United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2023 No. 20

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 31, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE FLOOD 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.

HISTORY REPEATED ITSELF ONCE MORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today appalled and disgusted and brokenhearted. Like so many others, I am still struggling to process the sheer inhumanity on display in the murder of Tyre Nichols.

Last week, our Nation watched helplessly as another innocent Black man was beaten to death by men sworn to serve and protect. In the final moments of his life, Tyre Nichols cried out for help as he struggled to understand what he possibly could have done to deserve such a fate.

As a mother, seeing Tyre cry out for his mom deeply pains me. As a Black woman, I am furious at the injustice that Black Americans face every day. As a human being, the vicious murder I have seen leaves me shaken to my core.

Tyre Nichols was a human being with a life as beautiful as any other. He was a photographer. He loved skateboarding. He was a son to a loving mother and a father to a 4-year-old son.

Tyre will never get to see his son grow up, and his son will never get another hug from his father.

I mourn Tyre, and I pray for his loved ones. I mourn Keenan Anderson, who invoked George Floyd's name when he, too, was killed by police this month. I mourn Elijah McClain, Philando Castile, Tamir Rice, and every other Black life stolen from us by police.

I have grown weary of my mourning, though, Mr. Speaker, because history has repeated itself once again.

The murder of Tyre Nichols comes 3 years after the murder of Breonna Taylor. It comes 9 years after the murder of Michael Brown. It comes 14 years after the murder of Oscar Grant. It comes 153 years after the murder of Henry Truman in 1870.

Nothing we can do will ever bring back Tyre Nichols, Daunte Wright, Eric Garner, or any Black American killed by a system that did not value their lives. We can, however, demand accountability and sweeping reforms from police departments that have built, maintained, and even encouraged a culture of brutality and even racism.

The time is now to reevaluate and reimagine the role of police in our community. We must stop waiting for justice and start doing our jobs.

As public servants, we have a duty to do right by our communities, even if that means starting the long, difficult process of reforming and restructuring our justice system. It is the duty of the Federal Government to ensure that law enforcement is used to protect communities, not tear them apart.

Last Congress, the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, but the Senate blocked it from becoming law. That was a disappointment, but it cannot be a defeat.

This Congress, we have a new opportunity to end qualified immunity and protect our communities. However, that opportunity will not seize itself.

House Republicans have spent endless time and resources establishing committees for conspiracy theories but have offered zero solutions to the rising tide of police brutality. I call on all of my colleagues to commit or recommit themselves to fixing the fundamental flaws in the fabric of our justice system. If we fail to do so, our society will forever be one in which police are seen as an occupying force instead of a force for good.

RECOGNIZING VIRGINIA SMITH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, throughout the course of our lives, we are both blessed and fortunate to cross paths with and befriend individuals who harbor a profound sense of dedication toward serving others and their communities. To me and countless others, Virginia Smith of Stokes County, North Carolina, is one of those people.

This year, she will retire as the chairwoman of the Stokes County Republican Party, a position she has held since 2003.

To know Virginia is to know someone who lives and breathes the meaning of possessing a servant's heart.

Printed on recycled paper.

From organizing events with her church to her civic involvement within her community, wherever Virginia goes, you know that she is on a mission to serve, and she will not be deterred in that mission.

Truly, she is a community-driven woman. I cannot overstate her rock-ribbed conservatism and how she has always espoused, promoted, and shared both the values and principles upon which our constitutional republic was founded.

The simple truth is that we need more Virginia Smiths in this world.

Her work as chairwoman and as a proud member of the Stokes County community has helped lay a foundation upon which our future leaders, the young men and women of today, can grow and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, as Virginia enters this new and exciting chapter of her life, may she know that she has left an indelible mark upon the lives of so many people, me included. I am confident she will continue to do so.

May God continue to bless her and her family in the days ahead.

REASONABLE RAISING OF DEBT CEILING

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, with $31.4 trillion in national debt, House Republicans are committed to finding a solution that is reasonable, sensible, and responsible regarding raising the debt ceiling.

President Biden would be irresponsible not to negotiate. We must finally address Washington's reckless government spending if we want to put America on a better fiscal path.

After 2 years of reckless deficit spending, the Biden administration is refusing to negotiate with Republicans to protect taxpayers and solve our Nation's debt crisis.

Democrats accelerated spending following the last massive debt limit increase. After passing the largest debt limit increase in American history, it took Democrats only a little over a year to max out the Federal Government's credit card again.

Democrats outspent record-high revenue. Despite record-high revenues from the Republican-passed Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Federal spending has continued to balloon, increasing by $10 trillion over the last 2 years, a record for a new President.

There is a bipartisan path forward. Instead of refusing to negotiate, Democrats need to join Republicans in crafting a plan that protects taxpayers. All eight major spending reforms since 1985 have been attached to debt ceiling legislation.

We must be, again, as Republicans say, reasonable, sensible, and responsible regarding raising the debt ceiling. We call on President Biden and the Democrats to join us in this effort.

CELEBRATING WIND RIVER TRANSFER

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

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to be a voice for my rural community and celebrate the passage of the Wind River Administrative Site Conveyance Act.

Before being sworn into Congress, I acted with my predecessor, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, Senator CANTWELL, and members of the Skamania County Commission to pass the Wind River Administrative Site Conveyance Act in the fiscal year 2023 spending bill.

As a Skamania County resident, I know that only 1.8 percent of our land is fully taxable for generating necessary revenue for community services. The Wind River Administrative Site Conveyance Act transfers 24 acres back into the county land base and increases opportunity for small businesses in our community.

I thank my predecessor, JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, and Senator CANTWELL for leading this effort. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass similarly important legislation.

RECOGNIZING REPAIR CLARK COUNTY

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to be a voice for my community and share with you the importance of Repair Clark County.

Repair Clark County is a nonprofit organization that rejects the premise that when things break, we just throw them out, that we are helpless consumers reliant on an endless cycle of cheap goods.

I was lucky to attend one of their events on January 21, and I saw a little girl light up when her favorite nightlight was fixed instead of being thrown away. What an amazing gift to teach this child that we can have a relationship of stewardship with our belongings, not just consumerism.

These volunteers uphold our values of stewardship and self-sufficiency because, in America, DIY is in our DNA.

I thank Terra Heilman, the head of Repair Clark County, for spearheading this effort.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work on Federal legislation that ensures all consumers have the right and the ability to maintain and fix their own stuff.

RECOGNIZING IURBAN TEEN

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the iUrban Teen organization for creating an incredibly diverse talent pipeline in my district.

IUrban Teen provides skills training for teens and young adults and gives them access to career pathways and alternatives that they need to be successful and have more opportunities.

For example, the Future Teachers Pathway program brings together Vancouver Public Schools, Washington State University Vancouver, and Clark College to mentor students and give them the training they need to succeed in their chosen career paths.

This is so critical for young people who face challenges and gives them the support they deserve in their efforts to become critical members of our community.

For the past 13 years, iUrban Teen has hosted a breakfast on Martin Luther King Jr. Day. I was honored to attend their event.

I thank the iUrban Teen team for bridging the gap for students and inspiring all of us to keep working for change.

HONORING MIKHAIL PAVENKO

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mikhail Pavenko, a resident of Vancouver, Washington.

In 1996, Mikhail emigrated from Ukraine to Vancouver, and he has proudly worked as a lineman for the Clark County Public Utilities since 2014, literally keeping the lights on in my district.

Mr. Pavenko has recently taken on a new role. Since the conflict between Ukraine and Russia began, he has returned to Ukraine more than a dozen times to serve as a volunteer military chaplain.

Mikhail is and continues to be a beacon of light for many during times of untold suffering. He inspires Ukrainians on the front line to keep the faith and keep up the fight, and he simultaneously reminds all of us that democracy is worth fighting for.

I cannot thank Mr. Pavenko enough for his service to the people of Ukraine as they stand together against authoritarianism.

CONGRATULATING THE COLUMBIA RIVER RAPIDS GIRLS VOLLEYBALL TEAM

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give a big shout-out to the Columbia River Rapids girls volleyball team. They are doing an incredible job. I am so excited to share this on the House floor.

The Rapids girls volleyball team won the 2A State title in three sets, finishing an amazing season for the volleyball team. The entire tournament, they only lost one set. What makes this even more notable is they were a No. 6 seed, and they defeated three higher seeds to attain this title.

These incredible young women played an impressive season and have made me and our whole community very proud.

Congratulations to the Columbia River Rapids girls volleyball team on their amazing accomplishments. I am so excited to see what they will do next season.

HONORING BROTHER FRED WOLFE

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a dear friend of mine, Brother Fred Wolfe.

Fred Hartwell Wolfe was born December 5, 1936, in Rock Hill, South Carolina, and he passed away on January 3, 2021. I was standing on this very floor being sworn in the moment they let me know he had passed away.

To so many people in this country, Fred Wolfe was a friend. He was a spiritual leader. He was a life coach. He was a father figure. He was a big brother. That is why we all simply called him Brother Fred.

□ 1015

Brother Fred had a God-given ability to make everyone feel special, and he truly believed that everyone was special. Every waking moment in Brother Fred's life, he understood that God was not only watching him, but God knew exactly what His next step would be in Fred's life.

Brother Fred, on numerous occasions, would tell me that everything in our life is controlled by God, and everything was put here to serve God.

Later in life, Brother Fred's health started breaking down, but he never took his eyes off of God. I remember when he had open-heart surgery and the men from the church would stay with him to take care of his needs. One night when I was there with Brother Fred, I asked him how his open-heart surgery had played a role in God's master plan.

He told me, I don't know. He said, It is part of the plan, but I don't know. I am here to serve. I thought that was a pretty strange response seeing he just had his chest cracked open and everything moved around. But he knew he would wait. He told me, We may never know; then again, we may.

Just a few minutes later, a nurse came walking in to take his vital signs—of course, as they do in the hospitals and keep you awake all night—while doing so, he smiled at Brother Fred and said, You don't remember me, but a few years ago, I got saved under your ministry.

Unfortunately, I have slipped away from God, and I am paying the price in my family today.

With all the tubes, with all the monitors, with everything going off in that room, Brother Fred stopped what he was thinking and doing and prayed with that man. He left with much higher spirits than he actually entered with.

As we sat there quietly, I was thinking, Did God use Fred Wolfe in this position because of this man? I looked up and made eye contact with Fred, who was laying in the bed, he simply winked and rolled over and went to sleep like he knew that was the answer.

For thousands of people who were saved under his ministry, raised their family with his wisdom, and learned that God is the most important thing in their life, I say this is not good-bye, for we will see you again. We will see Miss Anne, and we will see Brother Fred at the right hand of God.

CONGRATULATIONS TO DURANGO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as some extraordinary Durango High School students are making news and scientific history.

A team from Nevada's Third District, Durango High School, recently became one of only 60 teams nationwide to win the NASA TechRise student challenge. This year the challenge was to design an experiment that could be tested on a NASA-sponsored balloon flight.

The Durango team won with their entry, Project Nighthawk, which they will continue to work on for the rest of the school year. This summer, the project will be tested in a high-altitude balloon flight.

This is a big deal, but I know it is just the start of some amazing endeavors into STEM that these Durango Trailblazers will make in their future careers. These students will be mentored by the best and the brightest researchers and have an invaluable opportunity to learn about the edge of the Earth's atmosphere.

The ingenuity of these talented Nevadans reminds us that when it comes to exploration of our final frontier, the best is yet to come. I have no doubt that we will all benefit from their contributions in years to come.

Congratulations, Durango High School's Project Nighthawk.

REINING IN OUR NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our national debt. In 2022, Speaker MCCARTHY unveiled the Commitment to America which outlines the Republican platform for governing as we took control of the House in the 118th Congress.

Through our plan, it is critical we support policies that lead to a strong, healthy economy, fight inflation, and lower the cost of living. We must rein in reckless spending here in Washington and root out waste, fraud, and abuse in government.

For the last 2 years, the Biden administration has been left unchecked. Because of their policies, we have seen record-breaking inflation, skyrocketing gas and grocery prices, and increases to daily expenses. Hard-working families are forced to decide between feeding their families or paying the heat and electric bills.

These economic hardships are brought on by unrestricted reckless spending. That irresponsible spending stops now. With $31.4 trillion in national debt, House Republicans are committed to finding a reasonable, practical, and responsible solution to raising the debt ceiling. Just like millions of Americans are forced to make difficult financial decisions to make ends meet, we must finally address out-of-control government spending if we want to put America on a better fiscal path.

Mr. Speaker, I heard from hundreds of my constituents who are concerned about America's checkbook. On December 16, 2021, Congress voted to increase the national borrowing limit to $31.4 trillion, an increase of $2.5 trillion more than the previous allowance. This bill kicked the proverbial can down the road until now when we are, once again, faced with raising the Federal debt ceiling even further.

In recent years, the Federal debt has ballooned because of many of the Biden administration's policies, including the student loan repayment pause and forgiveness, Congressional Democrats' multitrillion-dollar spending spree, and rising interest rates stemming from historic inflation.

The first step toward reducing the debt is controlling the annual deficit. To fully address the drivers of the national debt, Members of both parties and the President will have to come to an agreement in addressing unchecked mandatory spending and reckless discretionary spending priorities.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my commitment to America, I will continue to work to rein in government waste, fraud, and abuse, while limiting skyrocketing government program costs and finding solutions on reducing our national debt.

RAISING AND EXTENDING THE DEBT CEILING 78 TIMES

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, since 1960, Congress has raised and extended the debt limit 78 times over a 63-year period.

Let's put this in perspective: 49 times under Republican administrations, 29 times under Democratic Presidents. Sixty-three years we have raised the debt ceiling 78 times.

We are one of only two democratic nations with a statutory debt ceiling and the only one, because of the magnificent extent of our country, the U.S. dollar being the common currency of the world that can threaten a global economic crisis—think about that—by playing around with the debt ceiling.

The debt ceiling has no impact on government spending. Why? Because it only commences to pay the bills that we have already committed ourselves to. Both Republicans and Democrats have passed legislation that has created debt, that requires us to pay Social Security, that requires us to pay other mandatory programs in which there has been bipartisan support for.

Instead, this debt ceiling restricts the Treasury, if, in fact, we do not lift the debt ceiling, from paying those bills. That is why for over 63 years, 78 times, the Congress has chosen to raise the debt ceiling. Why? Because we don't want to put the liability of the world's economy, let alone the U.S. economy, at risk.

We don't want to be deadbeats, right? I think most Americans feel they

ought to pay their bills. My colleagues on the other side want to hold the debt ceiling hostage, leaving Social Security recipients and veterans potentially without their pensions or benefits.

Does that make any sense? If we default on our debt, over 6 million jobs could be diminished. Seniors may not get their benefits for a period of time. Costs will skyrocket. Some economists indicate we could put $12 trillion of American savings at risk if it were extended in this gamesmanship, this attempt to stare each other down, on whether or not we lift the debt ceiling.

That makes no sense. That is risky business. We ought to raise our debt ceiling and pay our bills, and I think there is common agreement that we ought to get our debt under control.

As a Blue Dog, our focus and purpose of being is in the area of fiscal responsibility. As a matter of fact, the last American President that balanced the budget was President Bill Clinton. That was a while ago.

I think that there is common bipartisan agreement to focus on waste, on fraud, and abuse. I mean, those are the buzzwords, right? If we could only focus on waste, fraud, and abuse. But no one wants to highlight, well, how will that impact Social Security? How will that impact other mandatory spending that we have all committed to on a bipartisan basis?

The way to do this is for Republicans and Democrats to come together, separate from raising the debt ceiling, and agree to focus on two things that cause debt—expenditures and revenues.

If we can get an agreement on what we think the Nation's responsibility to be on our priorities for expenditures and the necessary revenues to pay for them, then, only then, would we get our deficit under control, which is what, by the way, President Bill Clinton was able to do a while ago on a bipartisan basis.

So let's get real. Let's not hold the American people hostage, our economy, or the global economy as we play fast and loose with this talk and notion of whether or not to lift the debt ceiling. We must lift the debt ceiling because it is the responsible thing to do.

I ask my colleagues on the other side: Let's come together, let's work on fiscal responsibility in a bipartisan fashion because we should. It is obviously an important, critical issue as we move forward. Let's not play fast and loose with whether or not we are going to be deadbeats and whether or not we are going to pay our bills. That is putting the American economy at risk. It is something we should not do.

HONORING MASTER SGT. JOSEPH KAPACZIEWSKI

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am here with a very heavy heart to honor Master Sergeant Joseph Kapacziewski, a member of the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment.

□ 1030

Army Rangers are some of the most elite soldiers in the world, and Master Sergeant Kapacziewski, nicknamed Kap, was no exception.

In April 2010, while serving in eastern Afghanistan, his team of Army Rangers was locked in combat with a group of armed insurgents. When one of his comrades was hit, Kap sprinted through the fire to provide aid. With the help of a fellow Ranger, they dragged the wounded soldier to safety, actions which earned Kap an Army Commendation Medal with valor.

Kap's actions would be remarkable under any conditions, but considering his experiences from a few years earlier, they were inconceivable.

A native of Connecticut, Kap enlisted in the United States Army following his senior year of high school in September 2001, just days before the 9/11 attacks. In 2002, he was deployed to Afghanistan, and the following year, he parachuted into Iraq for the initial invasion.

With only 2 days left in his fifth deployment to Iraq in 2005, Kap's convoy was ambushed by heavy fire. A grenade exploded inches away from Kap after falling through the hatch of his vehicle. Shrapnel ripped through his body, shattering his right leg and severing an artery in his right arm.

Severely wounded, Kap collected himself, directed his vehicle to cover, and alerted the rest of the convoy to the attack. It wasn't until then that he allowed his wounds to be treated. Kap was evacuated to Walter Reed Hospital, and while his arm recovered, his leg did not.

Despite numerous surgeries, his leg was barely functional. Ultimately, there was only one choice—to amputate it. With the pain gone, Kap was fitted with a prosthetic, and he completed hundreds of hours of physical therapy. He had one sole objective during his difficult and lengthy recovery: He wanted to return to combat with his unit.

Everyone thought it would be impossible for Kap to achieve that goal. No one under his circumstances had ever returned to combat, and they agreed Kap had completed his service to our Nation. Kap didn't care. He completed the 12-mile ruck march test, parachuted with a combat load, and not only regained his squad leader title but was promoted to platoon sergeant.

Kap became the first Ranger in United States Army history to return to combat action with a prosthetic limb. He was awarded the Bronze Star with valor and a Purple Heart, among numerous other decorations. Kap was deployed to combat 11 times to fight the global war on terrorism, five of which were while he had a prosthetic leg.

He wrote a book about it called ''Back in the Fight.''

There is more to any of our soldiers or warriors than what they do in uniform. I have had multiple friends reach out to me who talked about the impact that Kap had on them as a leader and as a friend, whether it was riding motorcycles together or just hanging out after a tough day at work, in training, or any other way. He never lost sight of how he came to be where he was.

Unfortunately, Kap's life ended far too soon last week at the age of 40 due to a significant enemy our veterans face right here at home: suicide.

Our Nation has a moral obligation to not only prepare and equip the servicemembers we send into harm's way but to support and care for them when their duty is done. Yet, we have drastically failed countless numbers of our veterans who have sacrificed everything, including their lives, to protect us.

President Lincoln's promise to care for the men and women who have ''borne the battle'' is one of the most important functions of our government, and we must do better.

Kap's wife, Kimberly, and his sons, Wyatt and Cody, as well as the rest of his family and friends, are in my prayers through this difficult time.

Kap will always be remembered by many for his warrior spirit and his extraordinary story of resiliency that made him an inspiration and a military legend.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of lyrics to a song one of my friends, Darryl Worley, sings called ''The 22.''

Let me share a few of the lyrics:

You can't unsee what I saw
You can't get back what I lost
I've lost a wife
Five brothers
My kids and the man I was
I thought that I left the front lines
But the fight for my life rages on
We've lost 21 soldiers in only a day
And that's the unthinkable truth
So I'll lay down my gun
And I'll soldier on, and I will not be 22
I'll lay down my gun
I'll soldier on, and I will not be 22.

At the end of his journey, the Apostle Paul said: I fought the good fight; I have kept the faith; and I have finished the race.

I pray that everyone would live a full and natural life, fight that battle, and never surrender to it.

I thank you, Kap.

RESTORING AMERICANS' TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the TRUST Act to ban individual stock trading by Members of Congress and their spouses.

Now, Representatives are elected to serve their communities back home, and this bill builds trust and makes important reforms. While the American people are working hard to keep

their small businesses afloat and keep food on the table, the last thing Members of Congress should be doing is trading stocks with any inside information.

As we work to restore Americans' trust in government, this is a commonsense step in ensuring that Americans throughout the country have no doubt about the work that we were sent here to do. This bill ensures more transparency in our government and is another step forward as we make our Congress more accountable to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored that this is my first cosponsored bill in the House.

MONTHLY COMMITMENT CHECKLIST

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a few of the ways that I am keeping my commitment to the people of the Big First.

A few weeks ago, I released my commitment to the Big First, which is a legislative roadmap for the 118th Congress that details my plans for an economy that is strong, a government that is accountable, a future that is built on freedom, and a nation that is safe.

Here are some of the ways I am working to get America back on track.

To create an economy that is strong, I voted ''yes'' on the Family and Small Business Taxpayer Protection Act, which the House just passed. Kansas families and small businesses are already paying the price of President Biden's inflation tax. The last thing we need is 87,000 more IRS agents and 1.2 million more audits.

I voted ''yes'' on the Family and Small Business Taxpayer Protection Act because it is a clear-cut way to fight back against one of the most egregious pieces of legislation from the last Congress.

The $72 billion of taxpayer money that Washington Democrats allocated to the IRS last year would have ballooned the agency to a size larger than the Pentagon, State Department, FBI, and Border Patrol combined. I am committed to creating an economy that is strong by stopping President Biden's audit army, and I am keeping my commitment.

To create a government that is accountable, I voted ''yes'' on the Strategic Production Response Act, which the House also passed. President Biden has been playing fast and loose with one of our country's most important national security assets. His administration's energy policies have caused prices to skyrocket at the pump, and using the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as a political tool to mask that failure has led to severe U.S. energy insecurity and depletion of our oil reserves, which poses a threat to our national security.

I voted ''yes'' on the Strategic Production Response Act, which is a step toward ending President Biden's war on fossil fuels, empowering domestic energy producers, and resurrecting American energy independence by protecting our SPR from an administration that clearly doesn't understand how important it is. I made a commitment to hold the government accountable, and I am keeping that commitment.

To create a future that is built on freedom, I voted ''yes'' on the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act, which the House passed. This vote was crystal clear: If a child is born alive following an abortion or an attempted abortion, that newborn child deserves the same standard of medical care that any newborn deserves.

It is horrifying that we need to address issues like this in a free country, but Washington Democrats have advocated for unthinkable, gruesome policies that constitute an all-out attack on human life. I am proud to be a pro-life Member of Congress, and I will always support policies that protect life. I made a commitment to building a future based on freedom by supporting the God-given right to life held by unborn American citizens, and I am keeping my commitment.

To create a nation that is safe, I will vote to denounce the horrors of socialism later this week. I hope that all of my colleagues can get behind this. Socialism ideology runs counter to everything we stand for in America because it requires the concentration of power, which results in totalitarianism. Democracy, on the other hand, enshrines individual liberty and gives people a voice in who governs them. Socialism creates famine, devastation, and bloodshed. It tears families apart, creates exile and mass theft, and flatly denies individual rights as fundamental as personal property.

You don't have to look very far, Mr. Speaker, into the history of socialism to find these abuses and atrocities. They happen every time a country tries socialism on for size.

It seems that certain people in America would like to experiment with socialism, but enough socialist experiments have been conducted already, and the verdict is clear: Socialism has no place on American soil.

I made a commitment to ensuring that America is a nation that is safe, which means continuing to stand strong as a world leader in democracy and freedom. I am keeping that commitment.

When we reflect on our work, it helps us to stay the course in the future, and we still have a lot of work to do in the 118th Congress. We need to create a balanced budget and strengthen the supply chain. We need to lower taxes and secure the southern border. We need to fully fund a robust police and military. We need a comprehensive reauthorization of the farm bill with strengthened crop insurance. We need a maintained stepped-up basis tax provision and global food security legislation that stops wars before they start.

I will be keeping all of these commitments to the people of the Big First, and 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 in the slow demise of America. I am here to fight and work to make America stronger. With all of us working together, our brightest days are yet to come.

RESTORING THE AMERICAN DREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my first general remarks on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I would like to start by thanking my predecessor, Jim Langevin, for his 22 years of distinguished service representing the people of Rhode Island's Second District.

As the first quadriplegic ever elected to Congress, Jim was no stranger to life's challenges. No matter what was thrown Jim's way, he always persevered.

For over two decades, Jim Langevin made Rhode Islanders proud through his leadership here in this body. He became widely recognized as an expert on national security and particularly cybersecurity. He was a trailblazer for the disability community and shepherded several key pieces of legislation that have made our society more accessible for all.

Most of all, Rhode Islanders always knew that they could count on Jim to listen to their problems and to advocate for their families here in Washington, D.C.

I thank Jim for all his years of service to Rhode Island.

I am so honored that Rhode Islanders have chosen me to take up the mantle of representing the Second District. I am deeply grateful for this opportunity, and I feel a great sense of responsibility to deliver for the working people who sent me here to fight on their behalf.

I enter Congress as a proud descendant of immigrants. My grandparents came of age during the Depression.

On my mother's side was Grandpa Bob, the son of Irish immigrants who grew up in Worcester, Massachusetts. After serving in the Marines in World War II, Bob took a job as a steelworker at a company that made airplane parts.

On my father's side was Grandpa Louis, the son of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe who was raised in New York City and served in the U.S. Army in Europe during World War II. After he returned, Louis worked as a bookkeeper in New York for a company that canned tomatoes.

Neither of them worked in particularly glamorous jobs, but with a lot of hard work and a little help from the GI Bill, these two children of immigrants

were able to buy houses for their families, put their kids through school, and earn a ticket to the middle class.

That is the way it is supposed to be in this country. If you work hard and play by the rules, you ought to be able to have a stable life, a comfortable retirement, and provide opportunity to your children.

We all know that has gotten harder. That American Dream of economic mobility has broken down for many families, and it was never fully afforded to others to begin with. There are a lot of statistics to back this up, but the Rhode Islanders I talk to don't want to see data. They feel it in their gut. They know that they are working harder and harder, but they feel that middle-class lifestyle slipping further out of reach.

This has to change. As a Representative for Rhode Island's Second District, I am determined to restore the promise of the American Dream so that everyone who is willing to do the right thing and work hard can get ahead.

That starts by going to bat for working people against the powerful interests and their well-funded lobbyists who stand in the way of better wages, better benefits, and good-paying jobs. We must fight for the right to organize because you cannot have a broad middle class without healthy labor unions. We have to take on Big Oil and Big Pharma, which are keeping record profits for themselves while overcharging Rhode Islanders at the gas pump and at the pharmacy.

We have to invest in childcare and universal preschool because no child's future should be limited by whether or not their parents have a lot of money.

I will advocate for vocational training and apprenticeships so that we have more people, like my Grandpa Bob, who can make a living by making things in this country.

I will partner with anyone on either side of the aisle to bring back more manufacturing jobs and transition to a clean energy economy.

I will always fight to defend the freedoms and democratic ideals that make us the greatest nation on Earth.

This is my commitment to the people of Rhode Island. There is no question we have a lot of work ahead of us, but together, I am confident that we can deliver real change to Washington so that all Rhode Islanders and all working Americans can have the opportunity to succeed.

□ 1045

CONDEMNING SOCIALISM

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the House concurrent resolution to denounce socialism in all its forms.

For decades, the embrace of socialist ideas around the world has led to evil regimes denying their people of their fundamental human rights and subjecting them to imprisonment and abuse.

Countless Cubans, Venezuelans, Russians, Chinese, Cambodians, and Koreans have escaped from murderous regimes to come live a better life in America. They are all a true testament to the promise of the American Dream and the hope of prosperity.

These survivors are members of our family, our friends, and our neighbors, like Pablo Cuevas from Rockingham County.

Born and raised in Cuba, Pablo worked on his parents' farm, which was apparently dispossessed by the Marxists. Pablo fled Cuba in 1958 during the Cuban Revolution and resettled here in America. He served on the Rockingham County Board of Supervisors in my district for 30 years and continues to be a leader in our community.

Mr. Speaker, socialism has led to painful human tragedies such as starvation, torture, and mass murder, taking more than 100 million lives around the world.

As oppressive and violent regimes still exist today, this resolution reaffirms our support for freedom, democracy, and human rights. May we always ensure that dangerous socialist, un-American policies are never brought to pass here in our great country.

WOODSTOCK FIRE DEPARTMENT CELEBRATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 200th anniversary of the all-volunteer Woodstock Fire Department.

Tracing its history back to 1823, the department has served the Shenandoah Valley as one of the oldest departments in the Commonwealth and the Nation.

Today, the department has 40 active volunteers who selflessly risk their lives every day to ensure the safety of their neighbors and the preservation of the community.

The department is led by Captain Zach Hottel, a third-generation volunteer himself, and truly represents the spirit of service. Captain Hottel and the volunteers' dedication to serving others, who are sometimes experiencing the unimaginable, defines what it means to serve your neighbor. It is an example we should all strive to follow every day.

The Woodstock Fire Department is commemorating its founding of February 8, 1823, with a bicentennial birthday bash at the Woodstock fire station.

Congratulations again to the Woodstock Fire Department on this incredible milestone. I wish them another 200 years of success in serving the people of the Shenandoah Valley.

TOP ISSUES IMPACTING OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the top issues impacting Oregon and the Fifth District that we have to address in the 118th Congress.

We need to get our economy back on track, secure the border, support safe immigration, and reduce homelessness and drug overdoses.

A report from the National Drug Helpline ranked Oregon worst in the Nation for drug problems. Oregon is number one in drug use, but number 50 in drug treatment.

This crisis in Oregon starts at our southern border and is exacerbated by the lack of leadership, including the lack of commonsense security measures that have allowed dangerous drugs like fentanyl to enter our communities.

I frequently hear from moms and families who are begging their leaders to please pay attention to this fentanyl crisis. The drug cartels have insisted on taking our children from us.

We have also seen an increase in violent crime. Mr. Speaker, 2022 was the deadliest year in Portland metro history with over 100 homicides. We are already on track to break that record this year, a record that we should never want to break.

Rising crime rates have forced businesses to close their doors, further weakening our economy. We have seen businesses leave the metro area for suburbia or leave the State altogether.

Tackling the drug crisis will, in turn, begin to help Oregon's homelessness crisis. Oregon had at least 18,000 homeless people living on the streets every day in 2022.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle to address these issues in the 118th Congress.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LOWELL MILES

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say the name of a gentleman I heard passed from Happy Valley, Oregon. He was a pillar of the community, and I want the families back home to know that we will miss Lowell Miles from Miles Fiberglass.

He was a pillar of the community, not only in Happy Valley, Oregon, where I reside, but in Clackamas County.

Mr. Speaker, the family has my support here in Washington, D.C., and I look forward to coming home this weekend and paying my respects.

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 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BICE) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord of our lives, may we approach You this day with earnest and truthful hearts. May we be eager to obey Your laws, desirous for Your company among us, and committed to remain loyal in our service to You and to this Nation.

Enable us to keep Your commands ever before us, like lenses through which we look to determine our steps; like reminders written on our hands, so that we cannot ignore them.

And when we walk these halls or take our seats in meeting rooms or rise to speak in these Chambers, may we pause to realize that You are here in our midst. Thus, may we not be hasty in word or impulsive in thought, but prudent in employing the opportunities You have entrusted to us.

