every resident of the city of Charleston for this decades-long recognition.

SAVING SEA TURTLES

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the Hilton Head Island Sea Turtle Patrol and their sister group, the Turtle Trackers.

From the beginning of May until the end of October every single year, hundreds of sea turtles return to Hilton Head Island to lay their eggs on 14 miles of sandy beaches.

These turtles are a crucial part of our ocean environment, and each nest is critically important for protecting their future as they are still endangered.

For over 15 years, Amber Kuehn, has led the effort to protect the island's sea turtle nests. When she began the Turtle Trackers program, it was just Amber and about six other women. Today there are over 500 volunteers across Hilton Head Island who work hard to remove obstacles from the beach. They fill holes, and they make it easier for the mother turtles to return safely and return to the water every year.

Her elite corps of 18 expert volunteers forms the Hilton Head Island's Sea Turtle Patrol. They travel the whole length of the beach every morning in search of sea turtle nests. Since they began their work, the number of sea turtle nests on Hilton Head Island has increased by over 300 percent. In 2021 they tracked and maintained approximately 423 nests.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in commending Amber and her team for their incredible conservation efforts.

BEAUFORT, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND OSTROH, UKRAINE

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the city of Beaufort on raising three-quarters of a million dollars for their sister city, Ostroh, in western Ukraine.

After the invasion of Ukraine began, Mayor Stephen Murray was looking for ways to help so he began looking for a sister city. There are many very strong similarities between Beaufort and Ostroh. They are very similar in size, both have centuries of rich history, and both have some of the oldest universities in their respective regions.

After connecting with Mayor Yurii Yahodka in Ostroh, which currently houses thousands of refugees from the eastern part of the country, Mayor Murray and the residents of Beaufort spent the next 4 months raising money and raising awareness across the Lowcountry.

Beaufort's famous Thibault Gallery sold Ukrainian flag pins, and they raised over $40,000. Community groups, businesses, and citizens from all walks of life raised almost $150,000 through raffles, fundraising drives, and several large anonymous donations to represent and assist their sister city.

Mayor Murray did not stop there. He worked tirelessly with members of the city council to secure MREs, grits, and cornmeal from local South Carolina businesses to bring approximately $600,000 worth of food and supplies to the people of Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mayor Murray and all of the residents of Beaufort for this incredibly generous effort.

HONORING SARA CATHEY

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sara Cathey, a paramedic who lost over 125 pounds to donate her kidney to her niece Natalyn. Natalyn had both of her kidneys removed at only 1½ years of age due to a devastating genetic condition.

As a healthcare professional, Sarah understood the difficulty of securing a donor kidney and had herself tested. She was a perfect match. But one thing stood in the way. When Sara learned her weight could prevent her from saving Natalyn's life, she was more determined than ever to get in shape. She got to work changing her habits and her lifestyle so that little Natalyn could have a chance at life.

Through grit and determination, she reached her goal and was cleared for surgery. The hard work and effort she put forth shows the love and compassion she has for her family and everyone in the Lowcountry whom she selflessly serves each and every day.

CONGRATULATING THE CHARLESTON RIVERDOGS

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Charleston RiverDogs, our Lowcountry minor league baseball team, on clinching their second consecutive league championship finishing the post season with a 4–0 record.

I have twice had the privilege of throwing out the first pitch. The RiverDogs is an integral part of the Charleston community and has created lasting memories for our community and in the Lowcountry for the better part of the last 40 years.

This year's team also tied the franchise record for the number of wins in a season, and I want to congratulate the RiverDogs on a terrific season and wish them all the best of luck in the next season.

GOOD MORNING TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BEAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish a very good morning to you and to the House of Representatives.

I am AARON BEAN. I am one of the new guys. Aside from a motion to adjourn earlier this week, this right now is the very first time I am speaking on this floor, and I want to say what an honor it is to be with everyone in this body.

To the people of northeast Florida—and specifically the brand new Fourth District of the free State of Florida—I say that I am humbled and grateful that you sent me here to be your voice on this floor.

I am keenly aware of the amazing opportunity it is as well as the responsibilities it comes with.

I am also, Mr. Speaker, keenly aware that our country and Nation have challenges—lots of them. The border and our growing deficit are just the tip of the iceberg.

So I say to all the Members here, I look forward to working with you, tackling these challenges, and making America more secure, safer, and stronger.

Mr. Speaker, let's go get 'em.

STRONG NATIONS NEED TAX COLLECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for most of my life, I have been a student of history. As a CPA, a tax lawyer, and a former head of the second largest tax agency in this country, I focused on the fact that if you look at empires, republics, and kingdoms, the ones that succeeded were those that were able to collect taxes. And when they were unable to collect taxes, they fell.

I have seen patriotic anarchists come to this floor. They want America to be

strong, but they want our ability to enforce our financial laws to be weak.

There are those who say correctly that we should not defund the police because we have crime in the streets. But we also have to prevent crime in the suites.

Yet every time a billionaire successfully cheats on his taxes, a member of the Freedom Caucus earns his wings. There are two threats to our ability to collect taxes. Both of them seem to be supported by many on the Republican side.

The first of these is the underfunding of the IRS. For 3 days and 3 long nights, we heard each faction of the Republican Party say how they wanted procedures that would eventually lead to reducing our national debt, and then the first thing they bring to the floor is a bill that increases the national debt by $1.6 trillion according to six bipartisan Secretaries of the Treasury.

Frankly, I think that estimate is way too low because I have seen tax collection from every side; as a legislator, as a tax administrator and auditor, and as an adviser to private businesses.

□ 1100

When you conduct audits, you not only bring in money from that taxpayer, but you create an image in that social circle that tax returns need to be filled out accurately and even conservatively. That will no doubt lead to far more tax collection than the $1.6 trillion that has been estimated.

Keep in mind that working people really can't evade taxes. They get W–2s and 1099s. It is those with complicated tax returns and our large corporations that we are talking about.

Now, with the additional funding the Democrats have provided the IRS, we can finally put ''service'' back into Internal Revenue Service. Hopefully, they will answer the damn phones.

We need to see one IRS employee for every 2,000 tax returns that are filed. As you can see on this chart, that is what Ronald Reagan had back in 1988. Now, we are close to 3,500 tax returns for every IRS employee. That is untenable. That is why Donald Trump could take outrageous positions in his tax returns. He counted on light audits.

Ronald Reagan paid his taxes and staffed the IRS. Stand with Ronald Reagan and stand with adequate funding for the Internal Revenue Service.

There is a second threat to our ability to collect taxes—it is longer term—and that is the possible rise of cryptocurrency. When somebody tells you what they are, believe them. Cryptocurrency tells you what it is or aspires to be in its name. Cryptocurrency literally means hidden money.

Now, I am the only Member of this House to get a grade of F from the only organization dedicated to crypto advancement that rates Members of this House because I have been trying to ban crypto for over 5 years.

No one has helped me more in that effort than Sam Bankman-Fried, but some will view Sam Bankman-Fried as just one big snake in a crypto Garden of Eden. The fact is, crypto is a garden of snakes.

From the outside, it looks like it is just a token, an electronic pet rock, something to bet on, not because it has any value or use but because you might be able to sell it for even more to somebody else. But longer term investors in crypto are investing in it because they hope it becomes a currency.

How does crypto compete with the dollar, the existing U.S. currency? It is right there in the name. Cryptocurrency means hidden money, and the market for cryptocurrency is tax evaders trying to hide their assets from the IRS.

SHERIFF JOHN D'AGOSTINI SERVED HIS COMMUNITY WELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, if you want to understand successful law enforcement, the first place to look is the career of El Dorado County Sheriff John D'Agostini.

It is not hard. It was under his leadership—in fact, it was because of his leadership—that the day-to-day operations of his department became the subject of the popular TV series ''Sheriffs: El Dorado County'' that ran from 2014 to 2019.

It is the very definition of successful policing, pioneered by Sir Robert Peel and perfected and practiced by Sheriff D'Agostini. Ideal police departments are run as extensions of the communities they serve. They work in partnership with local citizens, and this was the heart of Sheriff D'Agostini's success.

I have seen it over and over in action. During the devastating King fire, I watched him at his post even when his own ranch was imminently threatened. During the Caldor fire, he opened that same ranch to the stream of evacuees who had fled the devastation with only the clothes on their backs. I can't tell you the number of times I watched him during these terrifying disasters—always calm, always focused, always reassuring, and omnipresent.

He is loved by his community and his department because he loves them, and that caring is what binds the community to the sheriff's department and exemplified and, indeed, defined his successful record of modern policing.

He was first elected in 2010 by a razor-thin margin of 1,300 votes, but as he proved himself, he became a beloved institution in the community and won reelection overwhelmingly in 2014 and 2018 and would have won by acclimation in 2022, but for the fact that he chose to retire back into the community he has so faithfully served and protected.

They were not all easy years. He lost a deputy to an illegal alien in a marijuana grow in 2019 and became a national figure warning of the dangers that our porous border and sanctuary policies present to communities across America and to those who risk their lives to protect us.

When State bureaucrats ordered businesses to shut down during the COVID hysteria, Sheriff D'Agostini stood up for the constitutional rights of his constituents and refused to destroy their livelihoods. His courageous stand has since been affirmed by the mounting evidence that the lockdowns cost lives, destroyed livelihoods, and did nothing to slow the spread of the disease.

Sheriff D'Agostini worked his way up through the ranks, first graduating from the Sacramento County Sheriff's Academy in 1993. Throughout his career, Sheriff D'Agostini served in numerous positions, including patrol deputy, detective, SWAT team member, narcotics investigator, rangemaster and firearms instructor, and investigator for the Amador County District Attorney's Office.

Sheriff D'Agostini is well known for his many accomplishments and contributions to the community, including his leadership in constructing a new public safety headquarters located in Placerville. This building now provides local law enforcement with emergency operations services, a 911 dispatch center, a morgue, an evidence building, and a special operations and training building, as well as an indoor shooting range and armory.

Mr. Speaker, without law enforcement, there is no law, and without law, there is no civilization, which is why it is impossible to overstate the necessity of our local police departments and the law and order they uphold within our communities.

I am proud today to congratulate John on his numerous accomplishments and his exemplary leadership, and, on behalf of the grateful citizens across El Dorado County, thank him for his extraordinary service.

El Dorado County has been extremely fortunate to have had his leadership for these past 12 years. Although he isn't going anywhere—he is retiring right back into the community that raised him—and although his successor is well prepared under his tutelage to carry on his successful policies, that won't stop us from missing him anyway in the role that he defined and the responsibilities that he discharged so well.

COMMITMENT TO THE BIG FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in my first remarks before the 118th Congress, I rise today to share with you what I learned from my first term representing the Big First District of Kansas and how I will respond over the next 2 years.

I grew up on the farm south of Quinter, Kansas, that has been in my family for five generations. The house my parents live in and the house I grew up in is the same house my great-great-grandfather ordered from a Montgomery Ward catalog in the early 1900s. Growing up there meant that I spent thousands of hours on a tractor working in fields and on horseback doctoring cattle in our family feed yard.

I think of the Big First as the pilot light of America because the values that make America great are still alive and well there. People in the Big First are good people who carry a pioneering spirit with them, the same way those who settled my State did over 160 years ago. We know one another, look out for one another, and sacrifice for one another. We are farmers and ranchers, feedlot managers, businessowners, lenders, bankers, teachers, doctors, nurses, and parents.

Over the last 2 years, I did a lot of listening. I held listening sessions each month. I received tens of thousands of calls, emails, and letters from Kansans. I hosted leaders and other Members of Congress in the district to listen with them. I hosted townhalls 126 times over the last 2 years, and I am gearing up to start my 2023 townhall tour again next week.

As I travel across the district, I hear concerns about inflation, the border crisis, Big Government, sweeping executive orders, out-of-control government spending, sky-high taxes, and the infringement on basic rights like the Second Amendment and the right to life.

I have long said, if it matters to a Kansan, it matters to me. In response to what I heard over the last 2 years and to what I have seen while serving in Congress, I developed my ''Commitment to the Big First.'' It is a roadmap for the 118th Congress that gets America back on track, advocates for agriculture, and advances our Kansas conservative values.

My ''Commitment to the Big First'' details plans for an economy that is strong, a nation that is safe, a future that is built on freedom, and a government that is accountable. It is a plan for a balanced budget and a strengthened supply chain, for lower taxes and a secure southern border, for a robust police and military, for a comprehensive reauthorization of the farm bill and strengthened crop insurance, for a maintained stepped-up basis tax provision and global food security legislation that stops wars before they start.

Senator Bob Dole once told me about the Kansas approach: honesty; hard work; respect for your roots; service; simplicity; genuine, thoughtful care for people; and common sense. My ''Commitment to the Big First'' is a plan for commonsense solutions to the complex problems that America faces today.

I wasted no time implementing this commitment. On Monday, I reintroduced the More Accountability is Necessary Now Acts, or the MANN Acts. The MANN Acts are six pieces of legislation that will hold the Biden administration accountable, demand transparency from Washington, fight unconstitutional executive orders, and push back against Federal Government overreach.

The MANN Acts require the executive branch to notify the American public and Congress of its intent to issue any new executive orders pertaining to agriculture, energy, the environment, pro-life provisions, the Second Amendment, and immigration.

Single-party rule here in Washington, D.C., is over. The American people gave Republicans control of the House for a reason. They are tired of seeing their tax dollars wasted, their rights violated, and the laws of our land dictated by executive orders from the White House.

The MANN Acts and my ''Commitment to the Big First'' are just the first steps toward executing on a plan that America has demanded of us.

When we get into the middle of issues, roll up our sleeves, get to work, listen to those around us, and do the heavy lifting, we gain perspective and better results. That is what I learned in the Big First.

I refuse to be stapled to my desk in Washington, D.C. I will continue to spend time thinking, praying, and reflecting on how best to serve the people in my district.

I did not come to Congress to be a caretaker of the slow demise of America. I am here to fight and to work to make America stronger. I really believe that our brightest days are yet to come.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ROBERT BOWLES, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Robert Bowles, Jr., a loving father, husband, and leader from the great State of Georgia.

Robert was a proud graduate of the University of Georgia School of Pharmacy. He was the owner and pharmacist at Big C Discount Drugs of Thomaston until his retirement.

Robert devoted his professional life to God, his customers, his community, his family, and to both the Georgia Pharmacy Association and the National Community Pharmacists Association.

He was responsible for initiating one of the first successful diabetic care programs in the community pharmacy area.

Robert is the past president of the Georgia Pharmacy Association, where he served on almost every committee that existed.

He was the recipient of many State and national awards during his career, including the Bowl of Hygeia and the Larry L. Braden Meritorious Service Award.

Robert's impact on our State will be felt for generations to come. He will be dearly missed.

HONORING BRIAN TUTEN AND ED LIVINGSTON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Brian Tuten and Ed Livingston. Brian and Ed are trainers for Benedictine Military School in Savannah, Georgia.

In October, during a Benedictine football practice, a player experienced a cardiac event. Brian and Ed jumped into action immediately to save the young boy's life. They performed life-saving CPR and deployed an AED until the ambulance arrived.

Luckily for the player, he is now making a full recovery.

If it had not been for the quick action of both Brian and Ed, this situation could have been much worse.

Thank you both for your service and dedication to our community and our district. You are both heroes.

CELEBRATING THE CAMDEN COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Camden County Sheriff's Office for their hard work in finding a young man who went missing in Camden County during a hunting trip.

Camden County Sheriff's Office did not act alone. They had the help of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, McIntosh Fire and Rescue, and the McIntosh Sheriff's Office.

The sheriff's department found the man after he had been missing for 3 days. Authorities were worried because temperatures were dropping into the low 30s overnight. Luckily for the hunter, law enforcement worked quickly and efficiently to locate him. The hunter was evaluated by medical personnel and then returned home to his family.

None of this would be possible without the quick action of our wonderful law enforcement in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

□ 1115

RECOGNIZING TERRY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Terry College's first-place win at the National Black MBA Association Undergraduate Business Case Competition.

Terry College is a premier business school located at my alma mater, the University of Georgia, home of the national champions Georgia Bulldogs.

Terry College students, Kevin Kamau, Sophia Ige, Lauryn Sanders, and Phillip Ellington were a part of the team that won first place in the competition.

The national case competition is a hands-on student consulting experience that provides undergraduates early exposure to MBA-level business case strategy. The program also allows students to be considered for competitive summer internship opportunities.

Their team, the first to represent Terry College at the National Black MBA Association Undergraduate Business Case Competition, was tasked

with developing a recruitment plan for Generation Z graduates.

This team beat out teams from Emory University, the University of Southern California, and Purdue University to take home the first place prize of $15,000.

This was the University of Georgia's first time competing, and therefore, they were seen as the underdogs.

Congratulations to the team and to the Terry College of Business.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BRIAN CLINT WORLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life and service of Brian Clint Worley of Emory, Texas.

Emory is a small town in Rains County where great Americans reside. During my campaign in 2020, I befriended his parents, Fred and Sue Worley, who couldn't be more gentle, wonderful, loving souls.

Brian was born in Denton, Texas, on March 11, 1968. He graduated from Rains High School in Emory in 1987 where he was a star basketball, baseball, track, and football player. Brian received all-district honors for his athletic performances and was voted most courteous, best personality, and most prestigious at Rains High School.

In 1991, Brian graduated from Kilgore College Police Academy, and he began his law enforcement career at the Mount Pleasant Police Department. He received several commendations in his first 4 years as a police officer and once helped save an elderly citizen from choking. He saved a life. Moreover, his work in the Selective Traffic Enforcement Program helped apprehend numerous drunk drivers, and again, saved countless lives.

Brian attended the Texas Department of Public Safety Training Academy in Austin, Texas, in 1995 and was stationed in Cooper, Texas, and later Sulphur Springs.

Some of Brian's many recognitions include District Commanders Award, the Texas Department of Public Safety Chief's Award, and Trooper of the Year in 1988.

Brian was a man of faith and dedicated his career to serving the people of Texas. He was a loving father who deeply cared about his family, his friends, and his pets. He will be closely and fondly remembered by many.

I have requested that a flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to recognize Brian's tremendous life and his extraordinary public service. He will be dearly missed by his friends, family, and colleagues.

Fred and Sue, his parents, are salt of the earth people. They love things that are greater than themselves, and that is so incredibly inspiring. They know that God is greater than they are; that this country is greater than they are; that Texas, their friends, their family, and their community is more important than they are. When you meet people like that and see the lives that they lead, it warms the heart and it warms the soul.

When you lose a spouse, they call you a ''widow.'' When you lose a parent, they call you an ''orphan.'' Fred and Sue have lost a child. When you lose a child, it is so God awful they don't even have a name for it.

What breaks my heart is not only the loss of Brian, but that his children, Caden and Emily, have lost their father. I know they are watching right now, and I want to make sure they understand that a grateful Nation grieves with them.

I think the greatest compliment you can pay a person is to say that the world is a better place with them in it. The world sheds a collective tear now that we have lost Brian.

Mr. Speaker, we should take inspiration from the Worley family, extend our deepest condolences, and promise them that we will follow in the footsteps of Brian and emulate his love of this country and of others.

We will be praying for Brian. We will see him soon. God bless Brian.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, do not wait any longer to be gracious to the people of Ukraine. Rise up and show mercy to them as they endure the terror of their oppressors.

For You, O Lord, are a God of justice. We ask then that You would bless all those who seek cover in the undergrounds of Kyiv, those who mourn the destruction of neighborhoods like Bucha, they who seek refuge in Lviv. Be gracious to them and answer their cries.

You have given them the bread of adversity and the water of affliction. But do not hide yourself anymore.

May their eyes see You when they turn to the right and to the left. May their ears hear Your word behind them guiding their steps and delivering them from their torment. May their spirits be led by Your spirit into the redemptive future You have provided for them.

Bring soon the day when You will bind up the injuries of Your people and heal the wounds of the afflicted.

We offer this prayer in Your sovereign name.

Amen.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. We welcome the public back into the people's House. It is good to see you coming. It has been a number of years.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the Chamber the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Sykes) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. SYKES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PROMISES MADE, PROMISES KEPT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 118th Congress and its newly elected Republican majority, led by KEVIN MCCARTHY, began the session by voting to pass the Family and Small Business Taxpayer Protection Act.

This important legislation will give money back to the American people by rescinding billions of dollars in funding for 87,000 new IRS agents put in place by the duplicitous Democrat-led inflation expansion act. This is just the first example of promises made, promises kept.

Among the commitments to America by House Republicans:

Fight inflation and support working families.

Reduce gas prices and restore energy independence.

Secure the supply chain and restock our shelves.

Secure the southern border.

Defend America with peace through strength.

Ensure faith in free and fair elections.

Reclaim oversight and hold the Biden administration accountable.

Protect American rights and serve the people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the safe haven of Afghanistan to America.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, what an important topic, limited to 1 minute, but I rise today to acknowledge Human Trafficking Awareness Day, to acknowledge that a Texas woman just filed a lawsuit against one of our universities for sexual abuse and the grooming by her coach to use her over and over again.

Human trafficking is one of the greatest threats to human rights in the United States. In 2020, over 11,000 instances of potential human trafficking were reported to the United States National Human Trafficking Hotline, and at least 70 percent of those were, in fact, estimated to be sex trafficking.

I am delighted that Chairman MIKE MCCAUL and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, myself, have introduced the Stop Human Trafficking in School Zones Act because that is one of the largest sites for trafficking.

We look forward to a bipartisan Congress supporting this legislation that will particularly provide enhanced sentencing to those who would dare to recruit our children at schools, and they do it all across the Nation.

Madam Speaker, I hope that we are aware today is Human Trafficking Day and that we recognize we must do something to stop it.

OUR ONGOING BORDER CRISIS

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the ongoing crisis at our border.

When President Biden took office in January 2021, he inherited commonsense immigration policies, such as remain in Mexico and title 42, that worked to keep our Nation safe, reducing the flow of illegal drugs and gang members.

Unfortunately, President Biden immediately ceased construction of the border wall and enacted policies favoring illegal immigrants over Americans. Thankfully, the Supreme Court has challenged the legality of President Biden's policies and overturned the removal of title 42.

Now it is Congress' time to act. Both Republicans and Democrats acknowledge that our immigration system is broken, but only Speaker MCCARTHY's Commitment to America has a plan to repair our broken immigration system.

This Congress, Republicans will pass legislation that secures our border, stops the influx of illegal drugs and criminals, and ends catch-and-release loopholes and human trafficking.

Americans deserve a government that works in their best interest, and these policies will create a safe and secure Nation.

I would also like to wish a very happy birthday to my L.D., Kyle Jacobs.

GOOD TIME FOR PENNSYLVANIA

(Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is a good time for Pennsylvania. Some would say we are on a roll.

The Phillies made it to the World Series; Jalen Hurts is the MVP; and the Eagles are the best team in football.

Last November, Pennsylvanians spoke loudly. Josh Shapiro was elected our Governor and Austin Davis our Lieutenant Governor, and we begin this term with newly elected Democratic Speaker of the House Mark Rozzi, our Senator JOHN FETTERMAN, and nine Democratic Congress Members representing us here in D.C.

Just like the entire Democratic Caucus, Pennsylvania Democrats are united and determined to make a difference for everyday people on issues like gun violence, addiction, and providing high-quality education, which makes me eager to, once again, serve alongside returning Members MATT CARTWRIGHT, BRENDAN BOYLE, DWIGHT EVANS, MARY GAY SCANLON, SUSAN WILD, and CHRISSY HOULAHAN, and with dynamic new Members like SUMMER LEE, an activist lawyer and first Black woman to represent Pennsylvania in Congress, and CHRIS DELUZIO, an Iraq war veteran and voting rights attorney.

Pennsylvanians sent a congressional delegation to Washington that looks like Pennsylvania and, with Governor-elect Shapiro, we will govern for all.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL MILK DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Milk Day.

Today is a great day to raise a glass of milk in honor of our dairy farmers, who work 24/7 to bring fresh, nutritious, and delicious milk to our tables every single day.

We celebrate National Milk Day on January 11 because on this day in 1878 milk was delivered in sterilized glass bottles for the first time.

I am proud to come from a long line of dairy farmers. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Pennsylvania has 500,000 cows producing more than 10.2 billion pounds of milk annually.

The Keystone State ranks seventh in milk production in the country, and Pennsylvania is also second nationally in the number of dairy farms, with 6,200 farms across the Commonwealth.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania, with the Pennsylvania dairy industry providing 52,000 jobs and generating $14.7 billion in annual revenue.

Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating National Milk Day and thanking our dairy farm families for their continued efforts to provide us with such a delicious and nutritious treat.

CONDEMN ALL ACTS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express opposition to H. Con. Res. 3.

The resolution is nothing but a political move by extreme Republicans that is both disingenuous and actually puts healthcare clinics at risk.

This resolution only focuses on protecting pro-life pregnancy centers and faith-based women's health clinics, which are not medical facilities.

Let me be clear: I condemn violence in all of its forms. In fact, here is a fact: At clinics that provide abortion services, attacks are on the rise, increasing 128 percent in just 1 year. This source is from the National Abortion Federation report.

The resolution before us today falls short of condemning violence. The Pro-Choice Caucus resolution that I support condemns all acts of violence on healthcare personnel, patients, and facilities and affirms that everyone has the freedom to access reproductive healthcare services without fear of violence.

Let us all stand together and condemn all acts of political violence.

DEFENDING THE MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of the most vulnerable population, the unborn.

As we consider the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act and the concurrent resolution to condemn attacks on pro-life pregnancy centers, I hope that it is those innocent lives on our hearts and minds.

I implore my colleagues to stand with me in pursuit of doing what is

right by, as I say, those voiceless and vulnerable and to consider the divine worth of every human life that we have taken an oath to serve, from womb to tomb.

It is written in Psalm 139: ''For You created my innermost being; You knitted me together in my mother's womb. I praise You because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; your works are wonderful, I know that full well.''

We should do all in our power to stand for life and to ensure that the unborn get to live out each of the days that God ordained for them before one ever came to be.

Let us unite as a legislature to determine that, in the United States, we will preserve the most basic right to life and the ability of good-willed Americans to provide life-affirming care in pursuit of that cause.

GUARANTEEING AMERICANS ACCESS TO ACCURATE HEALTH INFORMATION

(Mrs. SYKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SYKES. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to legislation brought before this body today.

Our focus in this Congress should be to guarantee the American people have access to accurate health information, including their reproductive health. As we talk about crisis pregnancy centers today, we need to be clear and transparent about what these centers are actually able to do and, most importantly, not do.

Too often, people go to these centers expecting a certain level of care due to their misleading name, but they cannot actually get the medical attention they deserve and need. They target low-income and minority communities and shamefully insinuate that they are healthcare providers when they are not.

As such, these centers are inherently contributing to misinformation that fuels the high infant and maternal mortality across our country, which disproportionately impacts Black women and babies.

If we are serious about protecting life, we need to be honest and these centers need to be honest and provide transparent information about the services they provide to pregnant women and their families.

I hope this Chamber will work together to find real solutions to improve maternal and infant health outcomes for the American people. Lives are certainly dependent upon it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation before us today.

FLORIDA KEYS MIGRANT CRISIS

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today as our Florida Keys are under a state of emergency.

The President's unwillingness to secure our border, coupled with his pathetic policy of appeasement and concessions to the brutal Castro regime in Cuba, have created a migratory crisis unlike any other that the Florida Keys has seen in decades.

Since August 2022 alone, Federal, State, and local law enforcement have encountered nearly 10,000 people in waters off the coast of Florida, and the Biden administration is directly responsible.

Dry Tortugas National Park has already been forced to close because of this crisis, affecting the tourism-dependent economy of our Florida Keys constituents, boaters, and tour operators, and the Biden administration is directly responsible.

Secretary Mayorkas has repeatedly demonstrated abdication of his responsibilities as leader of the Department of Homeland Security and failed to enforce our public safety immigration laws. That is why I am calling on him to resign immediately.

Governor Ron DeSantis quickly activated the National Guard, and I commend him on behalf of my constituents for his leadership and bold action.

I am calling on the Biden administration to take action now. We must reimburse Monroe County and the State of Florida for local resources that have been expended to process and care for the latest wave of migrants. We need to increase Customs and Border Protection onsite in Monroe County and provide additional resources to the Florida Keys.

□ 1215

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

(Ms. BALINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BALINT. Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade was dehumanizing and dangerous. It does not reflect the will of the majority of Americans who deeply value control over their own bodies.

As leader of the State senate in Vermont, I worked to make sure that my State was the first in the Nation to explicitly protect reproductive freedoms in its constitution. It is time to provide these same protections for all Americans.

While Republicans seek to control women's bodies to try to distract us from their extreme stances with farcical resolutions, my Democratic colleagues and I will not stop until reproductive freedoms are restored as the law of the land.

The American people are overwhelmingly with us. They want their rights. They want their freedoms.

As a woman, as a mother, as a Congresswoman, I will continue to fight for a world where abortion care is legal, safe, and accessible for all Americans.

PROTECTING THE UNBORN

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand here today on the floor of the House of Representatives to serve as the voice of east Texans in Congress.

As a man of faith and father of four children, I rise today for the very first time as a Member of Congress to stand for the sanctity of life and in full support of children nationwide. I can think of no better cause than the cause of life.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congresswoman ANN WAGNER, for bringing this valuable bill to the floor. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which will ensure that all children who are born are protected and treated the same as any other newborn.

Every life is a gift. Every life has a calling divinely given by God. I stand firmly committed to protecting those lives and to opposing any action that threatens them. This legislation is the next step in our effort to protect our future generations and return to our Nation's values.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

(Ms. PETTERSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PETTERSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today because at a time when Americans across the country are facing urgent needs, Republicans are choosing to spend the first week of Congress attacking women's reproductive healthcare.

This week, we should be advancing legislation to fight inflation and lower everyday costs for families who are struggling to make ends meet. We should be passing measures to improve our education system and address our dire workforce shortages.

Instead, Republicans are doubling-down on their assault on women's reproductive freedom, even though the vast majority of Americans believe that women should have the right to choose.

I came to Congress to make a meaningful difference in people's lives and fight against extremism just like this.

The people of Colorado's Seventh Congressional District sent me here to ensure these personal decisions are kept between women, their doctors, and their families, not Members of Congress.

Just like I did in the State senate, I will not stop fighting until all Americans have control over their own bodies, their own healthcare decisions, and their own lives.

HONORING NEBRASKA'S 41ST GOVERNOR JIM PILLEN

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

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Nebraska's 41st Governor, the newly-inaugurated, Jim Pillen.

After traveling to all 93 counties in Nebraska, putting 100,000 miles on his truck, Jim has become a very well-known man, but I also wanted to share a little bit about his story with you.

Jim is the son of a tenant farmer and a seamstress. What most people don't know is that Jim came from almost nothing. He is a self-made man. His entrepreneurial spirit built Pillen Family Farms into a company with international success.

If you have eaten bacon in the last decade, you have probably enjoyed the work of the Pillen family, which reaches all the way from hog genetics to meat processing and everything in between.

The pig farmer is wasting no time as Governor. He has already rolled up his sleeves, getting to work raising awareness about human trafficking, fighting for school choice, and making government more efficient.

Jim has pledged to bring people together to make Nebraska better day by day. Our Nebraska delegation is excited to work with him to move the State forward.

REMEMBERING CHIEF McINTIRE AND HONORING OFFICER SCHRECENGOST

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

Mr. DELUZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise today with the solemn duty to honor the life of Brackenridge Police Chief Justin McIntire, who was gunned down in the line of duty last week. His family and my community mourn Chief McIntire today at his funeral, as does this House and this country.

Chief McIntire was a hometown hero in Brackenridge and a life-long resident of the area. He gave his neighborhoods 22 years of selfless service as a police officer.

Day in and day out, like so many who wear a badge or a uniform, Chief McIntire put himself in harm's way to keep others safe, ultimately giving the last full measure of devotion.

He represents the very best of western Pennsylvania, the very best of America.

So, too, does Tarentum Police Officer Jordan Schrecengost, who was shot and wounded in the line of duty that fateful day, and is recovering.

Although Chief McIntire's watch has ended, we will never forget his sacrifice.

THE PANDEMIC IS OVER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, in September of 2022, President Biden declared the pandemic is over. Despite this, he has continued to extend his public health emergency declaration.

Declaring an emergency gives the President overreaching authority over Congress and the State health departments.

While this emergency is in place, the Federal Government can keep States from removing ineligible people—that the rolls should be cleaned up—from the Medicaid rolls, and the welfare state will keep growing unchecked.

This declaration has enabled the emergency use of vaccines and allowed the President to mandate involuntarily those vaccines to vast swaths of the public with little input or debate from Congress and the courts. It has also given him legal cover to buy votes with attempts at student loan debt forgiveness, rent freezes, and eviction moratoriums.

Under the cover of this declaration, the President attempted to change laws, impose decrees, and has altered the economic life of millions of Americans very negatively.

This is setting a terrible precedent by allowing the executive branch to rule by decree with no oversight or input from Congress. He is replacing Congress' speech and debate with his own Presidential pen.

This gross overreach of authority must end and move back to a debate and an open process.

COMMEMORATE THE LIFE OF JAMES THOMAS WILBUN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of James Thomas Wilbun of Fort Worth, Texas.

Born November 7, 1918, in Hope, Arkansas. Mr. Wilbun grew up there where he obtained his education, including agriculture school. A dedicated veteran, Mr. Wilbun served in the United States military during World War II. For his service, he was given a number of honors, including recognition at the World War II museums in Washington, D.C., New Orleans, Los Angeles, and a ceremony that I was able to attend for him several years ago in Fort Worth.

Following his career in the military, he built a career as a landscaper and also served with the Fort Worth Independent School District until he retired.

A great listener and a happy man, Mr. Wilbun loved gardening, listening to gospel music, going to church, laughing, and he was an avid fan of the Texas Rangers and the Dallas Cowboys.

But most of all, he loved spending time with his friends, family, children, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren, along with a host of other relatives.

I want to end by commemorating Mr. Wilbun for 104 years on this Earth, and to his service to the city of Fort Worth and our independent school district.

Madam Speaker, our prayers go out to all of his loved ones.

VIOLENT ATTACKS ON PRO-LIFE ORGANIZATIONS AND FACILITIES

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

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn the violent attacks on the pro-life organizations and facilities in the wake of the Dobbs leak and subsequent overruling of Roe v. Wade.

There has been very little accountability for the leaked draft opinion and ensuing violent intimidation against pro-life activists. That is why this resolution is so necessary. It makes it crystal clear that violence, property damage, threats, and intimidation tactics must be condemned, and they must have consequences for those who do this violence.

I am proud of the work of the Palmetto Women's Center in Rock Hill, South Carolina, in my district, as it does tremendous work.

The Biden administration needs to use all appropriate law enforcement mechanisms necessary to uphold public safety and protect the rights of these pro-life groups and facilities. Just because this administration doesn't agree with protecting the unborn doesn't mean they should turn a blind eye to violence and intimidation.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, in every State where abortion rights were on the ballot last year, Americans voted to protect lifesaving reproductive care.

In Republican strongholds like Kentucky and Montana, voters rejected attempts to restrict or ban abortion. In Vermont, Michigan, and California, voters codified abortion rights into their State constitutions.

After such a resounding defeat for anti-abortion politicians, you would think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have gotten the message.

But rather than listening to voters and bringing forward legislation to codify the reproductive rights our mothers and grandmothers fought so hard for, the new Republican majority is catering to demands of extreme Members in their conference who have called for a national abortion ban.

The partisan bills on the floor today will do nothing to protect women. Instead, they will undermine access to

reproductive care that millions of women rely on.

Madam Speaker, the women we represent deserve better. Our daughters deserve better. I urge my colleagues to oppose these pieces of legislation.

CONDEMNING INTIMIDATION TACTICS OF PRO-ABORTION ACTIVISTS

(Ms. HAGEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn intimidation tactics of pro-abortion activists.

Since the very day the Dobbs v. Jackson decision was illegally leaked, acts of violence against pregnancy centers, places of worship, and other pro-life institutions have skyrocketed.

Cases of vandalism, harassment, firebombings, and physical assaults have been reported all across the country, in communities big and small. In addition to the actual acts, these violent acts amount to intimidation of those individuals that need the services provided by these pro-life, faith-based organizations.

Not only has President Biden and his administration failed to condemn these attacks, but his Department of Justice has also refused to take any action to identify and prosecute those that have committed these crimes. This is curious considering the way that this administration has been weaponized against so many American citizens that haven't committed any crimes at all.

Over 100 attacks have taken place in the last 8 months alone. Every Member of Congress, Republican and Democrat, should join in condemning the violence of these extremists. The rule of law matters, the sanctity of life matters, and equal justice matters.

SHAFT THE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, what is one of the first things that Republicans do when they take over the House?

They shaft the taxpayers and increase the budget deficit by $114 billion a year.

By seeking to roll back the 87,000 additional personnel for the IRS, which is intended to replace a 20 percent reduction in head count in anticipated retirements, they guarantee that taxpayers will have to wait weeks for their phone calls to the IRS to be returned.

They guarantee that the budget deficit will be increased by $114 billion for lack of audits of tax-avoiding multimillionaires.

Shaft the taxpayers and increase the budget deficit by $114 billion. Great work, GOP.

□ 1230

CONDEMNING ATTACKS ON LIFE-AFFIRMING FACILITIES

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

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H. Con. Res. 3. This resolution condemns the recent attacks on pro-life facilities across the country. Since the Supreme Court Dobbs decision, there have been over 100 attacks on pro-life organizations and churches in the U.S., causing life-affirming centers across the country to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in security—fearing they may be targeted next.

In Idaho, life-affirming organizations provide critical services to women. For example, Stanton Healthcare in Meridian, Idaho, recently helped Leandra, a young mother facing an unexpected pregnancy, with encouragement through pre- and post-natal care and education, childbirth classes, material assistance, and mentorship resources.

This resolution shouldn't be controversial. It simply highlights that acts of violence and intimidation are unacceptable and have no place in our society. But it is important for all of us to call out this violence and condemn it.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman MIKE JOHNSON for taking the lead on this resolution and for his efforts to promote life.

CONDEMNING ALL ACTS OF VIOLENCE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I unequivocally condemn all acts of violence, vandalism, and destruction of property. However, these acts are not all the same.

Graffiti on the side of a building is not comparable to the stalking of doctors and nurses and the assaulting of patients who try to access healthcare.

Yet, 38 of the 39 incidents listed in this resolution concern attacks on property, not people.

In fact, the lone act of assault mentioned in this resolution took place when an individual targeted a healthcare facility for providing abortions and then attacked police officers, striking them multiple times.

So, yes, the only threat to human life mentioned in this resolution was an attack on abortion providers and on patients who are seeking care and the law enforcement officers defending their right to provide and seek such care.

Today, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join me in condemning the countless acts of violence against abortion providers and patients that they face every single day accessing care in this country.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I have been reminded during these first days of the 118th Congress of the importance and significance of an open U.S. Capitol.

I have had a number of guests from my district here with us this past week as the people's House has finally been reopened to the public. Yesterday I had Bode Brewer and his family with here with me, the excitement, awe, and inspiration that I saw in this young man's eyes in viewing this Capitol, as well as the opportunity he had to meet so many of my colleagues who play such a significant role in this House, was truly profound.

Today I am visited by my constituent, Cadet Aidan Carr, whom I nominated to United States Military Academy West Point and who is in his third year at the Academy. Not only does Aidan have a clear sense of honor being here with us, but he is carrying himself with a great sense of respect, patriotism, and sense of duty for the commitment he has made to protect this country and this institution.

So as we begin the 118th Congress, I hope we all are reminded of the responsibility we have in this House to serve the American people in the greatest country on Earth.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JACOB LATURNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JACOB LATURNER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I write pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, to notify you I, Jacob LaTurner, Congressman from Kansas Second Congressional District, have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the United States Federal Court, District of Kansas, sitting at Topeka.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the rights and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JACOB LATURNER,
U.S. Congressman, Kansas Second District.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF, THE HONORABLE JACOB LATURNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Braden Dreiling, Chief of

Staff, the Honorable JACOB LATURNER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I write pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, to notify you I, Braden Dreiling, Chief of Staff for Kansas Second Congressional District, have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the United States Federal Court, District of Kansas, sitting at Topeka.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the rights and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BRADEN DREILING,
Chief of Staff.
CONGRESSMAN JAKE LATURNER,
Kansas Second District.

COMMUNICATION FROM MILITARY LIAISON, THE HONORABLE JACOB LATURNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Allen Askew, Military Liaison, the Honorable JACOB LATURNER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I write pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, to notify you I, Allen Askew, Military Liaison for Kansas Second Congressional District, have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the United States Federal Court, District of Kansas, sitting at Topeka.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the rights and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ALLEN ASKEW,
Military Liaison.
CONGRESSMAN JAKE LATURNER,
Kansas Second District.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JACOB LATURNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jacob Conard, District Director, the Honorable JACOB LATURNER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I write pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, to notify you I, Jacob Conard, District Director for Kansas Second Congressional District, have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the United State Federal Court, District of Kansas, sitting at Topeka.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the rights and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JACOB CONRAD,
District Director.
CONGRESSMAN JAKE LATURNER,
Kansas Second District.

COMMUNICATION FROM DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JACOB LATURNER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Monet Straub, Deputy District Director, the Honorable JACOB LATURNER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. SPEAKER: I write pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the United States House of Representatives, to notify you I, Monet Straub, Deputy District Director for Kansas Second Congressional District, have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the United States Federal Court, District of Kansas, sitting at Topeka.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the rights and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

MONET STRAUB,
Deputy District Director.
CONGRESSMAN JAKE LATURNER,
Kansas Second District.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS CONDEMNING THE RECENT ATTACKS ON PRO-LIFE FACILITIES, GROUPS, AND CHURCHES

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 5, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 3

Whereas since the May 2, 2022, leak of the Supreme Court's draft opinion in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, individuals professing anti-life views have targeted, destroyed, or vandalized numerous pro-life facilities, groups, and even churches to further their radical cause;

Whereas, on June 24, 2022, the Supreme Court issued a final decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, which upheld Mississippi's pro-life law and overturned Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey;

Whereas, following the leak of the draft Dobbs decision, radical anti-life advocates initiated a pressure campaign designed to influence the Supreme Court's opinion;

Whereas, following the leak and issuance of the Dobbs decision, radical anti-life advocates have defaced, vandalized, and caused destruction to over 100 pro-life facilities, groups, and churches;

Whereas, on May 3, 2022, individuals vandalized the Care Net Pregnancy Center in Frederick, Maryland, with pro-abortion graffiti, including the messages, ''not real clinic'', ''end forced motherhood'', and ''go to [Planned Parenthood] instead'';

Whereas, on May 5, 2022, in Portland, Oregon, vandals smashed numerous windows and spray-painted graffiti on the Southeast Portland Pregnancy Resource Center;

Whereas, on May 7, 2022, activists vandalized a crisis pregnancy center in Denton, Texas, with the radical pro-abortion messages ''not a clinic'' and ''forced birth is murder'';

Whereas, on May 7, 2022, in Fort Collins, Colorado, activists painted ''my body my choice'' on the doors of a Catholic parish;

Whereas, on May 8, 2022, Mother's Day, individuals attempted to break into the Oregon Right to Life office in Keizer, Oregon, reportedly igniting and throwing 2 Molotov cocktails at the building;

Whereas, on May 8, 2022, vandals spray-painted pro-abortion messages such as ''Abortion is a right'', ''Fake clinic'', and ''Liars'' on the side of a pro-life pregnancy center in Manassas, Virginia;

Whereas, on May 8, 2022, a pro-life nonprofit center in Madison, Wisconsin, was set ablaze and vandalized with the words, ''If abortions aren't safe, then you aren't either'';

Whereas, on May 13, 2022, activists left ''threatening messages'' on the front of the Alpha Pregnancy Center in Reisterstown, Maryland, including the messages, ''if abortions aren't safe, neither are you'', ''you're anti choice not pro life'', ''not a clinic'', and were signed ''Jane's revenge'';

Whereas, on May 18, 2022, vandals targeted a ''women's faith-based medical clinic'' in Auburn, Alabama, defacing the clinic's sign and staff members' vehicles;

Whereas, on May 25, 2022, in Lynnwood, Washington, anti-life activists smashed windows and vandalized the Next Step Pregnancy Center with the threat, ''if abortion isn't safe, you aren't either'';

Whereas, on June 2, 2022, Jane's Revenge claimed credit for an attack in which its members broke windows and scrawled messages including ''God loves abortion'' and ''fake clinic'' at Agape Pregnancy Resource Center in Des Moines, Iowa;

Whereas, on June 3, 2022, the Capitol Hill Crisis Pregnancy Center in Washington, DC, was the target of left-wing abortion extremists who threw red paint on the door, threw eggs at the window, and spray-painted the building with ''Jane Says Revenge'';

Whereas, on June 6, 2022, in Asheville, North Carolina, vandals broke windows and left graffiti on the Mountain Area Pregnancy Services building, including the messages, ''If abortions aren't safe, neither are you'', ''no forced birth'', and an anarchist symbol;

Whereas, on June 7, 2022, reports indicate that an ''abortion terrorist group Jane's Revenge'' firebombed the CompassCare pro-life pregnancy center in Amherst, New York;

Whereas, on June 10, 2022, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, vandals smashed the windows

and graffitied the walls of HOPE Pregnancy Center;

Whereas, on June 19, 2022, in Redford Township, Michigan, individuals smashed the windows of the Pregnancy Counseling Center;

Whereas, on June 22, 2022, in Jackson, Michigan, vandals graffitied and smashed the windows of the office of Jackson Right to Life;

Whereas, on June 25, 2022, in Lynchburg, Virginia, anti-life activists vandalized the Blue Ridge Pregnancy Center;

Whereas, on June 25, 2022, in Paso Robles, California, vandals broke the windows and spray-painted the walls of Tree of Life Pregnancy Support Center;

Whereas, on June 25, 2022, radical leftist rioters breached the Arizona State Capitol, forcing legislators to evacuate the building;

Whereas, on June 25, 2022, in Cortez, Colorado, Heart to Heart Pregnancy Center was defaced with pro-abortion graffiti;

Whereas, on June 25, 2022, in Longmont, Colorado, vandals graffitied and set fire to the Life Choices Free Pregnancy Services;

Whereas, on June 26, 2022, in Winter Haven, Florida, anti-life activists destroyed security cameras and spray-painted the LifeChoice Pregnancy Center with threatening messages, including ''Your time is up'', ''We're coming for U'', and ''Jane's revenge'';

Whereas, on July 2, 2022, in Hialeah, Florida, individuals vandalized the Pregnancy Medical Clinics with spray-paint, writing ''If abortions aren't safe neither are you'' on the walls;

Whereas, on July 7, 2022, activists vandalized 2 pro-life pregnancy centers in Worcester, Massachusetts, hours after the State's Attorney General issued a consumer advisory warning residents about such centers;

Whereas, between July 8 and 9, 2022, in Bethesda, Maryland, individuals either vandalized or set fire to 3 churches, causing physical damage to the churches and their properties, where 1 church faces approximately $50,000 in damages because of the vandalism;

Whereas, on July 11, 2022, activists vandalized the pro-life Women's New Life Clinic in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, by spray-painting anti-life messages and ''Jane's Revenge'' on its exterior walls;

Whereas, on August 1, 2022, in St. Paul, Minnesota, vandals broke doors and graffitied a pregnancy center, leaving messages such as ''if abortions aren't safe, neither are you'';

Whereas, on August 1, 2022, a Douglas County Church in Kansas City was vandalized with messages such as ''protect choice'';

Whereas, on August 1, 2022, in Lawrence, Kansas, two churches were vandalized with spray painted messages such as ''vote no'', ''protect choice'', and ''no forced birth'' on their properties;

Whereas, on August 9, 2022, in Pocatello, Idaho, the Compassion and Hope Pregnancy Center was vandalized with messages including, ''forced birth center'', ''God is a woman'', and ''beware'';

Whereas, on August 15, 2022, in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, a woman was accused of assault after throwing eggs and a dead raccoon at the Northeast Ohio Women's Center;

Whereas, on August 18, 2022, anti-life extremists vandalized a pregnancy center in western Massachusetts with messages including ''Jane's Revenge'' and ''if abortion isn't safe neither are you'';

Whereas, on September 16, 2022, in Southfield, Michigan, vandals broke a window and left graffitied messages including, ''Jane was here'' and ''if abortions aren't safe, neither are you'' on a pregnancy counseling center;

Whereas, on October 8, 2022, security camera footage showed anti-life activists spray-painting the sidewalk of the Church of the Resurrection in Lansing, Michigan, with ''abort the court'' and ''death to Christian nationalism'';

Whereas the Biden Administration has failed to take action to respond to the radical attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches, or to protect the rights of these organizations; and

Whereas these attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches have included vandalism, arson, incendiary graffiti, and other damage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns recent attacks of vandalism, violence, and destruction against pro-life facilities, groups, and churches;

(2) recognizes the sanctity of life and the important role pro-life facilities, groups, and churches play in supporting pregnant women, infants, and families; and

(3) calls upon the Biden Administration to use all appropriate law enforcement authorities to uphold public safety and to protect the rights of pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 3.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the FACE Act prohibits threats of force, obstruction, and property damage intended to interfere with reproductive healthcare services. Let me just go over that again. It prohibits threats of force, obstruction, and property damage intended to interfere with reproductive healthcare services.

The Justice Department has said that this act is not just about abortions but applies, as well, as to ''pro-life pregnancy counseling services and other pregnancy support facilities providing reproductive healthcare.''

So it applies across the board.

Here is the problem. On May 8, 2022, Mother's Day, activists targeted a pro-life, nonprofit center in Madison, Wisconsin, setting it ablaze and vandalizing it with the words, ''If abortions aren't safe then you aren't either.''

On June 3, 2022, leftwing anti-life activists targeted the Capitol Hill Crisis Pregnancy Center throwing red paint on the door, eggs at the window, and spray painting the window with, ''Jane says revenge.''

On June 25, 2022, in Longmont, Colorado, vandals graffitied and set fire—set fire—to the Life Choices free pregnancy center.

This has happened dozens and dozens and dozens of times all across the country.

What has the Justice Department done?

To my knowledge, no one has been prosecuted on the FACE Act—not one single person, to my knowledge.

But, oh, Madam Speaker, if you are a pro-life activist and you are praying outside an abortion clinic, like Mark Houck, then guess what happens to you?

The FBI kicks in your door, arrests you, puts you in handcuffs, and does it in front of your wife and seven children. That is what happens.

Madam Speaker, we don't want violence anywhere. As Mr. CICILLINE said in his 1-minute speech, we don't want any violence anywhere. But let's not have this double standard.

Not to mention this: Think about what happened after the Dobbs decision was leaked, the leak draft of that opinion; we had activists protesting at every Supreme—well, not every one because only the conservative Justices' names were doxed, and information put out there. We had protests at their homes. In direct violation of the statute 18 U.S.C. 1507: You are not supposed to be protesting and interfering when a decision is pending in front of a Supreme Court Justice's home.

This was a direct violation of the statute, and, again, nothing happened.

That situation, as we all know, got real serious. It got real serious with the assassination attempt on Justice Kavanaugh.

So this resolution is straightforward.

What has happened literally now at hundreds of crisis pregnancy centers and churches around the country this past year is just flat-out wrong. This is a resolution that says that we appreciate the good work that happens at crisis pregnancy centers where they take in women and where they help them and help that unborn child and make sure that that unborn child gets to experience the gift of life.

The sanctity of life is what this is all about.

I commend my colleague and friend, Mr. JOHNSON, from the great State of Louisiana for this resolution and the people across the country who volunteer and who work every day at these centers to help these ladies who are in a tough situation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this woefully incomplete resolution.

I will begin by saying that I condemn violence in all its forms, including the threats, vandalism, and property destruction described in H. Con. Res. 3. I would also like to reiterate my condemnation of the attempted murder of Supreme Court Justice Brett

Kavanaugh. That should go without saying.

I am grateful that no one appears to have been physically injured in the vandalism incidents described in the resolution, and that law enforcement took Justice Kavanaugh's would-be assassin into custody before he could complete an act of violence.

In a democracy, violence is never the answer in a political dispute, and it should be roundly condemned in all its forms.

This resolution, however, is a transparent partisan ploy that is a woefully and unacceptably inadequate condemnation of violence. It comes in the context of extremist MAGA Republicans' effort to enact a total ban on abortion at both the State and Federal levels. In what appears to be a glaring omission to H. Con. Res. 3, my Republican colleagues refused to condemn the long, documented history of violence, murder, and mayhem perpetrated by anti-abortion extremists against abortion providers and their patients.

According to the National Abortion Federation, since 1977 anti-abortion extremists have been responsible for 11 murders, 42 bombings, 196 arsons, 491 assaults, and thousands of incidents of criminal activities directed at patients, providers, and volunteers.

Sadly, these incidents have increased dramatically in recent years. In 2021, abortion providers faced a 600 percent increase in stalking incidents, a 450 percent increase in clinic blockades, a 163 percent increase in reports of hoax devices or suspicious packages, a 129 percent increase in invasions, and a 128 percent increase in assault and battery compared to previous years.

In some cases, violence against abortion providers has had deadly consequences. For example, in November 2015 a gunman murdered three people and injured nine others when he opened fire with an assault-style rifle at a Planned Parenthood health center in Colorado Springs.

In January 2021, a gunman attacked a Planned Parenthood clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, and later that year, the same clinic was burned to the ground by arsonists.

Regardless of your position on abortion rights, Madam Speaker, it is important that we condemn all acts of violence, regardless of who is the ultimate target. I am concerned that by refusing to condemn violence against providers, this resolution will inadvertently send a signal to anti-abortion extremists that violence against abortion providers is justified by the vandalism described in the resolution.

If this inadequate resolution could potentially fan the flames of political discord, what purpose then does it serve?

The only purpose I can infer is that it is intended to placate the extreme elements of the anti-abortion movement while this Republican majority figures out how to pass a total nationwide ban on abortion.

□ 1245

Let me be clear: Democrats stand with the majority of the American public and will oppose such a radical position.

H. Con. Res. 3 is nothing more than a partisan political ploy designed to advance an extreme anti-abortion agenda and is not a serious effort to condemn political violence. Indeed, it may have the opposite effect on the American public because it purposely fails to condemn the thousands of threats, violent incidents, and attacks that abortion providers and patients have endured for decades at the hands of anti-abortion extremists.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What purpose? It says it right in the title: ''Expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.''

Over 100 churches and pro-life facilities have been attacked in the last 7 months. That is all this resolution does.

Republicans condemn violence every time it happens. We condemn it when it happens to abortion clinics. We condemn it when it happens to churches. We condemn it when it happens to pro-life centers. We condemned it when it happened in the summer of 2020 all over the country. We condemned it when it happened on January 6. We condemn it every single time.

This is just highlighting what has happened in the last 7 months with churches and pro-life centers around the country. It is that simple. This should be unanimous.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and the sponsor of this great legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of my commonsense legislation, H. Con. Res. 3. I am really proud that this bill has been included among our very first bills that will pass in this Congress.

For Chairman NADLER, or Ranking Member NADLER now, I am happy to say, to stand here and suggest that this does not fulfill the will of the American people or is somehow not the right thing to do is absurd.

This resolution is very simple, and its language is clear. It condemns the attacks that have been committed against pro-life facilities, groups, and churches in the wake of the leak of the Dobbs opinion and the subsequent decision. It also calls upon the Biden administration to take action now to bring the perpetrators to justice.

Who could be opposed to that?

In recent years, there has been an alarming trend of more and more attacks on pro-life organizations and individuals. In the wake of the Dobbs decision, the problem became much worse. We have seen a significant increase in targeted violence against places and people who provide care for pregnant women and their unborn children.

Here are just a few of the more than 100 incidents that have taken place just in the last several months:

May 5, last year, a Catholic church and school in Armada, Michigan, was vandalized with satanic symbols and messages calling for the death of Republicans.

May 8, the Oregon Right to Life office was firebombed.

May 26, seven high school students in New Jersey were suspended after physically assaulting another student holding a pro-life sign.

June 26, a pro-abortion extremist was charged with attempted murder in Los Angeles.

July 7, Sacramento, a pregnancy care center was threatened by a man with a machete.

September 24, in Lake Odessa, Michigan, an elderly pro-life volunteer was shot while canvassing door to door to discuss an abortion ballot proposal.

January of this year, just several days ago, a pro-life billboard was defaced with the words ''kill them kids'' in Portland, Oregon.

This last one that I wanted to mention is personal to me. On July 11, pro-abortion activists vandalized the Women's New Life Clinic in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. They spray-painted anti-life messages on the walls. Being located right next to the abortion provider in Baton Rouge at the time, the largest in our State, this clinic has offered hope to countless pregnant women by counseling them on all of their options and not pushing them to abort their unborn children, as the clinics do.

I am proud to call many of the leaders of that clinic in Baton Rouge personal friends. We have to stand for them and stand against violence, vandalism, personal threats, and intimidation.

Nationwide, there are over 2,700 pregnancy care centers providing essential services in all 50 States. They serve millions of women every year. They have over 10,000 medical professionals supporting them. They do not deserve the treatment they have endured, and they certainly deserve that this Congress condemn the violence committed against them.

Since there has been so little accountability for the leaked draft Dobbs opinion and the ensuing violence and intimidation against pro-lifers that have followed, we are making the position of Congress clear today. We condemn violence, property damage, threats, and intimidation tactics, and these clear violations of Federal and State laws must be prosecuted.

We have the opportunity before us today to start to push back against the mob that has targeted the groups and individuals that care for women and their unborn children. Republicans are ready to act. I am so proud that over

100—I think nearly 130—Republicans so far have cosponsored this.

It will pass, and it should, and it will be a shame if our Democratic colleagues do not join us in this condemnation of violence. The question is, will they?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the resolution condemns violence at pro-life clinics but not at pro-choice clinics. That says it all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to note what is profound hypocrisy going on in this Chamber.

Last week, we heard from the Republicans about the importance of an open process and the ability to offer amendments on all bills or resolutions, but there were no hearings on this resolution, no markups, and amendments are prohibited.

If they were allowed, we could have discussed, and Mr. JORDAN could have made his statement that he believes the Justice Department says this would affect all types of facilities, but we didn't have that, so it is not here.

Every Democrat, and I hope every Republican, rejects and condemns political violence. We settle our disagreements at the ballot box and through the rule of law, not by violent actions.

Republicans say this resolution is about condemning violence and enforcement of laws, yet it only condemns those of their favorite organizations and facilities, the pro-life crowd.

They should be aghast that they don't include the murders of the 11 people killed at abortion care providers since 1993:

Dr. George Tiller, killed entering his church in Wichita, Kansas, shot in the back;

David Gunn, shot in the head at his clinic in Pensacola, Florida;

Just this past New Year's in Knoxville, a Planned Parenthood clinic was destroyed by arson.

Sadly, there are too many property crimes at Planned Parenthood and other facilities that help people with abortion needs to mention. None are mentioned. We should condemn all murders and serious violence.

This House did not hear from Republicans condemning the violence of January 6 when this Chamber was under attack, and we should do that in all cases.

They are trying to undermine and obstruct the Department of Justice, as well. This is just some of the other hypocrisy. They are having a committee to look into the attacks on America from the FBI, the Justice Department, and other security services. Those are law enforcement. That is defunding Federal law enforcement, and it is wrong. We should support all law enforcement and fund all of it and its activities.

If you want to know about the Republicans, you ask them about the bill on the IRS. If they wanted to help the middle class, they would have brought a resolution to direct the IRS to do more audits, or even all of its audits, on people earning over $1 million and save the middle class and get the money where it is. They did not.

We should listen to what they do, not what they say. I will vote ''no.''

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

I point out to my friend from Tennessee that it is not that I believe the DOJ has the ability to use the FACE Act to prosecute people who vandalize and attack crisis pregnancy centers; they have said it. The Department of Justice says they can do that. I am just asking why they haven't.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL), my good friend.

Mr. CARL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) for his leadership on all of these pro-life issues.

Madam Speaker, in the wake of the Dobbs decision, pro-abortion radicals have waged horrific attacks on our pro-life community.

Pro-life institutions are on the front line of meeting the needs of women, youth, and, yes, men. They provide critical services and support and have saved so many lives. Nobody should be in fear for their safety when seeking medical care and spiritual support.

This body has an opportunity to express its unwavering support for women and families across America and condemn this violence by voting for this act.

I am proud to be part of this effort. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a solemn moment. I join my fellow colleagues, the women of the Democratic Caucus, to stand here because we stand in the name of those who have died: 11 murders, 42 bombings, 196 arsons, 491 assaults, and thousands of incidents of criminal activity directed at our doctors, our nurses, and our patients.

After COVID–19, America woke up to the vitality and the necessity of our medical professionals, but I come here today to express my concern. I wish my friend from Louisiana had worked with my side of the aisle so that we would acknowledge that there has been loss of life of innocent persons who simply were providing medical care.

Dr. David Gunn was shot and killed by an opponent of abortion during a protest. A former pastor kills a doctor and clinic volunteer. George Tiller, twice a target, is killed.

This legislation is an extreme initiative because it is not here to acknowledge the solemnity of which we stand, first to recognize the constitutional right of a woman, her doctor, and her faith to be able to make a decision without fear and intimidation.

In a State like mine, we have vigilantism because it has passed legislation for bounty hunters to come back again from the 1800s to intimidate doctors, nurses, and patients.

This is a day that we must stand against. If we are to work together in this solemn moment, we must recognize all the doctors, nurses, and patients that have been intimidated.

The National Abortion Federation, in 2021, indicated that there has been an increase in violence. The significant increases in stalking, 600 percent; blockades, 450 percent; hoax devices/suspicious packages, 163 percent; invasions, 129 percent; and assault and battery, 128 percent.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation. Maybe we can, in solemnity, work together on this serious issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution that expresses the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

It is critically important that we opposed the Republican effort to rewrite history in a way that demonizes the victims and glorifies the aggressors.

Each American has the right to make their own healthcare decisions according to their own beliefs values, and conscience.

Republicans hope to strip women of their constitutional right of autonomy over their own body and their right to make their own healthcare decisions.

In Texas, Republicans have incentivized vigilantism and stalking by passing a law that provides civilians a cause of action against anyone who performs or aids an abortion and provides for a $10,000 cash reward if successful.

This resolution ignores the long-documented history of violence against abortion providers, their staff, and their patients and attempts to rewrite the facts.

According to Bloomberg, a survey of 390 clinics showed that assaults on abortion providers surged 128 percent in 2021 with reports of kicking, slapping and being pepper sprayed.

The National Abortion Federation 2021 Violence & Disruption Report, found a massive increase in violence and disruption against abortion providers.

The most significant increases were in stalking (600 percent), blockades (450 percent), hoax devices/suspicious packages (163 percent), invasions (129 percent), and assault and battery (128 percent) compared to 2020.

Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED), a nonprofit that tracks political violence and demonstrations, asserts that anti-government militias and extremist groups like the Proud Boys appearance at abortion related events spiked 160 percent in 2021, compared to the previous year.

Further, in 2020, far-right groups appeared at only 1 percent of demonstrations related to abortion rights; in 2022, almost one in five events involved members of a far-right group.

This violence, harassment, and cyberbullying against those who seek abortions, their providers, and supporters is unconscionable.

The American public made it clear last November that they want Congress to protect reproductive freedom.

We stand with all women, and staunchly reject the misinformation in this bill and its attempt to cover up the attacks on basic human dignity and constitutional rights.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose this outrageous and dangerous resolution.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which condemns the wave of attacks on pro-life groups and facilities.

As a Nation, we are blessed to have a nationwide network of faithful, dedicated pro-life pregnancy centers that provide care for pregnant women and their babies.

Women deserve to be offered the full range of health support that can help them in their time of need. Pro-life pregnancy centers do exactly that, offering a compassionate support system for pregnant women.

Shamefully, since the Dobbs decision was rendered, these pregnancy centers have been under attack by radical abortion activists. We have seen horrific displays of vandalism, threats, and intimidation directed at pro-life groups and facilities for the simple fact that they support life and serve to help pregnant mothers in need.

No one is forced to receive care at a pregnancy center, yet we see people committing violence on pregnancy centers. Why? Are they angry that so many choose to not terminate the life of their own baby and let their child live, like all of your mothers did, rather than violently terminate the life of their own baby?

Madam Speaker, I ask Congress to stand together and strongly condemn this violence by passing this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise because I am appalled that this is how my Republican colleagues have chosen to start this majority.

It appears that actually legislating is too great a challenge for my colleagues, who have no apparent plan to address the real issues facing our country, including the rising tide of violent extremism.

H. Con. Res. 3 condemns violence against anti-abortion organizations. It says nothing about the violence against abortion providers that has gone largely unaddressed for nearly 50 years. Last year, I supported legislation that offered real solutions to rising violence against abortion providers.

Madam Speaker, I would be happy to work with my colleagues on fixing H. Con. Res. 3 to actually acknowledge the rising violence, but I cannot and will not support it in its current form, and I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution before us here.

Last year, a draft Supreme Court opinion was leaked to the media in one of the biggest scandals to ever hit the Nation's highest court. It reestablished the authority of States to prohibit the killing of unborn children, sending the Democratic Party and other leftwing extremists off the deep end.

The liberal brush fire that ignited after the opinion was leaked wasn't contained to just Washington. Pregnancy centers and pro-life organizations across the country soon became the target of their rage.

□ 1300

The chairman said it very well in his opening comments when he cited the situation in Madison, Wisconsin: ''If abortions aren't safe then you aren't either.'' That is what it says right here.