Always and with sincerity, may we devote ourselves for Your intent for our lives, not with lipservice, but as ones totally beholden to You for all that we have. Today and every day, may we strive to do Your will with our whole heart.

In Your sovereign and gracious name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS 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 PRO TEMPORE.

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

OUR VETERANS DESERVE ACCESS TO CARE

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today because our veterans deserve access to care at every corner of the country as they have selflessly defended this country.

After Express Scripts, who manages the TRICARE benefit on behalf of the DOD, instituted network changes that cut out thousands of community pharmacies last year, my office received dozens of calls from veterans who are unable to access their prescriptions.

Our local pharmacies have the drugs these veterans need now, but unless there are changes from the DOD that provide access that is actually adequate, our veterans cannot access the medications they need from community pharmacies.

While the DOD drags their feet, veterans are being refused lifesaving medicines and offered unacceptable alternatives to the care they used to be able to receive.

Mr. Kimsey, a veteran from Warner Robins, Georgia, is one of the many patients in my district who this new rule affected. Mr. Kimsey is a cancer patient at Central Georgia Cancer Care and is taking a chemo drug. He has been on this medication for about a year and was told that TRICARE would no longer pay for the medication at the local pharmacy. He called my office after trying to fill his prescriptions and only had five pills left of this critical drug.

The new DOD-approved pharmacy said they could mail the drug to him in 10 days, but he couldn't wait 10 days. This is just one example of why community pharmacists are so vital to patients, especially in rural areas.

MASS SHOOTING IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, on May 14, 2022, a racist mass shooting took place at a supermarket in my home community of Buffalo, New York.

Armed with an assault weapon, the shooter killed 10 people and injured three more in just 2 minutes and 3 seconds; one shooter.

We continue to mourn, and we continue to struggle to move on. Sadly, we are not the only community facing this challenge. Horrific mass shootings have taken place in Uvalde, Texas; Highland Park, Illinois; Colorado Springs; Raleigh, North Carolina; Monterey Bay and Half Moon Bay, California.

Last year we passed the bipartisan Safe Communities Act. This was an important step, but more needs to be done. As we mark National Gun Violence Survivors' week, we must honor those impacted by shootings by continuing to deliver legislation that will save lives.

I am proud to support a Federal assault weapons ban, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO FRANKLIN GUTIERREZ, JR.

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

Mr. MOYLAN. I would like to take this time to honor and wish Franklin Gutierrez, Jr., a happy birthday.

Over the weekend, Frankie G., who is one of Guam's legendary musicians, turned the big 5–0.

For decades, Mr. Gutierrez has not only entertained many with his vocal gifts, but he has also nurtured a future generation of musicians in Guam. His band, Rumblefish, is an island icon. Frankie G. is more than just a musician. He is a proud husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend.

Frankie G. has also served his island as an officer with the Guam Customs and Quarantine Agency. He has proudly protected our borders while putting himself in harm's way. From the Halls of the United States House of Representatives, I wish Frankie G. a happy 50th birthday.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, my two sisters are public school teachers. They taught me that school breakfast and lunches are every bit as important as a textbook or a laptop to that child's ability to learn.

During the pandemic, Congress wisely provided 30 million kids free meals at school, but last spring that provision expired.

Most schools had to go back to onerous paperwork and millions of kids stopped getting free meals. I urge USDA to make it easier for States to adopt universal school meals, including by lowering the threshold for community eligibility.

California, Maine, and soon Colorado already made universal school meals permanent. Three other States, including Massachusetts, have extended universal meals through this school year.

Massachusetts is working to make the program permanent with legislation recently introduced by State Rep. Andy Vargas and State Senator Sal DiDomenico.

Madam Speaker, we have a sacred responsibility to keep kids fed, and I am hopeful that one day soon we can pass a universal school meals bill here in the United States Congress. Together, we can end hunger now.

THE PANDEMIC IS OVER

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have breaking news: The pandemic has ended. It seems that everyone knows the pandemic is over, except the White House.

Despite the fact that the President said in an interview last September on ''60 Minutes'' the pandemic has ended,

the public health emergency has been extended again for the twelfth time.

Madam Speaker, it is past time to end this blatant Federal overreach, and that is exactly what we are going to do. This week, House Republicans will vote to repeal the public health emergency, stop the forced vaccination of our healthcare workers, and finally get Federal workers back to their offices to serve the American people.

It is time to restore individual liberty to the American people so the American people, not the Federal Government, can make the best decisions for themselves and their families.

NATIONAL SALES TAX OF 30 PERCENT

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, extreme MAGA Republicans have an economic plan that will hurt working families. House Republicans are set to advance a new 30 percent national sales tax.

Let me repeat that: 30 percent national sales tax.

This will increase the average family's cost for groceries and everyday essentials by about $100 every single month.

On top of that, they want to cut Social Security, cut Medicare. Working families will lose their hard-earned benefits.

They are putting their special interests over the working class. They are putting special interests over people.

Rest assured, Madam Speaker, no matter what extreme MAGA Republicans do, House Democrats will continue to fight for working families. It is the middle class that makes our country strong. We will be there to put them over politics. We will be there to put people first.

OUR NATION IS CURRENTLY $31 TRILLION IN DEBT

(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, our Nation is currently $31 trillion in debt. Unfunded liabilities, meaning debt we can't fund, are almost $124 trillion.

For the past 2 years, Democrat majorities have added $300 billion in new extra Federal spending. This level of spending is actually driving inflation. It is fueling runaway inflation that is driving up the price of everything from gasoline—we have known about that for a long time—to eggs, which seems to be a more recent phenomena.

Why do we have to keep doing this? We shouldn't. America is the land of plenty. America is the land of innovation. We can produce anything we want. We can innovate new and better ways to do it in this country. We are being hampered by government, regulations, lack of planning. Overspending by government has taken away the initiative of people to be able to do things on their own instead of being harmed by government spending and regulation.

We have to address Washington, D.C.'s, reckless spending, which is driving inflation and a massive amount of debt. If the interest rates keep going up, we won't even be able to service the debt the way we should.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a major legislative win which was the designation of the National Heritage Area Act for my home of St. Croix in the Virgin Islands.

I thank Senator ANGUS KING for his support, who introduced the Senate companion bill, which was signed into law by President Biden.

St. Croix, with its place of landing, is the only place in the United States in which Christopher Columbus actually set his foot. It is home to native Caribs, as well as Taino Indians, who engaged and fought with Christopher Columbus. It is the home of Alexander Hamilton. We have a history of enslavement and struggle to maintain our African ancestors' culture on that island.

Seven nations have owned the U.S. Virgin Islands at one point or another, adding to a rich blend of many cultures and ideas; the epitome of Americanism, how the innovation and continual change in our country takes place.

St. Croix's National Heritage Area designation is the culmination of nearly 20 years of advocacy and work. We look forward to what it brings to our island.

□ 1215

REDUCING THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Speaker, this week, Americans are hearing about yet another battle over the debt ceiling, a fiscal restraint that was supposed to stop Congress from spending too much.

Every couple of years, Congress basically gives itself a free pass and votes to raise the debt ceiling, kicking the can down the road. With a national debt over $31 trillion, this is a game our country cannot afford to keep playing.

Today, President Biden is set to miss his budget deadline as required by law for the third consecutive year. I would love to see us actually handle the budget one item at a time rather than in a typical omnibus.

Vilification of debt control and protecting our future generations is not where this discussion should start. We are not going to get rid of this deficit in 1 year, but we can get rid of something this year. Can we at least have a small step toward reducing our national debt for the future of our children?

Hardworking American families have balanced budgets every month, every year, and they deserve a government that does the same.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 7, RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 139, STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 382, PANDEMIC IS OVER ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 497, FREEDOM FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 75 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 75

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID–19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered

on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 75, providing for the consideration of four measures: H.J. Res. 7, H.R. 139, H.R. 382, and H.R. 497.

The rule provides for consideration of all four measures under closed rules, with 1 hour of debate each equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committees of jurisdiction or their designees. The rule provides one motion to recommit for each measure.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bills.

Today, the Republican majority begins the long process of reversing the policy failures of President Biden and the previous Democratic majority.

Madam Speaker, Republicans last week demonstrated that Republicans are committed to governing for the American people. Toward that end, Madam Speaker, House Republicans have had one of the most productive legislative weeks in recent memory. Our new governing majority has demonstrated that it is no longer a closed shop, which was business as usual in a Democratic House in the last Congress.

Instead of a lethargic Congress, Republicans, in only 3 short weeks, have set a precedent that I hope subsequent Members will emulate. The new Republican majority is eager to begin the important work that America has sent us here to do.

Instead of legislating for the few at the expense of the many, Republicans are making good on our commitment to America. We are dismantling the COVID surveillance state. We are protecting the conscience rights of our healthcare workers. We are demanding that government employees show up to do their jobs like the rest of America has done. We are terminating and rescinding the interminable extensions of President Bidens's public health emergency declaration.

Sometimes, Madam Speaker, I almost feel as if I have been trapped in a Dickens novel. In this tale of two cities, it seems the Biden administration is clearly of two minds on the COVID pandemic, one being the best of times: the administration's policies to combat the pandemic have been a resounding success. But then, on the other hand, we are still living through a crisis that requires emergency measures that have to be prolonged indefinitely.

The American people spoke in the last election, Madam Speaker. Their message was clear enough. Their message by electing Republicans was enough is enough.

Now, thanks to Chairman GRAVES and H.J. Res. 7, the American people can be assured that President Biden's national emergency will be rescinded. Americans will finally have a government that recognizes the reality across our Nation, the very words spoken by President Biden on ''60 Minutes'' last September: ''The pandemic is over.''

Madam Speaker, nowhere is the contrast more evident between Republicans and Democrats than what is included in this rule today. The Republican majority is already hard at work passing commonsense legislation that will benefit our people, that will benefit all Americans, not just a connected few.

Madam Speaker, just like you, one of the most vital services I provide to the constituents of the people of the 26th District of Texas is communicating with Federal agencies on their behalf. Through this communication, I am able to ensure timely services like passport services, Social Security benefits, Medicare enrollment, veterans' benefits, and many more. Over the past few years, I have seen that these services have been severely delayed or even halted—completely in some cases—because what do you get? No one answers the phone, or you get an out-of-office response from a Federal agency.

I submit that is entirely unacceptable. In fact, last week, I introduced a bill called the REACT Act, in a bipartisan fashion, to require a timely response from executive agencies after inquiries from Members of Congress. However, in order for the agencies to fulfill their responsibilities, they first have to get back to work.

H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, would end the unproductive telework policies to ensure that these Federal agencies are back at work for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and I urge other Members to support the underlying bill, as well as the rule.

Madam Speaker, again this September, President Biden, in a candid and unguarded moment, officially admitted that the pandemic is over, and then for emphasis he repeated it. Despite this declaration, this administration just reauthorized the twelfth extension of the COVID–19 public health emergency.

I think all of us who were here at the time agreed that, in March 2020, the country was very much in a public health emergency. However, now the landscape has changed, and now the American people are transitioning back to their normal routines.

Today, the Biden administration's lack of transparency has, yet again, put our country in a very difficult position. Throughout the last 3 years and 12 extensions of this public health emergency, people have had ample time to seriously discuss a plan to avoid disruptions to patients and providers as we transition out of this pandemic.

This new House majority has been pressing the administration to come up with a plan to make permanent the policies that work and unwind those policies that don't. While there were several successful policies and innovations that came out of the emergency declaration, not just telehealth and hospital at-home flexibilities, this administration has repeatedly failed to provide a plan.

The public health emergency cannot serve as a permanent means for the Biden administration to subvert Congress to enact their radical agenda.

Madam Speaker, I support Congressman GUTHRIE's efforts to officially end this public health emergency, and I look forward to transitioning back to regular order.

Madam Speaker, our healthcare workers across America are still subject to President Biden's vaccine mandate enforced by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The healthcare industry is already suffering from a severe workforce shortage that will have drastic effects on our ability to take care of patients.

Republicans have been crystal clear on the issue, Madam Speaker. We never have and never will support Federal vaccine mandates. The personal health decision of whether to receive a vaccine should be left between a patient and their doctor. The Federal Government has no place in demanding what an American must do for their personal health and certainly as a condition of employment.

For Texas specifically, one of our hospitals lost over 150 workers due to

the Federal vaccine mandate. This decision has deepened the staffing shortages back home, especially in rural areas, leaving all of us ill-equipped to deal with day-to-day functions.

Madam Speaker, I will conclude by saying that I stand in strong support of this rule and the underlying bills that they will allow to be debated.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to support the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Texas, now the new vice chair of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, there is a lot to take in from the opening remarks the gentleman has provided. I want to say one thing. He says that the Republicans have a mandate. I think the message of the last two elections was that the overwhelming number of people in this country said no to extremism.

And mandate? Democrats picked up a seat in the Senate. The red wave that was predicted by my Republican friends turned into a pink splash.

The reason why was because people were turned off by their extremism, and this in spite of all kinds of gerrymandering, crazy redistricting plans, and money like we have never seen in an election before, and we have the narrowest of narrow margins.

So if the gentleman thinks that there is a mandate here to embrace extremism, I beg to differ with that.

Madam Speaker, there is no denying that the situation with COVID has improved. Cases are down, deaths are down, and most of us have returned to the lifestyles we had before the pandemic. That is because of the incredible steps we have taken to keep people safe: vaccines, expanded healthcare, telework flexibilities, and other programs and initiatives that ensure Americans can lead healthy, full lives.

The rule before us today allows for the consideration of four measures, four reckless and regressive measures, to turn back the clock on all that we have gone through and learned over these last 3 years, and all under closed rules. Let me repeat that: all under closed rules.

□ 1230

H.J. Res. 7 would terminate, effective immediately, the COVID national emergency declared in 2020 by President Trump and renewed by President Biden in 2021.

This immediate reversal offers no off-ramps for relief programs and benefits, threatening aid for nursing homes and hospitals, additional support for the VA, as well as help for small businesses and more. It would end flexibilities to ensure more food-insecure people have access to SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger.

H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act, would similarly repeal Health and Human Services' public health emergency declarations. This would roll back significant expansions to healthcare access and services for millions across the country.

H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, would force Federal agencies to return to prepandemic telework policies, despite the fact that the pandemic demonstrated workers from many industries could complete their jobs remotely.

H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, would remove COVID vaccine requirements for Medicare and Medicaid healthcare workers.

Now, if you take a second to think about these bills, not a single one makes things easier, safer, or more effective. They are sound bites. That is what my Republican friends are good at, sound bites, not legislating. They are good at making political statements but not solving problems.

Eliminating vaccine mandates for healthcare providers will not help healthcare providers. Instead, it increases their chances of getting sick, increases their patients' chances of getting sick.

COVID vaccines are safe and effective. You wouldn't know that if you listened to some of the commentary in the Rules Committee last night, but they are. They have protected millions of healthcare workers and their families from infections, hospitalization, and death.

Pulling the plug on the national and public health emergency declarations will throw Federal programs in our healthcare system into chaos. No longer will Americans be able to receive free COVID testing and treatments. Hospitals that already struggle to stock their shelves with proper PPE will face an even greater uphill battle.

I am not saying that these declarations should continue indefinitely. Nobody is saying that. President Biden announced yesterday that he plans to end the declarations on May 11. But we need time to understand the impact that ending the declarations will have on our country.

The responsible thing to do is to provide an orderly off-ramp for these agencies so that essential benefits aren't suddenly ripped away from those who need them most.

Essentially, getting rid of telework for Federal agencies when it has allowed our Nation and government to function through this historic pandemic is nonsense. Studies have shown that telework has been largely beneficial, resulting in increased productivity, reduced absences, reduced turnover, and reduced office costs. If corporate America has chosen to harness the net positive effects of teleworking, government agencies should, too.

Madam Speaker, my Republican friends who are screaming against teleworking provisions, I point out, for the RECORD, that Republicans voted by proxy more than 14,500 times in the last Congress.

Let me repeat that. Republicans voted by proxy—that means they were operating remotely—more than 14,500 times in the last Congress.

It was kind of comical. Last night, my friend from Texas in the Rules Committee said that Republicans were voting by proxy because they felt Democrats pressured them, that Democrats made them do that. Really? I mean, I have heard a lot of crazy things in my life, but I have never heard that used as an excuse. Give me a break.

I find it outrageous that some Members are so worried about government workers getting their work done from home while they themselves took advantage of proxy voting over the last 3 years. Guess what? Proxy voting is called telework, and my friends are okay with telework for themselves, but when it comes to Federal workers, no, they are not okay. I guess for House Republicans, it is do as I say, not as I do.

We had the chair of the Oversight Committee testify very passionately against telework last night, and he voted by proxy—get this—83 times. You can't make this stuff up.

We all know that COVID has moved into a new phase, and thanks to the use of safe, effective vaccines and other prevention tools, we are moving forward. We are learning to live with it, but let's not forget that over a million of our fellow Americans have died from it.

We should not ignore the fact that COVID continues to spread and mutate. It still poses a danger to people.

It is clear that House Republicans just want to pretend that COVID isn't still a problem, that science doesn't exist, and that telework doesn't have a place in the 21st century.

At the end of the day, these measures were introduced really out of spite. Our colleagues across the aisle are looking to undo everything we did, even if that means getting rid of important, effective measures that help American workers, families, and patients.

In closing, Madam Speaker, none of these have gone through committee. There were no hearings, not a single hearing.

Again, there were lots of questions raised about these bills in the Rules Committee last night, including whether or not title 42 would be overturned. The administration has one opinion, and the Republicans have another opinion. I don't know what the truth is. A hearing would have made a difference, but they couldn't even wait a couple of days to do a hearing. They just wanted to rush this to the floor to get a press release out.

There were not only no markups, but there were no amendments. We had amendments submitted to the Rules Committee last night not just by Democrats but by Republicans. They said: No. Closed. Can't even have a debate on the floor. Can't have an up-or-down vote.

Fifteen out of the 16 measures that this Congress has considered so far have been totally closed. I am thinking I need to call the Office of Attending Physician and get a neck brace because I have whiplash trying to reconcile what my friends said they were going to do and what they are actually doing.

I mean, the last time the Republicans controlled Congress, they presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. Let me repeat that. The last time they were in control, they presided over the most closed Congress in the history of our country, and they are on track to try to beat their own record.

This is not what the Speaker promised. I didn't see the secret memo that Speaker MCCARTHY was circulating to get votes. Maybe there was some stuff in the secret memo that basically said that, you know, say one thing and do another.

The bottom line is this is not what anyone was promised, and there is absolutely no reason that we couldn't have waited a few days to do hearings on this stuff so we could decide whether or not any of these measures were the responsible thing to do or whether or not there were some additions that we could have made to these measures to make them responsible.

We all want to move on, but we want to do so responsibly. We all want to move beyond the national emergency, but we want to make sure that there are not unintended consequences. This is not serious legislating. This is political posturing, and it is a lousy way to begin the new Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I disagree with everything the gentleman just said, except his kind remarks on me being named vice chair of the Rules Committee.

I do think it is somewhat ironic he brings up redistricting. After all, it was Democrats' gerrymandering in the State of New York that led to the court throwing out their map. As a consequence of the court map, we elected more Republicans from New York than anyone thought possible, which delivered the majority.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) to speak on the rule.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I would note that last week, for the first time in 7 years, we were able to offer amendments on the floor of this body with a modified open rule, and for the first time in 10 years, we were able to amend a bill other than an appropriations measure.

I believe the gentleman doth protest too much. The bills we are talking about here are one page each, and one is six pages. We have had these bills out there for 72 hours. They have been publicly available.

When the gentleman asks why we are doing this so quickly, I will tell you why. Because I am not going to look at another nurse, another doctor, another healthcare practitioner in my district who is begging to go do his or her job, to go care for the American people that they want to take care of, and have to look at them and say: You can't do it because the Federal Government is telling you that you can't, without any basis in science, without any basis rooted in any defense whatsoever.

Keep this in mind:

The OSHA mandate put forward by this President: Struck down by SCOTUS.

The Federal employee mandate: Enjoined by the Fifth Circuit.

Federal contractor mandate: Enjoined by Federal courts.

Head Start mandate: Enjoined by Federal courts.

The CMS mandate remaining in effect is making it impossible for some of the men and women who want to serve their constituents and take care of them to be able to do so.

Let's just keep in mind what we are operating under, something that dates back to September 2021, keeping in mind what Dr. Walensky, the CDC Director, said in August 2021: ''What they can't do anymore is prevent transmission,'' ''they'' being the vaccines.

The CDC's own website right now says that the vaccine does nothing for transmission, zero. Yet, that was the whole basis for the vaccine mandates, the whole reason given. To have the power of the Federal Government unconstitutionally and wrongly stepping into the purview of American people wanting to carry out their livelihoods, and you have to look them in the eye—you being us, broadly—look them in the eye and say: Sorry, you can't do your job. You can't do your job because some bureaucrats in Washington said so.

Now, the President of the United States, lo and behold, says: Oh, the groundhog has come out, and now, on May 11, suddenly, we can go ahead and end these emergencies. We can go ahead and end the public health emergencies, end the national emergencies so that we can move on, on May 11, the magic date that the groundhog has doth spoken.

Right now, the American people are dying for us to actually stop the madness out of this town interfering with their lives, and the Republican Party, the majority in the House, is now doing that.

With all due respect to the ranking member on the Rules Committee, this rule is allowing for us to bring forward four very simple measures. They don't need a whole lot of going back and forth in debate and discussion. They are four simple measures. We debated them last night. They have been put forward. They are one-page bills. The American people understand what those bills say, that these emergencies need to end.

Let me be clear: I am an equal opportunity basher of national emergencies that have been in existence for too long that shouldn't be here. I introduced legislation when President Trump was President, saying that we should end 40 years of national emergencies, the ARTICLE ONE Act Senator MIKE LEE and I introduced.

I invite my Democratic colleagues to just jump across the aisle. Let's work together to end 40-year-old national emergencies because we have no business carrying out business under emergency.

Why aren't we praising and applauding the end of the emergencies? Why aren't we saying this is a great day in America that we can move forward?

One last point on the efficacy of the vaccines. There are enormous questions that have been raised about the vaccines. There are Americans that are around this country that are saying: I don't want to have something put into my arm through the force of government mandate.

Why are we stepping over that for a vaccine that has been admitted by our own CDC Director, by the CDC, by the NIH, to do nothing to stop transmission?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want to address that. They want to hide behind ''the science.'' They want to say Congress has no role to step over into the executive branch and say, wait a minute, on behalf of the American people, enough. But today, the Republican majority is saying enough.

Madam Speaker, we should support this rule.

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

There is a lot to unpack here, but let me just tell the gentleman on the issue of national emergencies—by the way, I will add war powers—we did a hearing in the Rules Committee on that in the last Congress. I did it with now-Chairman COLE. We thought that it was appropriate to do a hearing because we wanted to avoid any unintended consequences. So, we have done that.

It is now becoming very clear to me how this Congress is going to operate in the Rules Committee. The gentleman just made it clear that everything should go through regular order except what he thinks is important. If he thinks it is important, we can come here with a closed rule.

□ 1245

Then I am a little confused over the gentleman's pontificating on the fact these are only one-page bills and, therefore, they shouldn't be amended. I point out that the bill that they had the modified open rule on was a three-page bill, but is the number of pages of the bill going to be determinative of whether or not we have amendments or not?

The bottom line is people had some good ideas that they offered to the

Rules Committee last night. Not only that, but people also had a lot of questions. If you read the President's Statement of Administration Policy, he raises issues about title 42 that we seem to have a dispute on, but, boy, if you did a hearing and you did a markup, you might have been able to address those things.

I'm not saying we are moving too quickly. I am just saying we are not moving responsibly. Once your committees are constituted, you can have a hearing immediately. You can bring this to the floor next Monday or Tuesday if you want; but you chose to shut the system down.

Notwithstanding all of your rhetoric, not notwithstanding all of the pontificating on the need for more amendments to be made in order, a more open process, a more transparent process, you are beginning this session with closed rule after closed rule after closed rule.

Last night, the Committee on Rules reported out four more closed rules. That is the choice you have made. We have a sense of where you are going. The last time you were in charge, you presided over the most closed Congress in the history of the United States Government. I wouldn't be surprised if you beat your own record.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that none of the bills in this rule take effect unless it is certified that they do not decrease Social Security benefits.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Social Security is the bedrock of our Nation's social safety net. Since its inception, it has lifted millions of our seniors out of poverty. Protecting the benefits it provides should be a priority for this Congress.

As my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying our Nation's bills, Democrats will continue taking action to protect Social Security. This is not the first time Social Security has been under attack by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Don't be fooled by their phraseology that they are only interested in ''protecting Social Security.'' We know that that is code for cutting benefits, for raising the retirement age, for throwing people off the benefit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, first and foremost, today should be a day of celebration.

Madam Speaker, 83 years ago today, Ida Mae Fuller received the first Social Security check. It is the Nation's number one insurance program. It is the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly. It is also the Nation's number one program to help children out of poverty, as well as the number one disability program, especially for veterans and those who utilize Social Security, even more so than the VA.

Looking at this proposal today, I commend the chairman for the Committee on Rules for having come up and situated because of everything we have heard from the other side. Imagine, holding the American economy hostage so you can make cuts to Social Security and Medicare, the bedrock insurance policy for the Nation; something that impacts your brothers, your sisters, your family members, people you go to church with, people you work with on a daily basis.

You have proposed both, in your study group analysis a 21 percent across-the-board cut to Social Security. That is what has got our attention.

In the midst of all of this, and especially amidst this pandemic, this global pandemic where more than 1 million people have perished here in the United States, over 756,000 are over the age of 65.

There are 66 million Social Security recipients. They are predominantly on fixed incomes and impacted the most by this pandemic and the most by inflation. So to call for 21 percent across-the-board cuts and to hold hostage the American economy is beyond the pale.

I hope all of our citizens are aware of this. We are going to continue to make everyone around the country aware of what is going to happen and the attempt to cut Social Security and Medicare.

That is what this is about, Madam Speaker. That is why I rise on this floor today.

Madam Speaker, there are 10,000 baby boomers a day who become eligible for Social Security. And Congress has done nothing to enhance Social Security in more than 51 years.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the passion on this other side. I think this passion and engagement has to be brought forward to the Nation's number one insurance program. It is not an entitlement. It is an earned benefit, and the citizens of this country know it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds for the purpose of response.

First off, the Speaker has been very clear that it is not negotiable. There will be no cuts to the Social Security and Medicare. But more importantly, the only person who is cutting Medicare right now is President Biden.

Ask any doctor in this country: Has your pay been cut in the last 4 years? And they will answer resoundingly in the affirmative.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), to speak on this rule, another new member of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it would facilitate the passage of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act.

What does that bill do? It ends the unscientific, illogical, immoral, unconstitutional, unethical, vaccine mandate on healthcare workers that is predicated on lies.

What are some of those lies? Let's start with the first one.

The first lie: The vaccine prevents spread. Who says that it doesn't prevent spread? Is this an internet conspiracy? Well, it is on the internet, but it is the CDC director, Rochelle Walensky, who said 1 year ago, ''What the vaccines can't do anymore is prevent transmission.''

Pfizer admitted they were not asked by regulators to assess whether their shots reduced transmission, nor did their trials measure whether the shots reduced transmission.

What is the second lie that this mandate is predicated on?

The vaccines don't cause any harm, can't cause any harm. They are safe. They are completely safe. You have nothing to worry about. No side effects. No adverse reactions.

Who disputes that? Is it an internet conspiracy? It is the CDC website. Yes, it is on the internet.

The CDC website acknowledges that the vaccines can cause myocarditis, pericarditis, blood clots, and even death.

CDC and FDA recently announced they had identified a preliminary vaccine safety signal for persons 65 and older for the bivalent vaccine, that it could increase their chance of stroke in the 21 days following vaccination with Pfizer's new bivalent vaccine.

What is the third lie that this is predicated on, this vaccine mandate for healthcare workers?

That it is scientific. That it makes sense.

How does it make sense? To require somebody to have two shots targeted at a variant of the virus that is no longer circulating; to have two shots that wear off after 8 months, two shots that were taken 2 years ago.

The CDC acknowledges that those vaccines that are mandated taken two years ago have worn off by now. Why would you mandate them?

What is the fourth lie that this vaccine mandate is predicated on?

It ignores natural immunity.

When the vaccines first came out, the CDC said that the Pfizer trial showed

that the vaccine was 92 percent efficacious for those who had already had COVID.

Guess what? It showed no such thing.

I called the CDC. They admitted to me it was wrong. They said they would fix the website.

Here we are over 2 years later, they haven't fixed that lie on their website. They know it is a lie. I have them on a recording if anybody over there wants to hear it.

Finally, who is liable for the damage that this could cause? Nobody is liable.

We are living under medical malpractice martial law right now under the PREP Act in the EUAs.

Madam Speaker, let me close with this: This vaccine mandate affects nurses; 85 percent of nurses are female.

Joe Biden's COVID vaccine mandate for healthcare workers have forced many from the workplace. Many of them quit nursing as a career, retired early, or didn't pursue it as a degree.

This is the epitome of hypocrisy. Nobody in this room was mandated to take a vaccine, and we are voting on whether we are going to force people who want to take care of people, whether they have to take the vaccine.

End the hypocrisy. None of us were mandated. None of the staff in this room were mandated to take this vaccine. End it now. Support this rule.

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

Madam Speaker, oh my God. There are doctors who serve in Congress—Democrats and Republicans. I hope that they will stand up and correct the misinformation. I mean, really.

The gentleman talks about herd immunity as if somehow that was some panacea here.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Harvard Medical School titled, ''COVID–19 diagnosis raises risks of heart attack, stroke.''

[From Harvard Health Publishing, Nov. 1, 2021]

COVID–19 DIAGNOSIS RAISES RISK OF HEART ATTACK, STROKE

(By Julie Corliss)

In one of the largest studies of its kind to date, researchers found strong evidence that heart attack and stroke risk rises sharply in the weeks following a COVID–19 diagnosis. The findings were published Aug. 14, 2021, in *The Lancet*.

The study included every person in Sweden diagnosed with COVID–19 from Feb. 1, 2020, to Sept. 14, 2020—a total of nearly 87,000 people. Their median age was 48, and 57 percent were women. Researchers compared them with more than 348,000 Swedish people of similar age and sex who did not have the virus.

In the week after a COVID–19 diagnosis, the risk of a first heart attack increased by three to eight times. The risk of a first stroke caused by a blood clot multiplied by three to six times. In the following weeks, both risks decreased steadily but stayed elevated for at least a month.

Other bacterial and viral infections (such as influenza) are known to temporarily boost rates of heart attacks and strokes. But COVID–19 infections appear to be especially risky, perhaps because they trigger an exaggerated inflammatory response that makes blood clots more likely .

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, a study found that in the week after a COVID diagnosis, the risk of a first heart attack increased by three to eight times. The risk of a first stroke caused by a blood clot multiplied by three to six times. In the following weeks, both risks decreased steadily but stayed elevated for at least a month.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a USA Today piece titled, ''Fact check: COVID–19 vaccines primarily designed to prevent serious illness, death.''

[From the USA TODAY, Jan. 21, 2022]

FACT CHECK: COVID–19 VACCINES PRIMARILY DESIGNED TO PREVENT SERIOUS ILLNESS, DEATH

(By Valerie Paviionis)

As the omicron variant surges across the world and the United States logs case numbers near and over 1 million per day, the virus is prompting scientists to develop new treatments and government officials to fight to curb the spread.