Following the attack, a radical pro-abortion group known as Jane's Revenge took credit, proudly proclaiming ''this was only a warning'' and ''next time the infrastructure of the enslavers will not survive.''

Leftwing extremists have shown us time and time again—first, during the summer of 2020 when they burned American businesses to the ground and then by firebombing pregnancy centers in 2022—that they will resort to violence and destruction when they do not get their way.

Unfortunately, there has been very little accountability for the leaked draft opinion.

This resolution makes it clear that violence needs to stop.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the dangerous measures that House Republicans are bringing to a vote in this Chamber as part of their ongoing efforts to end a woman's right to choose and inserting politics unnecessarily and wrongly into the doctor-patient relationship, denying abortion care to women, stigmatizing women who get abortions, and putting at risk the doctors who simply are doing their jobs by caring for them. All while ignoring the threats that abortion providers and patients face daily.

The American people sent a clear message during the midterms: Politicians have no place in our personal medical decisions.

House Republicans refuse to listen. Instead of protecting and expanding reproductive healthcare and women's rights, they are making it their first order of business to use their power to control women's bodies and their future.

I condemn violence in all of its forms. This resolution condemns only some violence and very intentionally omits violence like the murder of health professionals, against abortion providers, patients and their families. Maybe they don't regard murder as violence.

This comes at the same time as women's rights are under attack. This nonbinding resolution is meant to only divide and distract and will do nothing to actually reduce violence.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these biased bills and continue to stand up and speak out for what is right.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GUEST).

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution condemning the recent attacks on pro-life groups, facilities, and churches.

Last summer, in a landmark decision, the United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of my home State of Mississippi in returning decisions on protecting life to the States.

Unfortunately, the leak of the Dobbs decision led to instances of extremism committed against churches, pro-life institutions, and crisis pregnancy centers.

Sadly, my home State was not spared. Mississippi has a robust network of crisis pregnancy centers that provide care and resources to expectant mothers.

I, and many of my Republican colleagues, have called on the Biden administration to address these criminal acts and hold accountable those who committed these offenses. To date, no action has been taken.

I am hopeful that this legislation will move the administration to act, and I am grateful that the Republican majority is standing with those impacted by last year's extremist acts.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose violence and destruction of property regardless of venue.

The resolution on the floor today, however, is a distraction from the real issue regarding crisis pregnancy centers, which is that they regularly provide inaccurate, incomplete, and injurious information to people who are seeking guidance and fact-based healthcare.

Crisis pregnancy centers often engage in deceptive advertising to get people in the door, and then they mislead them about the services they provide.

A crisis pregnancy center in Texas, for example, was caught telling people that abortions cause mental illness and implied that abortions cause cancer

and infertility. I heard from someone who visited a crisis pregnancy center, and after she left she started getting calls from strangers who were told about her visit. Another woman was shown an ultrasound picture of her kidney and was told it was a baby.

This deception is unconscionable, which is why I will soon introduce the Stop Anti-Abortion Disinformation Act to direct the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules prohibiting unfair or deceptive advertising of abortion services.

At a time when reproductive rights are under attack, it is especially important for anyone seeking abortion care to be able to find a real healthcare provider they can trust who will respect their bodily autonomy and their privacy.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, one of the scary, ongoing stories over the last few years, more typical of an atheistic totalitarian regime than our wonderful constitutional Republic, has been a tax on pregnancy counseling centers.

They are hated because they try to persuade women to keep their babies, and they articulate how precious life is in the womb, which is considered to be dangerous speech to those who desperately want to legalize 8-month abortions.

Some of these attacks, like those in other venues by antifa and Black Lives Matter have become more physical in nature.

The lack of urgency by law enforcement to protect the speech of those who want women to keep their children is dangerous. This effort to muzzle those who express a wide variety of conservative Christian viewpoints has become more and more common and should scare anyone who does not want to live in a religiously hostile, large government State.

Please vote for H. Con. Res. 3.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 3.

This resolution is further proof of my colleagues' hypocrisy and their obsession with controlling a woman's inherent right to bodily autonomy.

This resolution ignores the long-documented history of violence against abortion providers, their staff, and their patients.

Violence is what Amanda Eid from Texas suffered when doctors could not induce labor after her amniotic fluid was leaking. Her doctors were prohibited from providing the treatment she urgently needed because of Texas' anti-abortion laws. Amanda's life will forever be changed, and that is the real violence.

The American people are overwhelmingly in support of protecting reproductive freedom. Women and the American people across this Nation have spoken loud and clear. They do not want the government interfering with their reproductive healthcare.

On behalf of all women in my district and across this country, I oppose this extreme resolution.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a pro-life leader and good friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, two women spoke at a pregnancy care center dinner I attended in New Jersey.

Both women were effusive in their thanks that the director had approached them in absolute kindness and empathy as they were literally walking from the parking lot to an abortion clinic. They changed their minds and were helped through their pregnancies and after the birth of their children, as well.

Later in the program, two young, teenaged girls spoke of the sanctity of life and the good work of the pregnancy care center. In a very dramatic moment from the podium—because they were standing side by side—they turned to the director, thanked her, and said that had she not reached out to their moms that day and followed up with such love and compassion, both of them would have been dead.

Pregnancy care centers across the country have suffered a surge of violent attacks, firebombing and vandalism by pro-abortion activists in a coordinated effort to intimidate frontline volunteers and licensed medical professionals providing critical support to mothers in need and their unborn baby girls and boys.

Now more than ever the Biden administration and law enforcement needs to enforce the law.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, my, my, my, here we go again.

First off, let's all condemn the violence on the streets of our country.

This resolution is a political ploy and a distraction from the violence that abortion providers and patients face every day.

Bombings, murder, arson; let's condemn these, too.

Madam Speaker, women across our country are being denied lifesaving care, and healthcare providers are being punished for doing their jobs.

Women deserve access to all forms of health services, including abortion and the freedom to make decisions about their health and their lives and their future without interference of politicians.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution which sidetracks us from the real danger women and healthcare providers are facing today: The Republican agenda.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H.Con.Res 3 and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

In June of last year, following the decision by the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade, a pro-life pregnancy center that assists pregnant women in Nashville, Tennessee, was the victim of an attempted arson attack. Thankfully, no one was injured, and local law enforcement opened an investigation into the situation in an effort to bring the perpetrators to justice.

Unfortunately, that is not the case across the entire United States, which is why it is essential that this body, the United States House of Representatives, condemns these heinous acts of political violence.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and will always and forever stand on the right side of history when it comes to protecting the unborn.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today.

While I strongly condemn violence and vandalism in any form, the bill before us neglects to address the real crisis facing Americans today, which is the loss of reproductive rights for millions of Americans in the blink of an eye since the Dobbs decision overturned Roe v. Wade last summer.

Madam Speaker, 8 in 10 Americans support the legal right to abortion, something that has been seen over and over again in poll after poll, in election after election. This resolution is an attempt to muddy the waters and distract the public from the fact that those on the other side of the aisle support a national abortion ban, regardless of which State you live in.

In fact, it was abortion providers who faced significant increases in stalking, invasions, and assault and battery as a result of the Dobbs decision.

I cannot support this resolution, which conveniently leaves out the majority of the victims of this type of political violence. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, attacks on churches and pro-life pregnancy centers are unconscionable and un-American.

Thugs elevate their extreme political ideology over the most basic gift from God: Life. This phenomenon is fed from here.

We all recall Senator SCHUMER's threat to Supreme Court Justices that they ''will pay the price.'' Now we see the price: firebombing pro-life pregnancy centers and assassination attempts.

In my own State there is rhetoric amid the broken windows, red paint, and anarchist symbols. ''If abortions aren't safe, neither are you.'' That sentence is repeated over and over across this country. That is a threat. This is the death cult's echo of the KKK's burning cross on the lawn; brazen, violent intimidation. The Federal Government responded to the KKK.

Where is the Biden Justice Department amid this violent campaign of national scope?

Mr. President, it is time for action. Do your duty.

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1315

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on these resolutions. This is a poll-tested focus group effort to change the subject.

We all know that attacking facilities or not providing healthcare to an infant is already illegal. This is a veiled attempt at distracting from the real consequences of the Dobbs decision.

People have had their rights taken away and can no longer receive the care they wish. When we see doctors consulting their lawyers when patients are dying on operating tables because they are afraid of abortion bans, voting on this resolution is an embarrassment.

It is unconscionable that when people are living in fear, even dying because they are denied healthcare, the House is ignoring this in favor of a political stunt.

I stand with the American public and in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Being a mother is the greatest gift in the world, and childbirth is a true miracle of God.

In 2019, pregnancy centers served roughly 2 million women, men, and youth. They provided services such as medical care, education, mentoring, and material support like diapers, car seats, and clothing.

From 2016 through 2020, pro-life pregnancy centers partnered with pregnant women at risk for abortion to save over 800,000 lives. Approximately 75 percent of women at risk for abortion who view an ultrasound of their baby in the womb at a pregnancy center ultimately make the choice to continue their pregnancy.

Merrick Garland calls parents who want to protect their kids from sexual indoctrination in schools domestic terrorists but refuses to protect facilities that help pregnant women carry their babies from being attacked by far-left extremists.

Since the Dobbs decision was leaked in May 2022 alone, approximately 40 churches and 60 pro-life pregnancy centers have been firebombed and vandalized across the country by pro-murder extremists. The costs of damages for each attack range from less than $100 to more than $250,000. Shameful.

Some of the things they have said—they have spray-painted on a church in Lansing, Michigan, ''abort the court'' and ''death to Christian nationalism.'' Death for Christians that care about our country? I don't think so.

They also caused $50,000 in damages in Bethesda, Maryland, setting fire to three churches. It is shameful.

Jane's Revenge, which is a terrorist group, said: ''If abortion isn't safe neither are you.''

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in opposing, on the strongest terms, all forms of political violence.

That is something that this resolution fails to do. This resolution fails to acknowledge decades of well-documented violence against reproductive healthcare providers in this country. In failing to do so, it fails us all.

I have seen that violence firsthand. More than 30 years ago, when I was a teenager, I stood in defense of our local Planned Parenthood as anti-abortion protesters tried to chain themselves to the doors to prevent women from going in not only to get abortion care but to get their Pap smears, their birth control, HIV tests, and other services. A few years later, a well-known anti-abortion activist drove a van through the same door of that same Planned Parenthood.

Like I said, I welcome the opportunity to vote on legislation that condemns all forms of political violence, but the resolution's purposeful omission of abortion providers and patients, and what that suggests, is why I am voting ''no'' today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I am against all forms of violence, including violence against any one of the majority of Americans who support abortion rights.

The statistics are absolutely clear. Since 1977, there have been 11 murders, 42 bombings, 196 arsons, 491 assaults, and thousands more illegal attacks on people who support abortion rights.

Let's include everyone in here when we talk about no more violence. We have to make sure that people who are pro-life and people who support abortion rights—and we support life—are included in opposing violence.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 3.

Of course, we condemn all political violence, whether it is aimed at those we agree with or disagree with.

These acts are all unacceptable, full stop. Hate speech quickly becomes hate violence. In a democracy, violence is particularly awful when it is designed to silence or intimidate.

Where were my colleagues every single time a doctor, a patient, a nurse, or a security officer was threatened, assaulted, or murdered just for providing, accessing, and safeguarding reproductive healthcare?

Congresswoman DEGETTE, Congresswoman PRESSLEY, and I have drafted a resolution that condemns all attacks upon healthcare facilities, healthcare personnel, and patients.

Every act of hate-fueled violence is worthy of condemnation, including those against Planned Parenthood clinics, abortion providers and patients, and other care providers.

We stand with survivors of those attacks. We condemn all of them, and our GOP colleagues should do so, as well.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 3, which condemns the epidemic of attacks on pro-life and faith-based organizations.

Unfortunately, Michigan's Fifth District has not escaped these attacks. Last June, Jane's Revenge vandals graffitied and smashed the windows of Jackson, Michigan's Right to Life and my own office. It was a despicable act. The Jane's Revenge perpetrator, who has yet to be caught, even accidentally graffitied a neighbor's house, as well.

Yet, this darkness presented an opportunity to show the best of our community. Volunteers from the community came out to clean up the broken glass and help board up the windows.

In contrast to this positivity displayed by everyday Americans, and despite congressional efforts we have spearheaded, President Biden's Justice Department has stayed silent on these acts of domestic terrorism.

Today, congressional Democrats have an opportunity to right the wrongs of this administration and join us in condemning these acts of violence as we condemn all acts of violence, as well.

Volunteers at pregnancy centers who remain committed to their convictions and efforts understand they have a target on their backs. These volunteers are individuals spending their time and their money to clothe, feed, provide

shelter, and minister to women in crisis.

Is this the progressive America my colleagues talk about? I think not. Does their idea of progress consist of political violence targeting those who provide services to women and families? Are intimidation and violence acceptable to the Biden administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle? I hope not.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge support for this resolution for the benefit of lives, security, and decency in our country.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is time for our Republican colleagues to stop playing politics with women's bodies.

With the fall of Roe, the criminalization of abortion access nationwide with no exceptions is well underway.

Just last year in my home State of Florida, Governor DeSantis signed a 15-week abortion ban into law that offers no exceptions for rape, incest, or human trafficking, and more restrictive policies are coming.

Other States are even more restrictive, and the bill and resolution before us will further erode women's reproductive rights. These measures incentivize violence by failing to condemn a history of violence against abortion providers and patients.

While millions of Americans will lose under these measures, its harshest impacts land on single, working, and women of color.

A lack of access to safe abortions not only deprives a woman of the basic right to control her own body, but it also stifles her future economic, educational, and family planning opportunities. It basically hands her body, life, and future over to the State.

These horrific anti-abortion measures are a revolting assault on women's rights, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on both measures.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST), for whom I think this is his first speech on the floor.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, we heard the word ''shameful'' a lot during this debate, but what is really shameful is the fact that my Democratic colleagues and I are willing to both say we condemn all violence and also put it on paper.

With my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all we hear is talk. They are not willing to condemn all violence in this resolution.

It is a one-sided resolution meant to fan the flames of anti-abortion and anti-freedom sentiment in this country.

See, my district in central Florida sees these sentiments in action as our Governor has passed an abortion ban and looks to go even further.

As someone whose birth mother made the brave and difficult decision to put me up for adoption, I recognize that that decision was deeply personal and can often mark one of the most vulnerable points in a person's life. No one should take advantage of that, and the Federal Government should actually protect it.

I will continue to fight for civil rights, personal freedom, and bodily autonomy of women and childbearing adults in this country, and I hope the rest of this Chamber will join me in voting ''no.''

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, if my Republican colleagues want to condemn the growing level of political violence in this country, let's do it together.

That is not what this resolution does. What it does is it goes to great lengths to condemn attacks against anti-choice groups, and it says nothing about the growing threat of violence targeting women's health clinics across the United States.

It doesn't condemn the numerous bullets that have been fired at healthcare clinics throughout the country.

It doesn't condemn the bricks that have crashed through windows at providers' offices or the assaults, kidnappings, and even the murders of doctors and healthcare personnel.

It doesn't condemn the arsons, bombings, death threats, or any one of the more than 7,000 acts of violence that have been reported against these facilities.

By ignoring these acts of violence, Republicans are sending a very dangerous message that will only embolden the extremists behind them.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a resolution that Congresswomen LEE and PRESSLEY and I have introduced to condemn all acts of political violence, regardless of their target or intent, and I urge my colleagues to support it instead.

Whereas workplace violence ranges from threats and verbal abuse to physical assaults and homicide;

Whereas, for decades, health care personnel for women and people who access reproductive health care services have been subjected to intimidation, threats, and violence;

Whereas between 1977 and 2015—

(1) nearly 7,000 violent acts were reported against providers at health centers for women, including bombings, arsons, death threats, kidnappings, and assaults; and

(2) more than 190,000 acts of disruption, including bomb threats and harassing calls, were reported;

Whereas, between 1993 and 2015, there were 11 murders, numerous attempted murders, 42 bombings, and 186 arsons targeted at individuals and facilities associated with care provided at health centers for women;

Whereas between 1993 and 2015, the 11 victims of anti-choice violence include Dr. David Gunn of Pensacola, Florida, in 1993; Dr. John Bayard Britton and a volunteer, James Barrett, both of Pensacola, Florida, in 1994; clinic receptionists Shannon Lowney and Leanne Nichols, both of Brookline, Massachusetts, in 1994; Dr. Barnett Slepian of Buffalo, New York, in 1998; clinic securitv guard Robert Sanderson of Birmingham, Alabama, in 1998; Dr. George Tiller of Wichita, Kansas, in 2009; and police officer Garrett Swasey, Ke'Arre Stewart, and Jennifer Markovsky, all of whom were lost during a violent attack at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in 2015;

Whereas, in 2016, two defendants vandalized a Baltimore, Maryland, area abortion clinic on two separate occasions, with one defendant pleading guilty and the other convicted at trial of Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act violations;

Whereas, in 2017, a defendant sent several threatening emails to abortion clinics located in Chicago, Illinois, and Hammond, Indiana, and the defendant pled guilty to FACE Act and other Federal offenses;

Whereas, in 2018, a defendant directed a threatening social media post to Planned Parenthood facilities and staff and defendant pled guilty to Federal offenses, including a FACE Act charge;

Whereas, in 2019, a defendant was indicted for FACE Act violations and other Federal offenses related to a 2015 shooting at a Planned Parenthood facility in Colorado Springs, Colorado, where he shot at several civilians and police officers, killing two civilians and one officer, while injuring several others;

Whereas, in 2020, a defendant pled guiltv to FACE Act related offenses in connection with a bomb threat call the defendant made to a Jacksonville, Florida, abortion clinic;

Whereas, in 2021, a defendant pled guilty to a FACE Act violation and other State felony offenses for throwing a Molotov cocktail at a Fort Myers, Florida, abortion clinic;

Whereas, in 2022, a defendant was indicted for FACE Act violations after he assaulted a Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, area Planned Parenthood clinic escort twice on the same date, with one assault resulting in bodily injury; and

Whereas extreme rhetoric continues to fuel a hate-filled climate that is dangerous for individuals who provide or access comprehensive health care services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns all acts of political violence;

(2) condemns attacks on health care facilities, health care personnel, and patients;

(3) affirms that all people have the freedom to access reproductive health care services and medical advice without fear of violence, intimidation, or harassment; and

(4) calls upon the Biden administration to use all appropriate authorities to uphold public safety, to protect health care facilities, and safeguard health care personnel and patients.

□ 1330

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, the resolved part of our resolution says this, and I think all of my colleagues should be able to join this.

Resolved, that the U.S. House of Representatives condemns all acts of political violence; 2, condemns attacks on healthcare facilities, healthcare personnel, and patients; and 3, affirms that all people have the freedom to access reproductive healthcare services

and medical advice without fear of violence, intimidation, or harassment.

Isn't that what this is all about in this country, fear from violence? No violence, everybody gets the healthcare services they want and they deserve without fear of being killed.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend from Colorado that we should condemn all violence. We should condemn violence to unborn children, also, but that doesn't seem to be something that is shared on the other side of aisle.

One of the pregnancy centers that was targeted last year was Life Choices Pregnancy Medical Center located in my home State and at the time in my district in Colorado. On June 25 at 3:17 a.m., first responders responded to a fire at the pregnancy center. The fire was the result of angry protestors acting out after the Supreme Court's Dobbs decision. Not much was salvageable from the fire, but what remained were hateful and extreme messages graffitied on the exterior of the building.

Kathy Roberts, the executive director of Life Choices, is here today to commemorate passage of this resolution. I am honored to have Kathy here and to introduce this brave and dedicated woman.

I thank Kathy for being here.

Sadly, our Nation has become all too familiar with the violent attacks on pro-life centers. In 2022, over 100 pro-life centers were violently attacked, and there has been minimal accountability. Instead of Democrats accepting the Supreme Court Dobbs decision and condemning this violence, they have egged it on, including some who told pro-abortion protestors to rise up and commended their violence by stating it was a way for individuals to channel their righteous anger into meaningful action.

Our Nation is a Nation of law and order, and violence is never the path we should pursue to create effective change.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, as chair of the Abortion Rights and Access Task Force, I rise to make plain exactly what is going on here. This is not a debate about political violence. Political violence and the violent rhetoric that drives it is a persistent threat; my staff, my family, and I know that intimately. Everyone should condemn it.

Our colleagues across the aisle continue to say the quiet part out loud in their selective contempt for political violence.

This resolution seeks to deny necessary medical care from those who seek it. Abortion is healthcare and a fundamental human right.

Across the Nation, those seeking care are met with intimidation, violence, and even loss of life. Imagine walking through a screaming crowd to get to a medical appointment. Imagine being a doctor or a nurse dedicating your life to helping others, and day after day your workplace receives violent threats, and you fear for your life.

But that is not what the other side of the aisle is concerned about. No, today, they are seeking to mislead the American people. They are trying to conjure up hateful rhetoric, spreading misinformation about crisis pregnancy centers.

Let me make it plain. Crisis pregnancy centers are no place to go for reproductive healthcare. They are sham clinics that coerce folks seeking to terminate a pregnancy or to access the full range of reproductive health services.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, to those pressing these divisive anti-choice resolutions, we see right through you.

Madam Speaker, abortion is healthcare and a fundamental human right, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for his strong defense of life, for the precious unborn, and for promoting a culture of life at all times.

I stand, Madam Speaker, in support of H. Con. Res. 3, expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

There have been now nearly 100 recorded acts of violence and intimidation against pro-life individuals and organizations by radical pro-abortion activists since the initial leak of the draft Supreme Court Dobbs opinion.

Following the leak and issuance of the Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, anti-life fanatics have targeted, destroyed, or vandalized, as I said, over 100 pro-life facilities, groups, and churches to further their radical cause.

Pro-life pregnancy centers nationwide play a critical and important role in supporting and assisting pregnant women, their children, and their families.

Because the Biden Justice Department refuses to protect these vital resource centers, Congress must be clear in condemning the violence against pro-life facilities.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand against violence and to support H. Con. Res. 3.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Madam Speaker, if House Republicans were serious about condemning violence surrounding the debate on abortion, the resolution would be clear in condemning all acts of violence, lest we give tacit acquiescence to extremist anti-abortion violence and against abortion providers. This resolution does not do that at all.

Undoubtedly, my Republican colleagues will attempt to portray any opposition to this partisan resolution as proof of Democrats' so-called extreme position on abortion, but the American public is not so easily fooled.

They will recognize this resolution for what it is, a transparent political exercise intended to lay the groundwork for MAGA Republicans' plans for a total nationwide ban on abortion.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Madam Speaker, I just want to read what the resolution says: That Congress condemns recent attacks, over 100 of them in the last 7 months, on pro-life pregnancy centers and churches; condemns recent attacks of vandalism, violence, and destruction against pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

Second, it recognizes the sanctity of life, the important role pro-life facilities, groups, and churches play in supporting pregnant women, infants, and families.

Three, it calls upon the Biden administration to use all appropriate law enforcement authorities to uphold public safety and protect the rights of pro-life facilities, groups, and churches.

That is all it says. This is as apple pie as it gets. The hundreds of churches and crisis pregnancy centers that have been attacked in the last 7 months, this resolution says: Biden administration, use the FACE Act, which you have said applies not just to pro-abortion clinics but also to pro-life crisis pregnancy centers, use that to make sure we can stop this stuff from happening in the future.

We condemn all violence every time it happens. Here is what is interesting: The violence that has been cited by the other side against abortion clinics and people associated with them, guess what? Those individuals were prosecuted, and we support that.

What we want to know is why. With over 100 attacks, why hasn't the Justice Department, to my knowledge, used the FACE Act to prosecute anybody? Why?

They say there is no political nature at the Justice Department now; there is no weaponization. Really? Because it sure looks like there is a conflict here. Sure looks like there is a double standard here. This resolution is as basic as it gets.

Madam Speaker, I urge support, hope this thing passes unanimously, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. 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.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 5, I call up the bill (H.R. 26) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 26

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—In accordance with the above findings, Congress enacts the following pursuant to Congress' power under—

(1) section 5 of the 14th Amendment, including the power to enforce the prohibition on government action denying equal protection of the laws; and

(2) section 8 of article I to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States, including the power to regulate commerce under clause 3 of such section.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

''§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive (as defined in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Born-Alive Infants Protection Act')):

''(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

''(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

''(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

''(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

''(b) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

''(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

''(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

''(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

''(C) punitive damages.

''(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(4) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

''(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

''(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

''(i) after viability, to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

''(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

''(2) ATTEMPT.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item pertaining to section 1531 the following:

''1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors.''.

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**Partial-Birth Abortions**'' and inserting ''**Abortions**''.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Partial-Birth Abortions'' and inserting ''Abortions''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally dividing the control by the majority leader and minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to enter extraneous materials on H.R. 26.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 26, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. In simple terms: Life is precious, life is sacred, all life, including unborn children, but that is not what this legislation is about.

This legislation is about those kids who are born alive making sure they get protected. For over 40 years, the decision in Roe v. Wade, as Justice Alito has stated, inflamed debate and deepened division over the issue of abortion in this country.

We have seen that play out over the last year, but what should be undisputed is the care of a child who is born alive after an attempted abortion.

Unfortunately, as evidenced by comments from prominent Democrats, not everyone believes that a child born alive should be protected.

We all know in 2019, then-Governor Northam of the State of Virginia stated this: The infant would be delivered, the infant would be kept comfortable, the infant would be resuscitated if that is what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.

Think about that. It is not just anybody saying that. It is the Governor of one of our largest States. The cavalier

attitude he displayed toward human life is just wrong.

H.R. 26 would require healthcare practitioners to give the same level of care to a child born alive after an abortion or an attempted abortion as the child at that same gestational age. Work to save the kid's life, work to help that newborn. It would also require the immediate transfer of the surviving infant to a hospital.

This legislation requires healthcare practitioners or other employees to report any violations of this provision to State or Federal law enforcement for criminal prosecution.

In addition, H.R. 26 provides the mother of an abortion survivor with a civil right of action against the healthcare practitioner who fails to provide the required level of care.

It is simple. Infants born alive following an abortion are kids. They are children. All newborns deserve the same level of care.

In the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers declared that it was life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that are the unalienable rights bestowed on us by our Creator.

Congress has a duty to protect these fundamental rights. This should be an easy vote for all Members.

I thank my colleagues, Representatives ANN WAGNER and KAT CAMMACK, for their diligent work on this legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 26, the so-called Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Despite what its supporters would have us believe, this legislation would do nothing to enhance protections or the quality of healthcare if an infant is born after an attempted abortion. What it would do, however, is directly interfere with a doctor's medical judgment and dictate a medical standard of care that may not be appropriate in all circumstances, which could, in fact, put infants' lives at greater risk.

Finally, by beginning this new Congress with a bill to restrict women's healthcare nationwide, House Republicans have made clear that they will not stop until they reach their ultimate goal, a nationwide ban on abortion.

It has always been the law that healthcare providers cannot deliberately harm newborn infants and that they must exercise reasonable care in their treatment of such infants. The bill's implication that providers who perform abortions routinely act in a callous or a criminal manner that would result in an infant's death, or that a provider who performs an abortion somehow cannot be trusted to take adequate measures to save a living baby's life, is insulting and untrue.

In opposing this bill, I do not oppose, in any way, proper medical treatment for newborn infants, whatever the circumstances of their birth, but determining the proper treatment is for medical professionals to decide, not politicians in Congress.

When I supported the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act in 2002, my reasoning, and the reasoning of my pro-choice colleagues, was simple: Killing an infant who is born alive, either by an act of omission or commission, is infanticide. It was, is, and always should be against the law, and we saw no harm in reaffirming that fact.

That law passed Congress with bipartisan support precisely because it was harmless, even if it was also useless since it did not change the preexisting law in any way because, after all, murder is murder in every State.

The bill specifically just reiterated existing law in florid language and did nothing to interfere with doctors' medical judgment or to cause needless harm.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today puts children's lives and health at risk. It requires doctors to immediately ensure transportation and admission of the infant to a hospital in all cases, with no regard as to whether doing so is actually in the best interest of the child's health and well-being.

This mandate effectively overrides the careful case-by-case exercise of professional medical judgment by healthcare providers and replaces it with a blanket rule enforceable with criminal penalties. It may be, after all, in a given case, that it is more beneficial to the infant's health to be treated on the spot and not rushed to a hospital immediately.

Such a ham-fisted approach fails to consider the fact that, in many cases, it may be safer and more conducive to the infant's health to care for the infant where it was born rather than transporting it many miles away to a hospital.

This bill assumes that Congress knows better, and it imposes a new obligation on providers that, rather than saving lives, puts infants at risk.

Perhaps, if this bill had gone through regular order, we could have avoided this unfortunate situation. There has never been a committee markup or a hearing on this bill, not in this Congress or in any previous Congress.

I would have welcomed the opportunity to hear from expert witnesses on best practices and standards of care for infants. Members could have offered amendments and perfected the bill to ensure that it achieves our common goal of providing the best, most medically appropriate care to infants and their mothers.

I am disappointed, but not surprised, that my colleagues rushed this bill to the floor when there is no evidence at all that doctors currently are failing to provide an appropriate level of care and when a chorus of provider groups oppose this bill.

Sadly, rather than protecting infants, my Republican colleagues are putting them at greater risk in the service of politics. Indeed, by bringing this bill straight to the floor as one of the first measures to be considered by the 118th Congress, Republicans and the most extreme elements of the anti-abortion movement have signaled their determination to enact a nationwide ban on abortion.

I cannot support H.R. 26 because it mandates a particular course of treatment, the immediate transport to a hospital, which may not be appropriate and may be medically dangerous in certain cases. In doing so, it abandons the practice of considering the best medical interest of infants and their mothers.

Republicans have made clear where they stand about a woman's right to control her body. Make no mistake: This bill is another step in their plan to criminalize abortion nationwide.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this ill-conceived legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I point out this bill has passed multiple times in previous Congresses, the exact same language, and it has passed with bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the sponsor of the legislation who has worked tirelessly on this good piece of legislation.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, a champion for life, our chair of the Judiciary Committee, JIM JORDAN.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, in support of H.R. 26, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I have championed this issue for decades, and I have been blessed and honored to lead this legislation since 2019.

I am so grateful to the co-leads of this bill, Representative KAT CAMMACK and our Majority Leader, STEVE SCALISE; to the leadership of this Congress; and especially to the thousands of champions of life across the country for their tireless work and support of the most vulnerable Americans, unborn and newborn infants.

Thanks to these efforts, after dozens of unanimous consent requests, two discharge petitions, and countless hours of advocacy work, the House will, at last, take action to ensure that every single baby born in the United States receives lifesaving medical care at their most vulnerable moment.

All children should be welcomed with joy and wonder, no matter the circumstances of their birth. Yet, too many of these sweet little ones are denied the medical care they need to survive and thrive simply because they were unwanted.

This commonsense legislation will require healthcare providers to administer the same level of care to the babies who survive abortions that they

would to any other child born at the same gestational age.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will, again, join me in supporting the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, as some did, as our chairman mentioned, when it passed the House in both 2015 and 2018 with bipartisan support.

To that point, I want to be absolutely clear that this bill has nothing to do with the Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs to return abortion to the States. Not a word of the born-alive act obstructs States' ability to implement Dobbs as they see fit.

I strongly believe that States should control pro-life policymaking, just as I support exceptions for rape, incest, and the life of the mother, but today, we are considering an entirely separate issue. We are considering the protection of infants that have been delivered alive after an attempted abortion. That is it, plain and simple.

I implore my Democratic colleagues to put aside politics and stand in support of lifesaving care for these innocent newborns.

We must remember today that children are not the only victims of born-alive abortions. Women, fathers, and whole families all suffer deeply from the loss of a child. Our communities are weaker because these bright young ones did not grow up to share their wisdom, laughter, and ingenuity with all of us.

Just down the hall a little bit later this afternoon, we will meet with extraordinary women who survived abortions. When they entered the world, they were not greeted with the profound love and all that I felt when I held my children and grandchildren for the first time. Instead, they were left to die.

They are alive today because of courage and grace, mostly of nurses who chose to act as they struggled for breath. Each of these women has built a happy, healthy life, bringing light and joy to their friends and families and enriching their communities. They inspire us all.

As a mother and grandmother, they affirm my belief in a culture of life for children, born and unborn, and their mothers and families. Every single newborn, regardless of the circumstances of their birth, deserves to share the miracle of life and have lifesaving medical care.

We must act with compassion to protect these little ones and give women a strong support system as they navigate the miracles and challenges of motherhood. This bill will save real lives, and it will give survivors a precious chance to build a future.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of the House to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 26, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the distinguished minority leader of the House.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding and all my colleagues for their continued leadership on this incredibly important issue.

The 118th Congress has begun, and the differences between our side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle couldn't be any clearer.

Let me, of course, reiterate that, as Democrats, we look forward to trying to find common ground whenever and wherever possible to solve issues of consequence on behalf of the American people, but we will oppose extremism whenever it rears its ugly head.