While the Biden administration continues to urge Americans to get vaccinated, a Jan. 10 Facebook post claims that Dr. Rochelle Walensky, director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, said vaccines can't prevent COVID–19 transmission. Other sites have shared the same claim, linking Walensky's words back to an interview with CNN in August 2021.

''Our vaccines are working exceptionally well,'' Walensky said to CNN's Wolf Blitzer in the interview. ''They continue to work well for delta, with regard to severe illness and death—they prevent it. But what they can't do anymore is prevent transmission.''

Though Walensky did say these words on CNN, the original interview was aired in early August, not recently. And while it's true vaccines can't entirely halt transmission, experts say they do reduce it—and reduce the chances of hospitalization and death—as USA TODAY previously reported.

USA TODAY reached out to the original poster of the claim for comment.

Various websites have written about the same claim, amassing thousands of interactions on Facebook.

VACCINE EFFECTS DEPEND ON SEVERAL FACTORS

In an email, Walensky spokesperson Kathleen Conley wrote that in August 2021—when the interview originally ran—the delta variant was the dominant variant in the United States.

Experts at that time said it was clear the vaccines provided protection.

''Vaccines provide significant protection from 'getting it'—infection—and 'spreading it'—transmission—even against the delta variant,'' a professor of immunobiology and molecular, cellular and developmental biology at Yale University, told USA TODAY in November.

However, Conley noted data did show vaccines were ''less effective at preventing infections and transmission with Delta than with previous other variants.'' Omicron has proven even more difficult to contain.

While mRNA vaccines—produced by Pfizer and Moderna—continue to offer some level of protection against transmission of omicron, other vaccines—such as Johnson & Johnson, Sinopharm and AstraZeneca—offer ''almost no defense,'' according to a Dec. 19, 2021, report by the New York Times.

Other factors beyond variant type, vaccination type and booster status can also influence whether or not a person contracts COVID–19.

Dr. David Dowdy, associate professor of epidemiology at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said it's difficult to succinctly explain the vaccines' nuanced effects on transmission.

A vaccine might protect you from a passing interaction with someone at a grocery store, but it may not prevent infection from someone you live with and share air with for several hours a day.

''It gets very easy to misconstrue,'' Dowdy said. ''If someone asks, do vaccines prevent infection, and you have to give a yes or no answer, then the answer is no, they're not a perfect blockade. But do the vaccines offer some protection against infection? The answer is yes.''

VACCINES STILL PROTECT AGAINST SERIOUS DISEASE

While vaccinations don't offer perfect protection against the transmission of COVID–19, experts still urge people to get vaccinated.

According to Conley, COVID–19 vaccination remains effective against hospitalization and death caused by the virus. Getting a booster, she added, further decreases these risks, and the CDC continues to recommend that Americans receive vaccines and boosters.

Dr. Chris Beyrer, professor of public health and human rights at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, said both the mRNA and J&J vaccines were never designed to prevent infection entirely.

It's ''very hard'', he said, to prevent infection via an injected vaccine when you're dealing with a virus that enters the body through the nose and mouth. Instead, the vaccine trials were designed to study reduction in serious illness, hospitalization and death. All three vaccines were highly effective by this measure, Beyrer said.

''People who say, well, why would I take it if it doesn't prevent me from getting infected?'' Beyrer said. ''You have to remember that having a COVID–19 infection can be everything from completely asymptomatic . . . to a head-cold-like symptoms or full flu-like symptoms, all the way to death. So what the vaccines are doing is really dramatically increasing the likelihood that you will have mild infection. And that's incredibly important.''

A CDC study released Jan. 21 showed booster shots of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines were 90% effective at preventing hospitalizations from the omicron variant.

OUR RATING: MISSING CONTEXT

Because it can be misleading without additional information, we rate MISSING CONTEXT the claim that the CDC director says vaccines can't prevent transmission of COVID–19. While vaccines do not offer 100% protection against COVID–19 infection, they can still partially defend against infection. Vaccines remain effective at protecting from COVID–19-caused serious illness, hospitalization and death.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would highlight one of the quotes that I guess the gentleman was referring to.

''Though Walensky did say these words on CNN, the original interview was aired in early August, not recently. And while it is true vaccines cannot entirely halt transmission, experts say they do reduce it—and reduce the chances of hospitalizations and death.''

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a study by the Commonwealth

Fund titled, ''Two years of U.S. COVID–19 Vaccines Have Prevented Millions of Hospitalizations and Deaths.''

[The Commonwealth Fund, Dec. 13, 2022]

TWO YEARS OF U.S. COVID–19 VACCINES HAVE PREVENTED MILLIONS OF HOSPITALIZATIONS AND DEATHS

(By Meagan C. Fitzpatrick, Seyed M. Moghadas, Abhishek Pandy, and Alison P. Galvani)

It has been two years since the first COVID–19 vaccine was given to a patient in the United States. Since then, the U.S. has administered more than 655 million doses—80 percent of the population has received at least one dose—with the cumulative effect of preventing more than 18 million additional hospitalizations and more than 3 million additional deaths. The swift development of the vaccine, emergency authorization to distribute widely, and rapid rollout have been instrumental in curbing hospitalization and death, while mitigating socioeconomic repercussions of the pandemic.

As more transmissible and immune-evasive variants have emerged over the past two years, the U.S. has responded by deploying additional doses and variant-specific boosters. The Omicron variants caused the largest wave of infections during the pandemic. COVID–19 monovalent vaccines available at the time were not as efficacious against the variant as bivalent boosters introduced later, but the wave would have been more devastating in the absence of vaccination.

As we mark the second anniversary of the U.S. COVID–19 vaccination campaign, understanding the impact of vaccines on reducing disease burden is needed to inform future, evidence-based actions. We therefore used a computer model of disease transmission to estimate hospitalizations and deaths averted through the end of November 2022. The model incorporates the age-stratified demographics, risk factors, and immunological dynamics of infection and vaccination. We simulated this model to compare the observed pandemic trajectory to a counterfactual scenario without a vaccination program.

FINDINGS

From December 2020 through November 2022, we estimate that the COVID–19 vaccination program in the U.S. prevented more than 18.5 million additional hospitalizations and 3.2 million additional deaths. Without vaccination, there would have been nearly 120 million more COVID–19 infections. The vaccination program also saved the U.S. $1.15 trillion (Credible Interval: $1.10 trillion–$1.19 trillion) (data not shown) in medical costs that would otherwise have been incurred.

DISCUSSION

Our findings highlight the substantial impact of the U.S. vaccination program on reducing infections, hospitalizations, and deaths. Curbing hospitalization rates by reducing both COVID–19 incidence and symptom severity is particularly important amidst the strain on the health care system caused by unusually high levels of flu and RSV (respiratory syncytial virus). COVID–19 vaccination has preserved hospital resources for individuals who would otherwise have not received timely care.

Vaccination also has prevented many millions of COVID infections. Although the acute phase of these infections may not have required medical attention, each infection carries a risk of long COVID and debilitating symptoms. Many of the prevented infections would have been reinfections, which have higher risk of death compared to initial infections. In addition, as our previous analysis demonstrated, vaccines have kept children in school, highlighting the societal value of the ongoing vaccination program.

The estimated infections, hospitalizations, and deaths averted by vaccination are particularly striking when compared to the actual values observed during this time period. Since December 12, 2020, 82 million infections, 4.8 million hospitalizations, and 798,000 deaths have been reported in the U.S. In other words, without vaccination the U.S. would have experienced 1.5 times more infections, 3.8 times more hospitalizations, and 4.1 times more deaths. These losses would have been accompanied by more than $1 trillion in additional medical costs that were averted because of fewer infections, hospitalizations, and deaths.

The impact of the vaccination program is more remarkable given the challenges posed by the multiple variants that have arisen. The Omicron variants have been particularly immune-evasive and drove the largest surge in COVID–19 cases to date. However, the vaccines provided broader and more durable protection against severe clinical outcomes, including hospitalization and death. The reported ''mild'' nature of Omicron is in large part because of vaccine protection.

A limitation of our study is that we modeled only viral dynamics within the U.S. However, vaccines developed by the U.S. were also deployed around the world, changing the trajectory of the pandemic on a global scale. Without them, more variants could have emerged or there could have been greater importation of COVID–19 cases. In this regard, our study underestimates the true impact of COVID–19 vaccine development on U.S. outcomes.

The unprecedented pace at which vaccines were developed and deployed has saved many lives and allowed for safer easing of COVID–19 restrictions and reopening of businesses, schools, and other activities. This extraordinary achievement has been possible only through sustained funding and effective policymaking that ensured vaccines were available to all Americans. Moving forward, accelerating uptake of the new booster will be fundamental to averting future hospitalizations and deaths.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, we have lost over 1 million of our fellow citizens to COVID, over 1 million in the United States alone; mothers, fathers, siblings, friends, and children, as well.

But the development of safe vaccines has meant that millions more lives have been saved. There is no question whether or not the vaccination is effective.

Madam Speaker, I would just highlight one of the findings in The Commonwealth Fund report.

It says, ''From December 2020 through November 2022, we estimate that the COVID–19 vaccination program in the United States prevented more than 18.5 million additional hospitalizations and 3.2 million additional deaths. Without vaccination, there would have been nearly 120 million more COVID–19 infections. The vaccination program also saved the U.S. $1.15 trillion in medical costs that would otherwise have been incurred.''

Here we are, after having gone through what we went through, after knowing the benefits of these vaccinations, and to hear what we are hearing on the floor, it really is disappointing.

Madam Speaker, I would ask the doctors in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, please stand up. Please correct the RECORD. Please tell people that vaccinations have been a good thing and that people should get vaccinated. They could save their lives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) to speak on the rule.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my own bill, H.J. Res. 7, terminating the COVID national emergency declaration.

It is the same bill text that I sponsored in the 117th Congress and the same bill text that passed the Senate twice last year, most recently in November with the bipartisan support of all Republican Senators and 12 Democratic Senators.

Emergency powers were created to give the executive branch flexibility to respond to a range of crises facing the United States, and the National Emergencies Act was passed in 1974 to rein in the Presidential emergency powers that are activated when a formal emergency is declared.

As I have said before, good process builds good policies builds good politics. So, let's look at the timeline. On March 13, 2020, President Trump rightfully declared a national emergency concerning COVID–19. Mr. Biden has since abused Presidential authorities by repeatedly extending pandemic powers beyond their timeline and scope.

Section 202 of the National Emergencies Act requires Congress to review termination of all national emergencies, stating that 6 months after declaration, and every 6 months after the emergency continues, Congress must—must—meet to consider a resolution of termination.

Sadly, rather than debate and vote on terminating the emergency declaration, the former Speaker changed the rules of the entire House of Representatives and handicapped Congress' ability to perform its most basic constitutional duty: check the powers of the executive branch and the power of the purse.

As a result, Mr. Biden continues to extend the COVID national emergency into perpetuity. Until now, there has been zero oversight from the House, even though Federal law requires congressional review.

By now, and by any measure, the COVID–19 pandemic in the United States has ended, but Biden has dubiously continued to extend his pandemic power. Why? Under the continued COVID national emergency extension, more than 120 special statutory powers only meant for times of actual emergency continue to be available to Mr. Biden, including the power to draft Americans without consent, barricade the United States Capitol, place the Public Health Service under military control, and, yes, even move money around.

Biden's unwillingness to let go of the temporary pandemic powers is tyranny, and the former Speaker is complicit.

Thankfully, with our new Republican majority and restored House rules, Members of Congress and millions of Americans that they represent are finally able to weigh in on their concerns with continued pandemic powers.

The COVID pandemic emergency in the U.S. has ended, and most Americans have returned to prepandemic normalcy. Biden himself stated: ''The pandemic is over.''

So, why does Biden continue to extend the COVID national emergency? The answer is simple: To force Americans to live under extreme measures that deprive us of our freedoms.

It is sad to hear the other side talk about all this lack of tyranny and not following the rules. We were forbidden to do our job.

The National Emergencies Act requires, demands, that Congress, every 6 months, look at this national emergency and decide whether to go up or down. That is all it did.

In the 2 years since he has been President, we have done neither. It is high time that we answer that call and do our job. At least the Senate has done it twice.

I think we need to get back to getting back the power of the purse and holding this administration accountable. Time is up. I ask that everybody vote for these bills.

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

I include in the RECORD a piece from the New York Post titled: ''GOP unveils 'Commitment to America' plan to halt Biden, inflation, and crime.''

[From the New York Post, Sept. 23, 2022]

GOP UNVEILS 'COMMITMENT TO AMERICA' PLAN TO HALT BIDEN, INFLATION AND CRIME

(By Steve Nelson)

House Republicans pledged Friday to end soaring inflation and reduce crime by serving as a check on President Biden if they reclaim power—calling the party's midterm election platform a ''Commitment to America.''

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R–Calif.) announced the big-tent framework inside an HVAC manufacturing plant outside Pittsburgh, Pa.

''We want to roll [the plan] out to you, to the entire country, to know exactly what we will do if you would trust us and give us the ability to take a new direction for this country,'' McCarthy said.

The kickoff featured a business-casual Q&A where dozens of GOP legislators took turns fielding questions.

The Republicans vowed to rein in government spending to lower the worst inflation in 41 years—with consumer prices up 8.3 percent over 12 months as of August.

Speakers also promised to address crime, including record-high illegal immigration, rising violent crime in cities and fentanyl smuggling that's accelerated overdose deaths.

''The sad part is these Democratic policies have already taken one month of your wages. So now the struggle that you have is you're living through 12 months with only 11 months' pay now because inflation is so high,'' McCarthy said, blasting Biden's $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan spending bill.

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy unveiled the Republican ''Commitment to America'' agenda at DMI Companies in Monongahela, Pennsylvania.

''We've watched what's happened to our border—the millions of people who are just walking across, people on the terrorist watch list. Now we're watching it create every community to be a border community,'' McCarthy said.

''Fentanyl is the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45. The poison starts in China and comes across our border. Do you realize it's killing 300 Americans every day? It's like an airliner crashing each day.''

No. 3 House Republican Rep. Elise Stefanik of New York said the GOP would be ''making sure that we stop the trillions and trillions of reckless government spending that we have seen under Democrat rule.''

House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy vowed to stop President Biden's spending policies if Republicans take the House this fall.

''That will immediately help lower the cost of goods as we seek to rein in inflation,'' she said at the event.

Rep. Patrick McHenry (R–NC) said, ''We have to have oversight of what's happening in the administration and go after the wasteful spending of the last administration and return to normalcy—that $1 today means $1 tomorrow.''

Rep. Brad Wenstrup (R–Ohio) said Republicans would declare fentanyl a weapon of mass destruction. ''That's what this is. It fits the categories completely. And we're going to declare it as that and use every resource we possibly can,'' he said.

Rep. Jim Jordan promised Republicans will nix President Biden's plan on hiring more IRS agents over the next decade.

Rep. Guy Reschenthaler (R–Pa.) said that unlike Democrats under House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.), ''we're not going to have this top-down leadership.''

''Kevin McCarthy is going to rely on all of us to have bottom-up leadership that comes from the districts,'' he said. ''We got members here from New York all the way to the border with Tony Gonzales. We got people that have different approaches—all the way from David Joyce to Marjorie Taylor Greene. But we're all united behind Kevin McCarthy.''

Republican speakers vowed various oversight efforts focused on the Biden administration and hearings on the origins of the COVID–19 pandemic.

House Minority Whip Steve Scalise said more hearings will be held on border security.

House Minority Whip Steve Scalise (R–La.) said, ''We were calling for hearings for over a year on the origin of COVID. Shouldn't we know that? I mean, this is a basic question. Millions of people across the globe died.''

Scalise said there would be many hearings on border security too after more than 2 million people illegally crossed the southwest border in fiscal 2022.

''We will give [Homeland Security] Secretary [Alejandro] Mayorkas a reserved parking spot, he will be testifying so much about this,'' Scalise said.

Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene claimed she will follow the Republicans' new agenda.

Speakers did not specifically mention expected investigations of Biden's links to his son Hunter Biden and brother Jim Biden's multimillion-dollar influence-peddling businesses in China, Ukraine and other countries.

Rep. Jim Jordan (R–Ohio) said the Republicans decided their first bill will seek to nullify an IRS crackdown recently authorized by Democrats to fund an environmental and health care spending bill. He also mentioned oversight of allegedly biased Justice Department actions.

''We're gonna look into this weaponization of the DOJ against the American people . . . not to mention the border. But specifically to the COVID issue . . . they told us so many things that turned out not to be accurate,'' Jordan said.

''They told us this thing [COVID] . . . didn't come from a lab. Sure it looks like it did,'' he added. ''But they want us to believe, 'No, no, no, it was a bat to a pangolin to Joe Rogan.' ''

''We are committed to doing the investigations that need to be done,'' Jordan said.

The ''Commitment to America'' organizes various pledges under four broad categories: the economy, safety, freedom and accountability. The outline is an attempt to harness the historical success of former House Speaker Newt Gingrich's 1994 ''Contract with America,'' which propelled GOP gains during President Bill Clinton's first term.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Republicans promised that as soon as they were in the majority, they would immediately move to address inflation. Well, we are a month into the 118th Congress with zero action to lower costs for families.

My question is, what happened? Why have Republicans spent all of January on messaging bills and trying to get their house in order?

I know it was a tumultuous week to try to elect a Speaker. We made history—4 days and 15 votes. Unprecedented.

Nonetheless, what happened to focusing on issues that were first and foremost on people's minds? Instead, we had abortion bans, and now we are dealing with this. I think we are dealing with a bill on socialism later today. I don't know what the heck prompted that.

In any event, I mean, really? Is that what my Republican friends think the American people want?

Again, I am going to just say that I am urging my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can have a vote on my proposal, basically, which says that Social Security benefits must be protected, that there is nothing in any of these bills or any bills going forward that would in any way negatively impact Social Security. Protecting the benefits that Social Security provides should be a priority for this Congress.

Quite frankly, none of us are comforted by any of the words that the Speaker has said. We don't know what is in the secret memo. I don't know what was promised on Social Security.

When Republicans say things like they want to protect the integrity of the program, that is code for they want to cut it. That is code for they want to raise the retirement age. That is code for all the things that our constituents, not just Democrats, but Independents and Republicans, fear might be coming down the road.

They are trying to use Social Security. They are trying to hold it hostage as part of this effort to get some sort of a deal on the debt ceiling.

They are basically holding this economy hostage. The good faith and credit of the United States, they are holding it hostage, ready to just throw it into the wind until they get these cuts in programs that help people.

Again, before I yield back at this point and let the gentleman continue with any speakers he has, I would say that the measures that we are dealing with today are concerning to us because there is a right way to wind down and a wrong way to wind down.

What we suggested last night in the Rules Committee as the right way to do this, and you can do it quickly, is to do hearings and make sure there are no unintended consequences, make sure there aren't vulnerable people who could be adversely impacted by your quick change of the rules. The majority would have none of it.

So, again, this isn't a serious effort. This is about messaging, and it is really disappointing.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK), a new Member elected last November, to speak on the rule.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Well, sir, you asked for a physician to stand. I am a physician. I am an emergency medicine physician who served during the entire COVID pandemic from before the pandemic began.

I am sure I was exposed to it over a thousand times with thousands of patients that I treated for COVID, some of which I intubated.

We had healthcare workers who had decades of experience exposed over and over again before there even was a vaccination. People went home sick. They had fevers.

It may surprise you that I was never tested for COVID. Not in the entire career that I have had as an emergency physician have I ever been tested for COVID.

I came to work time and time again, putting my life on the line. I lost friends. I watched people put their lives on the line and come to work when everybody else got to call in or stay home based on congressional mandates or congressional exceptions because we were essential, because we understand our profession.

We understand how important it is to public service, to save lives, to learn and to continue to grow, to have the debate over what would and would not work for patients, and we evolved.

It wasn't just one size fits all for medicine. People are not treated the same because people are different. Different exposures require different treatments.

Once you have had the disease, you develop an immunity. If you have immunity, and you are exposed to a vaccination within a certain time, you can have a hyperimmune response that can be harmful.

This is not taken into account by congressional people who do not understand medicine, who have not been to medical school, who have not had a residency, who have not had decades of experience either as a doctor, a nurse, a mid-level, or some other healthcare professional who understands healthcare far more than anybody who sits in these seats, who have never treated one patient or read one book or had one test concerning the outcome of a patient. They have never held the hand of a patient who is dying.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. So, I would challenge you, sir, to consider a healthcare professional, when they get to determine their own fate as they continue to put their lives on the line to serve the very people that we are supposed to be serving here in Congress.

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

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

I appreciate the gentleman's response, but I am not sure who he is responding to.

The question I asked was for physicians to come down here and to make it clear, contrary to what was said before, that these vaccines are not dangerous, that people should get vaccinated, that it could save lives.

People are still dying of COVID, by the way, and the idea that somehow we should be discouraging people from getting vaccinations by scaring them doesn't make a lot of sense to me. In fact, I think it is irresponsible.

I appreciate the gentleman's service to his patients, and I hope that he understands now his service is to the American people and that service includes getting out the truth and what is accurate and what is not accurate about these vaccinations.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, our side isn't afraid to embrace change. We know that living in the 21st century means that we can and should use technology to improve Americans' quality of life.

We know that vaccines save lives, and we know that science is real. We know that ending these emergencies immediately is irresponsible.

Most importantly, we know that we are here to make progress, not to go backward, which is what the four measures this rule includes would do.

Again, let me say none of these bills went through committee. They could have, but none of them did.

Madam Speaker, 94 percent of the rules this Congress has dealt with have been completely closed. That is 15 out of 16 measures with no hearings, no amendments, no markups.

Is this what Speaker MCCARTHY promised you in his secret memo, that this is the way you will conduct business?

On top of all that, we are deeply concerned that a small minority on the other side of the aisle representing the most extreme elements of the Republican Conference is calling the shots.

We are worried about Social Security, and we are worried about Medicare. That is why we are asking people to vote ''no'' on the previous question, because we want to be able to put in place protections so that a fringe group can't mess around with Social Security, can't take away from people what they have earned.

It is not an entitlement. It is what people have earned in this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a strong ''no'' vote on this rule.

There is a right way to do this and a wrong way to do this. The majority is in control and in charge. Take the time. Do the hearings. Ask the questions. Make sure there are no unintended consequences.

This is about the health and well-being of the American people. They deserve at least a hearing rather than a messaging bill rushed to the floor.

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

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

In preparing for this debate today on the rule, I reflected on the iconic photograph of the sailor kissing his girlfriend on the streets of New York at the end of the Second World War. Think about that for a moment.

My parents were married in 1946. My wife's parents were married in 1945. The end of the Second World War, the optimism of that couple on the streets of New York, then gave rise to basically my generation, the baby boom generation.

I was thinking back to about a year ago when there was a video making the rounds on the internet of an elementary school class where the teacher said masks are no longer required and the unbridled joy of those young students as they ripped off their masks, never to have to put them on again.

We are standing on the precipice of just such a moment today, and this truly is a historic moment. It is one that the American people should look back on and say this was the time. This is the time for optimism and to, without fear, embrace the future because

we know the good things of which our country is capable.

□ 1315

Now, I do need to thank some of our fellow Members; specifically, the chairwoman of my committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, Chairwoman RODGERS, Chairman SAM GRAVES of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and Chairman COMER of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for their hard work in delivering for the American people by bringing these bills to the floor and helping ensure that commitment to America and the future.

The Republican majority has again demonstrated that our governing agenda will be devoted to improving the lives of our Nation's citizens. Our governing majority will continue to focus on the issues that matter most to our people: combating the rising energy costs, sky-high inflation, rampant crime, our porous southern border, and the fentanyl crisis.

These are the issues that the American voters rightfully demand that their Representatives address. The Republican majority is committed to solving the crises that the previous Democratic majority has inflicted on our Nation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 382—Pandemic is Over Act, H.R. 497—Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, H.R. 139—SHOW UP Act of 2023, and H.J. Res. 7—Relating to a national emergency declared by the Presidenton March 13, 2020.

House Republicans have professed a commitment to transparency and fairness that allows all voices to be heard in the legislative process.

Yet, by House Republicans choosing a closed rule, have denied this body the right to weigh in on the rules or these bills.

Republicans are attempting to push through statements of principle that represent the entirety of the House without any reasonable consideration.

These bills have not been adequately considered in committee hearing by the committee of jurisdiction.

Amendments to these bills have not been raised or debated.

Now, with this closed Rule, members are unable to offer any amendments to each of these bills.

The business of the House is of the utmost importance to the American people.

Democrats remain committed to putting people over politics.

During 2020 within my District, the COVID–19 pandemic was surging and I worked desperately to bring COVID–19 testing and then vaccines to communities in need throughout my district.

At the time many Republican leaders refused to even acknowledge the reality of the pandemic.

Now the Republicans are furthering their narrative and lack of action on COVID–19 by attempting to normalize and even deny the horrors of the pandemic.

We should never forget the lives lost and all that we have learned for the pandemic.

In Harris County, over 11 thousand people have died of COVID–19 since 2020. Every one of those lives was important and we must work together to save every life possible.

Vaccines have saved lives and continue to save lives.

The issue of the pandemics' ongoing nature is a complex one that will need to consider potential seasonal surges and the need for annual vaccines.

The Republicans today barely secured a majority in the House and only chose a Speaker from their party after 14 votes. They cannot claim to have any mandate from the public.

We must continue to keep COVID–19 front of mind and create a plan of shifting to living with COVID–19 rather than these brash political statements.

I, for one, care about the safety of healthcare works, the safety of my constituents, and the safety of workers.

The fact is that we must continue to identify the best way out of the COVID–19 pandemic with careful consideration of the science, and strategic plans that consider the uniqueness of each of the communities that we represent.

The rule before us makes bold unsubstantiated claims that threaten the safety of our healthcare workers, teleworkers, and the constituents in each of our districts.

There is a better way forward.

We must have more discussion and debate.

I cannot in good conscious support this rule.

The material previously referred to by MCGOVERN is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 75

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID–19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in each of the other sections of this resolution is as follows:

''At the end, add the following:

''This Act shall not be effective unless and until the date on which the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that this Act will not result in a decrease to Social Security benefits.''.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 75; and

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 7, RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020; H.R. 139, STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023; H.R. 382, PANDEMIC IS OVER ACT; AND H.R. 497, FREEDOM FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 75) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID–19 pandemic and a plan for the agency' future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 209, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—218

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
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
Hunt
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
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
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
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)
Williams (TX)
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)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Green, Al (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
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)

NOT VOTING—6

Bacon
Goldman (NY)
Gottheimer
Menendez
Pence
Steube

□ 1352

Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SEWELL, Messrs. DOGGETT, and CASTRO of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. COMER, LUCAS, GROTHMAN, McHENRY, and Mrs. CAMMACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 208, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—216

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
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
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
Hunt
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
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
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
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)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—208

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)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Green, Al (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
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
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)

NOT VOTING—9

D'Esposito
Goldman (NY)
Gottheimer
Menendez
Omar
Pence
Rutherford
Self
Steube

□ 1402

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the 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. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, due to President Biden's invite to attend an event related to the Hudson Tunnel Project, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 95 and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 96.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I missed the following votes due to travel with the President related to the Gateway Train Tunnel project. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 95 and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 96.

PANDEMIC IS OVER ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATURNER). Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 382

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 ''Pandemic is Over Act''.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF COVID–19 PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.

The public health emergency declared by the Secretary pursuant to section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) on January 31, 2020, entitled ''Determination that a Public Health Emergency Exists Nationwide as the Result of the 2019 Novel Coronavirus'' (and any renewal thereof) shall terminate on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 382.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to push for immediate and overwhelming passage of my legislation, H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act.

President Biden and I both agree that the COVID–19 pandemic is over. In fact, on the eve of the Pandemic is Over Act going on the House floor, President Biden finally announced that he is going to end the COVID–19 emergency declarations. I am glad that my bill finally forced the Biden administration to act.

However, President Biden has taken too long to act on his statement last September that the pandemic is over, which is why I am moving forward with my bill to end the COVID–19 public health emergency and finally restore checks and balances between Congress and the executive branch.

There was a time and place for the COVID–19 public health emergency. On this day 3 years ago, then-Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Azar first invoked the COVID–19 public health emergency.

The COVID–19 public health emergency was used at the beginning of the pandemic to establish Operation Warp Speed and provide for CMS waivers that led to millions of seniors receiving critical healthcare services through mediums such as telehealth and removing various forms of red tape getting in the way of healthcare providers' ability to care for their patients.

Now, exactly 3 years later to the day of the original disaster public health emergency declaration, we are in a much better position to address COVID–19. We have proven therapeutics in addition to 95 percent of the population either being previously infected with COVID–19 or vaccinated. A senior administration official even stated, ''We are in a pretty good place in the pandemic. . . . Cases are down dramatically from where they were the past two winters,'' according to Politico reporting.

It is long overdue for President Biden to unwind the public health emergency. Despite overwhelming evidence that COVID–19 is now endemic and that

the pandemic is over, Secretary Becerra just renewed the public health emergency for a twelfth time.

The Pandemic is Over Act sends a loud and clear message to President Biden: The American people are tired of living in a perpetual state of emergency, and it is long overdue for Congress to take back the authorities granted under Article I of the Constitution.

The Pandemic is Over Act would immediately terminate the COVID–19 public health emergency. Nothing in my bill ends title 42, despite the administration stating that it will. Let me repeat: Nothing in this bill ends title 42.

The Biden administration alone controls title 42. That statute was written in 1944 before the authority of the public health emergency even existed. If the Biden administration chooses to end title 42 when the public health emergency ends without working with us to secure the border, then that is just another one of his failures to add to the list.

To be clear, we support the ability to declare a public health emergency to address clear and serious public health threats. Maintaining these regulatory flexibilities during a public health emergency is crucial, but these authorities should only be used for limited periods of time based upon the particular circumstances and prevalence or immediacy of the public health threat.

Now, it is time to rescind the President's emergency powers, and Congress can address the present and future needs that may arise with COVID–19.

Since President Biden took office, we have seen the pandemic used to justify countless executive overreaches. The President has used the pandemic for one-size-fits-all vaccine mandates for healthcare workers, mask mandates, and eviction moratoriums.

While ending the COVID–19 public health emergency will not relinquish all the President's power that has been used to make those decisions, it does make it more difficult to justify bypassing Congress to enact his policies.

Finally, I want to address the arguments about our unwinding the public health emergency too quickly. Democrats had unified control and could have extended, or the administration could have undertaken rulemaking to unwind, the COVID–19 public health emergency.

Congress is already working. We need to work together on extending a number of provisions tied to the COVID–19 public health emergency.

Where are their bills that would extend or unwind these things? Where was the hearing on this last Congress if this was such an issue?

Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 382, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 382, which would abruptly and irresponsibly end the COVID–19 public health emergency virtually overnight. It would require this action immediately without providing patients, hospitals, providers, and States sufficient notice to safely unwind numerous authorities, programs, and flexibilities that have been essential to protecting Americans throughout the pandemic.

Last night, the Biden administration announced that the COVID–19 public health emergency is planned to be ended on May 11, 2023. This timeline provides healthcare providers and patients with the certainty and predictability needed to responsibly wind down the COVID–19 response programs.

As a result of these successful programs, as well as the historic investments made by Congress, millions of Americans have received free vaccines and tests, safe access to their doctors through telehealth appointments, and continuous healthcare coverage through programs such as Medicaid and CHIP.

□ 1415

Unfortunately, Republicans are needlessly rushing forward today with a reckless plan that would jeopardize the health of millions of Americans by immediately ceasing these important response programs without advanced preparations.

Mr. Speaker, a pandemic of this magnitude cannot be unwound overnight. We cannot flip a switch and make COVID–19 end with the snap of a finger. If H.R. 382 becomes law, it would have disastrous consequences. It would disrupt insurance coverage for millions of vulnerable Americans by allowing States to immediately start kicking vulnerable Americans off their healthcare coverage without any protections. This is deeply irresponsible and dangerous.