Democrats have made clear that we are going to continue to work on issues like lowering costs, better-paying jobs, safer communities, defending democracy, protecting the public interest, ensuring economic opportunity in every single ZIP Code, and, yes, fighting for reproductive freedom.

My Republican colleagues, you promised to come to Washington to fight for the American people but have spent a lot of time fighting each other on politics, power, and personality, not working on issues related to the public interest. That is what the last few days have indicated, an extreme MAGA Republican agenda.

Now that you are getting into substance, on Monday, you passed a bill designed to allow the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected to cheat on their taxes, subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless, benefit millionaires and billionaires, not working-class families, not middle-class families, not low-income families, not veterans, not everyday Americans, the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. That was on Monday.

Then, on Tuesday, you came to the floor and passed a select committee on insurrection protection, a committee that is clearly designed, in the words of some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to obstruct justice as part of your evident desire, as many of you have said, to eventually defund the FBI. That was Tuesday.

Now, on Wednesday, you come to the floor with nothing on inflation, nothing on quality-of-life issues for the American people, nothing even on public safety. You come to the floor as part of your march to criminalize abortion care, to impose a nationwide ban, to set into motion government-mandated pregnancies.

That is the distinction for today. As Democrats, we believe in a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive healthcare decisions, period, full stop, decisions that should be between a woman, her family, and her doctors, period, full stop.

We believe in Roe v. Wade. Do you wonder about our position? That is it. The Women's Health Protection Act, that is it. Freedom to make your own reproductive healthcare decisions, that is it. As compared to a clear effort—that is what this bill is about today, a march toward criminalizing abortion care, a nationwide ban, government-mandated pregnancies, part of an extreme MAGA Republican agenda.

□ 1400

So, yes, we continue to extend our hand of partnership if you truly want to work on quality-of-life issues, but we haven't seen it. We haven't seen it on Monday, we haven't seen it on Tuesday, and we are not seeing it today.

Madam Speaker, we oppose this bill. We oppose an extreme MAGA-Republican agenda. Let's get back to the business of the American people.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I would point out, the minority leader said their position is Roe v. Wade. Their position is real simple and it is real radical. Their position is you should be able to take the life of an unborn child right up until their birthday, and then as Governor Northam has said, even after their birthday. That is what this bill seeks to stop and to make sure that it doesn't happen.

That is as radical as you can get, taking the life of unborn children right up to their birth day. And then, as Governor Northam pointed out, even after that. We want to make sure that ''even after that'' part never happens because we believe life is precious and life is sacred.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 26, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This bill does exactly what the title says, which in this town is a novel concept.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, ANN WAGNER, for her tireless efforts. I thank our majority leader, STEVE SCALISE, for his efforts on this issue. And, of course, I thank Chairman JIM JORDAN of the Judiciary Committee for being such an advocate for the pro-life community.

Today, we are not talking about abortion. We are talking about children. We are talking about children who have been born and are fighting to survive despite an abortion attempt. In some cases when a woman receives a late-term abortion, the baby can be born alive following the procedure.

Federal law currently recognizes these babies as persons but fails to outline any requirements of care after the infant is born alive. H.R. 26 would rectify this by requiring healthcare practitioners to treat any child born alive after an abortion as they would any infant and requires that the infant be immediately treated with lifesaving care and transported to a hospital. I honestly do not understand what is so controversial about that.

Madam Speaker, this bill establishes criminal penalties for any healthcare practitioner or abortion clinic employee who fails to comply with the requirements established by this bill, because let's face it, no one can deny that

a child who survives an abortion attempt, who is outside the womb, breathing, and struggling for life, despite all attempts to end it, doesn't deserve equal protection under the law. Under our law, murder is illegal. That shouldn't be a controversial position.

Eight babies in Florida alone, just last year, eight babies were reported to have been born alive during an abortion attempt. The stories are horrific. One that sticks out in particular was an NBC report in 2006. They told the story of a 23-week-old baby boy that was born alive at an abortion clinic in Hialeah, Florida. When he began breathing and moving, the abortion clinic owner, Belkis Gonzalez, reportedly cut the umbilical cord and zipped him into a biohazard bag where he then died. It is hard to read those words.

But as has been stated here on this floor in this Chamber, this isn't about pro-life versus pro-choice. This is about protecting those most vulnerable. It is about who we are as a society, who we are as a people, and who we are as Americans.

I hope that both sides of this Chamber can agree that accountability is a good thing. Protecting these children is a good thing. It is time to put the party politics aside and the talking points aside and give these children, wanted or unwanted, a fighting chance, a chance that they all deserve.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is a crime now to kill a child born alive. In fact, in May of 2013, a Philadelphia man was convicted of first degree murder in the killing of three infants. He is now serving life without parole.

Either my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are unaware of this already existing crime with a penalty of life without parole, or this is another extreme political stunt.

Let me be clear: Abortion care is healthcare, and that has been true for a very long time. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not interested in medical truths. No. Instead, they are interested in scaring people, outlawing all abortions and criminalizing anyone they can.

Politicians have no business making unsound medical decisions. We are legislators, not doctors.

In the unfortunate case when a child is born with fatal disabilities, this legislation will deny parents a say in how their child spends the final minutes, hours, or days of his or her life, whether hooked up to a medical device or in the arms of their parents.

Expectant parents have enough worries. They should not have to worry about extreme politicians in their doctor's office or hospital thinking they somehow know better.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 26.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Madam Speaker, I was a corpsman, that is a combat medic, in the Navy SEAL teams for over 20 years, and I would like to give you a different perspective.

If I were to encounter an enemy combatant on the battlefield who was wounded, which I have, I was obligated by international law to render medical care to that enemy combatant to the best of my ability, up to and including to the detriment of my own troops, or I would be subject to prosecution.

I find it absurd, I find it unconscionable that this would be a matter of discussion in this body that we would not render medical aid to the most innocent amongst us, an unborn child that is born alive after the most traumatic circumstances possible.

Madam Speaker, I would implore my Democratic colleagues to remember that this is not about a woman's access to abortion. This is about the sanctity of life and the basic dignity of a human child.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this grotesque attempt to politicize abortion care and criminalize doctors.

Politicians should not be in the business of mandating that women carry dangerous or unwanted pregnancies to term. They should stay out of the doctor's office when Americans are exercising their fundamental right to decide when or if to have children.

But rightwing extremists have made it their first order of business in this new Congress to attack abortion rights and spread disinformation.

This bill is deliberately misleading. It is harmful to both people facing pregnancy complications and to the doctors who provide their care. If passed, it would cause more maternal deaths in this country, which are already a national shame.

Congress has a responsibility to legislate honestly, and this bill is not honest. The American people deserve better than having Congress waste time on political stunts, pretending to fix problems that do not exist.

Americans don't want MAGA extremists to criminalize women's healthcare, and they don't want politicians in their doctor's offices.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), my friend.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend, Chairman JORDAN, yielding to me. I thank my friend, Representative ANN WAGNER, for introducing this important bill again—no better person than a mama and a grandmama—and she does a good job at both of those.

Madam Speaker, babies deserve a chance to live. They deserve a chance at life no matter their age or their circumstance. The Constitution says that people have a right to life. The science says babies are people.

The Democrats have been pushing, trust the science. Follow the science. Trust the science. Follow the science, the last 2 years. Yet, we are denying the science, Madam Speaker.

When I was a little boy, I was asking my mama—we were talking about abortion and we were talking about babies being born that were maybe disabled or had some other anomaly, and I said: Mama, what would we do if one of those babies was born and I was the father of one of those little babies?

And she said: Honey, we would love that baby just a little more.

Madam Speaker, we need to love those babies just a little more and not murder them.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the latest attempt by House Republicans to control women's reproductive freedom, a ruse to ban safe and legal abortions in this country. This legislation purports to address something that does not happen.

The hypotheticals some of my colleagues described are not based in fact. Their arguments are untrue and do not represent how medicine actually works. Their suggestions are not only false, but they are callous.

The truth is abortions that occur after 3 months of pregnancy account for only 1 percent of all abortions, and they occur almost exclusively because a woman's life is at risk or her pregnancy is not viable. We should not be in the business of enacting laws that make these difficult and painful situations worse.

What is not hypothetical is the real pain and suffering that politicians across this country are imposing as they continue to chip away at what should be an essential right.

A woman must have the right to make health decisions that are in the best of interest of themselves, their family, and their circumstances.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this sham piece of legislation.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. It sounds really good to call him Mr. Chairman. He is going to do a great job for us and the American people, more importantly.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 26, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Since my first year in office, I have shown a strong commitment to promoting a culture of life. The bill before

us requires practitioners who are present for an attempted abortion, resulting in a live birth, to exercise the same degree of care that would be offered to any other child born of that gestational age. After those efforts, the healthcare workers must admit the child to a hospital.

This bill also gives mothers a civil cause of action and protection from any prosecution, recognizing that women are the second victims of abortion and attempted abortions.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation because, surely, we can all agree that a child born alive has a right to live.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would say: Here we go again. For those of us who have served in the United States Congress, this is: Here we go again.

This is legislation that is attempting to be wrapped in mercy that is without mercy. First of all, it is without fact. It is extremely important to know that if you were here in the United States Congress you know the history because we have already passed the bipartisan Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which reiterates the fact that it is illegal to interfere with a newborn. They are protected from both intentional harm by healthcare providers and harm from medical negligence—plain and simple, period at the end of the sentence.

Why are we here today?

We are here today for news clips. We are here today for quotes and condemnation of the other side of the aisle that wants to be reckless with the life of a child.

□ 1415

I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that those of us who have given birth and those of us who have lost in the birth process are extreme lovers of those wonderful opportunities of life.

I refuse and reject condemnation of my personal self because I believe these decisions are with a God—the woman's God and the families' God—her faith, doctors, and, of course, the persons who are a part of the medical profession.

I have article after article that talks about the tragedy of partial-birth abortion, which is the name used more than a decade ago. They always find creative names to be able to be criminalized.

We heard from a member of the Rules Committee who said: How dare you grab up a child, put them in an ambulance, and take them hundreds of miles away from their family?

Or maybe the family who found out that the multiple abnormalities of their child would not allow them to live, and they had waited 8 years for this wonderful baby. The decisions, unfortunately, of neither life nor death come easily for these children. There is a painful existence marked by periods of breathing cessation and seizures when they are born.

Because my OB was unable to get a good image of the brain until the 13th week, we understand that these are personal decisions. We understand that these are painful decisions.

So I stand with those families, I refuse to condemn those families, and I refuse to be merciless. I am giving mercy in voting against this legislation. I am voting against it now.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 26, the BornAlive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which would establish requirements for the degree of care a health care practitioner must provide in the case of a child born alive following an abortion or attempted abortion.

In the first week of the 118th Congress, extreme MAGA Republicans are launching attacks on reproductive freedom, intruding on medical decision-making, and keeping their promise to criminalize abortion nationwide with no exceptions.

H.R. 26 is a clear attack on health care providers and attempts to evoke power over the care that they provide to patients.

When the Senate attempted to pass this bill in 2019, 17 medical and public health organizations sent a letter in strong opposition to the bill stating that it represented ''a dangerous government intrusion into private health care decisions''.

This bill undermines medical professionals' training and critical judgment, minimizing their ability to determine the best medical treatment for their patients.

Medical professionals abide by a Code of Ethics during their career.

For lawmakers to undermine the work of medical professionals and attempt to prosecute them for doing what is right for their patients is inappropriate and misdirected.

This bill is a direct way to compromise the health and safety of patients.

A 2015 study published by the New England Journal of Medicine states that a baby's viability is the determining factor in the care that they receive.

The study states that ''active intervention for infants born before 22 weeks gestation is generally not recommended, whereas the approach for infants born at or after 22 weeks of gestation varies.''

Seeing that there are already standards in place to determine level of care, why should we as lawmakers intervene to override what medical professionals agree is the most appropriate medical treatment warranted by the circumstances.

To suggest that medical professionals would not provide equal and adequate medical attention to all patients is thoughtless, insulting, and uncivil.

For a party that advocated for minimal federal government interference and big government, Republicans are attempting to increase the federal government's jurisdiction over local governments.

Why should we as lawmakers seek to prosecute medical professionals that are simply doing their job?

This bill would force medical professionals to worry about criminal penalties and legislative interpretation when the appropriate medical care is already laid out.

This bill would remove a medical professional's ability to make the medically sound decision for their patient without government interference and the threat of repercussions.

This bill endangers infants because it puts Republican wishes ahead of appropriate medical care.

H.R. 26, Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, is dangerous to both medical professionals and patients. Medical professionals would be placed under unnecessary scrutiny, when legislation and protocols are already in place for this situation.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill that would establish requirements for the degree of care a health care practitioner must provide in the case of a child born alive following an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement written by Audrey Eisen titled: ''How The Abortion Ban Debate Became My Story.''

[From ACLU, Feb. 2, 2009]

HOW THE ABORTION BAN DEBATE BECAME MY STORY

(By Audrey Eisen)

I never thought that so-called ''partial-birth abortion'' would ever have anything to do with me. Why would it? I'm 34 years old and I desperately want children. My husband and I have been together for eight years, married for four, and trying to have a baby for two. Abortion was not something I thought much about.

But earlier this year, all that changed.

In November of 2002, after fighting infertility and experiencing the sadness of a miscarriage in July, we were thrilled to find ourselves pregnant again. While still apprehensive, we consciously decided to be excited—another loss would hurt just the same, regardless of whether or not we had allowed ourselves to be happy.

In the first few months, my endocrinologist performed regular ultrasounds to ensure that the embryo was developing normally. It was such a treat to be able to see our child growing. I kept the pictures and my thoughts in a pregnancy journal.

When it became evident that we were going to make it through the first trimester, my endocrinologist referred me to an obstetrician (OB). At my first appointment, the nurse put a fetal heart monitor on my belly and, much to our amazement, from a seemingly great distance, we heard the characteristic ''whoosh'' of our child's heartbeat. We were on top of the world thinking that, for sure, this one was going to make it.

At 13 weeks, however, all this changed abruptly when, during a routine ultrasound exam, my OB discovered our child had

polydactyly (more than the normal number of digits). While at first we thought it was just the hands, we later learned that the feet were affected as well. At the time, my husband and I thought it was no big deal—we had both known people with an extra finger, and we were prepared to help our child live with the condition. However, we soon found out that an extra toe or finger were the least of our concerns: polydactyly is associated with over 100 syndromes, most commonly Trisomy 13.

Trisomy 13 is characterized by multiple abnormalities, many of which are not compatible with life beyond a couple of months. Most fetuses with Trisomy 13 die in utero; of those who make it to birth, almost half do not survive past the first month; roughly three-quarters die within 6 months. Long-term survival is one year. Unfortunately, neither life nor death come easily for these children—theirs is a painful existence marked by periods of breathing cessation and seizures. Because my OB was unable to get a good image of the brain during the 13th week ultrasound, we returned at 15 weeks.

The first thing my OB examined during this visit was the fetal brain. He didn't say a word. I could tell he was holding something back and asked that he tell me what he saw. He said, ''It is not normal.'' The rest of the scan was a blur as tears ran down my cheeks and those of my mother and husband, who had accompanied me to the doctor's office that day. Following the scan, the doctor left us alone to compose ourselves. I cried with my whole body, from the depths of my soul.

Shortly thereafter, I had other tests. These confirmed that our baby had Trisomy 13.

At this point we discussed our options with a genetic counselor. My husband and I both felt strongly that we did not want our child to suffer; we decided to terminate the pregnancy as soon as possible. I had an abortion on the first day of my 16th week of pregnancy.

Soon after I had the procedure, I began to see news stories about a new federal ''partial birth abortion'' ban. Like many Americans, following the press on this issue over the past several years, I had thought, ''My God, this must be something horrible.'' But as I mourned the loss of my much-desired pregnancy, I came to realize that if such legislation passed, the right to safe second-trimester abortions like the one I had might not remain available to those women who come after me. While proponents of this ban claim that it is aimed at one procedure performed late in pregnancy, the reality is that it would prohibit the safest and most common procedures used in the second trimester, well before fetal viability. Without access to this care, I don't know how women will endure if after routine prenatal testing they discover, as we did, that their fetuses suffer from grave conditions incompatible with life; I don't know how I would have endured.

Two weeks following my abortion, we received a letter from the genetic counselor. Our child had numerous abnormalities: the brain, heart, and other internal organs were not developing properly. Our child was also a girl and we miss her very much. In our case, abortion was the only humane choice. This choice must be preserved for the sake of all women and their families. The American public needs to understand the consequences of this ban and that the human face of so-called ''partial-birth abortion,'' my face, could be their own.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 26. I thank my colleague, the chair of the Judiciary Committee from Ohio, for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, as a mother, a doctor, a former nurse, and a former director of Iowa's Department of Public Health, I know firsthand the preciousness of life and the importance of prenatal care and the tragedies that ensue when proper care isn't provided. In fact, the first healthy baby I delivered as a doctor was to a young teenager who put the baby up for adoption.

Our Nation promises three things: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There is no clause in the Constitution to exempt newborns who survive an abortion procedure from these rights. It is not only unreasonable, but it is inhuman to deny care to babies who were born alive.

Regardless of maternal intent, what could be more extreme than denying care to an infant born alive?

My colleague on the other side of the aisle from New York is correct. It is infanticide.

H.R. 26 is legislation that should receive wide support from both sides of the aisle. It is unconscionable to think that some Members will choose to vote against this bill which will ensure infants receive lifesaving care simply because of partisan politics. This legislation isn't about abortions but saving the lives of living and breathing innocent newborns.

Many States, including Iowa, have put safe haven laws in place to allow parents to leave their infants at hospitals or care facilities without fear of being prosecuted. We already have laws in place to protect these infants.

Why should infants who survive an abortion be treated any differently?

Like all other medical professionals, I took the Hippocratic oath which promises that I will do no harm. This legislation reaffirms the Hippocratic oath and ensures that doctors across the United States are providing the same standard of medical care to all infants regardless of the circumstance of their birth.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand in support of life by voting for H.R. 26.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. My, my, my. Here we go again. Republicans are racing full steam ahead to criminalize abortion nationwide.

Madam Speaker, the American people want women—not politicians—to make their own healthcare decisions, including those about abortion.

So as to this misleading and offensively named bill, let's vote it down. Let's say no to putting women's lives in danger, no to denying patients needing lifesaving care, and no to putting healthcare providers in prison for doing their job.

Madam Speaker, because I love my grandchildren, I reject the extreme Republican agenda, and I am standing here today with the Democrats for people to have the freedom to make their own personal decisions about their health, their life, and their future.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. Madam Speaker, I especially thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, ANN WAGNER, for leading this effort for so many years.

I am so proud to rise in support of this bill that is about human dignity; and, frankly, it is about common sense. The idea, Madam Speaker, that if a baby is born alive outside the womb that that baby in America could be killed and it be called abortion and not murder defies logic. It defies humanity.

Over the years KAT CAMMACK has had a discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor. So many others all across the country have asked Congress to address this issue, and the first thing that people express is shock.

They say: Wait a minute. If a baby is born outside the womb alive, how could you then kill that baby and that be legal? How is that not already murder?

I questioned how it wasn't myself, and yet in a number of States it is legal, and it is happening today.

This is America. Madam Speaker, you see this in countries like China and North Korea. There aren't many countries in the world that allow this practice. The United States should not be one of those countries.

This is inhumane. This transcends the abortion debate. Before the Dobbs decision, this bill still would have been constitutional to pass because we are not talking about 20 weeks, we are talking about the baby born alive outside the womb.

Yet, in America there are some States that allow that baby to be killed and called abortion.

You can call it whatever you want, Madam Speaker. It should be murder. It shouldn't be allowed, and this bill takes care of that. Everybody should vote for this bill.

When you talk to people who identify as pro-choice, so many of them are shocked that this is a legal process. Some, obviously, still want it to continue, but we shouldn't. We should be better than that as a country.

There is an amazing group called the Abortion Survivors Network. ANN WAGNER and I and so many of us have surely met with some of these incredible people.

If you want to talk about a walking miracle, Madam Speaker, these are people alive today in their twenties, thirties, and forties living incredible lives who were the result of an abortion that wasn't successful. They lived through it. Think of the special plan God has for them that they survived an abortion, and they are alive today. They are incredible people. Everybody in this country should reach out and go meet them. It is a group, and you can look them up.

Their stories are incredible.

Why should they be denied life?

We are a country of laws. We are a country of great rights. Of our inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—the first among those is life. Very few countries in the world allow this to happen to someone if they are born alive.

So while they are shocked when people find out that it is legal, we are the United States Congress, we can actually do something about it.

Thank God we have people who are willing to stand up for those babies. I am not even talking about inside the womb. They are outside the womb born alive. If someone takes their life after they are born alive outside the womb, that should be murder.

We should be protecting those young babies. That is what this bill does. It is a bill we should all be proud to support. It is a list that the United States should want to take itself off of. We shouldn't want to be associated with the very few countries that allow this barbaric process to happen.

Let's pass this bill. Let's become an even more perfect Union.

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

Madam Speaker, Mr. SCALISE and every other Republican who has spoken on this bill is simply wrong on the facts. It is illegal and always has been illegal in every State and then Federal law to kill an infant born alive. It is illegal and always has been illegal not to provide that infant with appropriate medical care.

Just to make sure that no one had any doubts of that, we passed the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act with bipartisan support in 2002.

The problem with this bill is not that it provides any new protections for infants. The problem with this bill is that it endangers some infants by stating that that infant must immediately be brought to the hospital where, depending on the circumstances, that may be the right thing to do for the health and survival of that infant or it may not.

That is the problem with this bill.

It directs and mandates a certain medical care which may not be appropriate, and which may even endanger the life of an infant in certain circumstances. That is why we oppose this bill. It is not because we don't think that babies born alive must be saved, but because we do think that babies born alive must be saved.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, this bill is extremist, dangerous, and unnecessary.

It is extremist because it would criminalize doctors with up to 5 years in prison and put them in fear of providing lifesaving, medically necessary procedures to those who are pregnant.

It is dangerous because the bill has no exceptions to protect the health of the patient and no exceptions in cases where there is a serious fetal anomaly.

It is unnecessary because, as Mr. NADLER said, it is already a crime to kill a baby born alive.

Many of my Republican colleagues talk about keeping Big Government out of people's lives. But when it comes to the hardest and most intimate decision—decisions that should be made between patients and their healthcare providers—these same colleagues think the government knows better.

Republicans in Congress and conservative extremists on the Supreme Court are waging a war on reproductive healthcare, a war on bodily autonomy, and a war on the medical community and the doctor-patient relationship.

I will continue to stand up against these assaults on reproductive freedom and against extremist, dangerous, unnecessary, and misguided policies like this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 26 and to its very name because it is not about what House Republicans claim it is about, because what they claim it is about isn't a thing.

What this bill is about is an assault on the health, rights, equality, and dignity of American women and the people who provide their reproductive healthcare.

It is an assault we have seen in my home State of Texas where women having miscarriages are being turned away from the hospitals and told to come back when they are closer to dying, where doctors fear, and are told, that they cannot meet the standard of care for their patients.

Providers and patients are afraid of misleading bills like this one criminalizing healthcare.

But, of course, that is the point, isn't it?

I stand here today, and I will stand here every day, to oppose this bill and others like it, to talk about the real healthcare crisis facing women today, and to urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU.)

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, H.R. 26 would rob families of the ability to make difficult and complicated medical decisions in some of the most heartbreaking circumstances imaginable. It is a mean-spirited solution in search of a problem.

If the majority is interested in caring for newborns, I invite them to support Democrats' efforts to provide paid family leave to every new parent. Republicans are welcome to join our efforts to expand the child tax credit to families struggling with paying the bills. And we would be thrilled to have bipartisan support in this Chamber to make childcare affordable everywhere.

Alternatively, House Republicans have brought up a bill designed to intimidate doctors and perpetuate disinformation about how abortion care actually works.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and instead vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit which would bring up my bill, the Women's Health Protection Act, legislation that would create a Federal right to abortion care free from medically unnecessary restrictions in all 50 States.

□ 1430

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding.

As I have said before and will continue to say, I am pro-life, pro-family, and pro-child. I am very proud to see that one of the very first pieces of legislation that comes before this Congress and the new majority is protecting the vulnerable. That is something I have always stood up for since my first time here in Congress.

It seems like there is some confusion, especially on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, about what this legislation is about. This legislation is very simple. It simply states and ensures that babies who survive an abortion receive care and protection and that they are not discarded because someone else had intended to end their lives. It prohibits healthcare practitioners from turning a blind eye to abortion survivors.

No matter the intent of what you believe about life, failure to care for an unborn child is infanticide, and the law must be enforced.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to remember that the last time we voted on this bill, there was bipartisan support, and I ask again for support of this commonsense, lifesaving legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, born alive has nothing to do with abortion. Providers are already required, by law, to provide appropriate medical care. Infanticide is murder.

What we heard earlier is just not true. It is a lie that should not be repeated.

As our chairman has said, not only is it illegal to not care for a born infant, but the law that you have provided on the Republican side actually can create more harm. It requires immediately taking a struggling baby to a hospital. That hospital could be hours away and

could be detrimental to the life of that baby.

This is nothing more than a part of the effort to make abortion illegal nationally in this country. I object, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUCHIN) for her first speech on the House floor.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

From New Albany to Salem to Madison, Hoosiers across southern Indiana feel as I do, that every life is precious and all lives deserve the dignity and respect of lifesaving care. That is why I am proud to stand alongside my colleagues in support of this pro-life bill.

This legislation would ensure that children who are born alive despite an attempted abortion are given the same medical care and help as any other newborn infant. We know the majority of Americans agree on this issue, that saving the lives of babies who survive a botched abortion is not just humane, but it is necessary and foundational to our constitutional right to life. It is why I am an original cosponsor on this important bill to support mothers and their children. I stand with Hoosiers on behalf of these vulnerable infants.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, Democrats support the radical position of abortion on demand up until birth, funded by the taxpayers, and they would even deny care to an innocent child that miraculously survives a botched abortion.

This is a commonsense support of life. Madam Speaker, I urge the rest of my colleagues to stand with us in defending life. On this issue, we should all agree.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN).

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about freedom, specifically, individual freedom, a core American value, a value that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have for years co-opted, weaponized, and distorted.

I simply do not understand how my Republican colleagues can demand the individual freedom to spread a deadly disease to other people by not getting vaccinated or wearing masks yet have the gall to deny the individual freedom to make decisions about one's own body that has no impact on anyone else.

How can it be that autonomy to wear a mask or not is of greater importance than the autonomy over whether to have a baby or not?

Let me say it plainly: We cannot talk about preserving our individual freedoms while simultaneously ripping away a fundamental freedom for women in this country. Control over one's reproductive health is a human right.

We are in the first week of Congress, and what are we focused on?

Is it to fight inflation? No.

To create jobs for Americans? No.

To protect children from gun violence? No.

It is to continue the assault on our autonomy, on women's autonomy.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) a longtime champion of the pro-life cause.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I thank ANN WAGNER for authoring this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, in a Florida abortion clinic, Sycloria Williams delivered a live baby girl at 23 weeks. The clinic owner took the baby, who was gasping for air, cut her umbilical cord, threw her into a biohazard bag, and put the bag in the trash.

Heartbroken, Ms. Williams later had a funeral for her baby girl, who she named Shanice. CNN has reported since that Ms. Williams suffers PTSD from that ordeal.

Madam Speaker, why are these live births from abortion little known? Dr. Willard Cates, former head of the Centers for Disease Control's abortion surveillance unit, said several years ago live births are little known because organized medicine, from fear of public clamor and legal action, treats them more as an embarrassment to be hushed up than a problem to be solved. ''It is like turning yourself in to the IRS for an audit,'' he went on. ''What is there to gain? The tendency is not to report because there are only negative incentives.''

Madam Speaker, Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell, one of the few who got caught—and it was under a State law, not Federal, and many States don't have such laws—was convicted of murder for killing children who were born alive after attempted abortions.

The grand jury report described it in this way: ''Gosnell had a simple solution for the unwanted babies he delivered: He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors into the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that 'snipping.'''

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act seeks to end or at least mitigate this egregious child abuse by requiring that a healthcare provider must exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life of that child as they would a child of similar age.

The bill empowers the woman upon whom the abortion is performed to obtain appropriate civil relief. I am sure had it been available then, Ms. Williams would have done that, as well.

Madam Speaker, this is humane, pro-child, human rights legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 26.

H.R. 26 is presented within the context of what happened last year when the Supreme Court stripped millions of women in our country of their status and free right for equal access to reproductive freedom.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to correct this wrong and bring back reproductive freedom for women. This bill is not about the safety of children. This is more of the same. This is about policing the bodies of women.

A bunch of middle-aged guys in Brooks Brothers' suits stand here today and try to tell women what to do with their bodies. That is what this is about. This is not about the safety of children. That is already illegal.

Madam Speaker, I stand here to oppose H.R. 26. There are 64 million women across America of reproductive age. Many of them live in States that are beating up on their rights to reproductive freedom.

Madam Speaker, I stand here in opposition to H.R. 26 and ask my colleagues also to vote against it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), my friend.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, once again, we have to say: How did we get to where we are today? How did we get to where we have to have a debate to defend life that survives the heinous practice of abortion?

In the infamous words of the Governor of my very State, the Commonwealth of Virginia, just a few years ago, if a baby survives an abortion attempt, the mother and the doctor would have a conversation while they kept the baby comfortable to decide what to do with it. He said that on air in a radio broadcast.

I realize that the other side may not recognize the science of conception. I realize that the other side may not share the premium or the value of innocent life in the womb that most Americans have. The party of death that believes in abortion up until the moment of birth at any time for any reason—today we find ourselves even having to defend and protect life, a baby that survives an abortion attempt.

If it were not so, if it were not true, then this bill should pass unanimously. I fear that will not be the case for this same party will not even vote later today against and condemn the violence at pregnancy centers across the country.

Madam Speaker, I encourage everyone to support this bill and protect all life.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 26.

We didn't hop in a time machine back to the 1970s. It is 2023, and we all know what this is about. It is not about the protection of newborn children. It is about control. It is about Republicans' continued desire to control

women, take away their freedoms, limit their bodily autonomy, plunge poor women deeper into poverty, and further marginalize those already not seen.

It is about intimidating, silencing, and criminalizing doctors. It is about the nationwide abortion ban that Republicans have been itching to enact since the overturning of Roe v. Wade, bans that the American people have said loudly and clearly that they do not want.

We cannot continue to let the extreme Republican Party attack and erode the rights of women across this country. We have a responsibility to put an end to politicians inserting themselves into the doctors' offices and uteruses of women across this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Once again, House Republicans are eager to stand for the most vulnerable among us, the unborn. We are the party of life, and we are proud of it.

There is no difference between an infant born alive after a failed abortion and an infant born into the arms of loving parents. Those two babies deserve to be treated with the same level of excellent medical care.

Yet, abortionists have demonstrated a lack of interest in preserving the lives of babies who enter the world alive and supposedly under their care.

We know what happens in these clinics. By way of just one example, lifenews.com reports that an abortion provider in Minnesota was recently asked by a woman 22 weeks pregnant and considering an abortion what that provider would do if her baby were taken out while his heart was still beating. The abortion provider responded: ''We don't tell women this . . . but if we was to proceed with the abortion and the baby was to come out still alive . . . most likely, we will break the baby's neck.''

That is chilling and barbaric, but our Democratic colleagues will not admit that. They will vote against it today. Watch the board. It will be shocking, and it will be true.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act would make it a Federal crime for abortionists to kill or fail to provide care to babies who survive abortions.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of our colleagues to support this critical legislation. As was said, it should pass unanimously, but it won't.

□ 1445

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of parental and maternal rights and in opposition to H.R. 26.

I am the first mother in history to represent west Michigan in Congress. This matter is deeply personal to me. I recently shared publicly about my own experience navigating a complex miscarriage and the loss of my daughter. As a pro-choice Christian who chose life, this issue is so personal to me. My faith informs my actions, but it doesn't dictate the policy of an entire nation.

Further, when I read the Scripture, I am guided by passages like Jeremiah 1:5, which states: I knew you before I formed you, and I placed you in your mother's womb. It doesn't say the government's womb or the Speaker's womb, it says the mother's womb.

I believe life is precious, but I reject the idea that if I embrace the sanctity of life, I also must be forced to invite the Federal Government in to regulate it. We must protect families from unnecessary government intrusion into the most sacred and personal decisions of our lives and our children's lives.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

All life is sacred. Defending innocent lives should not be a policy issue.

This legislation protects babies who are not only born but who are then left without care from an attempted abortion. A baby who survives an abortion should receive the same medical attention that any other premature baby would.

These precious souls are given another chance at life. It is unacceptable that there are no criminal charges for those who want to take their life away. The people who allow babies to be killed after birth must be fully prosecuted.

Let's be clear: Killing a baby who is born alive, regardless of an attempted abortion, is murder.

The previous Democrat-controlled House has refused to vote on this bill. Today, a Republican-led majority keeps our commitment to America by voting on legislation that upholds the sanctity of life.

I urge the passage of this bill on the House floor.

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

Mr. JORDAN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. Just a couple of minutes ago we heard a speaker on the other side of the aisle criticize Republicans saying we don't support wearing masks, and wearing masks affects others; however, having an abortion affects only a woman.

So what is an abortion? What is an abortion?

It is the intentional taking of the life of an unborn child.

How in the world can you say that an abortion does not affect anyone except the woman?

That is the core of the difference between those of us who support unborn children and born children.

Those who support abortions ignore the fact that another life is involved. That is the core of the issue. There are two lives involved here, the mother and the unborn baby. We must recognize that.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 26 and urge my colleagues to instead support my motion to recommit to take up and pass Representative JUDY CHU's Women's Health Protection Act that will restore the protections that we had under Roe v. Wade.

If there is one thing this last election showed us it is that the American people believe strongly that every woman in this country should have the ability to make her own healthcare decisions, including abortion.

Sadly, however, if there is one thing this past week has shown us, it is that the House Republicans just don't care at all about that.

They don't care that 61 percent of the American people strongly support a woman's access to abortion care.

They don't care that just 2 months ago a record number of Americans showed up at polling locations across the country to overwhelmingly reject the GOP's plan to criminalize abortion care.

They don't care that in every State where abortion restrictions were on the ballot they were rejected overwhelmingly—in places like Kansas.

They don't care that Americans think that people, not politicians, should be making these decisions.

Apparently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think they know how abortion decisions should be made, not a woman and her doctor.

So instead of taking heed of the will of the American people, my Republican colleagues are intending to do just the opposite.

The legislation before us today is part of a concerted effort to fast-track this extreme agenda of anti-choice legislation. It creates new criminal penalties for healthcare providers that fail to provide specific standards of care—that the politicians on the other side of the aisle will enact—after an attempted abortion.

It doesn't really protect newborn children in any way. Why?

Because if a child is born it is already illegal to kill it—as it should be. Unlike what the majority leader said, it is already illegal in every single State in this country. It is illegal to kill people in this country.

Just in case anybody was confused about this, as Chairman NADLER said, in 2002 Congress passed the Born-Alive

Infants Protection Act, and all of us, including me, the co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus voted for it because clearly if the baby is born, we shouldn't kill it. Duh.

So what does this bill do? What it does, as I said, it creates criminal penalties for healthcare providers that don't do what the Republicans think they should do, and it creates new, complicated standards that will make it harder for healthcare professionals to do their jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HOUCHIN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DEGETTE. What it does is it hopes to deter doctors from providing abortion care in the first place, which is exactly what we saw after the Dobbs decision. This is not what the American people signed up for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to reject these extreme measures and instead support my motion to recommit to take up and pass the Women's Health Protection Act to ensure that everybody in this country, no matter where they live, has the access to the reproductive care they need.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

I am a little bit confused, though, because it wasn't before 2002 when our previous Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Governor Ralph Northam, said on a radio show that if a baby was born alive that the baby would be made comfortable, that then a conversation would ensue between the doctor and the mother about whether or not and how to treat that baby; essentially saying, if you want to go ahead and kill your baby after it is born, go right ahead.

That type of attitude persists, continues. If there are laws that exist to prevent it—the Governor was not aware of them, I am not aware of them—that would apply in that situation.

That is why this legislation is so important, because contrary to House Democrats and the Biden administration, the American people overwhelmingly believe that babies who are born alive should be protected, that a baby born alive, even after an attempted abortion, should be afforded the same constitutional protections as every other American.

I am proud to support the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which would require appropriate medical care for children who survive abortion procedures. It imposes strong criminal penalties for the failure to provide such care.

If a doctor like our former Governor, Dr. Northam, was engaging in the activities that he spoke about on that radio show, he would be subject to those same criminal penalties.

Protecting living and breathing babies outside the womb should not be a partisan issue, it should be one around which we all should unite.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

I will end this debate by reiterating the point I made at the beginning: This legislation would do nothing to enhance protections or the quality of healthcare if an infant is born after an attempted abortion.

It has always been against the law to intentionally kill or harm a newborn infant, whatever the circumstances of its birth. It has always been against the law not to afford such an infant appropriate medical care. The bill does nothing new to protect infants.

The bill, however, is not harmless. Rather, if enacted, it could place the lives and health of newborn infants at risk. The bill directly interferes with a doctor's medical judgment and dictates a medical standard of care, namely, immediate transport to a hospital, that may not be appropriate in the particular circumstances.

That is why a broad coalition of healthcare provider groups, joined by a wide range of additional health, civil rights, and women's rights groups, strongly opposes this bill.

We should listen to these healthcare professionals. We should support keeping babies alive, which is what the Republicans say they want to do, but yet, they have this legislation that would endanger babies' lives by dictating a standard of care that may not be appropriate in certain situations. We should listen to these healthcare professionals.

This legislation is just another step in the Republicans' plan to criminalize abortion nationwide. The House must reject this seriously flawed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I will say that the document that launched this experiment in freedom we call America, the Declaration of Independence, talks about all are created equal, endowed by our creator with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I think it is interesting the order in which the Founders placed the rights they chose to mention: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

You can't pursue happiness; you can't chase down your goals and dreams if you first don't have freedom. You don't have freedom and true liberty unless government protects your most fundamental right: your right to live, your right to breathe, your right to life.

That is what this legislation is about, protecting the most innocent, the most vulnerable's right to life.

I urge a ''yes'' vote and hope this thing passes unanimously. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DeGette of Colorado moves to recommit the bill H.R. 26 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Ms. DeGette moves to recommit H.R. 26 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all that follows after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Women's Health Protection Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On June 24, 2022, in its decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, the Supreme Court overruled Roe v. Wade, reversing decades of precedent recognizing the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy before fetal viability, and to terminate a pregnancy after fetal viability where it is necessary, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care professional, for the preservation of the life or health of the person who is pregnant.

(2) In their joint dissent, Justices Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan write, ''[The majority] says that from the very moment of fertilization, a woman has no rights to speak of. A State can force her to bring a pregnancy to term, even at the steepest personal and familial costs.''.

(3) The dissenting Justices continue, ''The Mississippi law at issue here bars abortions after the 15th week of pregnancy. Under the majority's ruling, though, another State's law could do so after ten weeks, or five or three or one—or, again, from the moment of fertilization. States have already passed such laws, in anticipation of today's ruling. More will follow.''.

(4) The dissenting Justices also stated, ''one result of [the] decision is certain; the curtailment of women's rights, and of their status as free and equal citizens.''.

(5) Indeed, some States acted to ban abortion outright in the immediate aftermath of the Dobbs decision, with half the States in the country expected to ban abortion entirely in the days and weeks to come.

(6) Even before Roe was overturned, access to abortion services had been obstructed

across the United States in various ways, including blockades of health care facilities and associated violence, prohibitions of, and restrictions on, insurance coverage; parental involvement laws (notification and consent); restrictions that shame and stigmatize people seeking abortion services; and medically unnecessary regulations that neither confer any health benefit nor further the safety of abortion services, but which harm people by delaying, complicating access to, and reducing the availability of, abortion services.

(7) Abortion services are essential to health care, and access to those services is central to people's ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States. Abortion access allows people who are pregnant to make their own decisions about their pregnancies, their families, and their lives.

(8) Reproductive justice requires every individual to have the right to make their own decisions about having children regardless of their circumstances and without interference and discrimination. Reproductive Justice is a human right that can and will be achieved when all people, regardless of actual or perceived race, color, national origin, immigration status, sex (including gender identity, sex stereotyping, or sexual orientation), age, or disability status have the economic, social, and political power and resources to define and make decisions about their bodies, health, sexuality, families, and communities in all areas of their lives, with dignity and self-determination.

(9) Reproductive justice seeks to address restrictions on reproductive health, including abortion, that perpetuate systems of oppression, lack of bodily autonomy, white supremacy, and anti-Black racism. This violent legacy has manifested in policies including enslavement, rape, and experimentation on Black women; forced sterilizations; medical experimentation on low-income women's reproductive systems; and the forcible removal of Indigenous children. Access to equitable reproductive health care, including abortion services, has always been deficient in the United States for Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) and their families.

(10) The legacy of restrictions on reproductive health, rights, and justice is not a dated vestige of a dark history. Presently, the harms of abortion-specific restrictions fall especially heavily on people with low incomes, BIPOC, immigrants, young people, people with disabilities, and those living in rural and other medically underserved areas. Abortion-specific restrictions are even more compounded by the ongoing criminalization of people who are pregnant, including those who are incarcerated, living with HIV, or with substance-use disorders. These communities already experience health disparities due to social, political, and environmental inequities, and restrictions on abortion services exacerbate these harms. Removing medically unjustified restrictions on abortion services would constitute one important step on the path toward realizing Reproductive Justice by ensuring that the full range of reproductive health care is accessible to all who need it.

(11) Abortion-specific restrictions are a tool of gender oppression, as they target health care services that are used primarily by women. These paternalistic restrictions rely on and reinforce harmful stereotypes about gender roles, women's decision-making, and women's need for protection instead of support, undermining their ability to control their own lives and well-being. These restrictions harm the basic autonomy, dignity, and equality of women, and their ability to participate in the social and economic life of the Nation.

(12) The terms ''woman'' and ''women'' are used in this bill to reflect the identity of the majority of people targeted and affected by restrictions on abortion services, and to address squarely the targeted restrictions on abortion, which are rooted in misogyny. However, access to abortion services is critical to the health of every person capable of becoming pregnant. This Act is intended to protect all people with the capacity for pregnancy—cisgender women, transgender men, non-binary individuals, those who identify with a different gender, and others—who are unjustly harmed by restrictions on abortion services.

(13) Since 2011, States and local governments have passed nearly 500 restrictions singling out health care providers who offer abortion services, interfering with their ability to provide those services and the patients' ability to obtain those services.

(14) Many State and local governments have imposed restrictions on the provision of abortion services that are neither evidence-based nor generally applicable to the medical profession or to other medically comparable outpatient gynecological procedures, such as endometrial ablations, dilation and curettage for reasons other than abortion, hysteroscopies, loop electrosurgical excision procedures, or other analogous non-gynecological procedures performed in similar outpatient settings including vasectomy, sigmoidoscopy, and colonoscopy.

(15) Abortion is essential health care and one of the safest medical procedures in the United States. An independent, comprehensive review of the state of science on the safety and quality of abortion services, published by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in 2018, found that abortion in the United States is safe and effective and that the biggest threats to the quality of abortion services in the United States are State regulations that create barriers to care. These abortion-specific restrictions conflict with medical standards and are not supported by the recommendations and guidelines issued by leading reproductive health care professional organizations including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the Society of Family Planning, the National Abortion Federation, the World Health Organization, and others.

(16) Many abortion-specific restrictions do not confer any health or safety benefits on the patient. Instead, these restrictions have the purpose and effect of unduly burdening people's personal and private medical decisions to end their pregnancies by making access to abortion services more difficult, invasive, and costly, often forcing people to travel significant distances and make multiple unnecessary visits to the provider, and in some cases, foreclosing the option altogether. For example, a 2018 report from the University of California San Francisco's Advancing New Standards in Reproductive Health research group found that in 27 cities across the United States, people have to travel more than 100 miles in any direction to reach an abortion provider.

(17) An overwhelming majority of abortions in the United States are provided in clinics, not hospitals, but the large majority of counties throughout the United States have no clinics that provide abortion.

(18) These restrictions additionally harm people's health by reducing access not only to abortion services but also to other essential health care services offered by many of the providers targeted by the restrictions, including—

(A) screenings and preventive services, including contraceptive services;

(B) testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections;

(C) LGBTQ health services; and

(D) referrals for primary care, intimate partner violence prevention, prenatal care and adoption services.

(19) The cumulative effect of these numerous restrictions has been to severely limit, and now eliminate entirely, the availability of abortion services in some areas, creating a patchwork system where the provision of abortion services is legal in some States and illegal in others. A 2019 report from the Government Accountability Office examining State Medicaid compliance with abortion coverage requirements analyzed seven key challenges (identified both by health care providers and research literature) and their effect on abortion access, and found that access to abortion services varied across the States and even within a State.

(20) International human rights law recognizes that access to abortion is intrinsically linked to the rights to life, health, equality and non-discrimination, privacy, and freedom from ill-treatment. United Nations (UN) human rights treaty monitoring bodies have found that legal abortion services, like other reproductive health care services, must be available, accessible, affordable, acceptable, and of good quality. UN human rights treaty bodies have likewise condemned medically unnecessary barriers to abortion services, including mandatory waiting periods, biased counseling requirements, and third-party authorization requirements.

(21) Core human rights treaties ratified by the United States protect access to abortion. For example, in 2018, the UN Human Rights Committee, which oversees implementation of the ICCPR, made clear that the right to life, enshrined in Article 6 of the ICCPR, at a minimum requires governments to provide safe, legal, and effective access to abortion where a person's life and health is at risk, or when carrying a pregnancy to term would cause substantial pain or suffering. The Committee stated that governments must not impose restrictions on abortion which subject women and girls to physical or mental pain or suffering, discriminate against them, arbitrarily interfere with their privacy, or place them at risk of undertaking unsafe abortions. Furthermore, the Committee stated that governments should remove existing barriers that deny effective access to safe and legal abortion, refrain from introducing new barriers to abortion, and prevent the stigmatization of those seeking abortion.

(22) UN independent human rights experts have expressed particular concern about barriers to abortion services in the United States. For example, at the conclusion of his 2017 visit to the United States, the UN Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights noted concern that low-income women face legal and practical obstacles to exercising their constitutional right to access abortion services, trapping many women in cycles of poverty. Similarly, in May 2020, the UN Working Group on discrimination against women and girls, along with other human rights experts, expressed concern that some states had manipulated the COVID–19 crisis to restrict access to abortion, which the experts recognized as ''the latest example illustrating a pattern of restrictions and retrogressions in access to legal abortion care across the country'' and reminded U.S. authorities that abortion care constitutes essential health care that must remain available during and after the pandemic. They noted that barriers to abortion access exacerbate systemic inequalities and cause particular harm to marginalized communities, including low-income people, people of color, immigrants, people with disabilities, and LGBTQ people.

(23) Abortion-specific restrictions affect the cost and availability of abortion services, and the settings in which abortion services are delivered. People travel across State lines and otherwise engage in interstate commerce to access this essential medical care, and more would be forced to do so absent this Act. Likewise, health care providers travel across State lines and otherwise engage in interstate commerce in order to provide abortion services to patients, and more would be forced to do so absent this Act.

(24) Health care providers engage in a form of economic and commercial activity when they provide abortion services, and there is an interstate market for abortion services.

(25) Abortion restrictions substantially affect interstate commerce in numerous ways. For example, to provide abortion services, health care providers engage in interstate commerce to purchase medicine, medical equipment, and other necessary goods and services. To provide and assist others in providing abortion services, health care providers engage in interstate commerce to obtain and provide training. To provide abortion services, health care providers employ and obtain commercial services from doctors, nurses, and other personnel who engage in interstate commerce and travel across State lines.

(26) It is difficult and time and resource-consuming for clinics to challenge State laws that burden or impede abortion services. Litigation that blocks one abortion restriction may not prevent a State from adopting other similarly burdensome abortion restrictions or using different methods to burden or impede abortion services. There is a history and pattern of States passing successive and different laws that unduly burden abortion services.

(27) When a health care provider ceases providing abortion services as a result of burdensome and medically unnecessary regulations, it is often difficult or impossible for that health care provider to recommence providing those abortion services, and difficult or impossible for other health care providers to provide abortion services that restore or replace the ceased abortion services.

(28) Health care providers are subject to license laws in various jurisdictions, which are not affected by this Act except as provided in this Act.

(29) Congress has the authority to enact this Act to protect abortion services pursuant to—

(A) its powers under the commerce clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States;

(B) its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment; and

(C) its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(30) Congress has used its authority in the past to protect access to abortion services and health care providers' ability to provide abortion services. In the early 1990s, protests and blockades at health care facilities where abortion services were provided, and associated violence, increased dramatically and reached crisis level, requiring Congressional action. Congress passed the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act (Public Law 103–259; 108 Stat. 694) to address that situation and protect physical access to abortion services.

(31) Congressional action is necessary to put an end to harmful restrictions, to federally protect access to abortion services for everyone regardless of where they live, and to protect the ability of health care providers to provide these services in a safe and accessible manner.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to permit health care providers to provide abortion services without limitations or requirements that single out the provision of abortion services for restrictions that are more burdensome than those restrictions imposed on medically comparable procedures, do not significantly advance reproductive health or the safety of abortion services, and make abortion services more difficult to access;

(2) to promote access to abortion services and women's ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States; and

(3) to invoke Congressional authority, including the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABORTION SERVICES.—The term ''abortion services'' means an abortion and any medical or non-medical services related to and provided in conjunction with an abortion (whether or not provided at the same time or on the same day as the abortion).

(2) GOVERNMENT.—The term ''government'' includes each branch, department, agency, instrumentality, and official of the United States or a State.

(3) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse practitioner, and physician assistant) that—

(A) is engaged or seeks to engage in the delivery of health care services, including abortion services; and

(B) if required by law or regulation to be licensed or certified to engage in the delivery of such services—

(i) is so licensed or certified; or

(ii) would be so licensed or certified but for their past, present, or potential provision of abortion services permitted by section 4.

(4) MEDICALLY COMPARABLE PROCEDURE.—The term ''medically comparable procedures'' means medical procedures that are similar in terms of health and safety risks to the patient, complexity, or the clinical setting that is indicated.

(5) PREGNANCY.—The term ''pregnancy'' refers to the period of the human reproductive process beginning with the implantation of a fertilized egg.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each territory and possession of the United States, and any subdivision of any of the foregoing, including any unit of local government, such as a county, city, town, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

(7) VIABILITY.—The term ''viability'' means the point in a pregnancy at which, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, based on the particular facts of the case before the health care provider, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustained fetal survival outside the uterus with or without artificial support.

SEC. 4. PERMITTED SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—A health care provider has a statutory right under this Act to provide abortion services, and may provide abortion services, and that provider's patient has a corresponding right to receive such services, without any of the following limitations or requirements:

(1) A requirement that a health care provider perform specific tests or medical procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services, unless generally required for the provision of medically comparable procedures.

(2) A requirement that the same health care provider who provides abortion services also perform specified tests, services, or procedures prior to or subsequent to the abortion.

(3) A requirement that a health care provider offer or provide the patient seeking abortion services medically inaccurate information in advance of or during abortion services.

(4) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to prescribe or dispense drugs based on current evidence-based regimens or the provider's good-faith medical judgment, other than a limitation generally applicable to the medical profession.

(5) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services via telemedicine, other than a limitation generally applicable to the provision of medical services via telemedicine.

(6) A requirement or limitation concerning the physical plant, equipment, staffing, or hospital transfer arrangements of facilities where abortion services are provided, or the credentials or hospital privileges or status of personnel at such facilities, that is not imposed on facilities or the personnel of facilities where medically comparable procedures are performed.

(7) A requirement that, prior to obtaining an abortion, a patient make one or more medically unnecessary in-person visits to the provider of abortion services or to any individual or entity that does not provide abortion services.

(8) A prohibition on abortion at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability, including a prohibition or restriction on a particular abortion procedure.

(9) A prohibition on abortion after fetal viability when, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, continuation of the pregnancy would pose a risk to the pregnant patient's life or health.

(10) A limitation on a health care provider's ability to provide immediate abortion services when that health care provider believes, based on the good-faith medical judgment of the provider, that delay would pose a risk to the patient's health.

(11) A requirement that a patient seeking abortion services at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability disclose the patient's reason or reasons for seeking abortion services, or a limitation on the provision or obtaining of abortion services at any point or points in time prior to fetal viability based on any actual, perceived, or potential reason or reasons of the patient for obtaining abortion services, regardless of whether the limitation is based on a health care provider's degree of actual or constructive knowledge of such reason or reasons.

(b) OTHER LIMITATIONS OR REQUIREMENTS.—The statutory right specified in subsection (a) shall not be limited or otherwise infringed through, in addition to the limitations and requirements specified in paragraphs (1) through (11) of subsection (a), any limitation or requirement that—

(1) is the same as or similar to one or more of the limitations or requirements described in subsection (a); or

(2) both—

(A) expressly, effectively, implicitly, or as implemented singles out the provision of abortion services, health care providers who

provide abortion services, or facilities in which abortion services are provided; and

(B) impedes access to abortion services.

(c) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—Factors a court may consider in determining whether a limitation or requirement impedes access to abortion services for purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B) include the following:

(1) Whether the limitation or requirement, in a provider's good-faith medical judgment, interferes with a health care provider's ability to provide care and render services, or poses a risk to the patient's health or safety.

(2) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to delay or deter some patients in accessing abortion services.

(3) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to directly or indirectly increase the cost of providing abortion services or the cost for obtaining abortion services (including costs associated with travel, childcare, or time off work).

(4) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to have the effect of necessitating a trip to the offices of a health care provider that would not otherwise be required.

(5) Whether the limitation or requirement is reasonably likely to result in a decrease in the availability of abortion services in a given State or geographic region.

(6) Whether the limitation or requirement imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct or failure to act, or that are more severe than penalties imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct or failure to act.

(7) The cumulative impact of the limitation or requirement combined with other new or existing limitations or requirements.

(d) EXCEPTION.—To defend against a claim that a limitation or requirement violates a health care provider's or patient's statutory rights under subsection (b), a party must establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that—

(1) the limitation or requirement significantly advances the safety of abortion services or the health of patients; and

(2) the safety of abortion services or the health of patients cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure or action.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY AND PREEMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Except as stated under subsection (b), this Act supersedes and applies to the law of the Federal Government and each State government, and the implementation of such law, whether statutory, common law, or otherwise, and whether adopted before or after the date of enactment of this Act, and neither the Federal Government nor any State government shall administer, implement, or enforce any law, rule, regulation, standard, or other provision having the force and effect of law that conflicts with any provision of this Act, notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, including the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.).

(2) Federal statutory law adopted after the date of the enactment of this Act is subject to this Act unless such law explicitly excludes such application by reference to this Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The provisions of this Act shall not supersede or apply to—

(1) laws regulating physical access to clinic entrances;

(2) insurance or medical assistance coverage of abortion services;

(3) the procedure described in section 1531(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code; or

(4) generally applicable State contract law.

(c) DEFENSE.—In any cause of action against an individual or entity who is subject to a limitation or requirement that violates this Act, in addition to the remedies specified in section 8, this Act shall also apply to, and may be raised as a defense by, such an individual or entity.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect immediately upon the date of enactment of this Act. This Act shall apply to all restrictions on the provision of, or access to, abortion services whether the restrictions are enacted or imposed prior to or after the date of enactment of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 7. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In interpreting the provisions of this Act, a court shall liberally construe such provisions to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any government to interfere with, diminish, or negatively affect a person's ability to obtain or provide abortion services.

(c) OTHER INDIVIDUALS CONSIDERED AS GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—Any person who, by operation of a provision of Federal or State law, is permitted to implement or enforce a limitation or requirement that violates section 4 of this Act shall be considered a government official for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General may commence a civil action on behalf of the United States against any State that violates, or against any government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) that implements or enforces a limitation or requirement that violates, section 4. The court shall hold unlawful and set aside the limitation or requirement if it is in violation of this Act.

(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual or entity, including any health care provider or patient, adversely affected by an alleged violation of this Act, may commence a civil action against any State that violates, or against any government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) that implements or enforces a limitation or requirement that violates, section 4. The court shall hold unlawful and set aside the limitation or requirement if it is in violation of this Act.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—A health care provider may commence an action for relief on its own behalf, on behalf of the provider's staff, and on behalf of the provider's patients who are or may be adversely affected by an alleged violation of this Act.

(c) EQUITABLE RELIEF.—In any action under this section, the court may award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief.

(d) COSTS.—In any action under this section, the court shall award costs of litigation, as well as reasonable attorney's fees, to any prevailing plaintiff. A plaintiff shall not be liable to a defendant for costs or attorney's fees in any non-frivolous action under this section.

(e) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings under this Act and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided for by law.

(f) ABROGATION OF STATE IMMUNITY.—Neither a State that enforces or maintains, nor a government official (including a person described in section 7(c)) who is permitted to implement or enforce any limitation or requirement that violates section 4 shall be immune under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or any other source of law, from an action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction challenging that limitation or requirement.

SEC. 9. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person, entity, government, or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to all other persons, entities, governments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 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 3 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. FISCHBACH) at 4 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:

Adoption of the motion to recommit on H.R. 26;

Passage of H.R. 26, if ordered; and

Agreeing to H. Con. Res. 3.

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 votes.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 26) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 219, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—212

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

NAYS—219

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

NOT VOTING—3

Buchanan
Hunt
Williams (TX)

□ 1620

Mrs. McCLAIN, Messrs. BUCK, ARRINGTON, and Ms. SALAZAR changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. WATERS, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. OMAR changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 210, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—220

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

NAYS—210

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

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gonzalez, Vicente

NOT VOTING—3

Buchanan Hunt Williams (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1629

Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS CONDEMNING THE RECENT ATTACKS ON PRO-LIFE FACILITIES, GROUPS, AND CHURCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Buchanan Hunt Williams (TX)

□ 1638

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, due to a personal family matter, I had to return back to Texas, and I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have noted "yea" on Roll Call No. 29 and "yea" on Roll Call No. 30.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 27

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request is accepted.

□ 1645

REMEMBERING FRANK EMOND

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, last night, Florida's First Congressional District lost an American hero who endured the tragedy of Pearl Harbor—Chief Warrant Officer Frank Emond.

In 1938, Frank enlisted in the Navy as a French horn player where he went on to become band director. On December 7, 1941, Frank was preparing to play ''Morning Colors'' on the USS *Pennsylvania* when at 7:55 a.m., a line of Japanese planes came from the east with a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor.

Frank boldly walked to the conductor stand, picked up his baton, and proceeded to direct the band in ''The Stars and Stripes Forever.''

Frank Emond was a true patriot who deeply impacted the lives that he touched doing what he loved to do: music.

Frank led the Pensacola Civic Band, the U.S. Air Force Band's Airmen of Note, and currently holds the Guinness World RECORD as the world's oldest conductor.

My greatest condolences to Frank Emond's family.

Thank you, Frank, for being an American hero. Your legacy is woven into the history of this country and this Congress.

WEAKENED GOVERNMENTAL OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Republican decision to weaken the Office of Congressional Ethics.

It is an independent, nonpartisan office that reviews allegations of ethics violations by congressional Members.

It is a watchdog that makes sure that this Chamber operates in the best interests of the American people.

The Republicans voted to take control of it so they can limit investigations of Republican Members.

Republicans claim to represent Americans, yet the first acts were not to help the working American families.

Instead, they weakened the governmental oversight of their actions, all done to make sure that they can abuse their power and push an unpopular agenda on the American people.

It is a disgraceful action that reveals the anti-American nature of the Republican Party today.

CONGRATULATING RICK DEASY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rick Deasy, the FLETC Associate Director for Training, who plans to retire this coming February.

Rick has had a long and impressive career working for the Federal Government. He served honorably for 22 years in the Armed Forces with active and reserve special operations forces.

Before working at FLETC, Rick served as Chief of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Homeland Security Investigations Training Academy.

During his tenure as the associate director, Rick was charged with developing and executing FLETC's COVID–19 response, which he did impeccably.

He also championed the need for a FLETC medical liaison officer to service medical professionals and trainees.

While Rick may be retiring, his impact on FLETC, our district, and our Nation will be felt for generations to come.

Congratulations, Rick, on a wonderful and successful career. We hope you enjoy your retirement.

HONORING DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY FOUNDERS' DAY 110TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 110th Founders' Day of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, founded in 1913 by 22 collegiate women from Howard University who refused to be denied the right to march in the women's suffrage march.

I am so proud today as we push forward with fortitude to join the seven female Members of Congress standing strong here in the Halls of Congress, working together just as our Founders did, to advance the fight for voting rights, for women's reproductive rights, for criminal justice, housing, HBCUs, and education.

Most importantly, I am proud to join my Delta sisters: Congresswomen CLARKE, MCBATH, PLASKETT, CROCKETT, LEE, and FOUSHEE.

To my sisters and Deltas and all members of Panhellenic, we say thank you for your service. But most importantly, today I say Happy Founders' Day.

UNITING IN PRAYER

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, what started out as an exciting game for our beloved Buffalo Bills turned into a tragedy that captured the attention of the Nation.

It became instantly clear that Damar Hamlin's collapse on the field would be seared into our memories as a moment where you remember exactly where you were and who you were with.

But for millions of Americans across every political spectrum, every background, every race and ethnicity, it was a moment of unity that reminded our Nation of the power of prayer.

It reminded us that our faith matters above all else. In our dire moment of need, our Nation turned to God, just as Damar Hamlin would have wanted.

He is a man of unwavering faith who has spent his gift of life honoring God and spreading love. I am happy to report today that Damar Hamlin was released from the hospital. His recovery is a miracle.

May Damar's adversity serve as an inspiration to remind us all that despite any differences we may have, we are one Nation under God and indivisible.

Go Bills.

THANKING FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Representative for the central coast of California, which has endured some of the worst storms and flooding in recent memory, to say thank you.

Thank you to our firefighters, our emergency crews, our search and rescue teams, our law enforcement officers, and all of our first responders and local leaders who have stepped up to save lives and protect property in our communities.

I share one story of this effort. On Monday, members of the Lompoc Fire Department reacted quickly to save a couple from rising flood waters.

As they carried out the rescue, they discovered that moments before, the woman had given birth. Thanks to the quick work of the Lompoc Fire Department, all three were rescued and are resting safely.

Mr. Speaker, our first responders have stepped up to avert further disaster this week, and I am proud today to take a moment to recognize their service in the permanent RECORD of this body.

HONORING JAMES HOLMES

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the lifetime of achievement of Mr. James Holmes.

Following decades of service to the Culpepper community and 35 years of service to the Culpepper County Electoral Board, Mr. Holmes is stepping down as the current chair of the board at the end of this year.

Growing up in Culpepper, Mr. Holmes attended George Washington Carver School and was among the first integrated classes at Culpepper High School.

Mr. Holmes' determination to improve our Commonwealth for future generations of Virginians brought him back to Culpepper after he graduated cum laude from Virginia Union University and earned his J.D. from Howard Law School.

A licensed and ordained Baptist minister who has pastored in Culpepper for decades, Mr. Holmes has held many positions with the Wayland Blue Ridge Baptist Association.

From his service on the electoral board to casting an electoral vote in 2008 for our first Black President, Mr. Holmes has demonstrated a commitment to civic engagement and elevating the voices of Virginians within our communities.

Mr. Holmes has touched many lives throughout his career as president of Culpepper Housing and Shelter Services, president of the Culpepper County United Way, president of the Culpepper County Equalization Board, and as a caring member of his community.

Today I stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives to thank James Holmes for his commitment to progress, equality, and community empowerment.

HONORING ED HANNON

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

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the incredible volunteer work of my constituent, Ed Hannon, of Charles Town, West Virginia.

Ed began volunteering for fire and rescue services in 1978 at the age of 16. Ed took a job as a paid first responder in Arlington, Virginia, in 1983 but continued to give his time volunteering.

When he moved to Jefferson County in 1993, he joined the Citizens Fire Company. Jefferson County has no paid fire and EMS personnel, so they rely on dedicated volunteers like Ed to provide these critical services.

Ed ran his final calls on December 31, completing 44 years of dedicated volunteer service. I wish Ed well in retirement and thank him for his service to the citizens of Jefferson County.

STANDING UP FOR REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM AND REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE

(Ms. BROWNLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, House Republicans sadly displayed their incoherent and chaotic approach toward governing in this country.

But when it comes to ripping away the reproductive rights and freedoms of women across the country, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have never been more united.

Despite the many immediate challenges facing our country, their priority was to criminalize abortion care and to put the health of women at risk.

The party that claims they want government out of our lives could not move more quickly to put the government and politicians in charge of one of the most personal decisions a woman can ever make.

Listening to my colleagues pontificate about the sanctity of life while attempting to take away life-saving healthcare for millions of women is appalling.

I am proud to stand with House Democrats to continue to fight for reproductive freedom and reproductive justice and the right to abortion across the United States.

□ 1700

REPUBLICANS HAVE GUTTED THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the changes the House rules package made to the Office of Congressional Ethics. OCE is a critical independent ethics watchdog, and it is a poor indication of the GOP's commitment to integrity that House Republicans have gutted the OCE as their first act in the majority.

The Republican rules package term limits the members of the OCE board, and in doing so removes the three Democratic members of the bipartisan board, giving Republicans a majority of seats instead of maintaining an even partisan divide. These rules also require the OCE to hire staff within a month, which requires a vote of four board members, guaranteeing a partisan lean amongst most staff.