Americans would also immediately begin paying out of pocket for the COVID–19 testing, and hospitals would see an immediate payment cut of 20 percent for Medicare patients with COVID–19. In addition, important waivers and flexibilities, including certain telemedicine flexibilities that providers and patients have relied on for the duration of the COVID–19 pandemic, would be terminated immediately, as well.

This legislation would also result in the elimination of vital tools for tracking COVID–19 outbreaks in nursing homes and other residential facilities.

It also impacts our veterans, ending VA clinicians' ability to prescribe controlled substances via telehealth. This would severely impact many veterans' access to medications that they need to manage chronic pain, complex mental health conditions, and substance use disorder. The legislation also threatens the progress the VA has made in ending veterans' homelessness.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it would abruptly end flexibilities for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, that would impact many Americans struggling to put food on their tables, particularly for those having trouble finding work and low-income college students.

The Republicans began their House majority with chaos and confusion earlier this month, and this bill continues that chaos and confusion, but this time it will hurt millions of Americans directly, and that is simply not right.

Responsibly transitioning to the post-emergency future requires careful planning and coordination with public health officials and policymakers. I applaud the Biden administration for properly guiding the Nation to a safe transition as we unwind these programs without endangering access to care and treatment for Americans.

Unfortunately, Republicans are rushing to recklessly and dangerously eliminate all these protections immediately and without warning. I just think it is the height of irresponsibility. For that reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have been asking for a year for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to start showing us a plan for unwinding the pandemic public health emergency.

Now that we are here doing this today, it seems like we are starting to move in that direction. Unfortunately, we didn't have any hearings last Congress to deal with that, but we are going to begin that, working together today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), my friend.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act.

A public health emergency was first declared by Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar in January 2020. It was a different time. We knew little about the novel coronavirus that was overtaking the world. We didn't understand how it worked. We had no way to treat it or reduce the spread.

Now, over 3 years later, the landscape has completely changed. Reliable vaccines, tests, and treatments are widely available. Businesses are open, Americans are traveling freely, and folks are ready and willing to get back to work.

As I have said from the beginning, it is unlikely we will ever fully rid ourselves of the coronavirus, but it can, and indeed has, become something we have the ability to deal with. Society can and should be returning to normal.

Even President Biden acknowledged as much in an interview last September, more than 4 months ago, when he said the COVID–19 pandemic is over. Yet this administration has continued to extend the length of the public health emergency, using it to retain fear in the American people and to justify continued requests for Federal funding.

In absence of the administration's willingness to immediately rightfully end the public health emergency declaration, it is time for Congress to act.

I am grateful to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for bringing this bill forward. I urge all my colleagues to support a formal end to the public health emergency declaration.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition. COVID–19 has been the worst pandemic we have had in this world in 100 years. It is a medical issue to be addressed by doctors and not a political issue.

Today, my colleagues are asking us to support a bill to terminate the COVID public health emergency, yet the Biden administration's current extension of the public health emergency is a rational one. It is rational in the way we exit from this emergency declaration: We let our healthcare system adjust from this tremendous terrible pandemic that continues to evolve in our society. I would say a politically driven end to COVID–19 is not the way to run our healthcare system.

Furthermore, while my colleagues are saying there is no need for a public health emergency, they want to keep title 42 at the border because of its public health emergency implications.

My colleagues, I say to you, if you truly believe the pandemic is over, then you can't say that title 42 is still needed at the border because of a healthcare crisis.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are ending the emergency powers of the President. We are not conceding that COVID–19 is over in this country, and it is not. People have to take mitigation. We certainly don't want it coming across our southern border, so we support keeping title 42 in place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act. I thank my friend and colleague from Kentucky, Mr. BRETT GUTHRIE, for leading this important effort.

This action is long overdue. This week we are voting on several bills designed to do what we all in America have known for some time, that the emergency declaration should go away. Constituents have been asking—heck, demanding—that we end this perpetual state of COVID emergencies in the Federal Government and get back to normal.

More than 4 months ago, President Biden declared that the COVID–19 pandemic was over, yet interestingly the Federal emergency declaration is still in place. It makes you wonder, why would the President declare that the pandemic is over but not officially rescind the emergency declaration?

In fact, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem more concerned with keeping the public health emergency in place rather than addressing the problems we are now being faced with: Things like investigating the estimated $163 billion with a b in COVID unemployment fraud and recovering those funds that were stolen from the American taxpayers; or the approximately $150 billion in unobligated funds that is just sitting there for COVID. That is a pretty easy way to start reducing spending. Or how about the approximately half a trillion dollars that has been obligated but hasn't been pushed out the door yet?

Ask yourselves, who benefits from the emergency declaration remaining in place?

It is a fact that the continuation of the public health emergency is costing taxpayers billions of dollars and worsening already-crippling inflation, inflation which is costing Florida families in my district an estimated $10,000 extra a year in basic goods and services. I don't know anyone who can afford an extra 10 grand a year.

The Federal mandates, like this, have increased private health insurance costs and grossly exacerbated the ever-increasing national debt that will be passed on to my generation, our children, and grandchildren.

It is time to get our kids back to school, folks back to work, and life back to normal. It is time for us to turn the page and end the COVID–19 public health emergency powers. Let's get back to commonsense fixes to our healthcare system. Let's get back to work on lowering energy costs. Let's get back to work, and let's get back to work in person.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this. It is not quite as simple as my friend from Florida implies.

Today we are voting to upend the healthcare system and interrupt patient care. Ending the public health emergency prematurely would have far-reaching implications, and this is a waste of time. The Biden administration has already made clear that they are planning on ending the emergency in May.

Why are we spending time abruptly ending this declaration, which is going to end in 3 months anyway, when we could have instead had a serious conversation about making this as smooth a transition as possible?

There are many things that are involved here. Congress already started this work in the omnibus by beginning a process to wind down Medicaid enrollment policies and extending important programs like telehealth.

I was happy that my bipartisan legislation to extend Medicare's Hospital at Home program was extended in this manner. We fought for this because we viewed the waivers and policies of the last 3 years as a blueprint for future opportunities to innovate and extract value from our healthcare system.

This work was bipartisan because both sides of the aisle saw the benefit of the pandemic-era policies. It is unfortunate that instead of continuing to build on that work, my colleagues are posturing.

I have heard from hospitals in my district, and I imagine you have heard in yours, how important it is to extend, not end, the waivers that address their capacity and staffing challenges.

If this bill were enacted, those operations would be upended. State Medicaid programs would be in unnecessary chaos, with millions at risk of losing their health insurance. Seniors would lose access to COVID tests because Medicare would no longer be able to pay for them. These are just a few examples of the complexity and how irresponsible this legislation is. It certainly does not honor the more than a million Americans who have lost their lives to this disease.

After a traumatic 3 years full of loss, the last thing the public needs is additional chaos at the hands of the Federal Government.

At the start of the pandemic, we saw an often divided Congress come together to bring meaningful relief to American families. I had hoped that we would continue that same spirit of cooperation and dedication to our constituents at the end of this chapter.

I know we have all heard from our hospitals and healthcare systems about the needs they still have. I believe we can work together to make this a stable transition and learn lessons from the pandemic.

I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation and instead come to the table to work to ease the transition in a reasonable fashion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I just point out that the omni gave the States clarity in how to deal with the Medicaid situation moving forward. We also extended telehealth, so a lot of things we have been trying to do, we have been asking the administration for a year to address some of the things that my friend from Oregon just brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, as both a physician and the former Director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, I agree with what President Biden said in September of last year: The pandemic is over. More specifically, even though SARS-CoV–2 is still circulating, it is endemic. The public health emergency is and should be over.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support H.R. 382, which would acknowledge the truth of the President's words and finally put an end to the public health emergency.

When COVID–19 first reached our shores, the public health emergency declaration was a tool that helped our country to mobilize, develop testing, develop vaccines, and to distribute PPE and institute our manufacturing sector. However, this emergency declaration is no longer needed, and instead of putting an end to it, the President has continually renewed it with no end in sight.

For example, we have already extended telehealth for 2 years. From mask mandates and vaccine mandates to extending Medicaid expansion to previously ineligible participants and student loan forgiveness, the President and this administration are using the public health emergency to expand government overreach.

What is irresponsible is not putting a transition in place during this past year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 382 and put an end to this outdated, bloated government overreach.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1430

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to try and speak something called commonsense speak, and that is for my colleagues to understand that Americans reject confusion and chaos.

According to The New York Times, ''An abrupt end to the emergency declarations would create wide-ranging chaos and uncertainty throughout the healthcare system—for States, for hospitals and doctors' offices, and, most importantly, for the tens of millions of Americans,'' as evidenced.

This is on the data from the White House, which by the way, under President Joe Biden, crafted a White House COVID task force that began to calm the uncalm waters that we suffered in the last administration.

Does anyone remember, ''maybe we should drink disinfectant'' in the midst of COVID–19?

Well, let me tell you, in Houston, Texas, we remember it. We also know that 6,812,798 persons died around the world from COVID; 1.1 million died in the United States.

It was only after an overwhelming effort by the Biden administration that we began to see the clock move on individuals willing to get their first, second, and third shots; their booster shots. That is why we are living, because we were vaccinated, because we overcame the stigma and the wrongheaded information that was scaring people about vaccines.

We didn't lose 1 million people on vaccines. We lost 1 million people due to not having that vaccination timely. I am struck by this legislation. The pandemic is not over.

Mr. Speaker, 500 people a day die, right now as I am standing here, from COVID. That is a reasonable amount. I know there are other infectious diseases, but doesn't it make sense that if we can have a vaccine and a protocol that allows people, our children, and those with preexisting conditions to live that we want them to do so?

The Biden administration has announced that they intend to reduce this national emergency declaration in May. It will allow our health facilities to get themselves organized for the possible onslaught. It will also deprive impoverished persons from the ability to get free vaccinations, including possibly flu shots, like we are doing in Houston, Texas.

I remember over 70 testing sites that I put in my district with healthcare providers week after week after week so that people could be tested and so we could bring down COVID in Houston, Texas.

I remember vaccination sites where people stood in line, a thousand at a time, to get vaccinated for free. Are we jumping for joy to condemn and now undermine the emergency pandemic that was utilized?

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. All I can say is that health professionals by and large in hospitals, clinics, doctors' offices will say no. They need their patients healthy. As many people that can get vaccinated with information should get vaccinated and, of course, guided by your healthcare provider.

I don't think it makes any good sense to be able to talk about how you never got tested, how you never got vaccinated. That is all well and good. I applaud an individual who is able to survive not getting tested, not getting vaccinated, but I know of so many of my close friends who died because there was not a vaccination, there was not good healthcare. They came to the end stages of COVID and COVID killed them.

So I don't make a mockery of the hard work of President Biden. I truly believe that his time frame—I might think it is a little too quick, but I adhere to the President's time frame of May 2023. Let us organize so that we can save lives.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, at any moment we can have a surge of COVID–19. We saw that at the beginning of the convergence of the flu, which was high this year, and COVID.

So I don't celebrate this legislation. I don't take angst or anger with the individual who thinks this is the right way, but I know that I am on the right side. I am on the dominant side of truth that 6 million-plus died, 1.1 million died here in the United States and 500 are dying every day.

This is not a time to precipitously end the emergency declaration. We should also make sure that we are not creating chaos and confusion.

Mr. Speaker, I again emphasize that we need not have chaos and confusion. Unfortunately, I see no purpose in this bill and will vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 382—the Pandemic is Over Act, which would terminate the COVID–19 public health emergency that was declared on January 31, 2020, on the date of the bill's enactment.

Yesterday President Biden announced that the Public Health Emergency would officially end on May 11, 2023.

The purpose of doing this would be to allow hospitals, health care workers, and health officials the ability to manage changes that will come with ending the public health emergency declaration.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, a Public Health Emergency declaration occurs when the Secretary of HHS determines that a disease or disorder presents a public health emergency (PHE) or that a public health emergency exists.

Secretary Becerra and the Biden administration have repeatedly said that the decision to terminate the public health emergency would be based on the best available data and science.

Through mass testing and vaccination campaigns, the public health emergency declaration has helped the American public contain the COVID virus, while also keeping the cost low for those seeking treatment.

The public health emergency has required that group health plans and insurers provide patients with COVID vaccines, testing, and treatment; expanded telehealth services, and extended health coverage for Medicaid beneficiaries.

Abruptly ending these pandemic declarations without a transition period would be extremely irresponsible because it would create uncertainty in health care systems; it would end Medicaid programs that have operated under special rules, telehealth would be impacted, and group health insurance plans could potentially change frequency of testing, vaccination, and treatment for patients.

These programs have been incredibly helpful at slowing the spread of COVID, so we must be thoughtful and practical about how we dissolve the public health emergency, which is why we need a transition period as proposed by the President just yesterday.

We must provide stakeholders with time to adjust to the changes that will come from ending the public health emergency.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to legislation that would end the pandemic far too early and would upend some of the flexibilities that we all have benefited from since the start of the pandemic.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a New York Times article, ''U.S. Plans to End Public Health Emergency for COVID in May.''

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 2023]

U.S. PLANS TO END PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY FOR COVID IN MAY

The end of the emergency, planned for May 11, will bring about a complex set of policy changes and signals a new chapter in the government's pandemic response.

WASHINGTON—The Biden administration plans to let the coronavirus public health emergency expire in May, the White House said on Monday, a sign that federal officials believe the pandemic has moved into a new, less dire phase.

The move carries both symbolic weight and real-world consequences. Millions of Americans have received free Covid tests, treatments and vaccines during the pandemic, and not all of that will continue to be free once the emergency is over. The White House wants to keep the emergency in place for several more months so hospitals, health care providers and health officials can prepare for a host of changes when it ends, officials said.

An average of more than 500 people in the United States are still dying from Covid–19 each day, about twice the number of deaths per day during a bad flu season. But at the three-year mark, the coronavirus is no longer upending everyday life to the extent it once did, partly because much of the population has at least some protection against the virus from vaccinations and prior infections.

Still, the White House said on Monday that the nation needed an orderly transition out of the public health emergency. The administration said it also intended to allow a separate declaration of a national emergency to expire on the same day, May 11.

''An abrupt end to the emergency declarations would create wide-ranging chaos and uncertainty throughout the health care system—for states, for hospitals and doctors' offices, and, most importantly, for tens of millions of Americans,'' the White House said in a statement.

The announcement came on the eve of a scheduled vote in the House on a bill that would immediately end the public health emergency. The bill, called the Pandemic Is Over Act, is one of several pandemic-related measures that the Republican-controlled chamber is scheduled to consider this week. The White House issued its statement as the administration's response to that bill and another measure that would end the national emergency.

The back and forth signaled what is likely to be a protracted political battle between House Republicans and the White House over its handling of the pandemic. Republican lawmakers hope to put the Biden administration on the defensive, claiming it spent extravagantly in the name of battling the coronavirus.

''Rather than waiting until May 11, the Biden administration should Join us now in immediately ending this declaration,'' Representative Steve Scalise, Republican of Louisiana and the majority leader, said in a statement. ''The days of the Biden administration being able to hide behind Covid to waste billions of taxpayer dollars on their unrelated, radical agenda are over.''

The White House argues that it is only because of federal Covid policies mandating free tests, treatments and vaccines that the pandemic is now under better control. Covid was the third-leading cause of death from 2020 through mid-2022; now it is no longer among the top five killers, federal officials said.

The public health emergency was first declared by the Trump administration in January 2020, and it has been renewed every 90 days since then. The Biden administration had pledged to alert states 60 days before ending it. The emergency was last renewed earlier in January, and many state health officials expected it would be allowed to expire in mid-April.

Ending the emergency will prompt complex changes in the cost of Covid tests and treatments that Americans are accustomed to getting for free. Any charges they face will vary depending on whether they have private insurance, Medicare coverage, Medicaid coverage or no health insurance. What state they live in could also be a factor.

Still, the consequences may not be quite as dramatic as public health experts once feared. Medicaid enrollment expanded greatly during the pandemic because low-income Americans were kept in the program for as long as the public health emergency was active.

But a congressional spending package enacted in December effectively broke that link, instead setting an April deadline when states will begin losing additional funding for Medicaid coverage. State officials are likely to gradually remove Americans from Medicaid rolls this year beginning then. That transition avoids a more sudden removal of millions of poor Americans from their health coverage.

By reconfiguring that expensive policy, Congress was able to use the projected savings to pay for expanded Medicaid benefits for children, postpartum mothers and residents of U.S. territories.

The December legislation also extended coverage for telehealth visits for Medicare recipients through 2024. Telemedicine proved a lifeline for many during the pandemic, and that coverage would have ended when the emergency was lifted.

Still, other services might prove more costly to Americans, particularly those with no insurance. People with private health insurance or Medicare coverage have been eligible for eight free coronavirus tests each month. Insurers were required to cover tests, even if they were administered by providers that were not part of their networks. Once the emergency ends, some Americans will end up paying out of pocket for those tests.

And while vaccines will continue to be covered for people with private insurance or Medicare or Medicaid coverage, the end of the emergency will mean that some Americans may have to pay out of pocket for Covid treatments, such as Paxlovid, an antiviral pill. Hospitals will also no longer receive higher Medicare payment rates for treating Covid patients.

Jennifer Kates, a senior vice president at the Kaiser Family Foundation, said the emergency declaration had provided an important reprieve from the American health care system's typically fractured way of covering the costs of care, giving more people access to services that might otherwise not have been covered by insurance.

The White House's decision, she added, could send the wrong message about how relaxed Americans should be about the virus.

''To the extent that it might let people let their guard down from one day to the next, that could raise some challenges,'' she said.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, we are trying to end the emergency powers of the President during the pandemic. We recognize COVID is still an issue that people have to deal with. We absolutely know that we are going to be working together over the next few weeks and months to make sure we have in place the proper protections.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my good friend.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act.

Mr. Speaker, to quote President Biden, ''the COVID–19 pandemic is over.''

This is one of the few times I have agreed with him from this Chamber. Now that the House is finally voting to end the public health emergency, President Biden has suddenly decided to end it in May. It is past time for us to act. That is why I will be voting for the Pandemic is Over Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same thing.

This is not just a symbolic gesture. It is critically important that we vote to end the so-called emergency once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has maintained the emergency declaration for 3 years. Americans have moved on from the pandemic. Georgians in my district went back to work and back to school over 2 years ago, so why is our country still under a public health emergency?

The reason why is because it is the vehicle this administration has used to implement mask mandates and other leftist policies. It is nothing more than an excuse for Federal overreach that prohibits States from making decisions for their constituents.

It is time to make it official. Let's end this COVID–19 public health emergency and focus on reviving our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GUTHRIE and Chairwoman RODGERS for working together on this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE, my colleague, for everything that she just said.

I remember so many times during the first year of the COVID pandemic when she was calling me and trying to get testing sites, trying to make sure that a lot of her constituents were tested and had received the vaccine.

It is very easy for our colleagues on the other side now to say, well, this is over. It is time to move on. But the bottom line is that we never know for sure exactly what is going to manifest itself. Even when the President said yesterday that he is planning on ending this public health emergency on May 11, notice he said ''plan'' because we are not sure that that is possible.

In any case, it makes no sense to just say that we are going to do this immediately upon enactment of this bill—which is not going to be enacted, but nonetheless—because we need to do a lot of preparation and planning. We did some of that even in the omnibus that passed at the end of the last session with continuous eligibility for Medicaid, for example.

My understanding is the way this bill is worded, that would end if this passed immediately, as well.

Mr. Speaker, so our point is that this is a pandemic that we just have to be very careful about what we do. We have to do adequate preparation.

The President has said May 11 is the likely date. That is fine. But it has to be based on science. We shouldn't be

getting up here and say, ''end it immediately.''

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GUTHRIE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act. As Representatives of the American people, we owe it to them to assess our country's response to the COVID–19 pandemic and look to better prepare for future pandemics. Most importantly, the American people deserve honesty and normalcy.

The pandemic is over. Even President Biden said as much last September. That level of honesty from the President is a step in the right direction, but after the President publicly declared the pandemic over, he extended the public health emergency not just once, but two more times. Today marks 3 years since the original public health emergency declaration.

Our country has been through a lot in the last 3 years but it is time to get back to normal. It is time to give power back to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 382.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 17½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, in times of national crisis, our Constitution and our Federal laws empower our President to temporarily seize extraordinary power. This is necessary to allow him the authority to alter Federal law to meet the urgent needs of the emergency.

In this case, that declaration of emergency to meet the crisis of the coronavirus pandemic occurred almost 3 years ago. Mr. Speaker, also incumbent in that authority is the expectation that the executive branch will return that authority to the people when it is no longer needed. That is certainly the case today.

Congress has met hundreds and hundreds of times since the executive branch first declared the state of emergency. Congress has had abundant opportunity to pass Federal legislation codifying or rejecting the President's recommendations. Unfortunately, the Biden administration has recently renewed the state of emergency for a twelfth time. This is not what the Founding Fathers intended.

Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers intended the legislative branch of government, the people's elected Representatives, to be the ones that set laws for the United States of America, and it is past time that that authority be returned to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Florida (Mr. MOSKOWITZ).

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 382, and I urge my colleagues to support my motion to recommit which would prohibit this legislation from going into effect if it will negatively impact Medicare beneficiaries.

Speaker MCCARTHY has publicly stated that cuts to Medicare will be off the table in any debt ceiling negotiations, but that commitment clearly does not carry over to today's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 382 would increase patient costs and cut hospital payments to Medicare beneficiaries.

In its nearly 68 years of existence, Medicare has given millions of Americans access to affordable healthcare coverage. Generations have been given peace of mind knowing that they will have comprehensive available coverage to them as they age, regardless of their financial status.

In 2021, nearly 64 million Americans, including 4.8 million Floridians, were enrolled in Medicare. These individuals are Democrats, Republicans, and everything in between. They are our friends, our family members, our colleagues, our neighbors, our mentors. We must ensure that these beneficiaries can continue to rely on the lifesaving coverage provided through Medicare.

The President has announced his intention to end the public health emergency on May 11, providing a glide path to smoothly transition out of the emergency era programs. As Florida's former director of Emergency Management during the early days of the pandemic, I helped stand up many of the public health emergency initiatives that provided Americans with COVID–19 tests, treatments, and vaccines at no charge. These initiatives offered enhanced social safety net benefits to help the Nation cope with the pandemic and minimize the impact.

What would an instant cut to the social safety net mean for Medicare beneficiaries and their families? The American family could face an abrupt increase in costs and decrease in care. What would this mean for your local hospital back home?

Hospitals could see a cut of 20 percent for care of COVID patients. Without a responsible plan in place, millions of patients, including many veterans and children, would abruptly face increased barriers to critical hospital care. Rural patients and those with behavioral health needs would be among the most impacted.

So why are some of my colleagues pushing for this to happen? Because it is rooted in political messaging, not thoughtful policy.

An instant termination to the public health emergency without proper coordination with agencies, States, and providers, would interrupt insurance coverage, access to care, increase patients' out-of-pocket costs, and threaten provider payments.

I, like many of my Democratic colleagues and millions of Americans, want to officially end the pandemic and the emergency. As I mentioned, President Biden has announced his intention to do so while taking the time necessary to absorb the impacts.

Pushing for an immediate cessation of the emergency initiatives for messaging purposes could leave millions of Medicare beneficiaries unexpectedly without access to programs that they are currently on.

Mr. Speaker, it is for those reasons that I submit a motion to recommit that will prohibit the bill from going into effect if it will negatively impact Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I know that we plussed-up accounts for COVID that went to hospitals. I am not sure there is any bill that has been offered from the other side to continue the plus-up for COVID spending. I guess what is being referred to in this motion to recommit must be what they are referring to.

I will point out that we do have to deal with Medicare. We do have to save Medicare. In the Inflation Reduction Act, money was taken out of Medicare.

If you take Medicare part D reform, if you take the rebate rule, $288 billion was taken out of Medicare with no Republican votes, cut from—taken from Medicare and used to spend on some things in Medicare but other programs without shoring Medicare up.

If they want to have an intellectual discussion on saving Medicare, that is going to be something we are going to have to work on over the next 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO), my good friend.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time.

There is a reason that nearly every other level of government in America has ceased to exercise executive authority. The emergency is over.

Mr. Speaker, 1,100 days ago, the President declared a public health emergency. We know this. Since then, that order has been extended a dozen times, including twice after President Biden declared the pandemic over during a ''60 Minutes'' interview on national television.

Mr. Speaker, 1,100 days ago, the public health emergency was warranted. I know this. I lived it as a county executive where I took immediate emergency action to protect our most vulnerable and help to save lives. I saw

firsthand the flexibilities granted under such an emergency, expanding access to care and services during a time of essential need.

I also simultaneously saw how the absolute power granted within such an order corrupted New York State government and enabled Governors and the President to choose who was and was not essential.

It is important that we find bipartisan solutions and agreements to extend those efficiencies and flexibilities we like, but it is past time to end the executive and Presidential overreach.

Emergency executive authority should be limited and only for extraordinary circumstances. This is no longer an extraordinary circumstance.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Michigan, there have been over 16,000 COVID–19 cases just this month. Nearly 200 people have died. Death and illness and viruses should not be politicized.

In both Wayne and Oakland Counties, we are still seeing nearly 3,000 cases per week, so the pandemic is far from over. We have residents being hospitalized and families having to say goodbye to their loved ones because of this deadly virus.

This pandemic is not over. The pandemic is still preventing people from going to work and school, disrupting everyday lives.

By ending resources and policies that have surely saved lives, we are leaving our residents and communities to fend for themselves. They cannot do this alone.

We must continue to provide resources to combat COVID–19 and the impacts of long COVID, from testing to treatment and care.

We can continue to save lives together. Continuing to provide resources is not only the right and sensible thing to do, but it is the moral thing to do.

Please, again, we must vote ''no'' on H.R. 382.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend from Michigan that we absolutely have to look at putting things in place and keeping things in place that protect our citizens from COVID–19. We are not dismissing that.

What I am saying, or what we are saying, is it should be a legislative branch-wide issue, that we believe that if things are going to stay in place or be put in place, it should be by an act of Congress, signed by the President, as the Constitution says, instead of just the President making decisions for almost 3 years now—two administrations, almost 3 years now.

That is what we are saying. We look forward to working together to solve these issues and moving forward.

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

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

I listened to my colleague from Kentucky, but as much as I respect him, I totally disagree with what he has been saying here.

Under the public law right now, the emergency—when it starts, when it ends—is done by the administration. Specifically, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, I guess, recommends to the President. There is a reason for that, and that is because he gets all this information from various sources about the science, about when we should be doing this.

I disagree to say that we, as the Congress, should be the ones that make that determination either to begin or end.

In addition to that, the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned in response to one of my Democratic colleagues the provision that we passed in the last Congress in the Inflation Reduction Act to negotiate prices for prescription drugs under Medicare. The fact of the matter is that wasn't a cut to Medicare. That was a way of trying to make drug prices more affordable for our seniors.

To suggest that somehow that is a cut I don't think is accurate. I mean, this is a major savings to seniors out of pocket once this program goes into effect.

By way of background, again, some of my Democratic colleagues have stressed that we hear constantly from the other side of the aisle this idea that the Republicans are going to refuse to raise the debt ceiling unless they can cut Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid and other vital programs. They seem so determined to cut Americans' healthcare that they are willing to recklessly risk defaulting on the national debt and wreaking havoc on the economy.

Again, it is the same thing here. What we are saying is if you cut off this public health emergency earlier than what the President is suggesting, under this bill, you end a lot of programs that are very important: continuous eligibility for Medicaid, a 20 percent cut in hospital payments, free testing, free vaccines.

I mean, all this ends, and it makes no sense, in my opinion. We should be trying to do what we can to help American families and make the right decisions based on the science.

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

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

I think I did use the word ''cut,'' and I think I corrected myself. We are spending less money in Medicare, so you are taking money out of Medicare under the Inflation Reduction Act, but that money wasn't really put back in to shore up Medicare. It was spent in other programs, so there is $288 billion less being spent in Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. As we stated today in our organizational session, she is the first chairwoman in the history of the oldest committee in Congress.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on the Subcommittee on Health, as well as bringing forward this legislation today. I think it is very important legislation, H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act.

Just to recap, 3 years ago today, Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar declared a public health emergency for the emerging threat that was the novel coronavirus. The U.S. had just identified its first official case over a week prior.

Within 1 year of the anniversary of the public health emergency, thanks to the early leadership of President Trump and Operation Warp Speed, an authorized vaccine helped prevent thousands of hospitalizations and deaths.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years later, it is estimated that 95 percent of those over 16 have been vaccinated or have had COVID–19.

Earlier in January, President Biden extended the public health emergency for the twelfth time, continuing to use the pandemic and the national and public health emergency authorities to achieve progressive policy goals. This includes pushing for an indefinite extension on the moratorium on evictions, the suspension of student loan interest payments, and attempts to require masking in public transit.

Last week, House Republicans announced that we would bring this bill, along with Representative PAUL GOSAR's bill, to end the COVID–19 national emergency to the floor today. Just yesterday, the Biden administration decided to announce their plans to end the public health emergency on May 11, 2023, which CNN has reported only came after the House Democrats were worried about voting against this bill without the White House having a plan in place.

Whatever the reason or the rationale for their announcement, I am pleased that the administration is following the House Republicans and finally abiding by President Biden's own acknowledgment 4 months ago that the pandemic is over, but it shouldn't take another 3 months to unwind this authoritarian control.

It is long past time for the Biden administration to stop relying on an emergency that no longer exists so that they can make unilateral decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Democratic colleagues to join the Democratic administration and House Republicans in voting ''yes'' on H.R. 382. Declare the COVID–19 pandemic over. Give Americans their lives back. Work to develop policies so that we are better prepared moving forward.

The Senate voted in a bipartisan way to end the national emergency, and I hope that this bill also will gain bipartisan support.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this in closing. We do have one more speaker, though.

I think that this legislation that is before us today is totally unnecessary and creates all kinds of problems. In other words, the President has indicated his plan is to end the emergency on, I believe he said, May 12. We estimated it would probably end sometime in April of this year when we were working on the omnibus at the end of last year. We put in the omnibus a lot of protections and guardrails for when the public health emergency would end, but there is still more that needs to be done.

My concern is that the way this bill is written, it basically eliminates a lot of those guardrails, a lot of those protections, like the continuous eligibility for Medicaid.

At the same time, it doesn't allow, because it says immediately upon enactment, us to wind this down in an effective way so that we don't have problems like the 20 percent cut for hospitals, eliminating continuous eligibility, free testing, free vaccines.

There are so many things here that the public relies on—I didn't even mention the veterans, the nursing homes, the SNAP program—that, to me, it is reckless to say we are just going to end it immediately.

Let's shelve this legislation. I suggest a ''no'' vote. Let the President and this administration wind this process down in an effective way to protect Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding time.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 382, the Pandemic is Over Act. This is an effort by our Republican colleagues to hastily terminate a public health emergency designation that will have damaging effects on our Nation's veterans and those who care for them.

Currently, this emergency designation grants our government a number of critical flexibilities that not only allow it to work more efficiently and effectively but that are essential to support America's veteran population.

When we passed the CARES Act in 2020, we did so carefully and thoughtfully to ensure that veterans would be able to safely and quickly access the care they needed throughout the COVID–19 pandemic. We also ensured the Department of Veterans Affairs and its employees had the tools and flexibilities they needed to meet their mission.