With these rules changes, my Republican colleagues are deviously turning the Office of Congressional Ethics into a zombie, alive in name but unable to execute its vital mission of investigating misconduct and ridding Congress of corruption.

After 14 failed Speaker votes and the undermining of independent ethics reviews, House Republicans have demonstrated their commitment to dysfunction and poor governance.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHRIS FARNITANO

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Dr. Chris Farnitano.

Dr. Farnitano has dedicated his career and his life to improving the lives of others and advancing wellness and compassionate care in the district that I represent in Contra Costa County and the San Francisco Bay area. Over the course of his 30 years, Chris has served in an important leadership role at the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and its clinics and ultimately ended up as the Contra Costa County health officer in 2018.

Chris' commitment to promoting public health and well-being in our community is apparent in all of the work he has done. In 1997, he assisted in the development of the Pittsburg Health Center's HIV Medical Clinic, which was the first of its kind in the Nation. Chris was also instrumental in minimizing the spread of the coronavirus in our county and in the region.

Chris' work has had significant impact on our community, and our county admires his compassion and his dedication and wishes him well in his retirement.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOOD FRIDAY AGREEMENT

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, we are now on the eve of the 25th anniversary of the historic Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, historic in large measure because of the American dimension through a negotiated settlement which helped to bring about the longest-standing political dispute in the history of the western world.

It was the people of goodwill and both parts of the island that voted referendum questions to help bring about this remarkable achievement.

In this House, the question of Ireland has always been bipartisan, and it has been celebrated by both political parties here with great enthusiasm and so recognized.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and I, as chairpersons of the Friends of Ireland, will be asking Members to sign the proclamation that we are offering through this resolution that will celebrate this historic achievement as we prepare across America, the UK, the Republic of Ireland, and Northern Ireland for this celebration. These have been ''it will never happen'' moments that we have all had a chance to participate in, and I hope that Members will all sign this historic resolution celebrating and acknowledging this achievement.

RECOGNIZING PAUL BANDY, AIMEE JOHNS, AND HEATH BRADDOCK

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the heroism of Paul Bandy; his wife, Aimee Johns; and Heath Braddock.

On a clear summer day last year, Steve Breummer, a triathlete, was doing his routine swim about 150 yards off the coast in Monterey Bay when he was attacked by a great white shark. Pulled under water, bitten across his thigh and abdomen, and bleeding profusely, Steve saw the cold black eye of that predator, fought him off, and yelled for help.

Paul, a police officer, and Aimee, a nurse, heard the cries and paddleboarded to the victim. Heath, who was onshore, grabbed a surfboard and joined in the rescue. Even though there was blood on top of the water and a shark lurked under the water, all three heroes were undeterred, got to Steve, got him out of the water, and saved his life.

For their actions, the rescuers have been honored by the Red Cross and the Carnegie Commission.

Steve, although not yet doing triathlons, is walking and swimming again.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I honor all of them for the determination to fight in the face of danger; for their will to act, despite it being to their detriment; and fulfilling what it means to be a hero in our community on the central coast and in our country.

AIRPORT DELAYS AND CANCELLATIONS

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, once again, this morning, thousands of Americans found themselves in airports staring at delayed and canceled flights. This comes barely 3 weeks after tens of thousands of Americans, and many of my own constituents, missed the holidays because of the catastrophe on the part of the airlines, the airlines that got billions of dollars in this Chamber from the American people barely 2 years ago. This is how the airlines repay the support that this institution gave to them so that they could get through COVID.

Now, the private markets will presumably address the failures of Southwest and other airlines. What happened this morning was a failure of government. The Notice to Air Missions is a function of the FAA.

I would like to point out that after last week, when we heard constant cries for cuts to the budget, understand, my friends, cuts to the budget means that we underinvest in the infrastructure that my constituents were relying on this morning. As we think about the budget in the next 2 years, let's remember what happened this morning.

WHY THE FISCAL HOUSE OF THE UNITED STATES IS COLLAPSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fry). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I can top my friend from California's great white shark attack or talking about airline delays, but we are going to do something that is particularly amusing and fun. We are going to talk about why the fiscal house of the United States is collapsing.

For a number of folks who have watched my floor presentations, a lot of this is going to be familiar.

This is a primer, particularly for our new Members. Right now, we have hundreds and hundreds of new staff with the new Members here in the House of Representatives. Hopefully, on the thousand-some televisions around the campus where you have C–SPAN on, please, if you actually are interested, if you really want to understand how much trouble we are in, give me a few minutes of your time. Actually, give me almost an hour of your time.

Let's sort of walk through the reality. I am going to walk through some of the solutions that are absolutely wrong, and then we are going to talk a little bit about the reality of the math; and the punch line we are going to come back to multiple times, is really simple.

The primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt is our demographics. Those of us who are baby boomers, we got old. And the political class here, unless we are willing to tell the truth, there is no path to saving us from a failed bond auction, a failed debt crisis, a world where we all live dramatically poorer. And it doesn't have to be that way.

Look, I know I am a broken record, but damn it, somehow, we have got to get this to start to sink in. So let's actually walk through some of the reality.

I always start with this chart because it is just easy to get your head around. This is 2022.

Now, the funny thing is, it looks like 2023, the percentage that is mandatory, that means it is on autopilot. Members here, people like me, we won't vote on it. This is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. These things that are a formula.

This percentage actually went down in this budget year. It is not going down because we are spending less money; it is because we are spending so much more money on discretionary, it actually took several points more of the percentage of spending.

Now, a lot of that was one-time spending. We will fade back down, but you got to get your head around the majority. The vast majority of U.S. spending is what we call mandatory. It is entitlements. It is you get because you work so many quarters. It is because you turned a certain age, because you are a certain Tribal group, because you are a certain level of poverty, you get these benefits, and they are automatic. It is a formula.

And then over here, you see this little green part, that is discretionary. That is what we call nondefense discretionary. This is what everyone thinks of as government. That is your foreign aid, that is your FBI, that is the IRS, that is all of those things.

And here the blue, that is defense. I am going to show you in some charts later, my brothers and sisters on the left, will often throw out rhetoric of cut out defense, get rid it.

Believe it or not, it is not even enough money to keep us in balance. You could get rid of every dime of defense. There needs to be an understanding of reality. Your government is an insurance company with an Army. I know that sounds like trying to be somewhat humorous, but it happens to be the truth.

Think of it that way. So what is the primary drive, if I came to you right now and said, you are a new Member of Congress, you have made a passionate pitch to your voters that you are going take on the deficit.

Did you stand in front of your voters and tell them over the next 30 years, 100 percent of the deficit is Medicare and Social Security? The rest of the budget, according to the Congressional Budget Office, actually has a positive balance.

Over the next 30 years, and this is based on the 2022 numbers, with inflation some of this is actually worse today. And we are not going to get the updated numbers till probably mid-February using the Congressional Budget Office.

Functionally, the shortfall of Medicare is about 75 percent of all of our borrowing. The shortfall of Social Security—and the reason you put that on there, understand, look at the Social Security actuary report. It is not Republican; it is not Democrat. These are people that actually own calculators.

With the COLA that was just given, you lost almost a full year of life. So there is this trust fund. Yes, it is Social Security money that we have paid in over the years. It is in loan to the Treasury. The Treasury gives special Social Security T bills and then when Social Security needs money, they cash them in with Treasury. Fine.

And then, actually, the Treasury goes out and borrows other money. That money runs out in about 10 years. Two years ago, I believe, the Social Security actuary report said, when the trust fund runs out, our brothers and sisters who are 65 and older or who are 62 and older or whoever are just taking a Social Security check will get about a 27 percent cut.

I think last year's actuary report said about 25 percent cut. It is based on—here is our projection of the revenue and FICA taxes we take in today, and then it goes out the door.

There is some data out there that says 10 years from now, unless we fix Social Security, you are going to double poverty among seniors. What is the moral aspect there? How many of this body are ready to actually deal with the political nightmare cascade of the trolls who lie—oh, excuse me—the politicians, trying to tell the truth about a multi-multi-multi-multitrillion-dollar system that is out of money and the negative shortfall. You do understand, I think the model said like in the next 60 years, 65 years, it is like $212 trillion short.

That is just the Social Security trust fund, and it is gone in about 10 years. It lost almost a full year of actuarial life with this year's COLA.

These are the things that we are here to fix instead of the trite crap we come behind these microphones and talk about. These are the things that destroy a society because it breaks our promises.

Don't laugh at me. My wife and I are both 60 and I have a 6-month-old. We adopted another child. When my 6-month-old is 25 years old, two things: We either blow up the debt and deficit, which we are probably going to do that, too, or double the U.S. taxes.

When he is 25 years old, we have to double corporate taxes, import fees, tariffs, everything else, every we call a receipt, we got to double.

It means top marginal rates like 70-something percent. That is just the Federal. Do you understand what these numbers mean? This was based on having $114 trillion of borrowing in today's dollars, and these calcs were done before this inflationary cycle.

This is what takes down a republic. How serious is this body really about telling the truth about the math?

□ 1715

Let's walk through the fragility. Once again, I am doing this substantially for the new Members and the new staff here to understand what reality is. All day long, you are going to get pitched by people with shiny objects or: ''I need you to regulate this so I don't get competition in my business in the home district.'' ''I want some free money.'' ''I want you to give me a grant.'' We get this inbound all day long.

We get the crazy conspiracy theory that has nothing to do with reality, and that consumes our time instead of thinking about this math and coming up with actual solutions.

We have come to this floor over and over with solutions, except it seems to terrify our brothers and sisters here because it means, A, telling the truth about the math, and then it means we have to do things really differently. You have to legalize technology. You have to legalize the disruption because it is not about changing who pays.

Before I do this, let me see if I can explain this. For my fans on the left who love ObamaCare, the ACA, understand that it is a financing bill. It just moves the money around. I get subsidized over here, but this group has to pay.

The brilliant Republican alternative was a financing bill. Now, we actually did a more elegant job of spreading it along the curve so you got some efficiency, but it was still a financing bill. It is who had to pay and who got subsidized.

Medicare for All is a financing bill.

None of those ideas in regard to healthcare change what we pay. They just move around who pays. Until the conversation becomes about what we pay, you can't save us because the debt doesn't change.

With my very last board, I am going to do something that is a little cranky and a little mean. I am going to make fun of some of my own work, but I am going to tell the truth that a lot of times when we talk 10 years to balance, you do realize one of the things we are doing is saying we are going to take this portion of the spending and are just going to give it back to the State.

We are going to take this portion of the spending and make the users of Medicare, or users of this group, we are going to make the individuals pay. We are going to take it off the Federal books, but we don't change the spending as you would do the calculation as a percentage of the GDP, or gross domestic product.

That is what is so important here. Unless we legalize the disruption, and do this quickly—I had a meeting earlier in my office today with someone that is really smart. He has been here for a long time. He is a medical doctor. He is one of my favorite Members: DAVID, you have to go slower. People aren't going to embrace it. The bureaucracy is going to fight you. Do you know how many vested interests there are in the lobbyist class and down on K Street?

We are watching the numbers erode. I am going to show you a slide here that, structurally, 10 years from now, we may have a structural $2 trillion a year deficit. That is the structural deficit, and half of that will be just interest.

Is this body ready to tell the truth about the math? Because the math will always win.

One of the other things that terrifies me here is that we are not telling the truth about the fragility of interest rates. I am going to do two or three slides here, but you start to look at what happens if interest rates are up. Rising interest rates could push up the national debt toward 300 percent.

Get this. If the mean interest is 3 points over what CBO projected last year, which, believe it or not, is actually closer to the mean of interest we have paid over the last 30 years, so we go back to what was normal for the last 30 years, we are at 345 percent of debt to GDP. It is all gone.

If you care about the poor, there is no more money for them. If you care about defense, there is no more money. Basically, every dime is just covering interest. Government is gone.

The fantasy that goes on around here of let's talk about shiny objects but avoid the real crisis ahead of us—I am going to show a bunch of slides that the Democrats' proposals of raising taxes doesn't work and a bunch of the Republican ideas of let's get rid of waste and fraud. We will get rid of foreign aid.

Do you realize every dime of foreign aid covers about 12 days of borrowing? Last year, we borrowed $43,600 a second.

How much of the conversation here is about my little Matthew, who is 6 months old? What is his future like?

Does anyone here give a damn about your kids, your grandkids, your own retirement?

This is everything. This will take us down. Will this body take it seriously?

You start to look at the charts. This is where we are at right now. Understand, the CBO model is now starting to look at that 10 years from now, 2032. That may seem like forever, but it is 10 years. What were you doing 10 years ago? Do you remember? It wasn't that long ago.

We are heading toward a structural cost just over $1 trillion, just in interest, just the interest cost. Now, add on another $1 trillion interest in spending, and remember, in that 10 years, just Medicare and a portion of Medicaid go up $1.1 trillion. The total budget 10 years from now goes up, I think, just a little less. The CBO model from a year ago was about $2 trillion more that we are spending.

We take in about half a trillion-plus more on due tax receipts. It basically means you are heading toward a structural deficit close to $2 trillion a year, and that is the baseline.

Now, how many of you ran for office here and said, ''I am going to balance the budget''? Okay. Your structural deficit 10 years from now is $2 trillion. What are you about to do? ''I am going to move it to the States and let them pay for it. I am going to play a shell game. I am going to tell my voters it is waste and fraud. I am going to tell my voters I need to tax businesses more.''

We got old. I am sorry, but go back to that second slide. Every dime of the borrowing for the next 30 years is three-quarters Medicare, one-quarter Social Security.

Look at the comments that will be on the video of this and people say: ''Oh, that is not true. Get rid of Ukraine.'' Fine, strip it, but you just got rid of 12 days, 14 days of borrowing.

It is this lack of ability to do math here, but I am glad everyone gets their feelings satiated.

You have to understand this is the baseline we are at right now. Thirty years from now, half of all tax receipts go just to interest. In Ways and Means, we call it tax receipts, tax revenues, whatever you want to call it. Half of it.

There is a model out there that if we are 2 points higher than the CBO model, in 30 years—it actually comes closer to 25 years—all receipts, if we kept the same tax code so all the things expire, all the tax reforms, we go back to the bad old days, and we have 2-point higher interest rates, so that is still lower than the previous 30-year mean. Every dime of tax receipts in about 25, 28 years, every dime goes just to cover interest. There is no more government. We are nothing more than a bond house paying out interest.

Does anyone here understand this? Doesn't this make anyone nervous? Am I the only idiot getting up here and

trying to point it out, saying we are going to fall off the cliff? Does anyone else care?

This is the stuff that is real, but we are going to have a great conversation of virtue signaling probably over the next couple of weeks.

The math is out there for everyone. Anyone that is watching, just go to CBO, some of the other groups that give a darn about the debt. It is all over the charts. You can get emails every single day talking about what is happening and the differentials.

We all ignore it because it is really uncomfortable to go home and stand in front of an audience of your voters and tell them the truth because we have lied to them for so long.

The Federal Government has a spending problem. Now, this may not look like a lot, but you start to look at average tax receipts. I have two or three slides that if you ever want to argue this—I have done this with leftist groups trying to show when we raise taxes and when we lower taxes, we always get within a certain band of about 18 to 20 percent of tax receipts in as part of the size of the economy.

There is just this sort of law of physics and taxes. You raise taxes really high; the economy and growth slows down; you get 18 to 20 percent of GDP in taxes. You lower taxes; economy grows; you get about 18 to 20 percent in taxes to GDP. It is just about 100 years' worth of data, okay? It is what it is.

What is happening is our spending, you see this huge spike there. That is COVID. We went to crazy town. It became an excuse to fund every dream, every group, trying to buy the vote for you.

Then, you go back to our baseline, and that baseline grows and grows. You have to understand that spending here, in just about 10 years, crosses about 25 percent of the entire economy. Yet, our best model is we might be getting 18, 19 percent of the economy in taxes. That differential year after year buries us.

It is not falling revenues. Look at it. Even in the long term, the best CBO data still has us hovering around 19 percent of the economy in tax receipts, and it is within the mean of functioning since the 1960s.

There were years here where we had very high marginal tax rates, some years where we had very low marginal tax rates, and look at the band.

Do you see, if I go way out, if I go out to 30 years, our spending hits 30 percent of the entire economy? Thirty percent of the entire economy is spending, and every dime of this growth out here is demographics. It will be the shortfall of Social Security and Medicare.

Why is that so hard? It is not Republican or Democrat. We got gray. Look at my hair.

There are fixes. I have come here dozens of times. I have walked through innovative solutions that disrupt the price of healthcare, that disrupt the bureaucracy, that make us more efficient, that make us grow. We ignore them because, it turns out, complex problems require complex solutions, and it is not one magic bullet.

I am sorry. Am I allowed to say ''bullet''? It is not one magic solution.

It turns out you have to do a dozen things, and you have to do them all at once. Yes, you have to fix immigration. You have to legalize technology. You have to change the way bureaucracies work so that bureaucracies start using these supercomputers to collect data instead of making you fill out paperwork.

There are solutions out there, but damn it, this place needs to get rid of its 1990s solution and join this century.

I bring this board just to knock down one of my leftist friends who always said, ''But you guys did tax reform, and you cut receipts.'' We are taking in $1 trillion more a year today than we did the year after tax reform.

It is spending $1 trillion more today, so that is like a 25 percent growth in receipts, in revenues, in tax receipts post-tax reform within, functionally, 4 years.

Don't tell me it is the tax reform because the tax reform grew the size of the economy. Do you remember what it did to the Social Security trust fund? It saved us for a couple of years because there were so many people working.

Could you imagine if we hadn't had the tax reform when we hit the pandemic? Could you imagine, if we hadn't had that healthy economy, what the numbers would have looked like?

I am sorry, I know this is repetitive, but there is a reason I am saying it over and over. I am trying to break through to people who have never really thought about the truth of the math.

Eliminating every dime of defense, in the long term, does nothing. Think about that. Here is defense. Defense is going to be sitting around 2.7 percent of GDP, and we are heading toward a time where just Social Security and the healthcare entitlements out here are over 15 percent of the size of the economy.

□ 1730

So defense is under 3 percent of the size of the economy, just Social Security and the health entitlements are over 15.

Does anyone see the issue?

But, yet, I will have my brothers and sisters on the left say: It is defense, we need to cut it. Fine. It doesn't do anything. The scale of the dollars is so out of control, we have got to stop living in a fantasy world.

I know it is good politics. I know it is good virtue signaling. You get your reporters and constituents at home going: Yay, that is true. None of them own a calculator and if they do there are no batteries in it.

You have got to understand, entitlement programs—I don't like it when you call these entitlement programs; call them anything you want; call them mandatory spending; Call them earned benefits, they are earned benefits—it is a societal problem. I don't give a damn what you call them, it is still about the spending.

You need to take a look at what it is driving. Over here is the growth over those years: defense, just Social Security, other mandatory, Medicare, all these, the growth in these mandatories here.

How many Members here are bold enough to tell the truth?

Because when you tell the truth on this stuff you get attack adds, you get groups that raise money, lie about it, beat the crap out of you if you are a Member of Congress. I can't talk about that, David. In that case, you can't actually talk about the debt and deficits.

Medicare. Medicare. Medicare. Much of my life I have done healthcare finance. As a child, I was in my State legislature for a couple terms and I was working on our Medicaid system. Even then, you'd have the experts come sit you down, and say: You do realize how much trouble we are in.

Well, here we are 30 some years later. Look at the curve. The curve. This isn't that long from now. We are looking at numbers that are only functionally a decade from now. This drives all policies. If you are a Member and say: I care about the environment.

Where are you going to get the money?

I care about defense.

Where are you going to get the money?

Healthcare is consuming everything.

I believe CBO in a couple weeks is going to update these numbers and they are going to look much uglier. We have some of the back-of-the-napkin math we have done with the Joint Economic Committee, but I used last year's CBO number for this chart.

Here is my point, once again: Over the next decade there is functionally a trillion dollars of additional spending on Medicare. If you add in Medicare and Medicaid, it is one-something. Take a look here. When you get out here, this is a $1.1 trillion increase, that is nine budget cycles from now. It is not 10 years. It is nine budget cycles from now.

So if I came to you and you saw the earlier chart, it said, okay, a decade from now if the nominal interest rates stay where they are at, our interest cost is $1 trillion a year a decade from now. Now my additional spending on Medicare and Medicaid is an additional trillion dollars.

Does anyone start to see where a structural deficit of $2 trillion a year is?

Now, you promised your voters you are going to balance the budget.

What are you going to do?

Just stop paying the interest on our debt? Okay.

Stop paying Medicare? Stop paying Medicaid? Fine.

How about Social Security?

Because remember, 10 years from now the trust fund is gone. Our brothers and sisters who are on Social Security that rely on it are going to take what, around a 25 percent cut.

Are we going to let that happen?

It is coming. The math is real. You can't pretend it away. And you start to look at some of the lunacy that we get from our friends on the left. Oh, let's just tax more. Even a 100 percent tax rate on small businesses and upper-income families, you can't even come close. So take all their money, and just assume that you live in some magic fantasy world where everyone keeps working. Let's live in fantasy.

This is what you get. My spending in 30 years is—my borrowing is about 12.4 percent of GDP. If I take every dime of someone who makes $500,000 or more, the next dollar, we just take it, you get about 5 percent of GDP, and that is pretending people would keep working. The math is the math, and we need to stop lying.

Look, if you don't believe me, you go look up CBO. Go to Brian Riedl, Manhattan Institute, he does a beautiful job of taking OMB data, CBO data, some of the others out there, and puts it on charts so that it is absorbable. He walks through all of your solutions.

What if we repeal the tax cuts and raise the taxes on low-income people?

How about if you get rid of every tax idea that is out there?

All the Democrat solutions. You still fall incredibly short. You get a fraction of what is required. You go on some of the other solutions that have been offered. No easy pay-fors for Social Security or Medicare programs. Everything falls short. I need more than 6 percent of GDP. And if I take almost every solution, I only pick up a fraction of that. The math is the math, and the math will win.

Now, here is the point where I am going to make some of my own friends on my side a little cranky; I am going to tell the truth. Many of the solutions we run around here and tout: We are going to balance in 7 years. We are going to balance in 10 years.

Do you understand the fraud?

We say: Well, we are going to cut Medicare. Okay. We are going to shift it to the individual. We are going to do this. We are going to take Medicaid and we are just going to cut our spending because we handed it back to the States. They are shell-gaming the math. They are not willing to actually tell the system we are going to legalize technology.

This exists today. The thing that looks like a large kazoo, you can blow into it, it tells you you have a virus. It bangs off your phone to know you are not allergic to certain antivirals, and orders your antivirals, allowing that algorithm, that technology, to write a prescription.

You can't do that?

Why?

Do you know anyone with a diabetic pump?

All day long that algorithm is prescribing to them.

We have got to get this out because if you can't have that type of technology disruption—my other idea is a much grander theory.

Five percent of our brothers and sisters who have multiple chronic conditions are over half of our healthcare spending. We are in the time of miracles where we are seeing cures. We, as a body, need to basically do an Operation Warp Speed as a way to save ourselves from our own crushing debt. Bring those cures.

If it is true that a San Diego company—which has just been bought up and was working with CRISPR—has now cured about a half a dozen people of type 1 diabetes—and we are trying to bring out one of their researchers to come talk to us in February—if it is true, if there is just the slightest opening of a door, there is a path there.

I know that is type 1. I know type 2 we have our health issues. What we do in our farm bill—the fact that so much of our society has become almost self-destructive with obesity—yes, I may have just hurt your feelings—but dammit, when government has to pay 70 percent of all healthcare costs, we as a society should care.

I represent the population of probably the second highest per capita diabetes in the world, one of my Tribal communities in Arizona. When I meet people who are blind in that community, who have lost parts of their feet, is that compassion?

So what would happen if we can marry up legalizing the technology that will make your life easier and more convenient and make you healthier?

Yes, it means that you don't walk into the urgent care center, because you have a breath biopsy in your home medicine cabinet. Legalize the technology.

Then we push as hard as we can, if we are in the age of miracles, cure, cure, cure because that is more moral and compassionate. And, dammit, it has an amazing effect on U.S. debt.

Do you remember how many times I showed you that 31 percent of all Medicare spending is related to diabetes? What would happen if you cut half of that?

Yes, it is lifestyle. Yes, it is what people eat. Yes, it is exercise.

What would happen if we can give people back islet cells that produce insulin again?

We found a way to cure hepatitis C. When I first got here, this body was getting ready to try to figure out how to have hundreds of thousands of people get liver transplants, and it was going to bankrupt Medicaid systems all over the country. Then someone came up with a hepatitis C cure. It was really expensive, and we bitched about the cost of it, except for the fact that it cured them. And 7 months later there was a second drug that crashed the price.

Was that moral?

Of course it was.

Was it really good economics?

Was it just compassion?

Yes.

I need this to become part of our lexicon that the solution is disruption through technology. Optionality. But it is also the morality of we need to push those cures out because it is really good economics.

Instead of giving lists of things of here is how we are going to cut the debt and deficit, we are just going to shift it to someone else to spend.

Is this body—and particularly to the freshmen and the freshmen staff that I have been trying to talk to with this speech—this will be the most important stuff you deal with in your time here. It is not the shiny object that may get you on FOX News tonight. It is not the shiny object that gets you applause when you go into your townhall meeting. Oh, we did this.

This stuff is hard. It is complicated. You are going to be lobbied like a war. They are going to spend money in your district beating the crap out of you because you are taking away their money.

It also saves this country and gives my little Matthew, who is 6 months old, a future. That is the morality.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE JOB OF A CONGRESSPERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Arizona. As he so often does, in outlining the extent to which we have significant fiscal challenges that could be met with the kinds of reforms that we don't often talk about: the need to reform healthcare policies, healthcare decisions, and things that get well beyond the rhetoric of balancing budgets, on that he and I agree enormously.

I look forward to engaging with him on the floor of the House and other places on that topic again. But I do want to say one thing that is true about what the gentleman from Arizona was talking about with respect to addressing mandatory spending, reforming so-called entitlements with respect to Social Security and Medicare, and otherwise reforming those complex areas of our government. If you can't tackle discretionary spending, you are

not going to tackle mandatory spending.

And importantly, this is the critical part, you have got to have the political willpower to address these things. That is actually why I came to the floor this evening.

□ 1745

America was drawn into an engaging debate among the Members of Congress who represent them in the people's House last week.

C–SPAN, not constricted by the rules of the House, was able to have cameras zeroing in on the Members of this body as we were debating last week. People were drawn into the conversations, the people on both sides of the aisle, on the drama of the debates and how we would choose the Speaker of the House and then whether we would pass the rules package.

But here I am on January 11, 2023, in the new Republican majority, and I am alone in the Chamber again with the Speaker. That is the requirement, by the way. There has to be a Speaker and then a Member on the floor. But I am alone again.

Now, we passed some bills today.

But what are we going to do as a body to make good on the reforms we passed last week and actually extend on them and build on them?

I would ask my colleagues why we don't have full debate right now on a number of the important issues of the day?

Why we don't have full debate tomorrow, next week, and the following week on the crucial issues of our day?

Today, I called a colleague on the other side of the aisle to inquire as to which Members of the minority party would be willing to sit down with me and anybody else to figure out how to deal with the debt and the deficit spending that is plaguing our country.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle engaged in conversation about what that would take, but the fact of the matter is that I don't know the answer.

What I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is: Come on down. Where are you?

Are you going to simply take potshots at any effort by Members of my side of the aisle—the majority now—who dare to raise questions about how we might tackle $32 trillion of debt, a trillion dollar-plus deficits every year, and tackle the question of interest rates going up causing our interest payments to go up every year?

Every 50 basis points—every half of a percentage point—that goes up adds about $100 billion a year in additional interest expense. I think in the next year interest is going to eclipse our national defense spending.

Now, where are all my defense hawks?

Where are all of my Republican colleagues who like to stand up and say: We have got to fund our men and women in uniform; we have to buy more planes and more bombers; we have to have more guns; and we have to make sure we have the strongest defense in the world?

Great. I agree. Peace through strength sparingly used, non-woke, and trained to kill people and blow things up. That is what I want our military to be and to do, and I want it to continue to be the best in the world.

But we are not going to be able to do that if we are spending more on interest to the debt than we are on our own national defense.

As the gentleman from Arizona rightly is pointing out about the state of our ''mandatory spending'' and ''entitlements,'' we are not going to be able to maintain our country, have a strong national defense, and ensure a peaceful world for our children and our grandchildren. These are just facts.

We used to have a lot of political back and forth between Democrats and Republicans. We would accuse our colleagues on the other side of the aisle of being tax-and-spend Democrats—and they were tax-and-spend Democrats. But something changed along the way. We stopped debating tax policy for the most part, and now everybody in this Chamber for the most part are spend-and-spend Members of Congress, spend-and-spend members of a uni-party.

Mr. Speaker, I am all on board with the enthusiasm, the unity, and the energy coming out of last week that we are going to transform this institution. I believe it.

I believe by offering amendments in the appropriations process on the floor of this body we will be better.

I believe that by having 72 hours to read bills and not waiving that rule—that we actually do it—that we will be better.

I believe that by having single-subject bills without them being multisubject, complicated, and thousands of pages that we will be better.

I believe that by requiring amendments to be germane—that is, actually related to the underlying purpose of the underlying bill—that we will be better.

Those are all things that will make us better.

But they will only make us better if we are all united in the purpose of what we are trying to do.

I know I have got very strong disagreements with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I have significant disagreements with a lot of my friends on my side of the aisle. But, Mr. Speaker, you will never solve those disagreements if you never sit down at the table and work.

The only way to work is to put some sort of constraint on our spending. So with all due respect to my friend from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) with whom I agree about mandatory spending and about having to solve those problems in the long term, discretionary spending matters. Discretionary spending matters because it charts the priorities of a Congress that represents the American people. We have to make the tough choices on discretionary spending.

Oh, by the way, that they are only 20 or 25 percent of the overall spending does not mean that they are not insignificant. If we do not balance our budget right now and chart a course to balance that budget over the next 10 years, we will spend an additional $10 trillion over the next 10 years—that we don't have.

But what will happen is—and here is what is going to happen, this is important for the American people to understand—we reached an agreement as a party last week to ensure that we return to 2022 levels of spending—that is a top line level of $1.471 trillion—and that we operate with that cap in spending that says nothing about what the levels are for defense or nondefense discretionary, just that we would cap at 2022 levels of spending.

But here is what will happen. We will have a debate about that, and we will pass some appropriations bills. If we do our job as Republicans, we will pass good, solid bills for this year's spending that stick within those caps and stay under the 2022 levels of spending.

We will send them to the Senate, and CHUCK SCHUMER will say—with all sorts of wailing and gnashing of teeth—that we are taking food out of the mouths of orphans and babies and that we are undermining the ability of people to survive and live and that we are taking away their medicine; we are killing people; and we are doing all sorts of horrible things.

As a result, it will be September, and we won't have an agreement, and then there will be some brinkmanship, a bunch of politics, and a bunch of messaging and speeches, and then there will be a continuing resolution that funds government at the current levels that were passed in December under that $1.7 billion omnibus spending bill that was passed on December 23 using Christmas as a backstop.

That is almost certainly what is going to happen if we don't stop it.

There are two ways to stop it: Democrats and Republicans sit down and work honestly around a table to stop it, or brinkmanship, forcing the question by bringing it to the brink. Those are the two possible ways that we can try to stop what I just described will occur from occurring. This is the reality of what we have got to change in this body.

What else is going to happen?

Come summer, at some time undetermined—usually chosen by the executive branch as the maximum moment to be able to extract some sort of pain on the body—we will be told that the debt limit is going to be reached. That might be May or June or July or August.

Then we will be told: You must raise the debt ceiling.

If any of us say: Wait a minute, why are we going to raise the debt ceiling if we don't stop doing the things that are causing us to accumulate more debt?

If any of us dare to say that, what will happen?

Oh, my. It is already happening. The Wall Street Journal, all of the bond traders and the stock traders on Wall Street, all of the investment bankers, all of the brilliant economists, and all of the opposing political party will all say:

> Don't default on the debt. You can't default on the debt, so don't you dare demand that we actually change the things we are doing that are causing the debt because we might default on the debt.
>
> So let's keep spending money we don't have and keep accumulating more debt increasing our interest payments and making it more difficult to service that debt while we undermine our own fiscal accountability and our own bonds ratings in the future.
>
> But no, no, don't you dare, Congressman ROY, say that you might use the debt ceiling as leverage to extract fiscal reforms to stop the insanity.

Let me just be clear. I think it is critical that we change the way we are doing business, and I intend to use the debt ceiling to ensure that we get fiscal and structural reforms. I am not going to bow down just because a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and a few pundits on TV write nasty editorials and some of my donors, some of the people out there in the world and activists text you and say: Oh, my Gosh, what are you doing? You are going to risk default on the debt.

Do you know why I am not going to do that?

Because it is my job not to back down when people are afraid of what we are supposed to do here. What we are supposed to do is bring things to a decision in this body responsibly.

All last week while we were debating the Speaker, a whole bunch of my friends and supporters—financial supporters—were blowing up my phone with text messages. A whole lot of them were saying:

> Attaboy, stand up, fight for the American people, change the institution, and let us actually try to make that place work rather than continuing down this road of destruction.

But a whole bunch of them were also texting me saying:

> What are you doing? What are you doing?
>
> We are not going to have a Republican Speaker. We are going to get a Democrat Speaker. You guys look like clowns.
>
> What are you doing?
>
> You look ridiculous. You are making the Republican Party look ridiculous, CHIP. Stop doing it.

Come Friday after 15 votes, we came to a conclusion. Nobody died, and nothing went crazy. We got a Speaker of the House, and we got some agreements among all of us about how the body should proceed, about ensuring we open it up, have transparency, offer more amendments, and give greater ideological diversity among the committees.

Let's have a real debate on these things, and let's get a really strong committee on the Judiciary Committee—a Church-style committee—to look at how government is acting.

That is what we got by standing up and fighting and ignoring all of the handwringers who can't stand the heat. Or to state it differently, all of the handwringers out there in the chamber of commerce crowd and the donor class who basically want us to do their bidding so they can get richer.

That is the truth.

Don't default on the debt. That might hurt my financial bottom line, CHIP. Don't you dare rattle and have debates on the House floor that might rock the boat, because my boat is pretty good, CHIP. I am doing quite well.

Mr. Speaker, there are a whole hell of a lot of people in this country who are not doing well, and I am not here to represent the donor class. I am not here to represent the talking heads. I am here to represent every hardworking American across this country and particularly in my district who are sick of the direction of this country.

So I am glad that we had the debate that we had last week. I am glad that we captivated the American people's attention. I am glad that C–SPAN was free to show the conversation and the debate. I am glad that we did something we hadn't done in 100 years because it is the two-party system entrenched that has broken down the ability of Members of this body to actually be Members.

That is actually our job.

Putting politics and partisan politics aside, it is our job as individual Members of this body to come here and do our job. It is not our job, for example, to get on a committee and say and do whatever the chairman of the committee says which, by the way, is one of the things that happens in this town.

Our job is to get on the committee and work, debate, put good bills on the floor, amend those bills, debate those bills, and pass some of those bills.

□ 1800

It is also not a race to introduce bills. It is not a race to pass bills. What would be wrong if we only passed about 30 bills this whole Congress? Would that be a bad thing? What if we only passed the 12 Appropriations bills, did our job, sent them to the Senate, passed a handful of bills that would actually make our country better, and then just sat back and worked a little bit and talked a little bit rather than running down to the desk to file another bill to introduce another statement to do another press conference to then run around and say: Oh, we have to pass a messaging bill. Oh, this is such-and-such week. This is the week for police officers, or this is the week for breast cancer awareness, or this is the week for whatever somebody in the Hallmark industry decided the week was for. Oh, well, we have to pass a bill.

Why? Do you think we lack laws? Do you think we lack regulations? Do you think we need to spend more money that we don't have? Why don't we just stop, pause?

My message to my Republican colleagues is the best thing we could do for our country is to stop doing all the things that this body has been doing for as long as I can remember. Whatever this body has been doing, let's do the opposite. How about that?

How about we actually have this Chamber full, like it was last week? Why don't we have hundreds of people on the floor and debate issues in front of each other? Why don't we pick a day like Tuesday and have 50 Members from one side and 50 Members from the other side and call that debate day?

Let's debate Ukraine in full view of the American people. Maybe the next week we can debate spending restraint, how we are going to tackle spending. I would like to listen to my colleagues tell me how you plan on tackling spending because, right now, my basic understanding of how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would tackle spending is tax people or keep spending money or both.

My view on this side of the aisle is that we don't want to tax people, but we want to keep spending money in the name of defense. Anybody want to come challenge me on that assertion? I am happy to debate them. Either side of the aisle, come on down. Let's debate it. I don't think anybody will take that debate on because they know I am right.

Why don't we change that? Where are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when it comes to spending? I would like to know. I think the American people deserve to know.

Do you believe in modern monetary theory, just keep spending money and it doesn't matter? I don't. I think that is foolish. I think it is reckless. I think it undermines our dollar. I think it undermines our financial stability.

More importantly, I think it makes it impossible for us to make good decisions about how to make policy and execute policy. How can you make a tough decision about whether or not you need to buy a bomber or whether or not you need to fund a particular grant program or fund a particular entitlement that is way oversubscribed and out of money? How can you make a decision about that if the answer is just to keep printing money?

I mean, that is my question. I suggest there is no more important question for us to answer because if we don't, then we are never going to come to agreement on the policies, ever.

If I go home and talk to my wife and say, ''Look, we are going to cap our spending at our 2022 levels of spending,'' then we have to make choices. We have to decide, well, are we going to just not make our mortgage payment? No, we have to do that. Are we going to not feed our kids? Well, no, we have to feed our kids. Are we going to have electricity and heat? Well, we would like to have that.

Then comes the discretionary questions: Do you take a vacation? Do you get a new car rather than patching together your 15-year-old car? Do you

send your kids to a certain school? Do you save a certain amount of money for college? Maybe you forgo college because you look at college and say, ''Why am I going to spend $300,000 to send them to college where they will teach my kids that America is evil?'' I will save that for another rant.

That is my point. We have to do that as families, but this body never does it, ever. We pretend to do it.

The point of the agreement reached last week was to open this body up, empower rank-and-file, but also, importantly, establish some parameters for how we fund the Federal Government. Those parameters should be that we set limits. If you set limits, now you have to sit down and figure it out.

Here is the problem. I don't believe that CHUCK SCHUMER and Senate Democrats want to sit down at the table and figure out how to limit spending. I don't believe that the President of the United States or his current Director of Office of Management and Budget or any of his team wants to sit down at the table with us and figure out how to limit spending.

I have not even heard them come down and say, ''Well, fine. You are right, Chip. We are spending more money than we have, and we are racking up more debt, so we believe we need to increase taxes.'' Okay. Come make your offer. We will raise taxes. Show me how raising those taxes is going to eliminate the deficit. He whispers, ''It is not.''

Show me how raising those taxes is not going to undermine economic growth, make it more difficult for American people to get jobs, undermine the prosperity of the American people. Show me that. Come demonstrate that. He whispers, ''That is not really that easy to do.''

But our job is to responsibly represent the American people. It is not to govern. We often use that word. That is crazy. We don't govern. We represent. Our job is to represent our constituents. I don't know any constituents—frankly, even my most left-leaning constituents, to be honest—saying, ''Oh, yes, please go up there and spend more money we don't have.''

I would just suggest that, according to the CBO, we are going to see another $15.7 trillion in deficits over the next 10 years. That is the truth. The truth is that, in fiscal year 2022, we collected a record $4.9 trillion in taxes, nearly a trillion more than the previous year.

We don't have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem. We have an overpromise problem.

I had a reporter come up to me in the hallway a minute ago and say: Mr. ROY, are there any circumstances in which you are going to support providing more aid to Ukraine?

How on Earth are we having that conversation on January 11 after, on December 23, we just added another $45 billion for Ukraine?

The reporter responded and said: They say that it is really important to get more money to beat Russia.

Oh, really? What do our experts say? What is our responsibility to pay for that? Do we just write a check anytime a world leader comes and says, ''But it is really important for my people that you write me a check''?

I want someone to write me a check, minus all the ethics stuff. Don't go write all that.

Look, the truth is, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is 100 percent correct that mandatory spending—Social Security, Medicare, all the related expenditures that go along with that—are driving the vast majority of the debt that we are accumulating every year. That is correct. If you are not willing to take on discretionary spending, how are you going to take on Social Security, Medicare, and reforming those to work when the first ad that is going to be run is going to be pushing granny off the cliff, if you dare even have a conversation about the issue?

I will make an invitation to any colleague in the Chamber, but particularly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, come down here and talk about Social Security and Medicare and all of our mandatory spending.

I will issue the same request that my colleagues on this side of the aisle acknowledge, that you cannot hide behind Social Security, Medicare, and mandatory spending to say that we shouldn't limit discretionary spending, defense spending because that is an insignificant part of the budget.

It is significant, and it is significant not just because of the trillions of dollars of debt that those spending accounts for Defense, Education, Department of Justice, Commerce, and every other agency, Homeland Security—it is not just because we are spending too much money there, and it is adding up to deficits and debts. It is because we are funding the very agencies that are undermining us.

We are funding the bureaucrats who are undermining the current individual in America who is out there as an entrepreneur trying to get a job started. It is undermining my friend Scott Smith in Loudoun County because we label him a domestic terrorist because the FBI was brought in along with the National School Board Association. They all coordinated and said: Okay, let's label him a domestic terrorist.

We are funding a Department of Homeland Security that wants to continue to create or execute policies that invite more people to come to our border, endangering them and us.

The reason you care about discretionary spending is because it funds the policies of government, of the bureaucracy, of the administrative state that undermines our well-being, undermines our prosperity.

We have the opportunity now, right now, as Republicans to lead the House of Representatives forward to change. We should, in fact, change.

Last week was a monumental step forward to changing this institution, to opening it up, to allowing rank-and-file Members to have a say, to putting more diversity on our committees, to having more debate in committees, coming down to the floor, and fighting for the people that we represent. All of that will be for naught if we don't embrace wholeheartedly the mission, the hard mission, of limiting the spending that is destroying our country and demanding that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle come sit down at the table so that we can actually do our jobs for the people we represent.

Then, finally, send a message to the United States Senate, to the Democrat-led United States Senate, to the Democrat President of the United States at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that it is not enough to give speeches. It is not enough to oppose what we produce out of the people's House.

The American people spoke in November. They want us to be responsible. They want us to limit spending. They want us to secure the United States. They want us to have a secure and sovereign border. They want us to get out of their business. They want us to stop being at each other's throats. If you want to do that, then embrace fiscal responsibility and stop spending money you don't have to fund the bureaucrats who are undermining our liberties.

Stand up in defense of liberties, civil liberties and the freedoms of the American people, by calling out the bureaucrats in our committees and exposing it through oversight.

Stand up for a strong military that is nonwoke, that is sparingly used but ready to go fight when needed.

Secure the border of the United States with the policies that are necessary to do so and embrace radical federalism where we return power to the States so we can agree to disagree and stop being at each other's throats.

Do you want to do those things? Then there is one key thing you have to do. You have to fight the swamp. You have to take on the bureaucracy. You have to take on the powers that be.

That started last week. We have some of the tools that we need, but that battle is just beginning. We are going to take this town on for the American people.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 12, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,

EC–56. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports created by the Clerk which it is the duty of any officer or Department to make to Congress, pursuant to Rule II, clause 2(b) of the Rules of the House (H. Doc. No. 118—4), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ESTES:

H.R. 271. A bill to provide for greater accountability with respect to Federal activities and expenditures relating to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 272. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize transportation for Government astronauts returning from space between their residence and various locations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 273. A bill to amend chapter 303 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of each military department to identify promising research programs of the Small Business Innovation Research Program or Small Business Technology Transfer Program for inclusion in the future budgets and plans of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 274. A bill to require a report by the Comptroller General of the United States on a national all-hazards disaster insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 275. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a study on the circumstances which may impact the effectiveness and availability of first responders before, during, or after a terrorist threat or event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 276. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a DHS Cybersecurity On-the-Job Training and Employment Apprentice Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARL, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. MOONEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. HINSON, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BACON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. BANKS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALMER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BARR, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. MACE, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. BICE, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FALLON, Mr. STEIL, Mr. MANN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HERN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAST, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. JAMES, Mr. ESTES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. EZELL, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLS, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 277. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 278. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the feasibility of establishing a Cyber Defense National Guard; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 279. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against certain health care providers with certain objections to abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 280. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on cyber vulnerability disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. COLE (for himself and Mr. LATURNER):

H.R. 281. A bill to establish the Commission on Long-Term Social Security Solvency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 282. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals reimbursed under the Medicare system to establish and implement security procedures to reduce the likelihood of infant patient abduction and baby switching, including procedures for identifying all infant patients in the hospital in a manner that ensures that it will be evident if infants are missing from the hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 283. A bill to prohibit funding for the implementation and enforcement of Federal red flag orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 284. A bill to promote bilateral tourism through cooperation between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the remediation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. ROSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WILD, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr.

PAYNE, Ms. CHU, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MENG, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. BALINT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LIEU, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BUSH, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. TRONE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 286. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to health care providers to enhance the physical and cyber security of their facilities, personnel, and patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. STEIL, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CLYDE, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BOST, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 287. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that local educational agencies applying for certain Federal education funds post the curriculum for elementary and secondary schools online, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 288. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 289. A bill to update requirements for the operation of the Central Valley Project and Klamath River Basin Reclamation Project by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 290. A bill to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. BOST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MAST, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 291. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that a member of the Armed Forces, granted a general discharge under honorable conditions on the sole basis that such member failed to obey a lawful order to receive a vaccine for COVID-19, is eligible for certain educational assistance administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KILEY, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 292. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the ''William L. Reynolds Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FALLON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. TRONE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SLOTKIN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. BERA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 293. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the export or sale of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 294. A bill to prohibit the United States Government from recognizing the Russian Federation's claim of sovereignty over any portion of the sovereign territory of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 295. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to support or facilitate the participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Seven, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 296. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from using charter air transportation until Congress enacts a law reauthorizing the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BOST, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FALLON, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 297. A bill to direct the Secretary concerned to reinstate a member involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces solely on the basis of the refusal of such member to receive a vaccination against COVID-19; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOONEY (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ):

H.R. 298. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 299. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to direct the United States Postal Service to establish rates of postage for packages shipped by priority mail from the United States to a foreign Army Post Office, Fleet Post Office, or Diplomatic Post Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BARR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BERA, Mr. HILL, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 300. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of settlement agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER):

H.R. 301. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards regarding the identification of credible information regarding the origins of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 302. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide financial assistance to graduate students and postdoctoral researchers pursuing certain courses of study relating to cybersecurity and energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or combat-related special compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. SANTOS):

H.R. 304. A bill to authorize grants for States, and units of local government that take efforts to stop enabling repeat violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 305. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to assist local educational agencies with ensuring that each elementary and secondary school has at least one registered nurse on

staff; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 306. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to stop abusive student loan collection practices in bankruptcy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BOWMAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 307. A bill to authorize additional monies to the Public Housing Capital Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens sixteen years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. KILMER):

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution establishing the Task Force on the Legislative Process; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 21. A resolution commemorating the life and legacy of Sojourner Truth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 22. A resolution condemning and opposing the unprovoked invasion and egregious act of aggression against the sovereign state of Ukraine by the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 23. A resolution recognizing the catastrophic impact of the 2022 monsoon season in Pakistan and the devastation inflicted upon the Pakistani people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 24. A resolution honoring the 2022 World Series Champions-the Houston Astros-and the team's dedicated, iconic manager, Dusty Baker, as well as all of the team's outstanding players who have contributed to making history and proving that anything is possible; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H. Res. 25. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2023, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 26. A resolution expressing support for replacing the term ''Thank you for your service'' with ''Thank you for our freedom''; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CHU, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ROSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CASAR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. LIEU, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. EVANS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CROW, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. WILD, Mr. CARSON, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. PELTOLA, Ms. CARAVEO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. OMAR, Mr. STANTON, Ms. MANNING, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. IVEY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. TOKUDA, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BERA, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BALINT, Ms. PORTER, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. TRONE, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CASE, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MENG, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 27. A resolution condemning attacks on health care facilities, health care personnel, and patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. TRONE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK):

H. Res. 28. A resolution condemning the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey and committing to advancing reproductive justice and judicial reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. BICE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. NORMAN):

H. Res. 29. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish the Committee on the Elimination of Nonessential Federal Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ESTES:

H.R. 271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution: ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to

the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 17, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 12, Clause 15, Clause 16, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 8, 10, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 & Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 8, 10, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clauses 1 and 4 of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress; Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; and, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

Further, the Commercial Remote Sensing Amendement Act of 2023 is a bill that addresses the single subject of licensing the operation of private remote sensing space systems.

By Mr. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California:

H.R. 292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MOONEY:

H.R. 298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 302 .

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Requirement with respect to single-subject bills:

The bill is focused on a single subject: energy sector cybersecurity.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THANEDAR:

H.R. 306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, Sec. 1

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.J. Res. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5 of the Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.J. Res. 16.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constituion

[page H10170]

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 21: Mr. ISSA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 22: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 24: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 25: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 27: Mr. ELLZEY.

H.R. 29: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. OGLES, Mr. MAST, Mrs. BOEBERT, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERN, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HUNT.

H.R. 30: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 38: Mr. BACON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. OGLES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MCCLAIN, and Mr. ALFORD.

H.R. 41: Ms. HAGEMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 51: Ms. SCHOLTEN and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 53: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SANTOS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EZELL, Mr. MANN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 128: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 149: Mr. OGLES.

H.R. 150: Mr. FINSTAD, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 151: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 152: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 185: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 186: Mr. BENTZ and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 192: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 195: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 209: Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. HAGEMAN.

H.R. 212: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. TRONE, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. BOST, and Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 214: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 231: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. FRY, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 233: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 239: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 263: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. BEAN of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ALFORD, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ISSA, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. MANN.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. TURNER, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. TIFFANY.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LIEU, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. PORTER.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. MOYLAN.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 8: Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CARL, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SELF, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. BICE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. SANTOS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H. Res. 17: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

DELETION OF SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mrs. SPARTZ.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

SPEECH OF

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2023

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Republicans' Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

The purported focus of this Select Committee is essential to the national security and economic vitality of the United States. Unfortunately, there is a consistent trend by some in the House Republican Conference, and unfortunately by many across the country, to use xenophobic rhetoric that enflames violence bias, and hate crimes against members of the Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) community.

Let me be clear. The CCP has an egregious record on human rights and forced labor, especially regarding the Uyghur people. Additionally, the CCP consistently uses underhanded economic tactics like manipulating its currency, stealing intellectual property, and using unfair trade practices to undercut American companies and gain an unfair advantage in the global market.

The CCP's record does not, however, mean we should condone xenophobic rhetoric, fearmongering, or attacks on individual people and AAPI community in the United States. This is especially concerning after the recent spikes in hate crimes and violence against Asian Americans. In 2021, hate crimes against Asian Americans increased by 339 percent and in 2020 they increased by 124 percent.

Many of my colleagues across the aisle have invoked racist terms like "the China virus" to ignore our own responsibility to safeguard public health throughout the COVID–19 pandemic. Under the Trump Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's China Initiative profiled Asian American researchers in the United States as conducting espionage on behalf of the CCP. The China Initiative led to numerous false accusations, quashing opportunities for affected researchers, and failed to demonstrate any effective results until, wisely, Attorney General Garland ended this program.

It is necessary to grow the United States' global leadership and dedicate resources that strengthen our scientific enterprise, bolster research and development, grow our domestic semiconductor manufacturing base, and onshore critical supply chains. That is what Democrats did, in a bipartisan manner, last Congress by passing the CHIPS and Science Act. Unfortunately, most of my Republican colleagues opposed this bipartisan economic competition legislation when it passed the House and was subsequently signed into law by President Biden.

Under the leadership of President Biden, CHIPS and Science will put our nation on a path to reassert our international economic strength. Expanding the market for U.S. goods will help businesses grow in this country. Oregon exports everything from computer chips to potato chips, and more exports means more jobs at home. Competing globally necessitates a level playing field for all nations, including China. And when the playing field is level, America wins.

Although I remain hopeful that this Select Committee might be an important forum to focus on priorities for economic and national security priorities, we must make it clear that xenophobia, hate crimes, and stigma against Asian Americans have no place in our nation. I am heartbroken and infuriated by the violent attacks on members of our AAPI community and vandalism against AAPI-owned businesses.

Additionally, there are existing committees in the House with jurisdiction over the related issues that already have authority to examine and make progress on these important matters. And the Select Committee lacks legislative authority, so it will not deliver the solutions that House Republicans argue it will be working toward. Members of these existing committees have the experience necessary, many from our work last Congress on CHIPS and Science, to take the nuanced approach required to address these challenges. For these reasons, I cannot support the formation of this new Select Committee.

CONGRATULATING HARRY K. STEWART UPON RECEIVING THE 2023 GOLDEN BEAVER MANAGEMENT AWARD

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Harry K. Stewart, Chief Operating Officer of the Dutra Group, upon receiving the 2023 Golden Beaver Management Award. Mr. Stewart has dedicated over 40 years to the Dutra Group, providing invaluable support to our nation's infrastructure, protecting the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, and directly contributing to the rapid development of the dredging and marine construction industry. Throughout Mr. Stewart's incredible career, he has demonstrated a sincere commitment to the construction industry and an unyielding zeal for defending the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta community.

Born and raised near the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the hub of California's water supply, Mr. Stewart grew up witnessing the comprehensive planning and detailed care necessary to maintain our nation's harbors and waterways. After graduating from the University of California, Davis, with a degree in civil engineering, Mr. Stewart embarked on what would become a 4-decade-long career with the Dutra Group.

Since joining the Dutra Group in 1983, Mr. Stewart has served in each of the company's divisions: dredging, marine construction, and aggregates. Today, he uses his firsthand knowledge and on-the-ground experience of every facet of the Dutra Group to manage and oversee the 3 subdivisions as Chief Operating Officer. From helping protect America's coastal regions to promoting environmental responsibility through sustainable practices, Mr. Stewart plays an integral role in furthering the Dutra Group's work as a leader of the marine construction industry.

For his decades of service in the construction industry, Mr. Stewart has been honored as a recipient of the 2023 Golden Beaver Management Award. This recognition is bestowed by the Beavers, a social organization formed by companies and individuals engaged in the heavy engineering construction industry and committed to fostering goodwill an partnership among members of the industry. Mr. Stewart's exemplary career, contributions to our Nation's infrastructure, and service to the people of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta area, make this high honor of the Golden Beaver Management Award well-deserved.

Through the hard work and innovation of leaders like Mr. Stewart, our Nation's infrastructure has greatly advanced to where it is today. Mr. Stewart's 40 years of service with the Dutra Group has left an indelible legacy on the maritime construction industry that will last for many years to come. I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Stewart upon receiving this great honor and extend my deepest gratitude for his decades of vital service to the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta community.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF ALISA KORN

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Alisa Korn on her retirement from the Grand Traverse County Parks and Recreation Commission, where she has served as the President and board member for almost 12 years. Alisa's continued effort to improve communities in Northern Michigan deserves unwavering praise and recognition.

Moving from Florida to Michigan during high school, Alisa graduated from Traverse City Central High School and soon began her service to her community through the Grand Traverse County Parks & Recreation Commission. Throughout her distinguished career, Alisa has held both elected and appointed positions in Traverse City's local government—from County Commissioner to Grand Traverse

County Delegate. Her effort to create lasting change in her community led her to become a valued member of the Traverse City Housing Authority, where she has been Program Manager and Family Self-Sufficiency Manager since 2016.

Throughout Alisa's career, she has been at the forefront of expanding the Traverse City Housing Authority's reach and impact within the community. Contributing to plans for future developments like the East Bay Flats community, and providing the necessary resources to ensure past developments, such as the Orchardview Townhomes, are efficiently run and operated to best serve the community. Her efforts throughout her career have created lasting change in the Grand Traverse area, providing the necessary resources to families and residents while ensuring the community's self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Alisa Korn for her continued service to the Traverse City community. On behalf of Michigan's First District, I extend my gratitude to Alisa and her family and wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING MARY ELLEN CONOLINE'S RETIREMENT AFTER 46 YEARS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding constituent from my district, Mary Ellen Conoline, whose work and dedication as an outstanding nurse anesthetist has touched many lives in the Lower Bucks County region and the surrounding areas over the span of over 40 years.

A lifelong resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Mary Ellen always had the conviction that her future career path lay in healthcare, which is why immediately after graduating from Bishop Conwell Catholic High School in 1974, she enrolled at the Saint Francis Hospital School of Nursing in New Jersey, graduating from that fine institution with honors in August 1976.

One of her first jobs after nursing school was at St. Francis Medical Center. Mary Ellen later went on to practice nursing in various capacities, earning certifications and degrees in the areas of nephrology and critical care nursing. While gaining invaluable knowledge and experience along the way, Mary Ellen still knew that she was capable of, and wanted to give, even more.

Therefore, in 1981, Mary Ellen made the decision to attend Nursing Anesthesia school at Our Lady of Lourdes in Camden, New Jersey, and it was there she found her niche as a medical professional, an area where she could bring all her passion, dedication and numerous talents to bear. She graduated in 1983 and has been a dedicated and respected Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetist up until her December 28, 2022 retirement.

Mary Ellen spent much of her 46-year professional career as a Nurse Anesthetist faithfully and tirelessly working at Lower Bucks Hospital and Bucks County Gastroenterology LTD, where she cared for many Bucks County residents during their most vulnerable and many times unexpected health predicaments. Her bedside manner and utmost attention to patient care will always be what she was most proud of during her career in the Pennsylvania and New Jersey's healthcare systems.

Mary Ellen's husband of 39 years and 2 daughters have witnessed her dedication and selfless commitment to her line of work and celebrate her as she reaches this well-deserved retirement. Mary Ellen is eager to start spending more time with her family, which now includes a young granddaughter, as she enjoys this new chapter in her life.

We are all incredibly grateful for for the positive impact Mary Ellen has had through her long career, and we wish her countless blessings during her retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 26.

HISTORY IN SOUTH CAROLINA TODAY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is historic in Columbia as South Carolina Constitutional Officers are sworn in to begin four-year terms. The State House, with its record majority of Republicans, gained seven seats, and with the State Senate now has the largest number of Republican elected officials in 150 years.

Governor Henry McMaster will begin a term to achieve 10 years of service, the longest ever for a governor to serve with term limits. He is joined by Lieutenant Governor Pamela Evette.

Re-elected for new terms today are Attorney General, Alan Wilson, Commissioner of Agriculture, Hugh Weathers, Comptroller General, Richard Eckstrom, Secretary of State, Mark Hammond, and Treasurer, Curtis Loftis.

Succeeding Superintendent of Education, Molly Spearman, who ably addressed the Wuhan Virus crisis, is the talented and innovative Ellen Weaver.

Appreciated legislative leaders also includes President Tom Alexander in the Senate, and Speaker Murrell Smith in the House.

The success of the Republican party is due to the conservative accomplishments of limited government and expanded freedom.

In conclusion, God Bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the Global War on Terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

HONORING LEWIS FIELDS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a great American, Lewis M. Fields. Mr. Fields lives in Lexington, Kentucky. Lewis Fields was born February 21, 1927, to Nancy and Gano Fields. He grew up in Sadieville, Kentucky as the oldest of 4 children. An active young man, Mr. Fields worked on the family farm, raised and sold miniature ponies, drove the local school bus, was a member of FFA, and played basketball and baseball at Sadieville High School.

Mr. Fields enlisted in the United States Navy on February 4, 1945, just prior to his 18th birthday. His father drove him to the enlistment office in Louisville, Ky. He trained at Great Lakes, Illinois. He was then sent to California, where he was assigned to the USS *Pensacola* as a Seaman 1st Class assigned to the Supply Division. The Pensacola CA–24 was a heavy cruiser that received 13 Battle Stars for its campaign during WWII. It was nicknamed "The Grey Ghost" by Tokyo Rose for its resiliency. Mr. Fields remembers sailing under the Golden Gate Bridge as they left California for Okinawa. All personnel were on deck and Sentimental Journey was played.

The battle in Okinawa, Operation Iceberg, was the last battle of WWII and was very intense. During the onslaught of enemy fire, numerous injuries were incurred by the crew. Mr. Fields still remembers how slippery the deck was from all the blood and was staggered by the thought that this blood was from his shipmates and friends.

Mr. Fields earned a Navy Occupation Service Medal, a WWII Victory Medal, an Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with 1 Bronze Star, a Combat Action Ribbon, a Discharge Button, and an Honorable Service Pin. He moved to the Reserves on August 4, 1946 and his final separation was August 3, 1954.

Mr. Fields moved back to Kentucky and married his high school sweetheart, Jeannine Hiles Fields. They were married for 69 years until she passed away in 2016. They have 2 children. He accepted a job with Gulf Oil, where he worked for 38 years. Mr. Fields has been a faithful member of Southland Christian Church and Tates Creek Christian Church. He used his woodworking hobby to craft many items for each church. He was also active in starting Right to Life.

Lewis Fields is a true patriot, a great American, and an inspiration to us all. I am forever grateful to him and other members of the Greatest Generation for sacrificing and fighting to preserve the freedoms that we hold dear. It is my honor to recognize him before the United States Congress.

HONORING MAYOR HARRY PRICE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and lasting contributions of dear friend and incredible public servant,

Mayor Harry Price. Passing away at the age of 85, Mayor Price leaves behind an indelible legacy of over 60 years of public service to the people of Solano County.

Born in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, Mayor Price demonstrated his persevering and industrious spirit from a young age, working numerous jobs throughout his youth. While earning his bachelor's degree at Lock Haven State University, Mayor Price broadened his horizons, gaining a myriad of professional experiences as the Master of Ceremonies for his community and as a news anchor for a local station.

After Mayor Price and his family moved to Fairfield in 1965, he began teaching English at Vanden High School. Throughout his 33-year-long career as a teacher, Mayor Price worked tirelessly to support his students. His selfless dedication to the youth of Fairfield earned him the well-deserved honor of Solano County Teacher of the Year in 1986.

Following his teaching career, Mayor Price continued to serve his community through an incredible three decades of public service in Solano County. His career in public service first began with his appointment to the Fairfield Community Services Commission in 1988, followed by his service on the Fairfield Planning Commission. As a critical member of these commissions, Mayor Price was instrumental in modernizing Fairfield's infrastructure and advocating for the interests of his fellow community members.

Driven by a genuine passion for service, Mayor Price went on to serve on the Fairfield City Council in 1997 and was subsequently elected to 4 consecutive terms as Fairfield Mayor. During his 16-year tenure as mayor, Mayor Price demonstrated his sincere love for his community through his compassionate leadership and altruistic advocacy. He continued his commitment to the students of Fairfield, spearheading efforts to institute youth empowerment programs and serving as a staunch supporter of the local Boy Scouts Troop 100 and the Leaven Kids Program.

In addition, Mayor Price's remarkable leadership of Fairfield was characterized by his unyielding advocacy for Travis Air Force Base. Having served eight years in the U.S. Army, Mayor Price was a proud champion of our Nation's servicemembers and played an integral role in representing the thousands of citizens who support Travis Air Force Base. Throughout his time as an elected public servant, Mayor Price faithfully supported Fairfield's military families, making him a loved and respected member of the Travis Air Force Base Community.

Mayor Price will be remembered not only for his 6 decades of service to the city of Fairfield, but also for his spirit of kindness and selflessness. His gentle demeanor, constant smile, and persistent optimism have left an indelible legacy on Solano County and the people of Fairfield.

Mayor Price is survived by 5 children, 7 grandchildren, and a community that will dearly miss his enduring spirit. I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Mayor Price's loved ones. I know that they, along with the people of Solano County, join me in celebrating his life and legacy.

HONORING MARY SUE RICH AND RUTH E. REED

HON. KAT CAMMACK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Florida's Third Congressional District, I'm proud to honor Councilwoman Mary Sue Rich for her service to the City of Ocala and her efforts to support the construction of the brand new community center at Reed Place.

Mary Sue Rich dedicated 24 years in service to her community as a councilwoman, working to improve the quality of life for Ocala's citizens. Among her many other accomplishments as a councilwoman, Ms. Rich recently led the charge to develop the community center for purposes of enhancing the quality of life for Ocala residents. Councilwoman Rich recognized the need for Ocala residents to have ready access to health and wellness and social opportunities at a high-quality facility, and her vision to create a multi-purpose center, serving the entire family unit, across multiple generations and all walks of life, is now a reality.

Ocala's new community center will be named the Mary Sue Rich Community Center at Reed Place in honor of her dedication and service to the City of Ocala and its citizens. I'd like to thank Ms. Rich for her service and commitment to Ocala and look forward to seeing the community center's growth.

Also, on behalf of Florida's Third Congressional District, I'm proud to honor Mrs. Ruth Reed, a long-time resident of Ocala.

For years, Mrs. Reed has worked side-by-side with the City of Ocala to help create a new vision for the site of the new community center as a member of the West Ocala CRA Advisory Committee, and the City's 2035 Vision Leadership Group, the steering committee for the West Ocala Community Plan.

In honor of her dedication and service to the City of Ocala, the new property on which the Mary Sue Rich Community Center sits has been renamed Reed Place after Mrs. Ruth E. Reed, a long-time resident of the surrounding neighborhood. We look forward to seeing how Reed Place continues to grow and serve the residents of Ocala.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF JOEL FRANCK

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Joel Franck for his retirement after 5 decades of work in radio broadcasting, including 26 years as the News Director at WTCM in Traverse City, Michigan. Throughout his distinguished career, Joel's professional demeanor and contagious attitude while on air made him a staple of Northern Michigan and a cherished part of the Traverse City community.