I am especially concerned by the risk that would be caused by hastily terminating healthcare providers' ability to prescribe controlled substances via telehealth. This will severely impact millions of patients' access to medications they need to manage chronic pain, complex mental health conditions, and substance abuse disorders.

Veterans who experience these conditions at greater rates than their nonveteran counterparts are among those who would be severely affected.

VA estimates at least 47,000 veterans have active controlled substance prescriptions from prescribers they have never seen in person. A sudden termination of the public health emergency would mean all of them would need immediate in-person visits with their prescribers in order to continue their treatments.

□ 1500

An additional 247,000 veterans have active controlled substances prescriptions through virtual care at VA, and many of these veterans' continued access to medications could also be at risk.

During the public health emergency, we also specifically addressed the unique health and safety needs facing homeless veterans. Those actions included ensuring that veterans experiencing homelessness had access to basic needs, like shelter, food, clothing, and transportation, while also ensuring service providers had the funding they needed to maintain social distancing and distribute those in need across multiple facilities to reduce the spread of COVID–19.

What we learned from the pandemic is that providing these foundational basic needs to homeless veterans and service providers works in promoting housing security.

Last week, VA announced it housed over 40,000 veterans experiencing homelessness in 2022, surpassing its goal of housing 38,000 veterans. That tremendous accomplishment can be directly attributed to the authorities Congress put in place during the pandemic.

Rolling back those flexibilities now would mean more veterans would go without the resources they need to survive.

If my Republican colleagues are so insistent on ending the public health emergency prematurely, I hope they are equally insistent on ensuring that we quickly make permanent those pandemic authorities that veterans need.

I am proud to support Congresswoman NIKEMA WILLIAMS' bill, H.R. 491, the Return Home to Housing Act, and cosponsor Congresswoman CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK's bill, the Healthy Foundations for Homeless Veterans Act.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. These bills will ensure that there is no lapse in the care and resources homeless veterans need when the public health emergency designation ends, and I hope my Republican colleagues will support them.

The Biden administration announced last night it intends to extend the COVID–19 emergency declarations to end on May 11. Unlike my colleagues on the other side who want to irresponsibly put an end to the national emergency today, the additional time gives the agencies and Congress time to ensure there is no disruption in care and services for veterans.

My Republican colleagues have a choice to make. They can continue to insist on pushing an agenda that politicizes the pandemic, terminate the public health emergency designation prematurely, and wholly disregard the disastrous impact such an action would have on veterans, or they can put aside this shortsighted approach and use their newfound control of Congress to actually do the job they were sent to Washington to do: pass legislation that helps our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 382.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill. As Mr. TAKANO said, so many things will immediately end needlessly from this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the points that my friend from California just brought up—we have this 3-year running telehealth that is moving forward. We all know that we can't put the genie back in the bottle. We have to work on telehealth, but we know for a fact there have been diversions of controlled substances through telehealth. We know that. So why don't we take back our authority? Let's negotiate moving forward.

Let's think about where this has gone. Three years ago today, Secretary Azar—two administrations—declares a public health emergency. It started doing a lot of things. One is that it allowed emergency use authorization, so we had therapeutics and had all these things come forward.

Also the status—not necessarily every statute under Health and Human Services, but because you have the status of a public health emergency, you can invoke other statutes: the Defense Production Act by President Trump to get respirators and moving a ship outside of New York so the people in New York and New Jersey could have an extra hospital, a mobile hospital.

I mean, all of those things happened. When we delegate our authority, those are the things that we move forward.

On January 20, 2021, almost a million people were being vaccinated. President Biden came in to continue the vaccination process. Then, a year into his administration, we, on our side of the aisle, sent a letter to the Health and Human Services Secretary saying that this needs to end. We can't continue to operate under emergency authority. Let's have a plan.

Everything that they have talked about today, every speaker they have

had: Let's have a plan to end this emergency, and let's do it in a way that we can address the issues that need to be addressed.

We have learned a lot during the pandemic about things that worked. Let's do things that work. Let's fix things that don't work, like the telehealth diversion of controlled substances.

Some of those are the things—we have been a year in, since February 1 tomorrow, almost a year since then, and we haven't seen a plan. We haven't seen anything.

There was some stuff done, I know, in the omnibus with telehealth. That is what we are saying. We don't need to continue to operate the country in an emergency status. We need to end it.

So why bring the bill up? They say this is irresponsible, the bill moving forward. The bill was in Rules last night. We have had no word from anybody in the executive branch that they are going to deal with this.

While the bill was being considered in Rules, they come out that it is going to end on May 11?

So this bill is needed. It is needed because it is moving us forward.

What we can do now, as the bill makes its way to the Senate—I don't know if the Senate is going to take it up or not, but what I will pledge to my friend from New Jersey and my friend from California, who is the ranking Democrat on the Health Subcommittee, is that we will work to make sure we find the areas that we need to continue the lessons that we learned, that we need to put into place, into statute, and to take care of things that need to be taken care of.

What we don't need to do is allow the carte blanche, 3-year open emergency pandemic that we know has had issues, as well. I mean, we always talk about the things we want to keep. We can talk about those and work on them.

The things that we need to address, using telehealth to divert controlled substances, we know that that has taken place. There are examples of that. We absolutely need to address that.

I will pledge that we will work, on our side of the aisle, with our friends on the other side of the aisle to find things to make sure that we continue to address the fact that we still have COVID–19.

One thing to note is we are still going to have COVID–19, and we don't need it coming across our borders. Because we are doing this, we also still need to keep title 42 in place.

I look forward to working together. This is necessary. It has moved this administration, hopefully, forward. We can say that, May 11, we move forward on this. I am proud to be the sponsor of it, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 75, 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

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. 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:

Mr. Moskowitz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 382 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Moskowitz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 382 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall not take effect until the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification that such provisions will not result in any negative impact to any individual entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FREEDOM FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS ACT

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs, 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 75, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 497

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 ''Freedom for Health Care Workers Act''.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATING THE COVID–19 VACCINE MANDATE ON HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS FURNISHING ITEMS AND SERVICES UNDER CERTAIN FEDERAL HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Omnibus COVID–19 Health Care Staff Vaccination'' published by the Department of Health and Human Services on November 5, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 61555) and may not promulgate any substantially similar rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 497.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, introduced by my Energy and Commerce Committee colleague Representative DUNCAN.

I want to start by making one thing clear: I believe in the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. I am a physician. I am pro-vaccine. At the same time, I am conservative, and I believe in individual choice. It is my firm conviction that, whenever possible, the Federal Government should leave decision-making to State or local authorities.

Additionally, my background in medicine has informed my belief that medical decisions are extremely personal and should be made by individuals in consultation with their doctors.

So, at the end of 2021, when the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services announced a decision to mandate that healthcare workers receive a COVID–19 vaccine to remain employed, I opposed the decision. I believed this move by the Biden administration to be unnecessary, inappropriate, and a net harm to our healthcare system as a whole.

That is why my colleague VERN BUCHANAN and I led a letter with 113 other Members outlining our opposition to the mandate and our concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD that letter in opposition to the mandate.

CONGRES OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2021.

Hon. CHIQUITA BROOKS-LASURE,
Administrator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Baltimore, MD.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR BROOKS-LASURE: The COVID–19 pandemic has taken a significant toll on the American public both physically and emotionally for almost two years. In that time, though, multiple vaccines have become widely available for those wishing to

be vaccinated. According to the Mayo Clinic, nearly 60 percent of the United States population over the age of 12 is fully vaccinated, including over 83 percent of the Medicare-aged population.

Thankfully, the United States has seen an overall decrease in new COVID–19 infections, hospitalizations and deaths since vaccines became readily available, and while we are not yet out of the woods, many are saying the end of the pandemic is in sight. Former Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Scott Gottlieb, M.D. recently stated the pandemic ''may well be over'' by January 4, which is the deadline the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) set for complying with either its vaccination mandate or enforcing the continued use of masks and weekly testing.

At a time when we are facing a growing health care workforce shortage—including a projected physician shortage of more than 100,000 by 2034—implementing a federal vaccine mandate will only serve to exacerbate the problem. By your own admission, ''[t]hese requirements will apply to approximately 76,000 providers and cover over 17 million health care workers across the country.'' It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the rationale for implementing a mandate like this at the tail end of the pandemic while we, as a nation, are struggling to staff hospitals, physician offices and other ancillary providers.

We fully support your agency's goal of ''[e]nsuring patient safety and protection,'' but if seniors are unable to access care because their provider no longer participates in the Medicare program, this rule will undermine its stated goal. By subjecting providers to egregious federal overreach, our nation's most vulnerable populations will be at risk and America's seniors will bear the brunt of any provider loss due to non-compliance with this heavy-handed and constitutionally dubious vaccine mandate. Americans are quitting their jobs at a record pace, and this new federal mandate will only make matters worse and keep more Americans out of the workforce.

There are over 54 million Medicare-aged Americans, and it is our duty as Members of Congress representing those seniors to ensure they maintain access to their preferred health care provider. This is especially true when that means opposing an administrative agency's actions that will lead to fewer options for our constituents; longer wait times; and the inevitability of adverse health outcomes due to fewer available providers.

We strongly urge you to abandon implementing this onerous new rule and instead heed current statistics that show seniors are vaccinated at a higher rate than the rest of the population of vaccinated Americans while also uniquely vulnerable to disruptions in the health care system and consider the potentially negative consequences this mandate will have on the size and strength of our health care workforce. To truly ensure patient safety and protection, we must preserve Americans' access to their preferred providers rather than impose a new one-size-fits-all federal mandate on our nation's health care providers at a time when they can least afford it.

Sincerely,

Vern Buchanan, Elise Stefanik, Jeff Duncan, Jodey V. Arrington, Mike Kelly, Larry Bucshon, M.D., Jim Banks, Brett Guthrie, Jackie Walorski, David B. McKinley, P.E., Gus M. Bilirakis, Bill Johnson, Debbie Lesko, Dan Crenshaw, Bill Posey, Bob Gibbs, Ralph Norman, John Joyce, M.D., Markwayne Mullin, Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter, Michael Waltz, Doug Lamborn, Randy Feenstra, Neal P. Dunn, M.D., Brian Mast, Robert E. Latta.

Guy Reschenthaler, Kelly Armstrong, William Timmons, Gregory F. Murphy, M.D., Mike Johnson, Beth Van Duyne, Darin LaHood, Warren Davidson, Brian Babin, D.D.S., Brad R. Wenstrup, D.P.M., Glen Grothman, John H. Rutherford, Adrian Smith, Fred Keller, Jack Bergman, Michelle Steel, Kevin Hern, Dan Newhouse, Michael Cloud, Troy Balderson, A. Drew Ferguson, IV, D.M.D., John Moolenaar, Tim Burchett, C. Scott Franklin, Barry Moore, Tom McClintock, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ronny L. Jackson, M.D., Jody Hice, Diana Harshbarger, Parm.D., Jason Smith, Tom Rice.

Tom Reed, Carlos Gimenez, Pete Sessions, Greg Pence, Ben Cline, Glenn ''GT'' Thompson, Mariannette J. Miller-Meeks, M.D., Claudia Tenney, Mike Rogers, Ron Estes, Ted Budd, Andy Harris, M.D., David Kustoff, Steve Chabot, Michael Guest, W. Gregory Steube, Randy K. Weber, Majorie Taylor Green, Lance Gooden, Pat Fallon, Michael C. Burgess, M.D., Kat Cammack, Andy Biggs, Carol D. Miller, Andrew S. Clyde, Devin Nunes, Stephanie Bice, Tracey Mann, Daniel Webster, Mary Miller, Darrell Issa, Rodney Davis.

Lisa McClain, Richard Hudson, Ann Wagner, Mario Diaz-Balart, Lloyd Smucker, Jeff Fortenberry, Dan Bishop, Jim Baird, John Rose, Louie Gohmert, David Schweikert, Rick W. Allen, Bill Huizenga, Bryon Donalds, Bruce Westerman, Andrew R. Garbarino, Nancy Mace, Vicky Hartzler, Steven M. Palazzo, Jake LaTurner, Chuck Fleischmann, Tom Emmer, Austin Scott, Trey Hollingsworth, Mike Bost.

Mr. BUCSHON. The move was unprecedented. CMS does not impose such a mandate for any other vaccine. Furthermore, the vaccine, while effective at preventing severe disease and death, is not shown to totally prevent transmission of the virus.

It was difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the rationale for implementing a mandate like this at the tail end of the pandemic while we as a Nation are struggling to staff hospitals, physician offices, and other ancillary providers.

Our Nation's healthcare system was already facing a growing healthcare workforce shortage, including a projected physician shortage of more than 100,000 by 2034. I was worried—and, indeed, we saw it play out—that implementing a Federal vaccine mandate would only serve to exacerbate the problem.

For example, in my home State, Indiana University lost 125 employees as a direct result of the vaccine requirement, and that is just one small example. Thousands of individuals across the country either resigned or were let go due to this mandate.

Now, over a year later, despite several lawsuits rising through the courts questioning the validity of this exact rule, the Biden administration continues to enforce this mandate.

Today's bill does what the Biden administration will not. It ends the onerous mandate imposed by a Federal Government agency on the American people. It provides important autonomy to healthcare workers and critical relief to hospitals and other facilities that continue to face staff shortages.

My Democratic colleagues will say that this mandate was worth it, that repealing it will hurt healthcare workers or patients they serve. I haven't seen any data to suggest that.

What we do know is that 95 percent of Americans have either been vaccinated or had COVID–19. We know the vaccine no longer totally prevents transmission of COVID–19.

CMS' vaccine mandate won't end with the public health emergency on May 11 or sooner if the previous bill that we just debated goes into law. It will go on indefinitely unless the administration rescinds it or Congress takes action.

Given that the administration threatened to veto this legislation, it doesn't seem like they plan to reverse course, so Congress must step in.

We are not taking away anyone's ability to get vaccinated. Healthcare workers can and should protect themselves, including getting vaccinated if they choose. Nor are we taking away the ability of individual health systems to make decisions about what vaccinations they may require.

□ 1515

For instance, many healthcare systems have required employees to get a flu shot for many years. The Federal Government simply shouldn't demand they do so.

Federal bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., do not know the needs of Hoosiers in my district or many Americans across the country and must not be allowed to make medical decisions on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 497 here today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 497, a bill I consider reckless that endangers the health and well-being of Americans. With this legislation, House Republicans are putting politics over science. The legislation would eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine requirement for healthcare workers. It ignores the fact that vaccination of healthcare workers saves lives and protects the most vulnerable.

The bill has had no hearings, no markups, no opportunity to examine its impact on our healthcare system. It is what we call regular order. But I am not saying that it should have had hearings or markups in committee just for regular order. I believe that if Republicans had taken the time to solicit input on this bill, they would have heard from healthcare leaders that H.R. 497 will jeopardize the health and safety of providers, patients, and their families. That is why we have committee hearings. That is why we have committee markups, to hear and get input from our constituents.

COVID–19 vaccines are safe and effective, and they have been essential to saving lives, rebuilding our economy, and protecting the health of our communities. More than 668 million

COVID–19 vaccine doses have been administered here in the United States, which has resulted in 120 million fewer COVID–19 infections, 18.5 million fewer hospitalizations, and 3.2 million lives saved.

These vaccines are especially vital to protecting the most vulnerable in our community, including seniors, people with disabilities, and people living in nursing homes. The public health data clearly shows that increased vaccination in nursing homes has prevented additional hospitalizations and saved lives. New deaths among nursing home residents decreased by 83 percent once vaccination efforts began.

We also know that vaccination of healthcare providers has protected our healthcare workforce and saved lives by ensuring that patients can receive safe, essential, and timely care. Prior to the availability of COVID–19 vaccines, healthcare providers were at higher risk of becoming infected with COVID–19, endangering themselves and their families while leaving patients without access to care when they needed it most. That is why more than 50 healthcare organizations representing doctors, nurses, and hospitals, agree that requiring COVID–19 vaccination of healthcare workers saves lives and improves health outcomes.

My colleague from Indiana mentioned the U.S. Supreme Court. They actually upheld the vaccine mandate for healthcare workers.

Mr. Speaker, vaccines mandates are also not new. Healthcare workers are often required to receive vaccinations for a variety of infectious diseases. Many States have requirements that healthcare workers be vaccinated against communicable diseases like hepatitis, flu, and measles, mumps, or rubella.

Why wouldn't we want the same requirements to prevent the continued spread of COVID–19, especially amongst our most vulnerable?

Again, in response to my colleague from Indiana, the healthcare workforce has grown since the vaccine requirement, with more healthcare providers and staff employed, for example, on December 10, 2022, than prior to when the COVID–19 vaccine requirement went into effect. As of December 2022, employment in the healthcare sector was 1.2 percent higher than the previous peak of February 2020.

Data shows requiring COVID–19 vaccination of healthcare workers did not contribute to worsening of staffing shortages in nursing homes. Nursing homes who were experiencing staffing shortages prior to COVID–19 had staffing levels remain stable after the COVID–19 vaccine requirement went into effect.

But I have to say, I was most disappointed yesterday. Yesterday, I was at the Rules Committee, last evening, where some of my Republican colleagues chose to ignore the broad-based scientific and medical consensus that the COVID–19 vaccine is safe and effective at reducing deaths and hospitalizations. Instead, some of my Republican colleagues chose to spend their time entertaining fringe theories about vaccine side effects and propagating vaccine myths, despite the fact that millions of Americans have received the COVID–19 vaccine safely and with no effect on their health.

It is just truly disappointing to me that this is what we have come to in the United States Congress. The last thing that I want on either side of this aisle is for any of us to make statements on this floor—and I know you are not saying that, my colleague from Indiana—but I am just so afraid that so much of this rhetoric, particularly last night in the Rules Committee, is giving the impression to the public that they shouldn't take the vaccine. If you listened to the Rules Committee last night and the Republican comments, you would have assumed that; you would suggest that. I think it is very dangerous. People should be taking the vaccine.

Finally, this legislation, I want to say, is also a distraction from Republicans' true agenda on healthcare, which they are continuing to work on behind closed doors, and that is to cut healthcare and retirement for millions of Americans. Republicans have repeatedly pledged that they will refuse to raise the debt limit unless they can cut Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other vital programs. They are so determined to cut Americans' healthcare that they are willing to recklessly risk defaulting on the national debt and wreaking havoc on the economy in order to do so.

If successful, their actions will result in millions of Americans losing benefits and lifesaving protections, including seniors, children with complex medical needs, people with disabilities, and pregnant and postpartum women. This is unconscionable.

I want to underscore that Democrats will not fall for this manufactured crisis, and we will not, under any circumstances, agree to cut these vital programs.

I hope I am wrong. I hope I won't see the other side moving toward these types of cuts. They are unacceptable to us.

I would just say, Democrats are committed to putting families first. We will continue to follow the science to fight COVID–19. We will build on the success of the most productive Democratic Congress in modern history and fight to ensure that Americans have access to affordable and quality healthcare, further lower healthcare, and prescription drug costs, and support our healthcare workforce.

This legislation is dangerous, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everyone that I am a physician, and I support vaccination. I just don't support the Federal Government mandating it. If local facilities want to mandate vaccination, that is up to them. I just don't believe the Federal Government at CMS should do it. Also, in recent history, the only ones who have cut Medicare are the administration and the Democrats, not Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the primary sponsor of the bill.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my legislation to end Joe Biden's COVID–19 vaccine mandate for our Nation's healthcare workers.

We have had a lot of debate and conversation, and we have learned a lot about COVID since 2020. I am proud to continue our work from last Congress to end this mandate, and I will not stop leading the charge until this requirement is lifted.

No American should be forced to choose between receiving a COVID shot or losing their livelihood. But CMS uses the purse strings of forced policies on healthcare systems. I have serious concerns regarding the practicality, efficacy, and morality of a vaccine mandate for healthcare providers.

The CMS mandate is one of the strictest mandates the Biden administration has implemented. With few permissible exceptions for healthcare workers, this mandate has only created resentment and distrust toward the government and loss of jobs, nursing jobs, CNA jobs, often replaced with traveling nurses being paid a higher rate, a higher cost for the taxpayers and the hospitals.

Joe Biden's draconian vaccine mandate is unscientific, un-American, and is deeply damaging to healthcare workers as we already face a nationwide shortage.

CMS's one-size-fits-all vaccine mandate exacerbates the ongoing staffing shortage by limiting the ability of healthcare providers to make important accommodations and set standards for their employees based on their staffing needs.

No American should stand for this type of authoritarianism that is a detriment to our healthcare system.

Last night, the Biden administration threatened to veto this legislation. The administration went on and on about protecting individuals from COVID–19, but there was no mention that the COVID–19 vaccine prevents transmission. That is because the CDC has confirmed that the shot does not prevent transmission.

Let's follow the science here and allow individuals to make choices for themselves.

I encourage my colleagues to support my legislation, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, and give medical freedom back to our Nation's healthcare workers and let them get back to work.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who is the

Ranking Member of our Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. Really? Freedom? Freedom from what?

We know that vaccine mandates are absolutely not new, and healthcare workers are often required to get vaccinated against infectious diseases, for various diseases. During the pandemic, the COVID–19 vaccine allowed our heroic nurses and healthcare workers to save lives and protect the most vulnerable, including senior citizens.

But, you know, we are not done with it yet. People are still getting sick and dying. If you have a loved one in a nursing home, if you know people, people you care about, that are immunocompromised, if you have a child who is in fragile health, don't you want to make sure that when you seek care, that the nurse that is going to be serving them, that the healthcare provider, is going to be safe and not bring that disease, not bring COVID to them?

I think this is really a serious mistake that we are making. This is not about freedom. This is about healthcare. Doctors, nurses, hospitals, and the American Medical Society believe that requiring COVID–19 vaccines for healthcare workers saves lives.

Let's do that. Let's save lives. Vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everyone that CMS doesn't mandate any other vaccine, and this also doesn't preclude local hospital systems, local governments, or State governments from mandating a vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 497, introduced by my good friend from South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN.

I strongly support this legislation, which would immediately repeal the Biden administration's vaccine mandates for all healthcare workers working in Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services-regulated facilities.

CMS officials decided in November of 2021 to tell doctors, nurses, chefs, physical therapists, and anyone else working in the facility that sees Medicare and Medicaid patients that they needed to be vaccinated against COVID–19 or lose their job.

This unprecedented, one-size-fits-all mandate came at a time in which healthcare workforce shortages are still challenging healthcare providers all over. This is the only such vaccine mandate in effect by CMS.

This overreaching decision requires affected facilities to be 100 percent compliant or risk significant civil monetary penalties, losing payment on new patients, or even the ability to bill Medicare or Medicaid at all. More consequentially, this misguided policy was issued at a time in which the United States is facing perhaps the worst healthcare workforce shortages in history. In the long-term care industry alone, there are 210,000 fewer jobs now than at the beginning of the pandemic in March of 2020.

We have all read about and heard directly from constituents about the impact this policy had in someone's employment status. The forced choice between getting the jab or losing your job has undoubtedly contributed to an already depleted healthcare workforce nationally and will continue to threaten patient access to high-quality care.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this mandate, and I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 497, which would actually endanger the lives of frontline healthcare workers, patients, and their families.

We have been fighting the COVID–19 pandemic now for nearly 3 years. Sadly, we have lost over 1 million Americans to this horrendous coronavirus.

Thankfully, we have turned the corner, in large part by making safe, effective, and rigorously tested vaccinations available to all Americans. These lifesaving vaccines help save lives. They help prevent unnecessary hospitalizations and severe illness, as well.

Perhaps nowhere is vaccination more important than for our healthcare heroes who care for our neighbors every day. Vaccination is a vital tool to protect them and to help end the pandemic.

□ 1530

Don't take it from me. Listen to the American Medical Association and the American Academy of Family Physicians who support the vaccination for healthcare workers.

They say that halting vaccination for healthcare professionals would severely and irreparably harm patients and undermine the patient-public interest.

They say the science is clear: No arguments against the need for vaccination are medically valid. Vaccines are our way out of the pandemic. No other measure has been shown to reduce hospitalizations, severe disease, and death to the degree that vaccination does. We must continue to let science lead the way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues not to confuse Americans, or worse, endanger their lives. Vote ''no'' on this reckless bill.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I support vaccination of healthcare workers. I just don't think that CMS should be mandating it nationally.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a pharmacist.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. When President Biden, Mr. Speaker, admitted that there is no Federal solution to COVID–19, he admitted that these vaccine mandates are not about public health. They are about control.

Nowhere in America, especially in Georgia's First Congressional District, should workers have to choose between a vaccine and their job.

As a pharmacist, I trust patients to work with medical professionals and their families to make the vaccine decision that works best for them and their health.

Listen, Mr. Speaker, I chose to participate in the trials, in the vaccine trials. I volunteered to do that because I trust the process. But that was my decision, and no one else's, as it should be.

A decision to receive a vaccine is a personal one and should only be done in consultation with a trusted healthcare professional. This mandate has also exacerbated our healthcare worker shortages and could cost patients' lives instead of saving them.

We need policies that empower workers to work, businessowners to innovate, and patients to foster relationships with their healthcare professionals, not one-size-fits-all mandates that are nothing short of government overreach in its most tyrannical form.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DUNCAN and Chairman RODGERS for working together on this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROBERT GARCIA).

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding his time and for his leadership in this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the so-called Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. This legislation is an attack on public health and will endanger the lives of medical personnel and patients. Why should we remove vaccine protections for nurses and medical workers in our hospital and clinical settings?

This bill is not supported by our public health officials and certainly not supported by our nurses on the ground. Why would we endanger vulnerable populations? This is cruel and irrational.

Over 1 million people have died in this country due to the pandemic, many of them nurses and healthcare workers. One of them was my mother, Gaby Elena O'Donnell.

My mom was my rock. She was a kind, loving, and strong immigrant woman who dedicated her life to serving her country and community. She served our country as a frontline healthcare worker. My mom also

taught me what real patriotism is, it is serving your neighbors through service and giving back to your country.

She was on the front lines of this pandemic helping as many people as possible. In the summer of 2020, my mom lost her life to COVID–19.

This vaccine could have saved my mom's life, but it was not yet available. I made a promise to my mom and to my community to fight for legislation that would protect them and keep them from the pandemic and keep them healthy.

No other family should have to go through what mine did and millions of others had to go through in this country. We know, due to science, that the vaccine saves lives, and our medical workers should be able to go to work knowing that their lives won't be endangered due to the service they are giving to our country. Vaccinating hospital and healthcare workers is a basic form of protection that they all deserve.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, no one is endangered by this legislation. As I have said before, it doesn't prevent healthcare facilities from requiring a COVID vaccine for their employees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 497, Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. I would also like to offer my condolences to my colleague on the other side of the aisle for the loss of his mother. I think that, you know, in a stark contrast of what CMS is doing to mandate this, which is the only vaccine that is mandated, what we should be doing is investigating the origins of COVID, the billions of dollars that have been spent, the countless lives that have been lost.

I am proud to serve on Energy and Commerce, to be the only rural Texan serving on that committee. Growing up in rural Texas, it gave me a strong appreciation for healthcare, for workers just like my colleague's mother, the heroes that were on the front line during the pandemic and those that have served as doctors and nurses in Texas, quite literally, saving lives every single day.

We are facing a massive shortage of healthcare workers throughout our Nation, and, unfortunately, this crisis is amplified in rural America.

Rural healthcare workers and providers are among the most negatively impacted by the President's tyrannical COVID vaccine mandate, which remains in effect for Medicare and Medicaid-certified providers.

The Biden administration should not be forcing American workers to take the vaccine or face the possibility of losing their job. Instead, they should be listening to the reasons that so many people in my district, throughout the State of Texas, and throughout the country, quite frankly, may not want to take it. That choice should not have to be made. Unfortunately, the overreach never ends.

Republicans are standing up today to free our healthcare heroes from this unconstitutional mandate. I am proud to join Representative JEFF DUNCAN on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is another moment that I am on the floor of the House, and I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce who has been so dutiful throughout the years that we suffered, somewhat lonely and somewhat confused, about COVID–19.

We never experienced this trauma. It certainly brings me to a deep sense of loss to hear a Member speak about the loss of his mother. These are personal matters for many of us, some having lost dear friends, but nothing can equate to losing a beloved loved one.

So when we stand on the floor, we speak with a sense of compassion and concern. I think it is certainly fine for there to be individual—I turn the card. I flip the coin—individual examples of individuals seeking not to be vaccinated. They can find medical facilities that would allow them to work there.

It is no doubt that the actions of the Biden administration saved lives. There is no doubt that, on our side of this issue, 50 healthcare organizations, professional societies, and others, believe that vaccinations helped healthcare workers save their own lives and save the lives of others.

It is well-known that prior to the widespread availability of the COVID–19 vaccine, healthcare workers in the United States were more than three times more likely to die. I have seen it myself. In my community, the Texas Medical Center, all of the beds in every medical facility within the reach of my district and others had people in hallways, in emergency rooms, individuals who couldn't see their loved ones take their last breaths; individuals who flew in from other jurisdictions, other States, desperate to get the care they thought was here in Houston, Texas because, yes, we did have the ability to save lives with the medical technology that we were using.

Many States have requirements that healthcare workers be vaccinated against many things: hepatitis, flu, measles, mumps, or rubella. Why are we trying to stand against COVID–19 in this long litany of infectious diseases? COVID–19 vaccines have resulted in 120 million fewer cases and 18.5 million less hospitalizations and saved $1.15 trillion.

So if we just talked about the numbers, that in and of itself would say that this legislation is wrongheaded, but it is also important to recognize that the Mental Health America, 76 percent of the respondents were worried about bringing COVID home to their children.

These are healthcare professionals. We know of some of them who died, unfortunately, because they got COVID, and they didn't even see their families because of this whole issue of separating people who had COVID. Half of the respondents worried about bringing COVID to their partners or an older family member.

Many U.S. physicians found that the portion of the day spent treating COVID–19 patients was associated with higher PTSD scores, depression, and anxiety. This was not a fun time, but it was the commitment of medical professionals and those who wanted to be saved to use the vaccines and use all precautions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, these medical professionals in the early stages were suffering from higher PTSD scores, depression, and anxiety. Many healthcare workers at the beginning of the pandemic saw workers get sick and die from COVID almost right in front of them, and this contributed to their increased stress and anxiety.

We did push them to the limit when we didn't have massive testing or massive vaccines, I hate to say it, in the past administration. According to the University of Chicago, it was found that an increase in staff vaccination rates resulted in fewer COVID cases among staff and patients.

My final words, Mr. Speaker, is, yeah, this is a free country. Laissez-faire, do as you will, but this mandate for medical workers saved their lives, saved patients' lives, and saved families' lives. I don't understand why we are going down this route where soon it will happen in good time, but since I remember 6 million dead around the world as the number that is gleaming and 1.11 million in the United States, this legislation is not going in the right direction. I ask for opposition to the underlying legislation.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, CMS mandates one vaccine, COVID–19. They don't mandate any other vaccines. That doesn't mean healthcare workers don't get the COVID–19 vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Dr. BUCSHON and thank him for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. Representative DUNCAN's bill, H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, and I join in offering my heartfelt condolences to the gentleman from California, Representative GARCIA, who lost his mom

early on in this pandemic, early on in 2020.

I also want to note that in November of 2021, long after the date it became available, the vaccines did not prevent the transmission of COVID–19.

□ 1545

We have known since November 2021 that the vaccines do not prevent transmission of COVID–19, yet the Biden administration released their interim final regulation requiring this vaccination for all Medicare and Medicaid providers.

This bill is long overdue to repeal what is an egregious mandate and to return the decisionmaking to our healthcare workers, as well as providing relief to our healthcare facilities that are struggling to hire frontline healthcare workers today.

Because of this mandate, facilities all across this country are being forced to require all of their employees, including support staff such as cooks and cleaners, to get the COVID–19 vaccination regardless of whether they even had the infection prior, or they face civil monetary penalties, a denial of payment for new patients, or termination of their entire Medicare or Medicaid provider agreement.

Healthcare workers have been forced to choose between violating their own personally held beliefs and their healthcare decisions informed by their doctors' medical advice or potentially lose their job and livelihood, be forced to move from their communities, and struggle to pay their bills during record-high inflation.

This mandate did not build trust in the vaccine. It has only further eroded Americans' trust in our public health officials and institutions. The CDC and other institutions have acknowledged that the vaccines do not prevent transmission of the COVID–19 virus, which reinforces that this is just an authoritarian mandate and that it does not protect vulnerable patients.

This is not about science. In Washington State, the Washington State Hospital Association estimates that 2 percent of the workforce has been lost because of this healthcare vaccine mandate. That may not sound like a lot, but at a time when we have unprecedented shortages, we need every nurse and every doctor available to be able to be hired and help meet the needs of patients. This is a burden on an already struggling system.

There is no reason that this administration should continue this policy, but since they haven't taken action, Congress must step in again as we did when we removed the mandate for our troops last year.

I am hopeful that some of our Democrat colleagues will recognize the toll of this mandate on this already stressed workforce and join us in supporting this legislation. Let's return critical healthcare decisions to doctors and their patients. It is time to close this chapter on the pandemic and the mandates and start looking ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct certain things that are being said on the other side of the aisle.

First of all, the fact of the matter is that the healthcare workforce has grown since the vaccine requirement. There are more healthcare workers now than there were before.

The other thing I keep hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that the COVID–19 vaccines do not help prevent infection from the disease. That is factually incorrect. Although breakthrough infections do occur, especially with more transmissible variants of the disease, COVID–19 vaccines still help in preventing infection and reduce transmission.

In fact, according to a study released just this month, it is confirmed that vaccinated individuals were likely to be less infectious than unvaccinated individuals, and the likelihood of transmission fell by 11 percent for each dose of the vaccine.

Moreover, we know that vaccination and continued upkeep with boosters continues to protect the public from infection. According to CDC, the most recent COVID–19 boosters cut the likelihood of infection by more than one-half in those who have gotten them.

As I hope none of us will dispute, even when there is breakthrough infection, vaccines are safe, effective, and dramatically reduce the length of illness. That matters for healthcare workers because we still have thousands of people hospitalized every day with COVID–19, cancer, and other grave illnesses, and without COVID–19 vaccines, we would have fewer people there to take care of them.

COVID–19 vaccines reduce infections, and they save lives. We can't let disinformation dictate our policy choices in this debate. We have to refer to the science.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, viral diseases like measles have been around for centuries. COVID–19 likely will also be persistent.

So, when do my Democratic colleagues propose that this Federal mandate end? I propose that we pass this legislation and end it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. This bill would repeal the Federal CMS mandate imposed on healthcare workers nationwide.

On December 4, 2020, then-President-elect Joe Biden was asked pointblank if he would mandate COVID–19 vaccines for Americans. His answer? ''No, I don't think it should be mandatory. I wouldn't demand it be mandatory.''

Well, as we came to find out and have since learned, you can't take him at his word. By September 2021, the President's tone and position on vaccine mandates did a complete 180. He said that he was getting impatient and ''frustrated'' with unvaccinated Americans. He went so far as to call it ''a pandemic of the unvaccinated.''

Mr. President, I hate to break it to you, but the American people do not exist to please you or any President for that matter. We don't simply comply because you are ''frustrated.'' Yet, it was his impatience that led to this vaccine mandate.

I don't know about you, but I am not sure where in the Constitution the government's powers over one's personal health decisions can be found, but apparently, those signs that we see so often, particularly outside the Supreme Court Chamber in bold letters screaming, ''My Body, My Choice,'' are only applicable when it is a certain political agenda.

What we do know is that the Biden administration's authoritarian COVID–19 vaccine mandate on our dedicated medical professionals is an absolute abuse of power. It is an attack on the personal freedoms of our frontline workers, and it has certainly unnecessarily exacerbated the healthcare workforce shortage.

This bears repeating: We are not anti-vaccine. We are anti-mandate. If you want the vaccine, great. Take it. If you don't, then don't. It shouldn't be mandated.

As many of you in this Chamber know, my husband serves our local community as a firefighter paramedic. At the height of COVID, as he was showing up—not staying home—and continually responding to 911 calls of folks who were getting sick, not once did a patient ask if he was vaccinated. Not once did they demand that the firefighters who showed up be vaccinated.

When they did answer the call, they went with honor and diligence, and they continued to do their job. Not once did they ask if that patient was vaccinated. Not once did fellow firefighters ask my husband if he was vaccinated.

Likewise, as the hospitals filled up, doctors, nurses, medics, and EMTs were working double and triple overtime, taking care of the sick, comforting people who had been left to take their last breath alone as families were left outside. They never once demanded a vaccinated doctor, never once asked for a vaccinated nurse. They were doing their jobs taking care of them because that is what they do. These are the frontline workers, and it is time we stand up for them.

Today, in every congressional district in America, hospitals are struggling with staffing shortages. We can address these shortages by looking to the thousands of healthcare workers who were fired or left their job because of this mandate.

Let's stand up to the Big Government, one-size-fits-all power grab. It is wrong. It ends today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

Ms. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me time.

Vaccinating healthcare workers against COVID–19 is a simple and effective way to save lives. It helped protect our healthcare workers and the most vulnerable from serious illness, hospitalization, and death. It has prevented our healthcare workforce shortage from getting worse by keeping our workers healthy and able to continue their essential work.

H.R. 497 is nonsense and would expose patients to unnecessary risk, all because Republicans are trying to score political points.

That is why my motion to recommit would strike this bill and insert the Women's Health Protection Act, legislation that would actually keep the American people safe and healthy.

Since the Supreme Court overturned the constitutional right to abortion access, 24 States have banned abortion or are likely to do so. Without Roe, Americans are now facing a confusing patchwork of State laws dictating who can make decisions about their healthcare and when.

Without Roe, State governments are forcing pregnancy on people. Maternal and infant healthcare outcomes are worsening. It is harder for people to access medications to treat arthritis, cancer, lupus, and more, all because they are also used for medical abortion.

This is deeply personal for me. As a 33-year-old woman, reproductive healthcare is my healthcare, as it is for millions of Americans. I want the freedom to be able to make the best choices for my body and my life, and so do other Americans.

That is why Congress needs to pass the Women's Health Protection Act to guarantee a pregnant person's right to access an abortion and a provider's ability to deliver these services, regardless of State laws.

Whether we admit it or not, we all know that conversations about reproductive healthcare in the House Chamber aren't reflective of America. In real America, whether you are living in a red State or a blue State or a purple State, the average American wants the freedom and the ability to make their own healthcare decisions, including if, when, and how to have a family.

We saw that clearly reflected in the midterms, with Americans mobilizing to defend abortion rights in places as disparate as California, Vermont, Michigan, Montana, and Kentucky.

The American people want the Women's Health Protection Act, and the House should pass it again today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), who is a physician.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. BUCSHON for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, before I acknowledge my support for the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act, H.R. 497, I want to respond that as a physician, as a mother, as a working woman my entire life, and as a former director of public health, let me just say unequivocally that the care of ectopic pregnancy is not an abortion. That is a lie. That is a misconstruction. I want to put that to rest right now.

Now, on to H.R. 497. This overdue legislation repeals the Biden administration's invasive vaccine mandate for America's healthcare workers who have borne a significant brunt of the COVID–19 pandemic.

As I have listened to this discourse, I thought we were back in 2020. It was deja vu all over again when we just started to have vaccines. We are not at the beginning of a pandemic. We are 2 years, almost 3 years, into a pandemic.

Even before this pandemic, rural areas in southeastern Iowa, such as in my district, were already struggling with maintaining healthcare staffing levels. Existing challenges were exacerbated by the pandemic, which were then compounded by the vaccine mandates.

Healthcare workers, if you will remember, Mr. Speaker, were lauded for over a year for going to work every single day. I was part of that, administering vaccines in all 24 counties in my district. They were lauded for going to work, putting themselves and their families at risk for a novel coronavirus of which we knew very little.

Yet, even though they put themselves and their families at risk, we are going to insult them by telling them, despite a plethora of research and data that infection-acquired immunity can be even superior to the vaccine, that we are going to demand that they be vaccinated even though they worked over a year with no vaccine available, putting themselves at risk.

We also have further data after the delta variant that the COVID–19 vaccine does not prevent transmission. Yes, there is rebound illness. Yes, it does reduce maybe illness and death, but it doesn't prevent transmission.

As a physician, I understand the importance and the meaning of the doctor-patient relationship.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Healthcare workers have a variety of knowledge and information available about the vaccine, and like any other individual, they should be able to make healthcare decisions for themselves with the guidance of their physicians. This vaccine mandate is almost malpractice.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this repeal through this legislation.

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

Again, I know that the previous speaker is a physician, and I respect her, but I have to continue to point out that this idea that vaccines don't help prevent infection from the disease is factually incorrect.

I mentioned before various studies, and I include in the RECORD a study by Berkeley Lovelace, Jr., that shows that the vaccine does cut the infection risk.

[From NBC News, Jan. 25, 2023]

UPDATED COVID BOOSTERS CUT THE INFECTION RISK FROM XBB.1.5 SUBVARIANT BY NEARLY HALF, CDC FINDS

(By Berkeley Lovelace Jr.)

The updated Covid boosters reduce the risk of Covid infection from the predominant omicron subvariant by nearly half, according to early data published Wednesday by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

In adults up to age 49, the latest boosters from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna were 48% effective against symptomatic infection from the XBB.1.5 subvariant, the new report said. As of Jan. 21, that subvariant accounted for about 1 in 2 new cases in the U.S.

Protection was lower in older groups: The boosters were 40% effective in adults ages 50 to 64 and 43% effective in people 65 and older.

The findings are ''quite reassuring,'' Dr. Brendan Jackson, the head of the CDC's Covid response, said on a call with reporters Wednesday. ''These updated vaccines are protecting people against the latest Covid–19 variants.''

The Covid boosters were modified in the summer to target the BA.4 and BA.5 omicron subvariants, in addition to the original strain of the coronavirus first identified in Wuhan, China, in 2019.

BA.5 was the dominant variant in the U.S. in the fall, but now accounts for only 2% of new cases.

As of last Wednesday, only about 15% of people in the U.S. had received an updated booster, according to CDC data.

''With this data, we see there is a benefit that might convince some people to sign up and get a bivalent booster,'' said Dr. Peter Hotez, the co-director of the Center for Vaccine Development at Texas Children's Hospital and the dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine at the Baylor College of Medicine in Houston.

The CDC report is based on test results from more than 29,100 adults with Covid symptoms who were tested at pharmacies nationwide from Dec. 1 through Jan. 13.

People who were vaccinated but had not received the updated booster were compared to those who got the updated booster in the previous two to three months. Those who hadn't received the updated booster had their last vaccine dose about 13 months ago, Ruth Link-Gelles, who heads the CDC's vaccine effectiveness program, said on the call.

The protection provided by the booster is on par with what's typically seen with the flu vaccine. Flu vaccine effectiveness varies

from season to season, but the shots reduce the risk of the flu by 40% to 60%, according to the CDC.

Dr. Greg Poland, the director of the Mayo Clinic Vaccine Research Group in Rochester, Minnesota, cautioned that the CDC's estimate on the updated boosters may be an overestimate.

People who got the updated boosters are probably ''much more likely to wear masks indoors or restrain their travel or not go to indoor restaurants,'' he said.

He also pointed out that the CDC data doesn't capture people who were vaccinated with the updated booster but were asymptomatic, or people who were sick enough that they went to the hospital.

Hotez said that while the CDC's findings appear promising, he'd like to see data on how well the boosters perform against symptomatic infections after five or six months.

He said he'd also like to see more data on how well the updated boosters work against hospitalization.

Jackson, of the CDC, said on the call that the agency is releasing data later Wednesday that found the updated boosters reduced the risk of death from Covid by nearly thirteenfold, compared to people who are unvaccinated.

The data, he said, also found that people who got the updated booster had more than twofold lower rates of death from Covid compared to vaccinated people who did not get it.

The CDC's report comes a day before a meeting of the Food and Drug Administration's advisory committee that will discuss simplifying the Covid vaccination schedule.

In a document posted online Monday, the FDA proposed using the bivalent formula in all Covid vaccines moving forward, not just for booster shots.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the University of California San Francisco regarding COVID–19 vaccines reducing transmission.

[From the University of California San Francisco, Jan. 2, 2023]

COVID–19 VACCINES, PRIOR INFECTION REDUCE TRANSMISSION OF OMICRON

(By Laura Kurtzman)

Vaccination and boosting, especially when recent, helped to limit the spread of COVID–19 in California prisons during the first Omicron wave, according to an analysis by researchers at UC San Francisco that examined transmission between people living in the same cell.

The study demonstrates the benefits of vaccination and boosting, even in settings where many people are still getting infected, in reducing transmission. And it shows the cumulative effects from boosting and the additional protection that vaccination gives to those who were previously infected. The likelihood of transmission fell by 11% for each additional dose.

VACCINES REDUCE RISK OF SERIOUS ILLNESS FROM OMICRON INFECTION

In dense populations such as prisons, vaccines were shown to significantly reduce the risk of hospitalization and death from Omicron infections.

Of over 20,000 confirmed Omicron infections in California prisons, there were 31 hospitalizations and no deaths attributed to COVID–19 infection.

Vaccinated residents with breakthrough infections were significantly less likely to transmit them: 28% versus 36% for those who were unvaccinated.

''A lot of the benefits of vaccines to reduce infectiousness were from people who had received boosters and people who had been recently vaccinated,'' said Nathan Lo, M.D., Ph.D, a faculty research fellow in the Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases and Global Medicine at UCSF and the senior author of the study, published Jan. 2, 2022, in Nature Medicine. ''Our findings are particularly relevant to improving health for the incarcerated population.''

The researchers analyzed deidentified data collected by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). This included COVID–19 test results, vaccine status and housing locations for 111,687 residents, 97% of whom were male, between Dec. 15, 2021, and May 20, 2022.

Breakthrough infections were common, despite the residents' relatively high vaccination rate of 81% with the primary vaccine series. But the rate of serious illness was low. In just over five months, there were 22,334 confirmed SARS-CoV–2 Omicron infections, 31 hospitalizations and no COVID–19 deaths.

Vaccinated residents with breakthrough infections were significantly less likely to transmit them: 28% versus 36% for those who were unvaccinated. But the likelihood of transmission grew by 6% for every five weeks that passed since someone's last vaccine shot.

Natural immunity from a prior infection also had a protective effect, and the risk of transmitting the virus was 23% for someone with a reinfection compared to 33% for someone who had never been infected:

''A lot of the benefits of vaccines to reduce infectiousness were from people who had received boosters and people who had been recently vaccinated.''—Nathan Lo, M.D., Ph.D

Those with hybrid immunity, from both infection and vaccination, were 40% less likely to transmit the virus. Half of that protection came from the immunity that one acquires from fighting an infection and the other half came from being vaccinated.

The researchers said they were gratified to see that vaccination confers addition protection even for those who had already been infected, but they were surprised by how much the infection continued to spread, despite the residents' relatively high vaccination rates.

''Regardless of the benefits you see in vaccination and prior infection, there is still a high amount of transmission in this study,'' said Sophia Tan, a researcher in Lo's lab and the study's first author. ''We hope these findings can support ongoing efforts to protect this vulnerable population.''

This includes making efforts to keep residents current with boosters and increasing the vaccination rate of the prison staff, only 73 percent of whom had received the primary series at the time of the study.

The general rate of boosting could also be improved significantly. At the time of the study, just 59% of residents and 41% of staff had received all the doses recommended by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), based on their age and health status.

''Within the two months following vaccination, people are the least infectious, which indicates that boosters and large timed vaccination campaigns may have a role to reduce transmission in surges,'' Lo said. ''New ideas are needed since the risk of infection in this vulnerable population remains so great.''

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE).

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act.

I would like to take a minute to reflect on what one of my colleagues was talking about across the aisle, and that is about having the ability to choose when it comes to abortion. Yet, here are mandates that have been forced on our healthcare workers since the vaccines have been introduced through the Democrats and through the Biden administration, and it has been devastating for our healthcare industry.

It is pretty hypocritical to talk about abortion rights for healthcare workers in the workplace when they are completely against the ability of healthcare workers, who I would call the experts—doctors, nurses, and people who work in the healthcare field. They have the right to choose when it comes to the vaccines.

□ 1600

Mandates are tyrannical and they need to end. The COVID pandemic is over, and I am glad Republicans are making sure that we declare that this week on the House floor.

I would also point out that we have a severe shortage of healthcare workers, many of whom were heroes who worked on the front lines saving lives throughout this pandemic who have said they don't want a vaccine, they do not want to take it, and they want to trust their own natural immunity. We need to give these healthcare workers the right to choose their natural immunity and not be forced to take a jab or a vaccine that they know they do not need and they do not want.

We believe in freedom here in the Republican Conference. We believe in freedom for Americans. We believe in freedom for the healthcare workers of this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time because I believe the other side has more speakers.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about political points. This is about freedom. Our workers in the healthcare industry fight every day on the front line for us. These precious workers should never have been placed in this position to choose between a forced medical procedure and losing their employment.

Today, we are going to vote on this bill. I will tell you the story of Melissa Thomas from my district. Melissa lives in Cass County, Missouri. She is a nurse who has served her community for more than 40 years. When CMS, a government bureaucracy, implemented the vaccine mandate, Melissa was presented with three different outrageous choices: to fight for her job, to comply with the mandate, or be forced out of the medical field entirely.

Ultimately, Melissa fought. She was granted an exemption, but Melissa's story does not hold true for thousands

of frontline workers, workers who were forced out of their jobs, where they worked for years to protect us.

Today, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill to end this mandate, to take a stand. This is a stand for freedom.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that hasn't come up, and it didn't come up in Rules last night as well, we have exemptions for this mandate for people who have serious religious convictions or medical reasons to grant an exemption. No one has mentioned that, but I think it is important that that exists.

The mandate exists, but at the same time, if people have serious religious reservations or they have medical conditions that would result in having an exemption, those do exist. I think everyone should understand that.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act.

The people of north Texas have expressed their opposition to President Biden's authoritarian COVID–19 vaccine mandate for a variety of reasons.

Today, I would like to highlight the concerns that I have heard from firefighters and EMTs back home. The Biden administration's COVID–19 vaccine mandate is not only an overreach of government power, it has also become a public safety threat.

Since the vaccine mandate took effect, fire and EMT departments in north Texas have struggled to fully staff their departments.

This administration claims the vaccine requirement is in place to ensure patients have access to safe and essential care, but what about the people who experience a medical emergency, dial 911, and must wait longer for care due to staffing shortages?

Our local firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs provide lifesaving care. A fast response time can quite literally make the difference between life and death. It is already difficult to recruit and retain people to work in these stressful roles. The Federal Government shouldn't make it any harder.

The healthcare system is being overburdened by this unnecessary mandate, which has only worsened the EMS staffing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to cosponsor this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 497 today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has additional speakers, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), who is a physician.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I speak on this bill from personal experience because I am probably the only Member in the Chamber who actually fell under this mandate because I am still actively practicing, and I am still on staff at an active medical center.

I have practiced at this one institution for 30 years. I don't know how many calls I got from nurses, people on the floor taking care of COVID patients, pleading with me to not be forced to take this vaccine.

Let me just say, if there were any individuals who knew what they were talking about, it was these nurses. They were actually taking care of COVID patients. I have been very pro-vaccine, very pro-vaccine, but I have said since day one that this is not a decision that should be made between a government and a citizen, but rather one made between a doctor and a patient. It is a medication. There are risks and benefits that go with this.

Sadly enough, we lost a lot of our nurses, way too many, because they chose not to get this. They were young, of fertility age, and they were fearful.

I am just going to speak to my colleague's comments about exemptions. Yes, there were exemptions, but they were minute, and I won't speak about one institution in specific, but nationwide they were oftentimes ignored. Thirty-year-olds who desired not to get this vaccine based upon fears about fertility don't have preexisting medical conditions.

I think this is the right thing. I am pro-vaccine, but I do not believe in the avenue of forced vaccination. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining.

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

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

I stress again that for people who have serious religious reservations, for people who have medical conditions, they can get exemptions from the mandate.

In addition to that, I know that the previous gentleman on the Republican side talked about risks and side effects. The FDA and CDC have been transparent that there are rare side effects that may happen to some individuals when they take the vaccines, but they and independent health experts all agree that the benefits of being vaccinated far outweigh the risks of any side effects.

Arguments from the other side of the aisle insinuating an inflated risk of side effects also ignore the risks associated with contracting COVID–19 as an unvaccinated individual. COVID–19 is a dangerous disease that has killed over a million of our fellow Americans, and the vaccines are safe and effective. They are strongly protective against severe illness and death.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that some Members use their opportunity to speak on the floor—and I am not saying that the people who spoke here have, but last night I certainly heard it in the Rules Committee—to fan the flames of misinformation when describing the risks of side effects when the risks of being unvaccinated are so grave.

I just think that this is dangerous and opposed by virtually every public health and medical organization. They are saying that they recommend the vaccine. Again, there may be some rare side effects. There may be some people that, you know, would seek to have exemptions. Let's try to understand that this is often a difficult situation, but the bottom line is that vaccines have saved millions of lives, and we can't give the impression that that is not the case.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that I am a physician. I was a practicing physician for 15 years before I came into Congress. I am pro-vaccine. I believe that the COVID–19 vaccine saves lives and prevents serious illness. I have been vaccinated myself and boosted. My family has taken the vaccines.

That is not what this is about, Mr. Speaker. What this is about is a Federal mandate to force medical decisions on individual American citizens.

Again, it also doesn't stop local hospitals, like my hospitals in Evansville, Indiana, from requiring the COVID–19 vaccine for their employees. I think we have a disconnect here about what this legislation is actually about. It is actually about Federal control at CMS. Again, CMS has only mandated one vaccine, and that is the COVID–19 vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that vaccines save lives, but I also think it should be a personal choice, and that is what this is about. We need to get past this because, as I mentioned earlier, other viral diseases like the measles have been around literally for centuries—centuries—so when does a Federal vaccine mandate for COVID–19 end?

When do we come to an end point, say, okay, the risk is so low that we are not going to mandate from CMS that you get a medical treatment that you may not want or you lose your job?

Now, again, I reiterate, if your local hospital or medical facility says, look, this is part of our employment requirement, okay, that is up to them, but not the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over. The President said so himself. So why, then, are our friends on the other side of the aisle fighting

to keep in place an authoritarian mandate on our healthcare workers?

When the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services issued its vaccine mandate in 2021, the emergency situation with respect to the delta variant was cited as its justification. The problem isn't just that the delta variant has come and gone, it is that we have an administration that has made a habit out of violating Americans' basic freedoms.

Our frontline workers were the heroes of the pandemic, but this vaccine mandate robbed those very workers of the right to make medical decisions for themselves.

All of the President's vaccine mandates are wrong. They have been wrong from the start. Today, House Republicans will begin to set things straight by prohibiting this administration from enforcing COVID vaccine mandates on our healthcare providers.

During a time of workforce shortages, especially among healthcare staff, no American should be forced to choose between the jab and the job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am just so concerned that we are seeing another example here on the floor today of what I call Republican extremism. Republicans are keeping up their commitment to extremism, in my opinion, by attempting to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine requirement for healthcare workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is really dangerous legislation that is going to strain our healthcare system, exacerbate existing staffing shortages, and further limit American families' access to healthcare.

With H.R. 497, the Republicans are really putting politics over science. Democrats are committed to putting families first, where we can continue to follow the science to fight COVID–19. We are going to build on the success. We had a lot of success in the previous Congress in so many things to make sure that Americans have access to affordable and quality healthcare, to further lower healthcare costs and prescription drug costs, and to support our healthcare workforce.

Everything that we do here should be designed to not only prevent infection but prepare for future types of pandemics. I am just so concerned because I listened last night at Rules and here on the floor, and I just think that the impression is being given somehow that maybe people shouldn't take vaccines or that there are risks to vaccines that, in my opinion, are being stated that are way out of proportion or that somehow there is significant evidence out there that it doesn't matter if you get vaccinated or not because that is not going to cause more infection.

The bottom line is that this mandate was put in place for healthcare workers because the agencies involved that studied the science at the Federal level believed that it was going to be a good thing for the healthcare workers themselves, that they wouldn't get ill and die, that it would help in preventing the spread of COVID–19, and that it would give people a sense of security knowing that the people that are helping them when they are sick have also been vaccinated.

□ 1615

I just don't understand why all of a sudden now the Republicans say: Well, that is not really accurate. Let all the healthcare workers do whatever they want.

It makes no sense. I just think it is politically motivated, if you will, because they have certain people, I guess, their base voters, who are anti-vaccination. But you can't be anti-vaccination if you look at the science and what has been done with these vaccinations that saved so many lives, to make it so that now the situation with COVID–19 is much better than it has been in the last few years, which is why the President is saying that he can lift the healthcare emergency.

We have made a lot of progress. We have made a lot of progress because we have based our actions on science. To suggest today that we should eliminate this mandate, I think is very dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I reiterate again that as a physician, I support vaccination for healthcare workers if they choose to do so or if their local medical facility says it is a requirement for them to be employed at that facility. I just don't support the Federal Government mandating it nationwide because they don't mandate any other vaccine, and they never have that I am aware of.

So there are all kinds of other things in medicine that I wish people would do:

I wish people would get screened for colon cancer.

I wish people would get their mammograms.

I wish people would get their pap smears.

I wish people would get their prostates checked.

The reality is it is a free country. We are not going to mandate all of those things, are we?

We could, I guess.

This is just another medical treatment that people should have the freedom to choose. The Federal Government shouldn't be mandating it.

Again, I can't be more clear, and other doctors that have spoken today have said, ''we believe in vaccinations.'' In fact, we did public service announcements supporting it. We just don't believe that CMS should be mandating this for healthcare workers, and that this mandate should end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 497, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 75, 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. JACOBS. Mr. 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. Jacobs moves to recommit the bill H.R. 497 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Ms. Jacobs moves to recommit the bill H.R. 497 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all 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) 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.

(2) Since 1973, the Supreme Court repeatedly has recognized 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.

(3) Nonetheless, access to abortion services has 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.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) 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.

(7) 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.

(8) 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.

(9) 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.

(10) 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.

(11) 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.

(12) 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.

(13) 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.

(14) 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.

(15) The cumulative effect of these numerous restrictions has been to severely limit the availability of abortion services in some areas, creating a patchwork system where access to abortion services is more available in some States than 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.

(16) 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.

(17) 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.

(18) 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.

(19) 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.

(20) 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.

(21) 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.

(22) 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.

(23) 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.

(24) Health care providers are subject to license laws in various jurisdictions, which are not affected by this Act except as provided in this Act.

(25) 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.

(26) 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.

(27) 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 a person's ability to terminate a pregnancy, to diminish or in any way negatively affect a person's constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy, or to displace any other remedy for violations of the constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy.

(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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit H.R. 497;

Passage of H.R. 497, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 382; and

Passage of H.R. 382, if ordered.

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.

FREEDOM FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS 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. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), 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 210, nays 219, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—210

Adams	Bowman	Case
Aguilar	Boyle (PA)	Casten
Allred	Brown	Castor (FL)
Auchincloss	Brownley	Castro (TX)
Balint	Budzinski	Cherfilus-McCormick
Barragán	Bush	Chu
Beatty	Caraveo	Cicilline
Bera	Carbajal	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Cárdenas	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Carson	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carter (LA)	Clyburn
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Cohen
Bonamici	Casar	

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
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (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
Buchanan
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
Hunt
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
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 (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
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)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

García (IL)
Goldman (NY)
Pence
Smith (MO)
Steube

□ 1707

Messrs. VALADAO, BURCHETT, NUNN of Iowa, BRECHEEN, WEBSTER of Florida, WALBERG, WENSTRUP, GREEN of Tennessee, CLYDE, and HILL, changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mses. ADAMS, McCOLLUM, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. HIMES 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 203, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—227

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
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
Davis (NC)
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
Golden (ME)
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
Houlahan
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
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
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Salinas
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
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)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—203

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)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Hoyer
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
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
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—4

García (IL)
Goldman (NY)
Pence
Steube

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1715

Ms. BALINT changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANDEMIC IS OVER 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. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MOSKOWITZ), 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.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 220, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—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
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
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (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—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
Buchanan
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
Hunt
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
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
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)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

García (IL)
Goldman (NY)
Pence
Steube

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1721

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. PALLONE. Mr. 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, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

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
Buchanan
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
Hunt
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
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
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)
Williams (TX)
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
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
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (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)

NOT VOTING—4

García (IL)
Goldman (NY)
Pence
Steube

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1739

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 11

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 7, 2023, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

PROVIDING FOR A CERTAIN TOTAL NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON CERTAIN SELECT COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 78, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 78

Resolved,

SECTION 1. TOTAL NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN SELECT COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES.

(a) PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE.—Clause 11(a)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking ''not more than 22 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner, of whom not more than 13 may be from the same party'' and inserting ''not more than 25 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner, of whom not more than 14 may be from the same party''.

(b) SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY.—Section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 11, as agreed to January 10, 2023, is amended by striking ''composed of not more than 16 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, not more than 7 of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader'' and inserting ''composed of not more than 24 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, not more than 11 of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader''.

(c) SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 12, as agreed to January 10, 2023, is amended by striking ''together with not more than 13 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 5 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader'' and inserting ''together with not more than 12 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 9 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader''.

(d) SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC.—Section 4(a)(1)(B)(i) of House Resolution 5, as agreed to January 9, 2023, is amended by striking ''not more than 12 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 5 shall be appointed in consultation with the Minority Leader'' and inserting ''not more than 16 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 7 shall be appointed in consultation with the Minority Leader''.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LIEU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 79

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Costa, Mr. McGovern, Ms. Adams, Ms. Spanberger, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Brown, Ms. Plaskett, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Ms. Slotkin, Ms. Caraveo, Ms. Salinas, Ms. Perez, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Ms. Tokuda, Ms. Budzinski, Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Vasquez, Ms. Crockett, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Mr. Casar.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Courtney, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kim of New Jersey, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Crow, Ms. Slotkin, Ms. Sherrill, Ms. Escobar, Mr. Golden of

Maine, Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Strickland, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Jackson of North Carolina, Mr. Vasquez, Mr. Deluzio, Ms. Tokuda, Mr. Davis of North Carolina, Ms. Sewell, Mr. Horsford, Mr. Panetta.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Ms. Wild, Ms. Escobar, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Ross, Mr. Ivey.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Payne, Mr. Swalwell, Mr. Correa, Mr. Carter of Louisiana, Mr. Thanedar, Mr. Magaziner, Mr. Ivey, Mr. Goldman of New York, Mr. Robert Garcia of California, Mrs. Ramirez, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Titus.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Costa, Mr. Sablan, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Neguse, Mr. Levin, Ms. Porter, Ms. Leger Fernández, Ms. Stansbury, Mrs. Peltola, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Mullin, Ms. Hoyle of Oregon, Ms. Kamlager-Dove, Mr. Magaziner, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Case, Mrs. Dingell.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Ms. Norton, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Carson, Ms. Titus, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Brownley, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Payne, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Allred, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Mr. García of Illinois, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Auchincloss, Ms. Strickland, Mr. Carter of Louisiana, Mr. Ryan, Mrs. Peltola, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Hoyle of Oregon, Mrs. Sykes, Ms. Scholten, Mrs. Foushee.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Ms. Brownley, Mr. Levin, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Mrvan, Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick, Mr. Deluzio, Mr. McGarvey, Mrs. Ramirez, Mr. Landsman, Ms. Budzinski.