Joel started his illustrious broadcasting career in 1969, acting as a sports broadcaster for local high schools in his hometown. Joel soon moved to Portland, Oregon, where he continued his play-by-play analysis of local high school sports and minor league baseball. After 13 years in Portland, Joel moved to the Wisconsin-Michigan area where he found a home at WTCM Radio in 1996. Remaining with WTCM until his retirement on December 9, 2022, Joel became a familiar and trusted source of information for all in the Traverse City area.

Joel Franck was a true professional in an everchanging and evolving field of work with extremely high turnover rates. His 26 years spent with WTCM Radio is an amazing accomplishment in the broadcasting industry and displays the value Joel added to the station on a daily basis. His infectious laugh, genuine personality, and professionalism while on air, made him an integral part of thousands of commuter's treks into work. News of Joel Franck's retirement has saddened the Traverse City area and all who listen to him. His familiar and trusted way of evaluating the news will be missed and his impact on all communities he broadcasted to is immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Joel Franck for his decades of service in Michigan's radio broadcasting industry. On behalf of Michigan's First District, I extend my gratitude to Joel, his family, and the entire WTCM Radio Team, and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GEORGE MILLS

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor George Mills who passed away on November 18, 2022, to celebrate his extraordinary life and commitment to serving his community.

George grew up in Dearborn, Michigan where he played varsity football at St. Alphonsus School. In his youth, he worked at the Dearborn Independent, a weekly newspaper published and co-owned by his father. In 1959, the family moved to San Francisco where George earned a degree in Political Science from the University of San Francisco. He then attended the Naval Officer Candidate School in Newport, Rhode Island and served 3 years on the USS *Ticonderoga*. In 1964, George decided to further his education at the St. Patrick Catholic Seminary in Menlo Park, returning to the San Francisco Bay Area to earn his Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy.

George's long and impactful career in education began with his return to the University of San Francisco, where he earned both his teaching credential and his Master of Arts in Education. His entire teaching career was with the San Rafael High School District (District). He started as a teacher at the San Rafael Continuation School, and within a decade, he established a Title I Language Arts Learning Center at San Rafael High School. In total, George dedicated 32 years to teaching English, Yearbook, and Journalism in the District. He was also active in the San Rafael Federation of Teachers in San Rafael and a respected advocate for his profession and colleagues.

During his decorated career, he received the ''Classroom Excellence'' award from the California Association of Teachers of English in 1983 and was selected as a Bay Area Writing Project Fellow at U.C. Berkeley in 1985. Fittingly, he was named an ''Outstanding Teacher'' in Marin County in 1997.

In addition to teaching, George was deeply involved in the San Rafael community with his wife Gayle. As Chairman of the Sun Valley Neighborhood Association, George traveled door to door to convince his neighbors to contribute to a community purchase of the land around Sun Valley Trail. This effort preserved the land for public use in 1985, which today is managed by Marin County Open Space District. George also coached his son's soccer and baseball teams and served as Assistant Scoutmaster for his Boy Scout troop.

George is survived by his beloved wife of 53 years, Gayle Mills, his 2 children: Christopher and Claire, and 2 grandchildren: Georgia and Donovan Illingworth. While he will be greatly missed, George's legacy will live on through the positive impact he had on his family, Marin County, and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that George Mills was a dedicated civil servant who will be missed and whose many years of service are worthy of commendation. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor his many contributions and express our deep condolences to his family and friends.

HONORING THE INSPIRATIONAL LIFE OF RAYMOND NIHLEAN

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Raymond Nihlean, a constituent and valued member of the Edgewater community, who believed in the goodness of every person. When you heard his contagious laugh, you knew his generous spirit would soon fill the room. His efforts resulted in tangible improvements in people's lives across every generation and background. ''Raymond was a landlord with heart,'' said community activist, Clare Tobin. ''He helped residents through the pandemic. He and his team connected renters with programs such as rent grants and resources for food.'' For one elderly tenant in particular, after finding supportive senior housing and 24/7 caregivers, Raymond even made funeral arrangements with her pastor.

In classic Raymond fashion, when a teenager threw a rock that dented his classic 1975 Lincoln Town car, he called the school instead of the police, and when Raymond learned the boy had a court date, he accompanied him. With such support, the young man received probation instead of a sentence. Always sensitive to youth needs, Raymond mentored many young people sparking their creativity, building self-confidence, and making them laugh. At neighborhood events, kids and grown-ups alike delighted in his convertible King Midget, a tiny red racing car with headlights that squirted water.

''Imagine you're at a restaurant and start singing happy birthday to your daughter. From across the room an energetic man with a booming voice and a gentle smile stands up and joins in. He's much louder than anyone else, with energy and body language that take over, inspiring everyone in the restaurant to join in. Your daughter will never forget the joy of that moment, and neither will you. The man who created that moment was Raymond,'' remembered cousin Sim from years of family gatherings.

His devoted wife Tina recollects how excited Rayond was when heavy snow fell. He had such fun riding his red ATV snowplow over 2 miles of sidewalks and alleys so neighbors could safely reach shops and public transit. ''I always heard from neighbors how much they loved Raymond. Some didn't know his name, but they loved him because he plowed their sidewalks. They never asked, he was just always there with love and joy in his heart,'' according to former State Senator Carol Ronen. For 15 years, he was a familiar early morning good Samaritan.

Former 48th Ward Alderman, Mary Ann Smith, recalls that ''Raymond's $35,000 donation was the lynch pin that got city funding for Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management training program. It was attended by local business owners who wanted to take their company to the next level.'' Raymond was a philanthropist who continued to provide resources to help other entrepreneurs flourish, including the Edgewater Uptown Builders Association (EUBA) and other community organizations. ''Raymond was always generous with his time and resources and always knowing when and how to pitch in to fill a need. He personally provided and engineered state-of-the-art sound and visual equipment to help people communicate more effectively. Raymond is a one of a kind. Truly a prince of a man.'' added Jim Byrne, past EUBA president.

A lasting tribute to Raymond's love for his community is the beautiful mosaic ''bricolage'' at the gateway to the Bryn Mawr Historic District. He brought the student artists lunches and treats, as well as donating money and materials. Raymond and Tina's wedding photo is memorialized in the art wall too, forever sharing their joy and love.

Raymond's bravery inspired his medical team. ''I will always use Ray as an example to my staff and patients what support and advocacy can do,'' remembers Dr. Samman Shahpar, Shirley Ryan Ability Lab. He further remarked at an international symposium, ''Put aside whatever you know about brain injuries, because there is Raymond.'' To Dr. Jeffrey Raizer, neuro oncologist at Northwestern Memorial Hospital, ''Raymond was indeed an inspirational person who fought hard against his GBM and by all measures Raymond had a wonderful life up until his passing.''

Throughout his 6 year and 3 month survival with brain cancer, Raymond never lost his humor, his optimism, or his zest for life. ''Every day is precious, each moment was the only moment we were sure that we had,'' said Tina. ''In the hospital, we created our own world with natural sounds of birds singing and falling water. The smell of lilies would fill the room. We were content. Patient through the pain and the healing process, attentive to the details, giving and receiving kindness, hopeful. The Zen like quality, peacefulness and good will was conducive to healing for everyone entering the room. And after 21 years of marriage, Raymond's devotion to his wife Tina, never dimmed. Their friend, Ellen Pritsker knew, ''They spoke to the beauty in one another.'' On his final day, he and Tina were looking out of his hospital window at the place by the Lake where he proposed so many years ago. Then, with a smile on his face, he took his last breath. Raymond freely shared his love and his time with all who knew him. His generosity of spirit and deeply felt joyfulness will stay with us always.

HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF NOREEN KOKORUDA

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Noreen Kokoruda of Madison, Connecticut. A stalwart community leader and advocate, Noreen passed away on December 21st, 2022.

Born in Bridgeport, Connecticut to Victor and Eileen Swaller, Noreen immediately showed traits of the characteristics which would define her life: compassion for others; commitment to service; and devotion to friends and family. At an early age, she distinguished herself for her friendly and out-going nature, going out of her way to help others. Even in high school, Noreen's penchant for public service was made clear after her election to the student council at Notre Dame High. Her passion for service blossomed as she continued her studies at Pace University, earning a Bachelor of Arts in Education. While at Pace, she was once again elected to represent her peers, this time as class president.

Soon after her graduation from Pace, Noreen met her life partner, Daniel. Noreen and Daniel began their lives together in West Haven, Connecticut, but soon settled in nearby Madison where they grew their family and community roots.

In Madison, Noreen threw herself into community work. She dedicated her time to the parent teacher organization, athletic boosters, and even worked as a substitute teacher. After serving on the Beach and Recreation commission, Noreen was elected to serve on Madison's Board of Selectmen, where she worked tirelessly for 14 years to weave a bright future for the town.

Ever savvy, Noreen was also an influential member of the Shoreline Foundation, an organization dedicated to creating recreational and enrichment opportunities in the Madison area. Through this organization, Noreen helped host summer camps in Killingworth to support local youth. Additionally, recognizing the want for a regional pool, Noreen was the one to discover an angle for the Foundation to support the construction of the Madison Aquadome, a facility which helped meet the needs of the community at no additional taxpayer cost.

In 2011, Noreen was elected to represent the 101st district in the Connecticut General Assembly, where she worked on the Planning and Development, Children, Appropriations, and Education committees. In the General Assembly, Noreen distinguished herself as a tenacious fighter for her constituency who worked across the aisle to collaborate on efforts to support the 101st district with her colleagues from both parties. Following Noreen's work in Hartford, she served on the Board of Selectman in Madison. Her dedication to public service was rare and her work touched the

lives of many people throughout the communities of Madison and Durham and the State of Connecticut as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders as devoted and compassionate as Noreen. Her absence will be felt throughout the region, and I offer my sincere condolences to her family and friends during this time. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Noreen's life and work.

HONORING TIMOTHY BURKE ON HIS 26 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Timothy Burke on his retirement from the City of Vacaville, following an incredible 26-year career devoted to serving the people of Vacaville. Throughout Mr. Burke's public service career, he has demonstrated a sincere commitment to improving his community and an unyielding zeal for addressing the pressing challenges faced by the residents of Vacaville.

During his tenure as a public servant, Mr. Burke served as Assistant Engineer, Associate Engineer, Senior Engineer, and most recently, as Assistant Director of Public Works and City Engineer. From his first role as Assistant Engineer, Mr. Burke has played an instrumental role in revolutionizing Vacaville's infrastructure, demonstrating his staunch spirit of innovation and leadership.

Throughout his career as an engineer, Mr. Burke approached every challenge presented to him with ingenuity and resourcefulness. He worked tirelessly to improve Vacaville's public systems, making them more efficient and prioritizing the concerns of his community. Mr. Burke's engineering efforts played an indispensable role in ensuring the safety of Vacaville residents.

As the Assistant Director of Public Works, Mr. Burke collaborated with Vacaville land developers to negotiate countless agreements to ensure the stability of Vacaville's infrastructure. In these negotiations, he demonstrated his great commitment to serving the needs of his community.

Mr. Burke's remarkable career is characterized not only by his wealth of knowledge and profound engineering skills, but also by his spirit of kindness and empathy. His patient guidance and persistent optimism left an indelible legacy on the people of Vacaville and Solano County.

While his presence will surely be missed, Mr. Burke's 2 decades of service to the residents of Vacaville will leave a long-lasting impact. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for Mr. Burke's dedicated service to the people of Vacaville and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GEORGE BRYAN

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of George Wilkerson Bryan, Sr. George was born in West Point, Mississippi, in 1944. He was the son of John H. Bryan and Catherine Wilkerson Bryan and the youngest of 4 siblings. George was a devoted husband and father and a member of the First Presbyterian Church in West Point, Mississippi. Throughout his life, he devoted his energy and passions toward his family, his friends, his businesses, and golf. He had a deep and positive impact on the people in his life.

A 1968 business administration graduate of Mississippi State University, George began his business career in 1964 at Bryan Foods, his family's West Point-based meat products manufacturing company, which was acquired by Sara Lee Corp. in 1968. After working in cost accounting, George became production manager and vice president of sales before being named Bryan Foods president in 1974. He was named Sara Lee Corp.'s senior vice president in 1983 and served the position until 2000. George served as chief executive officer of Sara Lee Foods and chairman and director of the American Meat Institute.

A tireless champion of business, civic, and charitable endeavors, George also served as general campaign chairman for the United Way of the Mid-South; a 30-year director and member of the Audit, Trust, and Compensation committees of Regions Bank; and past president of the Chickasaw Council Boy Scouts of America. He was named an ''Outstanding Mississippian'' in 1979 by then-Gov. Cliff Finch and was inducted into the West Point Hall of Fame in 1992 and West Point ''Citizen of the Year'' in 2000. George was named MSU's College of Business and Industry Alumni Fellow in 1992, College of Business Alumnus of the Year in 1996. He was named MSU's National Alumnus of the Year in 2000 and was a longtime board member of the MSU Foundation.

George served in 4 components of the Armed Forces: U.S. Marine Corps; U.S. Army; U.S. Army Reserve; and Army National Guard, where he was mobilized as a combat engineer during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Later in his military career, he served under the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, DC, as an advisor to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in the 1980s. He retired as a colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve and was the recipient of the Legion of Merit, the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Army Achievement Medal.

In 1988, George and his wife, Marcia, were co-founders and owners of his hometown's Old Waverly Golf Club, one of the South's premier golf destinations and home to Mississippi State men's and women's golf programs. He led in bringing the U.S. Women's Open to Old Waverly in 1999—an achievement that earned him the Jackson Clarion-Ledger's 1999 ''Sports Person of the Year'' award. George was a cofounder of Mossy Oak Golf Club, which also serves MSU's golf programs and was recognized in 2018 as one of Golf week's Top 100 Modern Golf Courses.

George Bryan is survived by his wife, Marcia Lavender Bryan, and their children: Suzanne Lavender Bryan, Brentwood, TN; George Wilkerson Bryan, Jr. (Amy, West Point, MS; Laura Bryan Williams (Shane), West Point, MS; and Nancy Bryan Campbell (Matt), Oxford, MS. He was preceded in death by his daughter, Kimberly Bryan; father, John H. Bryan Sr.: mother, Catherine Wilkerson Bryan; sister, Catherine Bryan ''Kitty'' Dill; brother, John H. Bryan Jr.: and brother-in-law, Robert Donald Harrell, Sr.

HONORING HOWARD GANTER FOR 44 YEARS OF SERVICE AT THE ARC JEFFERSON—ST. LAWRENCE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard ''Howie'' Ganter for over 40 years of service to The Arc Jefferson—St. Lawrence, formerly Jefferson Rehabilitation Center. Since 1978, Howie has served The Arc in many capacities, culminating in his promotion to Chief Executive Officer in 2009.

Howie began his career at Jefferson Rehabilitation Center in 1978 as a Recreation Therapist, where he was an exceptional provider of services for people with disabilities and truly embodied the vision of the Jefferson Rehabilitation Center. Under Howie's tremendous leadership, Jefferson Rehabilitation Center merged with St. Lawrence NYSARC and established The Arc Jefferson—St. Lawrence. During this time, Howie successfully led these organizations through a smooth merger, while never losing sight of their missions to enhance the lives of people they serve to help them achieve their hopes and aspirations.

Howie's immense passion for serving others extended beyond his career at The Arc. Howie served on numerous committees and boards and volunteered countless hours to many organizations dedicated to helping those with disabilities. He served as the President of 1 World Foundation, where he coordinated shipments of needed supplies for people with disabilities in underserved areas all over the world. Additionally, Howie was the President of DOHL Development Corporation, a for-profit corporation that employs and trains nearly 100 people with disabilities providing them with vocational independence and confidence. Howie's motivation to make the world a better place for everyone, especially for those with disabilities, led him to lead a life of service even above himself.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I am honored to recognize Howie's immense contribution to his community that has assuredly left an indelible impact for generations to come. His dedication to serving those with disabilities and tireless support of The Arc should serve as an inspiration to us all. I congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement, and I wish him the best for all of his future endeavors.

SUPPORTING THE OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS AND CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2023

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 118th Congress and the new year, I want to take a moment to voice my strong support for the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, Public Law 117–328. Given that this legislation will help so many, it is fitting that we enacted this bipartisan bill during the holiday season—a time of kindness and caring for others.

As people struggle with higher costs, this law provides substantial help paying for food, housing, health care, childcare, and education. For example, a few notable provisions include:

It increases affordable housing funding by 8 percent, including an expansion of vouchers for 12,000 households at risk of homelessness;

It ensures that the 40 million children on Medicaid and CHIP have uninterrupted access to health care through the year by offering continuous coverage;

It expands high-quality childcare and preschool by increasing the Child Care and Development Block Grant by $1.9 billion and Head Start by $950 million;

It invests in mental health services for Medicare beneficiaries by expanding the physician workforce, creating a new outpatient benefit, and extending telehealth flexibilities for 2 years;

It helps improve customer service by the Social Security Administration for seniors, people with disabilities, and survivors with an additional $785 million;

It lowers food insecurity with an additional $13.4 billion for the SNAP program and by giving 29 million kids healthy meals during the summer with the creation of a permanent summer food program;

It increases Pell Grants by $500, the largest increase in over a decade;

It helps lower energy costs with $6.1 billion for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program or LIHEAP;

It helps individuals, families, and communities affected by disasters with $27 billion; and

It strengthens retirement for Americans.

I am very proud that this law includes 3 of my bills and over $24 million to help my local organizations and constituents via community projects funding.

The law includes The Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022 that provides historic funding for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program that funds evidence-based home visiting proven to improve mother and child health, family safety, and child development.

It includes the Retirement Parity for Student Loans Act that improves retirement savings and lowers educational debt by allowing employers to make 401(k) matching payments for employees making student-loan payments, helping younger workers who currently cannot afford to save for their retirement to begin saving much sooner.

In addition, the law includes key provisions of the Unclaimed Savings Bond Act that will help locate bondholders and heirs of unclaimed bonds, helping ordinary Americans claim the over $33 billion owed to them. Illinois citizens are owed over $1 billion in matured unredeemed savings bonds. Under current practice, Treasury has required bondholders and heirs who cannot produce the physical bond from redeeming those funds unless they are able to provide the serial number and other detailed information. This requirement likely affects poorer and elderly bondholders who face the most challenges in retaining all of their personal records and who hold a significant percentage of these bonds. Working with my colleague, Ron Estes, and other Ways and Means Members, the law included a fix to ensure that Treasury makes every effort to provide each state with the complete information, including the serial numbers, for bondholders in that state. Helping bondholders and their heirs redeem their investments is the clear purpose of the statute, and I will work with the executive branch to ensure it is carried out.

Finally, this law delivers over $24 million to help my local organizations and constituents via community projects. These projects will: increase access to quality health, substance abuse, and mental health services; expand affordable and transitional housing; improve higher education for minority men; expand community well-being programs to improve community safety and economic security; help modernize one of our cherished local museums; improve the trauma-informed care system for children on the south and westsides; and provide high-caliber programming to youth.

I am proud that the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, does so much to support individuals, families, communities, and businesses—improving well-being, safety, and economic security. I look forward to seeing all the goods things that this law does unfold during 2023.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF DALE CLARMONT

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Dale Clarmont for his 35 years of service in the Cheboygan County Sheriffs Department. Over his time working for the people of North Michigan, including more than 2 decades as Sheriff, Dale has shown considerable poise and professionalism while working to make his community a safer place.

Upon graduating high school in 1979, Sheriff Clarmont started his 8-year military career with the United States Navy as an Aviation Electronics Technician, later returning to the Cheboygan area to raise his family. Dale soon started his time in the Cheboygan County Sheriffs Department as a dispatcher in 1987, quickly cementing himself as a key part of the department and an ideal candidate for county Sheriff in 2000. He would go on to hold this position for 22 years, until announcing his upcoming retirement in January of 2023.

Throughout his distinguished career, Sheriff Clarmont prioritized his community's safety and well-being above all else. Dale's longtime devotion to our country is commendable, and the impact of his work on his fellow officers and the people of the Cheboygan cannot be overstated. We owe Dale our utmost gratitude for his continued effort to better himself, his colleagues, and the community he has served for the past 35 years.

Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to recognize Dale Clarmont for his decades of combined service to the United States Navy and the Cheboygan County Sheriff's his local Sherriff's Department. On behalf of Michigan's First District, I extend my gratitude to Dale and his family and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO GERALD ''BUD'' CHITTOM

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Gerald ''Bud'' Chittom, a larger-than-life restaurateur, musician and promoter of Memphis' iconic blues throughfare—Beale Street—and my friend. Bud passed in 2018 after a career opening and managing dozens of Memphis area restaurants and night clubs. He was awarded a Beale Street Brass Note in 2011 with the inscription ''A Man You Don't Meet Everyday,'' putting him in the company of fellow Brass Note honorees, B.B. King, Isaac Hayes, Elvis Presley and Sain Phillips. Bud will be honored this week by the Downtown Memphis Commission with its Vision Award, which will be received by his daughter, Caitlin. It's well-deserved. Bud was instrumental in the renewal of Beale Street, creating the Blues City Café at Second Street, founding Jerry Lee Lewis' Café and Honky Tonk at 310 Beale, and driving business to other venues on Beale and his restored Earnestine and Hazel's on South Main Street, now world-renown as the Nation's best dive bar. He didn't rest until the area's revival as a mecca for tourism and music lovers was assured. A bass player himself, he often sat in with bands playing venues up and down the street. After I successfully passed the Tennessee Education Lottery as a Tennessee state senator, Bud and Blues City Café co-owner, Wilbur Hensley sold me the first lottery ticket in Tennessee in 2004. The Vision Award recognizes Bud's contribution to our community, and I commend the Downtown Memphis Commission for saluting him, and congratulate his family and friends for making him a part of our lives.

HONORING JAY PENDERGRAPH ON HIS 19 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jay Pendergraph upon his retirement from the Wheatland City Council. Throughout Mr. Pendergraph's tenure on City Council, he fervently advocated for his fellow

community members and led efforts to revolutionize Wheatland's infrastructure through investments in critical projects.

Mr. Pendergraph has served on the Wheatland City Council since 2003, faithfully advancing the interests of Wheatland residents and helping usher his community into a new era of prosperity. As a prominent member of the Economic Development Sub-Committee, Mr. Pendergraph played an indispensable role in ensuring Wheatland's economic stability. Moreover, his leadership on the Pool and Sewer Ad-Hoc Committees played a critical role in improving the resources and services available to his community. His efforts not only modernized Wheatland's infrastructure, making it safer and more efficient, but also improved Wheatland residents' quality of life.

As the Vice-Chairman of the Feather River Air Quality Management District, Mr. Pendergraph also collaborated with local leaders across Yuba and Sutter Counties to promote and improve their communities' air quality. Mr. Pendergraph's advocacy on this issue was essential in reducing emissions and safeguarding the people of Wheatland from the health impacts of air pollution.

Mr. Pendergraph's dedication to public service extends beyond his role on City Council. Following over 2 decades of brave service in the U.S. Air Force, Mr. Pendergraph continued to proudly support his fellow veterans and current servicemembers through his 10 years of work with the Department of Defense at Beale Air Force Base. In addition, Mr. Pendergraph diligently serves his community outside his professional career as a proud member of the Wheatland Lions Club.

While his presence on the Wheatland City Council will surely be missed, Mr. Pendergraph's years of service to the residents of Wheatland have left an indelible legacy. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for Mr. Pendergraph's service to the people of Wheatland and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DEPUTY SONNY JOHNSON

HON. SHARICE DAVIDS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and work of Deputy Sonny Johnson of the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Department. Deputy Johnson led a dutiful life of public service and was known to those around him as one who emitted selflessness. Deputy Johnson leaves behind a family and community that will miss him dearly.

Deputy Johnson was born July 24, 1962, in Czechoslovakia, later moving to Germany where he spent most of his youth. In the late 80's, Deputy Johnson moved to the United States, earning citizenship and beginning his career in service to Wyandotte County. Deputy Johnson became a deputy with the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office on August 07, 2008, proudly serving his entire career in the adult detention center where he worked multiple positions—including acting supervisor. Those who knew him would say that no deputy was prouder to put on the uniform and wear a badge each day.

Deputy Johnson's compassion and service did not end with his career—he cared for his community. As Wyandotte County Sheriff Daniel Soptic shared, Deputy Johnson would walk by his coworkers and greet them with a kind ''Hey Bubba,'' his way of asking after you to see how you were doing. He was devoted to family, to caring for his chickens, and to bringing laughter to those he loved. He loved his wife, Nadine. Those who knew Deputy Johnson best know he would do anything, for anybody, at any time.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Deputy Johnson will be remembered by many for the way he loved his job, he loved his family, and he loved the country he served.

NO VOTE ON ANTI-CHOICE H.R. 26 AND H. CON. RES. 3

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 26 and H. Con. Res 3, two pieces of legislation that yet again seek to limit access to reproductive health care and insert politics into personal reproductive health care decisions.

H.R. 26 is a deliberately misleading bill that effectively politicizes abortion care and criminalizes doctors. This bill is offensive to those who face pregnancy complications and opens the door to political interference when families are making difficult, complicated, and often heartbreaking medical decisions. This legislation is based on false claims; it vilifies families and the doctors who care for them, and carelessly misleads the public about these rare and complicated scenarios. When a family is dealing with the unthinkable, an infant that will not survive, they should be able to hold and comfort their child and peacefully say goodbye. If this bill were to become law, forced medical intervention would cut short parents' final moments with their child, and doctors across the country would face extreme penalties simply for doing what is best for their patients.

H. Con. Res. 3 is nothing but a political move by the extreme Republican House majority that is both disingenuous and puts actual health care clinics at risk. Let me be clear: I condemn violence in all its forms. However, this resolution only focuses on protecting ''pro-life pregnancy centers'' and ''faith-based women's health clinics''—not medical facilities. Here's a fact: attacks on abortion providers and clinics are on the rise, increasing 128 percent in just one year. The resolution before us falls short of fully condemning political violence, and I encourage my colleagues to stand together and condemn all violence, so that everyone can have the freedom to access reproductive health care without fear.

COMMENDING THE INCLUSION OF AN ALL-FEMALE DIVISION IN THE QUEBEC INTERNATIONAL PEE-WEE HOCKEY TOURNAMENT 2023

HON. MARY GAY SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the importance of promoting inclusion and equity in sports by promoting women and girls' sports, and to commend the efforts of our neighbors to the North in promoting such inclusion and equity with the addition of an all-female division at this year's Quebec International Pee-Wee Hockey Tournament, one of the largest pee wee hockey tournaments in the world.

The United States and Canada enjoy both a vibrant rivalry and partnership in the sport of ice hockey. Each year, that rivalry and partnership is on display at the Quebec International Pee-Wee Hockey Tournament.

From February 8 through 19, 2023 the 2023 Quebec International Pee-Wee Hockey Tournament will feature 120 teams, including an all-female division for the first time in its 62 year history.

We applaud this significant development.

The United States and Canada are the closest of friends, partners, and allies, sharing common values and goals, such as promoting representative democracy where all may develop their skills and talents to the benefit of society as a whole, including in women and girls' sports.

In 2022, the United States celebrated the 50th anniversary of the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 that prohibited sex discrimination in education and opened new athletic opportunities for girls and women.

Similarly, Canada's Physical Activity and Sport Act states that the Government of Canada's policy regarding sport includes the principle to ensure the full and fair participation of all persons in sport.

Accordingly, my Congressional colleagues and I congratulate the 2023 Quebec International Pee-Wee Hockey Tournament on the ilusion of an all-female team division this year for the first time in the tournament's history. We express our appreciation to the people and Government of Canada for their long history of friendship and cooperation with the people and Government of the United States.

CELEBRATING COLONEL ANTOINETTE GANT'S PROMOTION TO BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Antoinette R. Gant on her promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the United States Army. Brig. Gen. Gant is the first African American female, active-duty engineer to be promoted to the rank of general officer. She was officially promoted to the rank

in a traditional military ceremony at her alma mater, Prairie View A&M University in Prairie View, Texas on October 28, 2022. Vice Chief of Staff of the Anny, Gen. Randy George, conducted the promotion ceremony.

Gant assumed command of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) South Pacific Division in July 2021. Established in 1888 and headquartered in San Francisco, the South Pacific Division is one of 9 USACE regional commands. The region encompasses all or part of 10 states with 4 operating districts headquartered in Albuquerque, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San Francisco.

Gant is responsible for leading a workforce of more than 2,800 military and civilians, overseeing hundreds of water-resource development, military, interagency design, and construction projects valued at more than $16 billion in support of our communities, our Nation, and our warfighters.

A native of Port Gibson, Mississippi, Gant graduated from Prairie View A&M University in Texas as a Distinguished Military Graduate with a Bachelor of Science in civil engineering and a commission in the Engineer Regiment. She holds a Master of Science in engineer management from Missouri University of Science and Technology, Rolla, Missouri, and a Master of Science in national resource strategy from the Dwight D. Eisenhower School, National Defense University, Washington, D.C. She is also a certified Project Management Professional.

Gant has served in a variety of command and staff positions for engineering units stateside and abroad. Prior to South Pacific Division, Gant was commander of the USACE South Pacific Border District from July 2020 to June 2021. Gant previously served as the combined joint engineer for the Resolute Support and OFS headquarters, Kabul, Afghanistan, military assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Army-Civil Works, Washington, D.C., chief of operations for the engineer directorate, U.S. Army South, Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas, and the director for the Directorates of Public Works and Installation Support, ASG-Kuwait.

She has received several national and community awards, to include 2021 Black Engineer of the Year Conference Awards, Army Stars and Stripes Award recipient, the 2020 Women of Color Career Achievement in Government Award, the YWCA Women on the Move Award, Women of Influence in Government by Albuquerque Business First, BEYA Special Recognition Award, and Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., South Central Region Visionary Leader and Global Leader Awards.

I commend Brig. Gen. Gant on her historic achievements and thank her for her leadership and service to our country.

HONORING HOLLAND WHITE ON HIS FOUR YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Holland Barrett White on his 4 years of service as Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Councilmember on the Pittsburg City Council. Throughout Mr. White's tenure on City Council, he advocated for vulnerable populations in his community and valiantly led efforts to revolutionize Pittsburg's infrastructure through investments in critical projects.

From his first months as Councilmember, Mr. White demonstrated his staunch spirit of innovation and leadership by playing an instrumental role in establishing Pittsburg's first Community Services Ad-Hoc Committee. Focused specifically on improving the services available to underserved members of the community, this committee directly led to the formation of a new program providing recent Pittsburg residents with vital information and resources regarding the immigration process.

During his tenure on City Council, Mr. White exemplified a genuine commitment to combatting systemic injustice and racism in our society. Through Mr. White's work, the Pittsburg Police Department invested $10,000 towards implementing the Pittsburg My Brother's Keeper Initiative, which addresses the persistent gaps in opportunity faced by youth of color. Under Mr. White's leadership as mayor, Pittsburg invested $1.49 million through the My Brother's Keeper Challenge towards ensuring all youth, regardless of their race or ethnicity, can achieve their full potential.

In addition, Mr. White also worked tirelessly to modernize Pittsburg's power infrastructure and guarantee internet access for all. Using his extensive knowledge as a member of the Pittsburg Power Company Board of Directors, Mr. White's advocacy was essential in prompting the City Council to authorize a new project to expand internet services for individuals most in need.

While his presence on the City Council will surely be missed, Mr. White's 4 years of service to the residents of Pittsburg have left an indelible legacy. Mr. White is a vibrant young leader and I eagerly anticipate his future work. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for Mr. White's dedicated service to the people of Pittsburg and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands in recess until 1:30 p.m. on Friday, January 13, 2023.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 37 public bills, H.R. 271–307; and 12 resolutions, H.J. Res. 15–16; H. Con. Res. 8; and H.Res. 21–29, were introduced. **Pages H202–04**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H206**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H155**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:20 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H164**

Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 26, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 210 nays with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 29. **Pages H178–90, H190–92**

Rejected the DeGette motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 28. **Pages H190–91**

Expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 3, expressing the sense of Congress condemning the recent attacks on pro-life facilities, groups, and churches, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 30. **Pages H169–78, H192**

Hour of Meeting: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, January 12th. **Page H198**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H191, H191–92, and H192.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1:30 p.m., Friday, January 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, January 12

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 22—Protecting America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve from China Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barr, Andy, Ky., E16
Bergman, Jack, Mich., E15, E17, E20
Bonamici, Suzanne, Ore., E15
Cammack, Kat, Fla., E17
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E20
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E18
Davids, Sharice, Kans., E21
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E20
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E16
Garamendi, John, Calif., E15, E16, E19, E20, E22
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E17
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E19
LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E16
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E21
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E21
Scanlon, Mary Gay, Pa., E21
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E18
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E19
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E16

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.