Mr. LIEU (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 80

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Lucas, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Crawford, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Baird, Mr. Mann, Mr. Feenstra, Mrs. Miller of Illinois, Mr. Moore of Alabama, Mrs. Cammack, Mr. Finstad, Mr. Rose, Mr. Jackson of Texas, Mr. Molinaro, Ms. De La Cruz, Mr. Langworthy, Mr. Duarte, Mr. Nunn of Iowa, Mr. Alford, Mr. Van Orden, Mrs. Chavez-Deremer, Mr. Miller of Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Turner, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Banks, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Waltz, Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Jackson of Texas, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Gimenez, Ms. Mace, Mr. Finstad, Mr. Strong, Mr. Luttrell, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia, Mr. LaLota, Mr. Moylan, Mr. Alford, Mr. Mills, Mr. McCormick.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Grothman, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Allen, Mr. Banks, Mr. Comer, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Owens, Mr. Good of Virginia, Mrs. McClain, Mrs. Miller of Illinois, Mrs. Steel, Mr. Estes, Ms. Letlow, Mr. Kiley, Mr. Bean of Florida, Mr. Burlison, Mr. Moran, Mr. James, Mrs. Chavez-DeRemer, Mr. Williams of New York, Mrs. Houchin.

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Joyce of Ohio, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Garbarino, Mrs. Fischbach.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Perry, Mr. Issa, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Mast, Mr. Buck, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. Barr, Mr. Jackson of Texas, Mrs. Kim of California, Ms. Salazar, Mr. Huizenga, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Hill, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Baird, Mr. Waltz, Mr. Kean of New Jersey, Mr. Lawler, Mr. Mills, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Moran, Mr. James, Mr. Self.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. McCaul, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Guest, Mr. Bishop of North Carolina, Mr. Gimenez, Mr. Pfluger, Mr. Garbarino, Mrs. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Tony Gonzales of Texas, Mr. LaLota, Mr. Ezell, Mr. D'Esposito, Ms. Lee of Florida, Mr. Luttrell, Mr. Strong, Mr. Brecheen, Mr. Crane.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Steil, Chair. Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Bice, Mr. Carey, Ms. Lee of Florida, Mr. D'Esposito.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mrs. González-Colon, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Tiffany, Mr. Carl, Mr. Rosendale, Mrs. Boebert, Mr. Bentz, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia, Mr. Moylan, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Collins, Mrs. Luna, Mr. Duarte, Ms. Hageman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Posey, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Babin, Mr. Baird, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Mike Garcia of California, Mrs. Bice, Mr. Obernolte, Mr. Issa, Mr. Crawford, Mrs. Gonzalez-Colon, Ms. Tenney, Mr. C. Scott Franklin of Florida, Mr. Strong, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Collins, Mr. Williams of New York, Mr. Kean of New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Meuser, Ms. Van Duyne, Ms. Salazar, Mr. Mann, Mr. Ellzey, Mr. Molinaro, Mr. Alford, Mr. Crane, Mr. Bean of Florida, Mr. Hunt, Mr. LaLota.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Crawford, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Massie, Mr. Perry, Mr. Babin, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Bost, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Mast, Mrs. Gonzalez-Colon, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Nehls, Mr. Gooden of Texas, Mr. Mann, Mr. Owens, Mr. Yakym, Mrs. Chavez-DeRemer, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Kean of New Jersey, Mr. D'Esposito, Mr. Burlison, Mr. James, Mr. Van Orden, Mr. Williams of New York, Mr. Molinaro, Mr. Collins, Mr. Ezell, Mr. Duarte, Mr. Bean of Florida.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. Bergman, Ms. Mace, Mr. Rosendale, Mrs. Miller-Meeks, Mr. Murphy, Mr. C. Scott Franklin of Florida, Mr. Van Orden, Mr. Luttrell, Mr. Ciscomani, Mr. Crane, Mr. Self, Mrs. Kiggans of Virginia.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING PENNSYLVANIA PARKS AND FOREST FOUNDATION'S PHOTOGRAPHY WINNERS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dot Monahan of Oil City and Ryan Kunselman of Clarion for their people's choice awards in the Pennsylvania Parks and Forests Foundation's 2022 photo contest.

Dot won her award in the Caught in the Rain category with a photo of a soaked bald eagle in Oil Creek State Park.

Ryan took home his award-winning photo in the Raindrop to River category while visiting Clear Creek State Park.

The 2022 photo contest had stiff competition, with nearly 600 entries. This annual contest allows both professionals and amateurs to compete in a variety of categories.

The other winning photos from all the 2022 photo contest submissions can be viewed on the Parks and Forest Foundation's Facebook page.

The Parks and Forest Foundation supports 124 State parks and 2.2 million acres of forest by coordinating volunteers, activities, and donations through its 48 chapters.

The Foundation's mission is to inspire stewardship of Pennsylvania State parks and forests.

Mr. Speaker, these photographs are a great reminder of the beauty that we can find in nature even on a rainy day.

Congratulations to Dot and Ryan on their awards.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR SELECTION AS SUBCOMMITTEE RANKING MEMBER

(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 thank my Democratic colleagues for selecting me as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials for the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I will work to accomplish at least four strong railroad priorities in the new Congress.

The first is the completion of the Hudson River Tunnel and the entire Gateway Program. This is the most important transportation project in the

Nation, and it will help commuters in my district as well as travelers throughout the East Coast.

The second is using the bipartisan infrastructure law funding to improve Amtrak and travel throughout the Northeast corridor.

The third is more oversight over freight railroads nationwide.

The fourth is a promise that I made early on in the Congress to make sure that rail workers finally get the sick time they have earned and deserve. We need to make sure they are operating safely and efficiently across the country.

Again, I thank my colleagues for my selection. I look forward to working with all of them to make these priorities into realities.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAYOR RICHARD DAVIS

(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 and honor the life of my friend, my fellow mayor, Richard Davis.

Richard was first elected to Richmond Hill City Council in 1979. He served there for 10 years. He then went on to be elected mayor in 1989, and he served honorably for 31 years.

During his tenure as city councilman and mayor, the city grew at a tremendous rate. When he first joined the city council, there were around 1,800 people living in Richmond Hill. Today, there are almost 12,000.

Richard made invaluable contributions to his home city through his passion for and commitment to public service. He is credited with helping start the Great Ogeechee Seafood Festival and the building of the J.F. Gregory Recreational Park.

Richard's name will always be synonymous with Richmond Hill, and our district will forever be indebted to Richard for his leadership and public service.

Our thoughts and prayers are with his family.

ENDING THE ARTSAKH BLOCKADE

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn Azerbaijan's blockade of the Lachin corridor, the only humanitarian lifeline connecting the people of Artsakh to the Republic of Armenia.

For over nearly 2 months, the region's 120,000 Armenians have been denied food, fuel, medicine, and other essentials as a result of this cruel and inhumane blockade.

Azerbaijan's goal is clear, to force the ethnic Armenians of Artsakh from their homeland by imposing conditions that make life impossible. We must hold Azerbaijan accountable for its aggression. I continue to call on the administration to take immediate steps to end this blockade.

We must end all U.S. military assistance to Azerbaijan. American taxpayers shouldn't be subsidizing Azerbaijan's constant aggression against the Armenian people.

I continue to stand in solidarity with the Armenian people and the Armenian-American community.

HONORING HOGANSVILLE MAYOR BILL STANKIEWICZ

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the passing of my dear friend and former colleague, Mayor Bill Stankiewicz. Mayor Bill was a staple of Troup County, and he was loved by everyone.

Bill served his community as the city manager, a two-term mayor, and through his involvement on a number of boards, including the LaGrange-Troup County Chamber of Commerce, the Racial Trustbuilding Initiative, and the Joint Development Authority Board.

He was an extremely dedicated public servant, and he took great pride in doing the tough work to improve his community. As mayor, he worked to reestablish the city's finances during a period of instability, and he proudly worked to relocate and renovate city hall in Hogansville.

When I was the mayor of West Point, I had the privilege of working with Bill on many projects for the greater good of our county and our cities. He was a pleasure to be around.

My heart goes out to his wife, Mary, and the entire Troup County family. Bill will forever be remembered and honored for his invaluable service to his community and to this Nation. He will be sorely missed.

TYRE NICHOLS' DEATH SHOULD BE A CATALYST FOR CHANGE

(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. Mr. Speaker, like many of us, I spent the weekend thinking about the savage beating and murder of Tyre Nichols at the hands of five Memphis police officers.

Sworn to protect and serve, they did neither.

Had they honored their duty, Mr. Nichols would be alive with his 4-year-old son, family, and friends.

I am a mother to a 29-year-old son, the same age Tyre was. I have not worried that my sons could die at the hands of police at a traffic stop; a privilege of White mothers denied to mothers whose children are Black.

Black Americans are killed at a rate twice as high as White Americans. A 2019 report found that 1 in every 1,000 Black men between the ages of 20 and 35 can expect to be killed by law enforcement.

We must do more to ensure all of our communities are safe. Pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and find ways to reverse a police culture that sees Black Americans as a threat.

We can respect police officers as we require reform of practices rooted in hatred and violence. Black Americans have waited long enough. We must act.

SPACE SHUTTLE COLUMBIA DISASTER

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, February 1, 2003, was intended to be a day of celebration to welcome back home seven brave men and women from their mission to space.

Instead, that day of intended celebration turned quickly to tragedy when Space Shuttle Columbia disintegrated over east Texas upon reentry, an event captured on camera by local medical doctor, Scott Lieberman.

I rise today to honor those seven individuals who lost their lives in pursuit of space exploration and to commend my fellow east Texans who participated in the recovery efforts that followed.

I am proud to represent east Texans, who in the face of tragedy do not hesitate to spring into action, whatever the cause and whatever the need.

Please join me in honoring those astronauts who lost their lives 20 years ago: Rick Husband, William McCool, Michael Anderson, Kalpana Chawla, David Brown, Laurel Clark, and Ilan Ramon.

We pray for their loved ones and remember with sympathy all impacted by this disaster.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF COLONEL JOHNNIE PANTANELLI

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of Colonel Johnnie Pantanelli.

Colonel Pantanelli embodied so many of our values. She fought for freedom, broke glass ceilings, and made sure the next generation of women flew.

Colonel Pantanelli served in the Marine Corps Reserves in 1944 and 1945, and soon after was told her service was no longer needed because the men were coming home.

Instead of quitting, she joined the Civil Air Patrol in White Plains and served as a wartime mission observer searching for German subs.

After the war, Colonel Pantanelli earned her pilot's license and survived

a plane crash during her flight training. She served for decades as commander of the squadron that is now named after her. In 2011, she earned the rank of colonel.

Colonel Pantanelli passed away on January 14, 2023. She would have been 98 in March.

New York's 16th District and I thank her for her service and send our deepest condolences to everyone impacted by this monumental loss.

WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS DESERVE SUPPORT

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of our Nation's wildland firefighters.

In my role as Secretary of the Interior, as Congressman, and as a Montanan, I have seen the devastation that mismanagement and overregulation has brought to our forests.

Every year, we bear witness to our forests and homes burning in catastrophic wildfires, wildfires that will be made worse by frivolous and potentially deadly litigation that seeks to prevent firefighters from doing their job.

Last year, I was at a fire camp in Elmo, Montana. While I watched scoopers from Bridger Aerospace do their work on the ridge, I also noticed the red stripe where retardant was dropped to protect homes, ranches, and lives.

In many ways, wildland firefighting is a lot like serving on the battlefield. The men and women are dropped behind enemy lines, surrounded on all fronts, and the only resources they have next to them are those men and women who fight fires and the air support above. If they call in air support, it is because they need it.

We would never think of denying our troops in battle the lifesaving air support they need, so why would anyone think that our firefighters doing their job deserve any less?

□ 1800

HOMES FOR HOMELESS VETERANS

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

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 33,000 veterans in this country experiencing homelessness and ask for your support for my bill, the Healthy Foundations for Homeless Veterans Act.

This bill would make permanent the temporary flexibilities granted to the Department of Veterans Affairs from section 4201(a).

Veterans make up 7 percent of the general population but represent 13 percent of adults who are suffering from homelessness. Nationally, the total number of veterans experiencing homelessness has decreased by 11 percent since January 2020.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has placed over 40,000 veterans in permanent housing as a result of the temporary flexibilities granted to it to provide shelter. This is a great start; however, we can make more progress. This is just the beginning, as there are an estimated 267 homeless veterans in Broward County, where I represent.

This commonsense legislation would authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide shelter, food, clothing, bedding, hygiene items, transportation, communication devices, and other necessary assistance to veterans who are homeless and are using rental vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, we will not stop until every veteran has a roof over their head.

HONORING THE NASSAU COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women of the Nassau County Police Department.

Last week, the Nassau PD arrested eight men in New York's Third Congressional District who are said to be part of an organized theft group from South America.

While I am grateful to their ongoing commitment to preventing these acts of violence, but for suburban New Yorkers in New York's Third Congressional District, we are seeing a major uptick in crime.

In Nassau County alone, a reported 7,394 crimes have been recorded in 2022. This includes grand larceny, burglaries, and vehicle theft.

Recently, I spoke with the NYPD's commanding officer, Assistant Chief Kevin Williams of Queens, to discuss the potential protests in response to the unfortunate events that have taken place in Memphis.

I personally extend my support to Assistant Chief Williams and his team during this time of uncertainty. While peaceful protests may occur nationwide, we should also offer our support to the brave men and women of our local law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, it is my commitment to support good policy that will provide both the training and resources that our local law enforcement requires to keep our communities safe.

IN MEMORY OF ALBERTO BHOGE

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a saddened occasion to talk about a son, a brother, a husband, father, soldier, agent, and friend, truly beloved by so many whose lives he touched.

Alberto Bhoge was born February 12, 1984, and honorably served in the U.S. Army Reserves from February 2010 to September 2014.

During his time serving honorably in uniform, he deployed to Afghanistan in April 2010 until February 2011 with C Company 478th Civil Affairs Battalion.

If serving wasn't enough to dedicate your life and be willing to die for this Nation, he took his uniform off and continued his service in the Federal Bureau of Investigation where he protected our country through his civil service.

Alberto passed on January 17, 2023, and is survived by his wife, who also serves with the FBI, and their two children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that everyone here today join me in praying for his family, friends, and all those who cared for Berto. We love you. God bless. Airborne.

IMPROVING OUR GOVERNMENT THROUGH LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to introduce three bills to make our government work a little better. Before I get to those, I would put a question to all of us in this Chamber, the thousands who are sitting here tonight in the gallery, folks watching, but those of us who have the privilege to have this job.

Why are we here?

What is the reason we decided to get into this line of work?

There is a small number of us who, I don't know, may go on to be President or some other office. There is a handful of us who get our viral clips on the local news. There is some larger number of us who actually get our name on a big bill that makes a difference, and we are remembered by our name: The Tafts and Hartleys and Sarbanes and Oxleys.

The truth is that most of us are going to be about as well-known to our successors as our predecessors are to us.

We are here. We are doing a job. We will be known for the office that we held. We will be remembered for the dignity with which we held that office but not for who we are as individuals. And that is okay, right?

One of my favorite pieces of advice I got when I got into this line of work was from President Obama, who said, This is not a sprint, this is a relay. And your job is to pass the baton to the next person in a little bit of a better position than you had it when you picked it up on the last leg.

Now everybody in this body has different policy views, different ideas of what a better position in that relay might look like. But I submit that we do have some universal goals that we all agree on or else we wouldn't be in this line of work.

We all want a government that delivers the greatest good for the greatest number. We all want a government that upholds our founding promise of freedom and equality.

We all, I think, believe Abraham Lincoln's admonition to us that a government of, by, and for the people should not perish from this Earth. We all, also, I think agree that on those really hard questions, the beauty of the government that our Founders created, it is on the hard ones where we disagree the single best way to resolve those disputes is through a democratic process.

It ain't always the best way, but we decided not to have kings. We have agreed not to resolve those through wars. We have agreed to resolve them through a democratic process.

I agree with Winston Churchill when he said that democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the other ones that have been tried, but it is the best one that we have.

I put those goals out there because I think they are universal. But if we are honest with ourselves, I'm not sure we are doing such a good job. When we have record wealth inequality, when we have record numbers of mass shootings, when we have surging levels of deaths of despair from the opioid crisis to suicide, it is hard to say that we are doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

When we have persistent male-female wage gaps, racial wealth gaps, steady numbers of Black men getting killed for minor traffic violations, it is hard to say we are doing a really good job of upholding a promise to freedom and equality.

When we look at what we do in this building, not just on our end here but the north and the south end of the building, do we do what the people ask us to do, things that are overwhelmingly popular?

Campaign finance reform, getting rid of gerrymandering, holding ourselves to the same legal and ethical standards that we ask all American citizens to be held to.

We can't get those bills sent to the President's desk. Those things are rejected. We don't even get them out of this building. That is a question of whether we really are making sure that we have a government that is of, by, and for the people.

I know that you all face the same questions I get when I go home. People ask: Why is it that people in this institution are failing to do things that are overwhelmingly popular?

When we see those little polls that say Congress has a 20 percent approval rating, that should be a red light that we have to fix things.

And, of course, the refusal of substantially all of one political party, the party of Lincoln, to condemn an attack on the U.S. Capitol that sought to overturn a free and fair election is not a commitment to preserve and abide by the wisdom of the majority.

Now, I can get depressing, and I am not trying to depress anyone. It can be a cause for hopelessness, but not for us, right? I mean, we got into this job to fix things.

Mr. Speaker, I know you got into this job to fix things, to make things better, right? Seeing something that is broke is an opportunity to make it better. Maybe it is an opportunity for us to build something better and maybe people will remember our names.

We have to get to work and move the baton forward to do that. If we are going to do that, we have to first acknowledge some unpleasant, if self-evident, truths.

First of all, we don't like to say it around here often, but we should. Our Founders actually weren't perfect. They weren't Moses. They weren't Jesus. They were fallible people just like us.

One of my favorite descriptions of the Constitutional Convention was Benjamin Franklin when he was asked about the process. And he said, When you assemble a number of men to have the advantage of their joint wisdom—he should have said ''and women'' but it's with the times—when you assemble them to get their joint wisdom, you inevitably assemble all of their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views.

He was talking about the Constitutional Convention.

It sounds an awful lot like he is talking about all the people we work with every day, right? We all have our errors of opinion and our selfish views, and that is okay. Trust our Founders that they were not perfect and they were just as flawed as we all are.

The second thing we have to acknowledge is that our Founders didn't actually think the Constitution was perfect. It is not this immutable stones' path on the mountain.

This is Thomas Jefferson in September 1789, after the Constitution was ratified. He wrote to James Madison: Every Constitution—this is a little crazy, I'll warn you.

Every Constitution, every law should naturally expire at the end of 19 years. It might be that every form of government is so perfectly contrived that the will of the majority—will of the majority—could always be obtained fairly, but this is true of no form.

I am not suggesting that all our laws expire in 19 years, but these are the people who wrote the Constitution saying, I'm not sure this thing is really good for more than 19 years or so, that if we are going to make sure that we fulfill the will of the majority, we might have to prune it.

Okay. That is fine.

The third thing, and this is the one that I think is most important for us here today, is that our Founders did not understand democracy nearly as well as we do.

They were an amazing group of people. They did an amazing thing, but we have 233 years of wisdom that they did not have. We learned something with that time over the course. Think about the fact that our Founders designed the Constitution with the idea that they would not be political parties. They called them factions but they couldn't contemplate of a world where you could have a functioning democracy and political parties.

Well, I think we have proved you can do that.

They didn't have standing armies. They didn't have income taxes. They couldn't contemplate of a country where women had the right to vote. They couldn't contemplate a country where they didn't have the ability to hold slaves and not only not allow them to vote but do a whole bunch of other things to suppress their freedom and their equality. They kicked that problem down the road.

Again, these things sound familiar, right? We have been there.

Now, they were wise enough to plan for those surprises—they made the Constitution amendable—but we know things they didn't know. We are governing in a different environment still under those tools. If we acknowledge they were no perfect than we are, we acknowledge that we have a responsibility to move this baton forward, then I think we can be honest about what we can do and not be constrained by our own ambition.

Because what is clear, the answer to that question, ''why is it that we can't do things that the majority of the American people want?'' is in large part because while our Founders paid lipservice to democracy, they said in that letter that Jefferson wrote to Madison, that it is important that a government do the will of the majority.

At core, they didn't really trust the will of the majority. They created the electoral college because they didn't trust that people could be trusted with the vote. The direct elections of Presidents were going to be a problem.

You go and you read the stuff they wrote. They said some populous could just stir up the passions of some uninformed rube in the rural areas.

These are almost direct quotes.

They didn't trust that people in a fully democratic society could elect a President so they created the electoral college. They created the Senate expressly to frustrate the will of the majority.

Now, I say ''they,'' it wasn't a universal view, but there was no way that we were going to have these United States, to get all those colonies to agree unless there was some way to prevent the will of the majority from causing laws to go forward.

So we created the Senate. You could argue that we created the Senate to preserve slavery, and it did that for, I don't know, a couple dozen years. But it massively overrepresented the low population States in order to make sure that we could actually get people

to agree to join in these United States. That is what they did.

□ 1815

Today, or when it was founded, the biggest State had 10 times the population of the smallest State. Today, it is up to almost 100. So, we have massively disenfranchised huge numbers of American people because of a structure that was designed to disenfranchise large but not as big numbers of American people.

We kick a bill out of here and can get 50 votes in the Senate with people representing 17 percent of the United States population.

When our voters ask us why we can't get things done that are supported by the will of the majority, it is built into our system.

Finally, our Founders created the Supreme Court with largely no checks and balances on the Supreme Court—lifetime appointments, no ethics obligations. Goodness knows, we have seen a fair amount of what is going on there right now.

Remember, Marbury v. Madison that significantly expanded the power of the Court relative to the legislative branch came after the Constitution was signed. This is a different structure than what they contemplated, and that effectively gave the Supreme Court not the ability to write laws but darn close to it because you get one Supreme Court Justice that flips the majority, and all of a sudden, you can say that our work here, all the good work we put in, is unconstitutional and turn it over with the whim of one vote. That is not majoritarian.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider for a moment what our country would look like just over maybe three decades if the will of the majority had prevailed, if we actually lived in a country where we only did what the majority of Americans want us to do.

First off, I would like to introduce you to President Gore, followed not too long after by President Hillary Clinton. We would have elected our first female President because that was the will of the majority, right?

That would have had a dramatically different Supreme Court, whole numbers of decisions. How do we think about the Second Amendment in the wake of Heller? It would have been a heck of a lot different with different Justices on that Court.

How we think about campaign finance in the wake of Citizens United would have been quite a bit different with different folks on the Supreme Court.

The Dobbs decision—do we believe that women are truly equal in this society? That might have been a different decision if we had expressed the will of the people.

By the way, campaign finance reform, a woman's right to choose, wanting to not get shot, these are very popular things with the majority of the American people, yet we can't deliver that because of what happened.

I am going to give an exception that proves the rule, and this one we don't talk about enough here, but as House Members, this one should make us furious.

Last year, this body passed, on a bipartisan basis, the Emmett Till Antilynching Act. It made lynching a Federal crime—long overdue.

It went to the Senate. The Senate passed it, and the President signed it. It is a law now. It is now a Federal crime to lynch in America. Good for the Senate.

Do you know when that bill first passed this body? 1922. It took a hundred years, a century, for the Senate to acknowledge what the House had acknowledged for a hundred years, that lynching is bad. We have to fix this place, folks.

If we don't want to answer that question anymore, when people say, ''Why can't you do what we want?'' We all know what they tell us, right? ''It is because you are corrupt. It is because your donors won't let you do this. It is because you are just in it for your ego.''

Look, there are some of us who suffer from those problems, but if the institution needs fixing, we can fix it on our own.

If any of what I am saying sounds partisan, I mean, I get it. I am talking about women's right to choose. I am talking about sensible gun control legislation. I am talking about who would have won President. All of those things sound kind of partisan. That is only because, in this structure, we have gotten to a point where one party in America is representing the views of the majority of the American people, and the other party derives its power solely from those minoritarian institutions.

In a healthy democracy, we should all be competing for that mythical center of the electorate. We shouldn't be sitting there and saying: I have a 20-year plan to stack the Court with Justices who will agree with me to overturn the will of the American people.

We shouldn't be sitting there saying: Well, I can control the Senate if I just find a couple of Senate seats in a couple of low-population States with cheap TV markets.

We all know it happens, right?

We will be healthier, both of our parties, if we commit ourselves to the idea, as Jefferson said, that if we are not representing the will of the majority because no form of government ever consistently does, let's fix it so that we do, which brings me to the three bills we introduced today.

The first bill is a constitutional amendment to add 12 national at-large Senators. It doesn't do anything else to change the Senate. It doesn't do anything to frustrate Article V. You can't in any way diminish the relative power of the Senate. But imagine what would happen if 10 percent of the Senate had an interest in representing the will of the American people.

We would then sit there in this House, the people's House, where we represent the will of the American people, with confidence that we had people fighting for us over there.

It would make it that much harder for them to filibuster a good bill that comes out of here because why would they filibuster something that is supported by the majority of the American people?

It would also, by adding 12 senators, add 12 more electors representing the popular vote. That would reduce the number of scenarios where we could have the popular vote winner lose an election to the electoral vote winner. That is the first bill.

The second one is to expand this House, and in the next Census, 2030, say let's go out and look at the smallest State in the Union and say the size of that State is going to set the size of a congressional district because if we are the House of Representatives, we should make sure that all of us represent as close as we can the same number of people.

The House hasn't grown since 1911. The population of the United States has grown three and a half times since 1911.

All of us in this room, on average—your mileage may vary—represent 737,000, 740,000 people. In 1911, we represented 200,000 people.

Imagine how much different our jobs would be if we had 200,000 constituents to represent, to go talk to, to understand, to make sure that we reflected their views. We would be better. We would be more representative.

There are only two countries in the world with parliamentary democracies that represent more people than we do: India and Afghanistan. We are the crazy outlier, right?

Let's expand the House and make us more representative. If we did that based on the last Census, that would add something like 130 seats to this House.

Again, it would add further electors. It would make us more diverse. It would bring in a new group of people. It would make us better, make us more representative.

The third, because I know there are a lot of constitutional originalists in the room, is to restore the Supreme Court to its Article III responsibilities.

If my colleagues haven't read it in a while, I encourage them to go read Article III of the Constitution that lays out the scope of the Supreme Court. It says that they are responsible for matters of admiralty law, maritime law, matters relating to ambassadors, disputes between the States, and in such appellate jurisdictions the Congress may see fit to provide from time to time.

If we have a Court that is consistently not fulfilling the will of the American people, if we have a Court that is consistently encroaching on our power here in this Chamber, overturning our judgments and what we do, it is in our power to perhaps see fit from time to time to reduce their appellate jurisdiction.

So, what we have said is: Let's reduce their appellate jurisdiction to the circuit courts, and let's depoliticize judge selection processes. If the courts are going to say that a law that we passed is unconstitutional, we will select from a pool of circuit court judges, appellate court judges, at random, and it will take at least 70 percent of them to overturn a bill that we pass out of here.

It takes two-thirds for us to overturn a veto, right? Let's hold them to the same standard. Let's not make this political. Let's get enough people involved in the pool that you can't politicize this. Do it for the good of making this place work.

Also, it would eliminate the shadow docket. Why do we allow ourselves to continue to live in a world where the Supreme Court can just decide to rule on something and not even explain it? How do you work as a lawyer if you don't know that? Let's get rid of the shadow docket.

I am not perfect. You aren't perfect, Mr. Speaker. None of us in this room are perfect. Our Founders weren't perfect, but we are perfectible, and we have a job that affords us the opportunity and the responsibility to make our government a little bit better, a little bit more responsive, a little bit more democratic to move the baton forward.

I would submit that that is just an amazing privilege. I am grateful to have it. I am grateful to serve with all of my colleagues.

I hope I can get the support of this body and my colleagues to redouble our commitments to make our government better, to make sure that we honor Jefferson's promise to tune it and tweak it if it is not carrying out the majority will, and to pass that baton forward to whoever follows us up to be in a little better position than we had ourselves.

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

THREATS FACING CONSERVATIVE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the threats facing conservative speech in this country. When members of government take it upon themselves to declare certain speech illegal or undesirable, they effectively silence opposition. This isn't the American way.

We have seen this kind of censorship in Saudi Arabia, Communist China, and Soviet Russia. We never want to see it in America.

Tonight, we are gathered to call attention to a shocking, coordinated attempt by progressives in business and government to suppress dissent, stifle debate, and threaten free speech.

Last week, one of the largest satellite TV providers, DIRECTV, chose to deplatform Newsmax from their lineup.

Newsmax is the fourth highest-rated cable news channel and is watched by more than 25 million Americans. This decision means that more than 13 million homes will lose access to Newsmax programming.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, Democratic members of the Energy and Commerce Committee wrote to AT&T and DIRECTV encouraging the censorship of One America News, FOX News, and Newsmax. Two years later, two out of three of those networks are now deplatformed.

One year ago, after pressure from Democrats, AT&T and DIRECTV removed the One America News Network from its programming, and now DIRECTV has removed Newsmax.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has immediate jurisdiction over the business interests of DIRECTV. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand why AT&T and DIRECTV felt pressured to comply with committee demands.

Simply put, Democrats in that committee disagreed with the content coming out of One America News Network and Newsmax and decided they wanted them canceled.

This is a clear case of free speech infringement and viewpoint discrimination. Government colluding with telecommunications giants should chill us all.

We are facing a concerted, unabashed effort to shrink the limits of debate by corporations in an unholy alliance with political activists and their government avatars. These companies have become willing prosecutors of dissent.

Woke corporations are actively interposing themselves between Americans and the conversations they need to have. Why? Because they are afraid, afraid that the lessons they learned in progressive universities won't stand up to objective scrutiny; afraid that vigorous debate breeds societies of citizens, not sheep; above all, afraid that if they cannot anoint themselves enlightened arbiters, their ideas will just have to stand on their own merits like the rest of us.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to rethink their desire to silence opposition. The people who want to silence opponents are people who can't win debates.

I urge American businesses to stiffen their spines and stand up in favor of free speech and open speech.

We acknowledge that we may never know the exact mindset of the decisionmakers who decided to join hand in glove with progressives' drive to silence their opposition, but what we know is more than enough.

Democrats asked, and DIRECTV delivered. Progressives spoke up, and One America News was silenced. Newsmax is now on the chopping block.

Where does that leave us? Under the lengthening shadow of censorship or at the beginning of a new era when freedom fights back.

I know what side I will be on. Which one will you join?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague from the Tar Heel State.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado and my colleagues will show in this hour that censorship of conservative voices proliferates among social media and other tech companies, banks and other commercial service providers, and massive public companies and capital markets pursuing ESG policies.

As Mr. BUCK suggested, it is worse than that because the leading and most insidious censors, whose predominant selection of conservatives to victimize, by the way, as only an aside, are the powerful and secretive agencies of Federal law enforcement and the so-called intelligence community.

□ 1830

In only the most recent example of this egregious wrongdoing, and solely due to the commendable voluntary disclosure by a social media company of the Twitter files, we now know that not only the FBI but also the ODNI, NSA, and CIA audaciously abused their power to coordinate Big Tech and Big Media to suppress from circulation information that was highly significant to the 2020 Presidential election; namely, the New York Post's Hunter Biden laptop story.

But even this jaw-dropping disclosure focusing on an isolated document brings home just how insidious, how brazen the conduct of these massive and unaccountable agencies has become.

Here is one. Twitter files Number 7, Tweet 15, by one of the reporters with integrity, Michael Shellenberger: My colleagues at the Fort had a query for you. This is from Elvis Chan at the FBI to Yoel Roth at Twitter.

My colleagues at the Fort is a reference to Fort Meade, the headquarters of the National Security Agency. He says that Twitter no longer provides their data feed, as they had in earlier years apparently, and asked if they would be willing to change it.

Their data feed; comments, postings of 77 million Americans and more than 330 million people worldwide.

My colleagues, Mr. Chan says, are currently contracting with a vendor for an analytic tool for open-source intelligence. The commercial version of this tool includes the Twitter data feed. However, the feed was disabled because

the vendor said they did not want to violate their terms of service with Twitter.

My colleagues are wondering if Twitter would be open to revising its terms of service to allow this vendor to continue having access to the Twitter feed.

This representative of the FBI is asking for Twitter to reverse its policy to allow government agencies to conduct analytics on the discourse of the American people; mass surveillance of the public conversation; collection and preservation, so it can be searched at will by government bureaucrats for whatever purposes.

And note, he makes reference to the provision of this, not to the FBI, but ''to members of the IC,'' the intelligence community.

Bad enough if this were the FBI, but he is talking about the agencies who are supposed to direct their attention abroad for the sake of American security and, instead, they are seeking mass surveillance on Americans' utterances and those of unsuspecting people the world over.

A good Democrat, William Proxmire said, power always has to be kept in check. Power exercised in secret, especially under the cloak of national security, is doubly dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, in the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government, we will plumb the depths of powerful agencies gone rogue; and then this Congress must act to keep in check power exercised in secret.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, the Grand Canyon State (Mr. BIGGS), America's favorite Arizona podcaster.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this.

In years past, I would imagine that this particular issue would draw people from both sides of the aisle to come and protest the marriage of Big Business, Big Tech, and Big Government, to silence dissenting voices in this, what once was the freest Nation in the history of the world.

Censorship is an authoritarian tool used to keep power by suppressing dissent. It is done, in our case, under the myth of keeping Americans safe. Conservatives, though, are playing against a stacked deck. This administration is doing the stacking.

Last year, for instance, the Department of Homeland Security attempted to establish the Orwellian disinformation governance board, ultimately having to walk that back but, in reality, they just gave it another name and they will continue to try to suppress conservative voices.

We learned months later that Facebook implemented a special portal where government officials can request the censorship of specific posts.

Ahead of the 2020 election, unelected, deep state bureaucrats coordinated with major social media companies to ensure that the contents of Hunter Biden's laptop would be suppressed, right before an election.

Users could not even share a link to the New York Post story to read the report for themselves, and Twitter even locked the New York Post's account and others for simply sharing the report.

Facebook spied on individuals' private messages and reported users to the FBI if they questioned the 2020 election.

Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram and others removed a sitting United States President from their platforms. Meanwhile, Twitter allowed Iran's Ayatollah Ali Khamenei to tweet horrific messages and tweets, without so much as deleting the tweets.

And we wonder, we wonder, why Americans feel threatened by their own government, and why polling consistently tells us that our governmental institutions are viewed with disrepute by the American people.

The moderators of these platforms have put their thumb on the scale of debate and have targeted conservatives over and over. But censorship does not just occur online, it can occur in the chilling of speech and the removal of debate altogether. We see that on college campuses, where students are fearful of retaliation if they express a conservative viewpoint.

We have seen this administration target concerned parents attending school board meetings to protect their First Amendment activity by likening them to domestic terrorists.

Recently, we have watched as Democrats, instead of promoting free speech, wrote a letter demanding that AT&T, that Alphabet, Hulu, Apple, Comcast, Roku, et cetera, remove three conservative media outlets from their programming. They have taken down OAN, and they have now notified Newsmax they are going to take them down.

We know what happens in nations where you have the Big Government utilizing the power of the marketplace through Big Business, and now the marriage of Big Tech. We know that that leads to something that I call fascism. That is what we see happening in this once and, hopefully, future great Nation today.

The idea, '' . . . that ideas can be dangerous; but that the suppression of ideas is fatal to a democratic society. Freedom itself is a dangerous way of life, but it is ours.''

That statement was originally issued in May of 1953 by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association.

I am suggesting that we have the courage to allow free speech, free thought, free debate in this great Nation.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, the Palmetto State, one of Biden's many vacation spots (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate him for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, as citizens of the United States of America, we are privileged to have a constitutional right of free speech. This right entitles us to the ability to speak, but not the right to be heard.

Favoring liberal voices over conservative ones, while pretending to be neutral, is both hypocritical and profoundly unfair. However, no law compels private companies to be fair and evenhanded arbiters of information.

Censorship of conservatives online and by Big Tech has become a commonly used mechanism by the left to silence conservatives. Silencing people because you simply disagree with them dangerously infringes on the rights of free speech as protected in the First Amendment of our Constitution.

When I learned that DIRECTV dropped Newsmax from its channels, I was outraged. Newsmax is the fourth highest-rated cable news channel and is watched by 25 million Americans.

Everyone should be allowed to choose what news outlets they want to hear from, especially with the dominance of the democratic media. I frequently reach a wide audience of my constituency to communicate the ongoings of Congress and can personally speak to how large the audience is based on the feedback I receive from my constituents in South Carolina's Fifth District and from other States.

I am glad that House Republicans will hold hearings on this matter to get to the bottom of the blatant censorship of conservative views so that we will know, once and for all, if DIRECTV has been selectively targeting Newsmax.

DIRECTV should be held accountable for its actions, and I fully stand behind conservatives having their voices heard.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), the best dentist in Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, not many have tasted true freedom like Americans have because, in all of the world, there is no place like the United States of America.

But if we are not careful, this unique experiment that has persevered through depression, famine, sickness, terrorism, world wars, and a civil war will disappear before our very eyes.

The French philosopher Montesquieu wrote that ''the deterioration of every government begins with the decay of the principles upon which it was founded.'' This statement is as true today as it was in 1748.

Right now, we are literally witnessing the decay of our freedoms of speech. For years, we have watched one political party silence and discredit those they disagree with by deplatforming them, censoring them, shadow-banning them, and suppressing their ability to reach the public.

We have seen this tactic used against duly elected Members of Congress, professionals in countless fields, conservative media outlets like Newsmax and OAN, and even a sitting President.

The endless kowtowing to a political faction with an agenda so radical that you either have to bend the knee or be exiled goes against the very fabric of our Constitution. It is un-American, and it is a disgrace.

The left treats debate or, God forbid, even a simple difference of thought, as public enemy number one. Why is our freedom of speech so threatening to the democratic narrative?

We cannot stand idle while our freedoms are being extinguished. As President Reagan said, ''freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.''

I don't want my 17 grandchildren to spend their sunset years telling their children and their children's children what it was once like in the United States, when men and women were free.

We must ensure that America remains that beacon of hope, the city on a hill, a nation with a dream that anyone can grasp if they only have the courage to dare.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the Old Dominion State, the State for Lovers (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership, his continued leadership on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness, more awareness to the continued censorship of conservative voices.

Leftist bias and discrimination continues to threaten a diversity of thoughts and viewpoints being represented in the public arena. It is not hard to find examples of conservative voices being silenced.

In fact, we know that Democrats and the White House have been colluding with private companies in recent years to censor and eliminate conservative voices.

In fact, back in February of 2021, Democrats on the Energy and Commerce Committee went so far as to write and ask AT&T's DIRECTV to censor OAN, FOX News Channel, and Newsmax. Then, in January of 2022, AT&T-owned DIRECTV complied and dropped OAN from their platform and their channel lineup.

Now they are planning to do the same thing with Newsmax, the fourth highest-rated cable news channel, or the fourth most popular one, and a top-20 cable channel overall.

Meanwhile, DIRECTV carries 10 to 12 liberal news channels with a much lesser audience, and actually pays them to be on their platform.

It is wrong for DIRECTV to make nonbusiness decisions for ideological reasons that are in direct conflict with the interests of their customers, their employees, and their shareholders.

Worse yet, it is wrong for DIRECTV to utilize their business to suppress conservative voices by infringing on the constitutional freedoms of speech and the freedom of the press because Newsmax is actually a media company that is trying hard to hold government accountable.

Why else would DIRECTV drop one of their most popular channels?

□ 1845

DIRECTV's actions are just another example of Big Tech and big media being leveraged to discriminate against conservative voices.

Whatever happened to classic liberalism where we allowed a variety of viewpoints to be heard and let people think for themselves?

Republicans must conduct appropriate oversight to determine the degree to which Democrats in Congress and the White House are colluding with media companies to suppress First Amendment freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUCK for doing this and putting this together.

Blatant attacks on conservative speech are truly nothing new. First, the left and Big Tech removed a sitting President from social media platforms. Imagine that: a sitting President removed.

Then Big Tech companies deemed conservative views on COVID ''misinformation'' and removed sitting Members of Congress from Twitter. Then these same Big Tech companies deemed the Hunter Biden story ''misinformation'' and wiped any mention of it from their platforms.

Yet, Democrats can freely post that former President Trump was involved in Russian collusion, despite that being proven a lie. Democrats in Congress can tweet anti-Semitic rhetoric with no repercussions from Big Tech or even their own party. It is unbelievable.

When an outsider of politics came in and took over Twitter, thank God, Democrats knew they were in a little bit of trouble. They did everything possible to stop the overhaul of the platform, which desperately needed to be done. It is because they knew our government was involved in censoring Americans, censoring American free speech.

Our First Amendment is unequivocally the most important right afforded to us, the most important right given to us, from our forefathers. It is a blessing from God.

We teach our children to have a voice. We teach them to stand up for what they believe in. Yet, this trend being perpetuated by the left that differing viewpoints should be censored cannot stand.

With DIRECTV making the decision to remove Newsmax, it is essentially depriving millions of Americans from hearing directly from their Representatives. It is definitely censorship, and it is departing from our Nation's, from America's, core principles.

That is why I am standing here. I am standing here, and I am fighting here for Newsmax on DIRECTV.

It is not just about Newsmax. It is about Americans' right to freedom of speech. We cannot lose the America, the America that we know and the America that we love, but we are so painfully close to losing it in so many ways, and this being the most important way.

We cannot allow the silencing of views. We must foster and encourage debate in this great country. Everybody should be at the table. All the issues should be discussed and hammered out.

Whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, or an independent, everyone deserves a voice. Everyone deserves to be heard. This is America. Everyone deserves to exercise their First Amendment right without any interference, without interference from big companies, without interference from Big Tech, without interference from government. That is what our Founders intended. That is what America is about. We have the responsibility to stand up and fight for and love that America.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who has been described as New Jersey's best dentist.

Now, we are going to Arizona's best dentist.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, censorship in America is a major problem. Congress cannot continue to deputize Big Tech to censor competition and lawful political speech.

Reforming section 230 of the Communications Decency Act is critical. That is why I have sponsored Stop the Censorship Act: to empower users with their editorial control, not government or Big Tech.

Making it worse, Big Government has colluded with Big Tech to censor American citizens and to influence elections, which is a clear and illegal violation of the Hatch Act and First Amendment. Now, we have AT&T's DIRECTV deplatforming Newsmax. It is all unacceptable.

Corrupt corporations and bureaucrats must be held accountable. We will utilize the Holman rule and all tools at our disposal in Congress.

Looking back even 10 years, it was difficult to predict the totalitarian instincts that Big Tech and fake news media now promote.

Our country was literally founded on free speech and other civil liberties. Today, the fragile Big Tech hipsters are afraid of ideas. They are afraid of open discussion. They cannot fathom how to issue a counterpoint to anyone or an idea they don't like.

Censorship is un-American. It is uncivil. It is a recipe for discontent and authoritarianism. An enforced contract between the subscriber and user protects free speech.

I thank the Congressman from Colorado for hosting this Special Order on this important issue, and I look forward to our investigations and to our reforms.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUCK for his leadership on this and thank him for bringing us together for this important conversation.

The First Amendment recognizes what we understand to be a God-given right, the right to freedom of speech and the right to free press.

Tragically, Americans have seen their government conspire against them recently. We have seen parents targeted at school board meetings. We have seen pro-life activists brought under light by the strong hand of their government.

Too many times, American companies have joined in this effort. We have seen once-great American companies become the enforcement arm of a radical, woke, left agenda. They have enforced and become the authoritarian enforcement for this effort. But Americans are aware of what is happening.

Too many times, we have seen them go after people who voiced concerns over COVID lockdowns and vaccines on social media. Now, they are going after news channels that air stories that they disagree with.

Last year, several Members on the other side of this aisle sent letters to several cable and satellite providers, including DIRECTV, demanding that they stop showing OAN, Newsmax, and Fox. In recent weeks, we have seen AT&T's DIRECTV cave to the Democrats' anti-American and Marxist demands by demonetizing Newsmax and OAN.

Many Americans are concerned. They realize that their government's suppression of speech is the mark of totalitarianism. We are committed to pushing back on this administration's attempt to silence and suppress the American people.

To those on the left, I would simply ask this: If you have to work this hard, if you have to use censorship, coercion, and suppression for your ideas to gain any traction, maybe you have bad ideas.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), a marine mom.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank all my colleagues, but unfortunately, this isn't a bipartisan group.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep concern about the state of free and diverse speech in American public life.

DIRECTV, as part of the extreme negotiation tactic, deplatformed Newsmax and silenced their unique perspective for over 13 million DIRECTV subscribers.

This negotiation tactic is a clear example of political bias against conservative news outlets like Newsmax, and it is having a chilling effect on free speech and freedom of the press.

Media outlets enjoy certain privileges as members of the fourth estate. Limiting free speech based on political views is against the spirit of the First Amendment and contrary to a country that celebrates and encourages the marketplace of ideas.

As a former newspaper owner and publisher, I know what it means to represent all viewpoints in the media and to revere that marketplace of ideas. DIRECTV has a responsibility to reassure its customers and the American people that it is not silencing Newsmax for political reasons.

I ask, and all of us are asking, that DIRECTV immediately come to the negotiation table with Newsmax and end this disruption of access rooted in political bias.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, my colleagues and everyone standing up for this. I just hope that everyone on both sides of the aisle, with all viewpoints, would stand up and fight on behalf of all of us who are now not getting a robust debate as promised by the spirit of our Founders.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), whose district borders the sweetest place on Earth, Hershey Park.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend, Mr. BUCK, for his leadership on this issue. This is quite a somewhat disturbing issue, I think, to all of us, Republicans and Democrats.

For the last 2 years, Americans have often been led to believe that anything they see and hear that does not comport with the stance of the Biden administration is somehow ''misinformation,'' whether it is criticism of COVID mandates, the fact that our border is not secure, or the authenticity of Hunter Biden's laptop.

Thanks to the Twitter files, we know that social media companies actively exploited their ideology and suppressed speech with which they disagreed. Nice, in America.

Two years ago, two of our Democrat colleagues sent letters to every cable and satellite provider calling conservative news channels FOX News, Newsmax, and One America News purveyors of disinformation and asked specifically: ''Are you planning to carry FOX News, Newsmax, both now and beyond any contract renewal date? If so, why?''

Last year, DIRECTV announced that it was deplatforming One America News and just last week they deplatformed Newsmax.

Over a million DIRECTV subscribers in Pennsylvania, hundreds of thousands in my district, no longer have access to Newsmax through their TV. Dozens and dozens of my constituents have written or called my office to voice their concern and anger about DIRECTV's actions to deplatform Newsmax. This is unacceptable.

The Committee on Oversight and Accountability will be, I very much hope and will be supporting, investigating private companies that have circumvented the First Amendment for ideological purposes, and this investigation should not be limited to social media platforms alone.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS), my good friend and a Super Bowl champion.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, KEN BUCK, a leading voice on demanding accountability from Big Tech and big media, for bringing us together tonight.

I am here to speak against the censorship of conservative outlets by AT&T and DIRECTV.

On April 16, 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., was confined in a Birmingham, Alabama, jail. His crime? Fighting Jim Crow segregation and showing the injustice to the American people through peaceful, nonviolent protest.

He shared his thoughts through a letter titled: ''Letter from Birmingham Jail.'' He gave millions of Americans the opportunity to read the thoughts of reason and one of faith in the Judeo-Christian values upon which our Nation was founded. Dr. King was someone who believed in the innate goodness of American's justice-seeking heart.

He stated in that letter: ''Injustice anywhere in this country is injustice everywhere.''

We see injustice in the canceling of conservative voices by board members and executives who cowardly hide in secret behind closed doors, using the power granted to them through the corporate name built by other American-loving business leaders. AT&T and DIRECTV have in the last 2 years deplatformed two very prominent and successful conservative platforms, OAN and Newsmax.

The cancel culture is driven by the insecure, the weak, and the intellectually lazy who work in the shadows to control the American heart. This is because they feel inept and unable through meritocracy to compete and change the American heart.

We are standing in Congress today to fight against injustice. It is an injustice that literally threatens our freedom. The power brokers of the early 1900s focused on controlling the marketplace of property, wealth, and industry. Today's power brokers are focused on controlling the marketplace of thoughts, ideas, and communication. In doing so, they steal the American people's opportunity for unity.

□ 1900

There will never be American unity without the freedom of speech, to be heard, and our thoughts to be judged by one another.

Ignorant and free can never be. Those who seek to keep us ignorant, regardless of how powerful and popular they are, are not the friends of freedom. They are not friends of the American way.

I call on all Americans to join us in this fight against censorship and preserve our freedom.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms.

HAGEMAN), my neighbor to the north from the Yellowstone State.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's America, conservatives are constantly under attack. Attempts to silence us take many forms and are perpetuated by numerous people, agencies, and corporations.

Conservatives are more often audited by the IRS, and conservative organizations are more often denied tax-exempt status than are liberals. This is an indisputable fact and has been happening at least since the Obama administration. This is, in part, the reason why voting to stop the hiring of 87,000 new IRS agents was so critical.

Conservatives are more often investigated and harassed by the Department of Justice than are liberals. The DOJ has even gone so far as to seize the cell phone of a sitting Congressman. It has raided residents of conservatives, while ignoring liberals whose actions are far worse. It has aggressively advocated for holding right-leaning Americans in jail without due process.

How many liberals have been banned or shadow-banned on Facebook, Twitter, Google, and other social and digital media sites. Scores of conservatives have been so banned, including our former President.

How many times do we see the so-called ''fact checks'' on the social media posts of conservatives while never seeing them on the posts of liberals. These ''fact checks'' have covered such topics as COVID, climate change, gun rights, crime, and actions of protestors. The fact checks are dubious at best and downright dishonest at worst.

Financial platforms such as PayPal, Venmo, and GoFundMe routinely refuse service to or censor conservatives. In the past year alone, GoFundMe has taken down fund-raisers for Kyle Rittenhouse, conservative students at Arizona State University, and from the freedom trucker convoy after having raised $9 million.

Finally, just this last week, we saw that YouTube and Facebook have censored Project Veritas in some of the most important investigative research that we have seen come out of a media company.

While all of this sounds like an impossibility to overcome, we must fight to end this bias. Through my assignments to the Judiciary Committee and the Select Committee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government, we will do exactly that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), the best Florida podcaster from the Sunshine State.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, does it feel sometimes like we are living in a crazy sci-fi movie where powerful entities and interests are trying to control what we see and what we hear and what we read? Because they ultimately want to dominate what we think and how we behave.

My fellow Americans, there is a broad effort underway to deplatform, demonetize, and destroy anyone who has a conservative America First perspective. We have seen this with ''Newsmax,'' with ''One America News.'' We saw Google work to demonetize ''The Federalist'' and my question is this: When did we become so frail as a country? When did we take the position that if we saw something we didn't agree with that somehow that would dehumanize us and limit our ability to participate in meaningful dialogue? I think we became that frail when the left started to say that words were violence, which they are not.

Speech is what liberates us from violence. It gives us an alternative path, but people get frustrated and concerned when they see that the choices that they want to make in telecommunications or the digital world are deemed unacceptable by the powers that be.

When did this realignment happen? I remember when I was in school, it was always the liberals, the classical liberals that wanted this robust marketplace of ideas, and it was a few conservatives who didn't want you to see certain things or look at certain things or read certain things. Now it has like totally flipped the script because they have such a low view of our fellow Americans.

So what are we going to do about it? The Energy and Commerce Committee should be holding hearings on this. The Department of Justice antitrust entities should be looking into whether or not this is too much of a concentration of power in entities like AT&T and DIRECTV that are stifling ''Newsmax'' and ''One America News'' and even Google's terrible work to try to demonetize ''The Federalist.''

I also believe that in the House Judiciary Committee we should ask these questions seriously and encourage the Department of Justice to take action.

By the way, if you are a shareholder out there in AT&T, I would encourage you to pursue a derivative suit. Why is it that some of these woketopians that sit on these boards in these senior leadership positions are devaluing the stock you own, limiting access to popular channels because they don't like the viewpoint? They don't like you, and they don't care about an America where the values that undergird the Constitution are more important than the terms of service that we see at Big Tech companies.

I thank my colleague, KEN BUCK, for having led on these issues for many years. There is much work ahead for the Biden administration, for Article III courts, and for this very Congress.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Grothman).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that Congressman BUCK has asked me to be a speaker this evening as we defend the U.S. Constitution.

Our U.S. Constitution is under attack like never before. I am not talking about the Second Amendment, which, of course, is disliked by so many people on the other side of the aisle. I am not talking about the right to a speedy trial, as we see in Washington, D.C., itself, people spending months and months in jail without ending their ordeal there.

I am talking about the First Amendment. Throughout my life, the First Amendment is almost the amendment that would have been most unanimously agreed to. Nevertheless, in part, I assume, because of the popular culture and in part because of our educational system, we are in a situation in which the Pew Research Center found 76 percent of Democrats support tech companies censoring online.

Even more amazing, 65 percent of the Democrats support censorship by the government. How in the world did such a large, important party in this country it become apparently the accepted view of the First Amendment to be that it is obsolete?

Just last year, the then-chairman of the Intelligence Committee wrote to Meta, the parent company of Facebook, threatening congressional action if Facebook did not continue to censor conservative views and maintain bans on conservative figures, such as the former President. Can you imagine people in this body saying the way we are going to deal with political disagreements in the future is we are just going to censor one side?

That is what is going on here.

Their message is loud and clear: Get in line, or we are going to use the levers of government to silence you. It is a chilling message, reminiscent of the practice of communists in China or Russia or Cuba.

It surprises me what open criticisms of the government you can find in Russia. In China, the Communist Party exercises complete control over the internet, restricting what its citizens can search for. It is hard to believe people in this country want this country to become more like China.

It is not unfounded. You can even bleed into freedom of religion.

In Canada, recent court rulings have held LGBTQ rights trump an individual's right to freedom of religion. Freedom of speech should be a given. Liberal college students when I was in college used to pride themselves on defending free speech.

Look at Canada, censoring views that come from the Bible. In other words, censoring religion in Canada. That is what it is coming down to in our country.

I thank my friend from Colorado for giving me an opportunity to defend the Constitution, and I hope anybody back home listening to this educates their children and grandchildren. We do not have the government censoring free speech.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's passion. I yield to the

gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), the gentleman from the Butternut State. That is a new one for me.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the Volunteer State. The Butternut State, I never heard that.

Dadgummit, Mr. Speaker, here I am again bringing attention to yet another example of our woke telecom companies targeting conservative speech. I am very glad though that they did not censor my good friend Mr. BUCK's new book ''Crushed,'' which is actually on the best seller list, I have heard. I am fired up about that, brother.

DIRECTV, of course, is co-owned by AT&T and TPG, and they have taken ''Newsmax'' off the air as we have heard.

DIRECTV says this was purely a business decision, but nobody believes that, Mr. Speaker. Big media corporations don't exactly have the best record of protecting conservative speech.

Last year, Democrats in Congress wrote letters to AT&T and other telecom companies demanding they deplatform ''Newsmax''—which is really just a fancy way of saying we are going to deny your First Amendment rights, Mr. Speaker—along with ''Fox News'' and ''One America News'' because of so-called disinformation.

After these letters were sent, DIRECTV dropped ''One America News,'' and now it appears to be doing the same thing to ''Newsmax.''

This fits a disturbing pattern, Mr. Speaker, of these woke corporations using their market dominance to censor conservative networks to appease Washington politicians and further their demands on woketopia.

After receiving lots of criticism from the American people about this decision, DIRECTV announced it would launch a new conservative network. That is great, but it is still not an excuse for deplatforming another popular network, Mr. Speaker.

Our country was built on freedom of speech, and Americans benefit from having access to a wide range of viewpoints, not just the ones approved by the liberal Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, one day they will be coming after the liberal media, and then it will be too dadgum late.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, if the stenographer needs help with dadgummit, we will try to get a spelling for her on that.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT). She is from my home State, and she is a young person who has set this place on fire since she has been here.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I have not literally lit this place on fire.

At midnight Tuesday, January 24, 2023, ''Newsmax'' was removed from DIRECTV, DIRECTV STREAM, and U-verse, denying 13 million customers this highly rated news channel.

This is not the first time that we have seen this, and I am afraid that it won't be the last time that we are seeing this here in our great country. OAN was deplatformed by DIRECTV in April of 2022.

So what is next? FOX News? Will The Weather Channel be canceled next if they refuse to bow to the left's altar of climate change? What about The History Channel? We see on a regular basis the left wants to erase history and deny truth. How about TBN? There has definitely been an increase in disdain and intolerance by many liberals for Christian beliefs, simply by saying we love Jesus. So is TBN next?

Americans are tired of cancel culture. Conservatives are not being treated fairly. We are the ones who are censored by Big Tech. We are the ones targeted and called domestic terrorists when moms and dads show up at school board meetings.

We are the ones targeted by the IRS because our organizations have the word ''patriot'' in their name.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, if you are a conservative pastor, the government persecutes you. If you are a liberal pastor, Joe Biden shows up to your church, whether he realizes he is there or not.

Yet, now we are faced with Newsmax, a conservative news organization followed and watched, again, by millions of Americans, and it has been removed from DIRECTV. Newsmax is the fourth most watched news channel, but they have been removed for hyperpolitical reasons.

What can be done? I have been asked time and time again: What do we do to rein in the censorship and the oppression of conservatives because free and open speech is worth fighting for?

The First Amendment in our Constitution defends our freedom of speech. That is something that we will continue to pursue, to preserve, and to never let the left take away from us entirely. So, here is where we will start.

AT&T: As long as you continue to censor conservatives and attack the press, I will make it my personal mission to strip the wasteful, ridiculous Federal subsidies you receive.

To AT&T, DIRECTV, and all the woke corporations: This isn't a threat. It is absolutely a promise. If you continue to stifle free speech in this great country and muzzle the press corps, Congress will have no choice but to hold you accountable. I promise you that my colleagues and I are happy to take you on to preserve free speech for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BUCK for organizing this tonight. I thank the gentleman for being a defender of free speech from the censorship that is going on. I thank the gentleman for fighting against that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and wish her safe travels back to our great State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON), who is a hunter, a fisherman, and a great American.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for yielding.

I am from Missouri, the Show Me State, and the home of Harry Truman, who said: ''Once a government is committed to the principle of silencing the voice of opposition, it has only one way to go, and that is down the path of increasingly repressive measures until it becomes a source of terror to all its citizens and creates a country where everyone lives in fear.''

This sounds like a nation that we see with China or Russia. Sadly, it is something that could happen in the United States if we are not vigilant here.

The First Amendment is this country's foundation. The diverse and competitive marketplace of ideas is the heartbeat that keeps this Republic alive. People need to be able to debate and to be able to challenge one another.

Yes, free speech means that people have the right to sometimes be wrong. Yet, over the last few years, we in the United States have ceded power as a Federal Government to Big Tech and Big Tech entities. We have executives from San Francisco to New York who have crowned themselves the free speech police for the rest of our Nation.

When Elon Musk purchased Twitter last year, he took a great step in the right direction by allowing an independent journalist to review the company's records, and their findings are now what we call the Twitter files.

It has confirmed what conservatives nationwide already knew what was going on, that Big Tech and Big Government were working together with the left to silence conservative views and voices and to relegate them to being a second-class citizen.

In one instance, the reporter found that Twitter censored the Hunter Biden laptop scandal in the middle of the Presidential election. Bari Weiss revealed that Twitter was, indeed, silencing conservative voices and shadow banning individuals. Perhaps what was most disturbing was that the FBI gave Twitter a list of accounts to shut down.

It doesn't stop there. Last year the DHS, our own Federal Government, tried to set up its own disinformation board. We see entities and businesses that the Federal Government has given special privileges to provide over-the-air television, cable television, right-of-way to deliver entertainment to the homes of individuals across America. These companies choose to silence conservative speech by first deplatforming and eliminating One America News Network and now going after Newsmax.

There is a famous quote about what happened during the Holocaust when the Nazis first came for some individuals and people said nothing. Then, eventually, they will come for you.

I say this not as a Republican or a Missourian but as a concerned citizen for a country that has these rights that were here because of the blood that was shed by thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of patriots from the time of the American Revolution until today, who fought and died so that you and I would have free speech. We must fight all the attacks against the First Amendment and uphold the values that make this country so very special.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I thank all 18 of our speakers. All 18 felt so strongly that they came here during their evening and dedicated themselves to making sure that a message was heard in America, a message that we will not tolerate censorship in this country and that we will not tolerate the left. Whether it owns a corporation or whether it is colluding with the government, we will not tolerate the unacceptable behavior of taking news shows off just because they reflect a conservative viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that many of the speakers today, many of the Members of Congress who spoke, made it absolutely clear that they are going to dedicate time, energy, and staff resources to make sure that we look into this further.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your patience and the patience of the staff here. I very much appreciate being able to speak directly to the American people.

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

MOST AMERICANS POORER TODAY THAN IN 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my friend from Georgia is enjoying the experience. In the old days when you were bad, we used to put you in the chair to have to cover Special Orders.

Would you believe I had to cover a lot of Special Orders as a freshman?

We are going to spend a couple of minutes tonight doing all sorts of things, Mr. Speaker, but one of the first things I want to walk through is: How many understand we are all poorer today than we were just a couple of years ago?

We have to stop this White House, my brothers and sisters on the left, and even others, talking about how wonderful the economy is and how well things are going. The fact of the matter is that for the vast majority of the population, you are poorer today than you were in 2019, except for a little bit of a quirk for some population in L.A.

To give you a sense, Jason Furman—you know that rightwing economist. That was sarcasm. Real wages are lower today than they were in December 2019 for every industry except retail trade and some leisure and hospitality. That is Jason Furman putting it out on social media because we have some updates today. This is off the Bloomberg Terminal from about 20 minutes ago.

One of the reasons I am also here is I represent Scottsdale-Phoenix, one of the greatest spots on Earth, particularly during the winter. Please come visit us.

My folks in the Scottsdale-Phoenix area, if you look at the index that has come out from BLS, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, their wages, they are 4.5 percent poorer today than they were just 1 year ago.

Don't tell me things are wonderful if you are a family struggling just to figure out how you cover your gas and groceries.

''Well, David, gas is down.'' The data is the data.

If you have had this type of wage growth but inflation in your area is dramatically higher than that, that gap is cruelty. That gap means you are poorer. That gap means your savings for your retirement is harder. That gap means taking care of your kids is more difficult.

When you go to the grocery store and are just trying to buy stuff for your family, somehow you seem to have a lot more—what is that old saying?—month than you do paycheck.

I am sure I just screwed up the colloquialism, but you know what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. This is our brothers and sisters out there.

Please, will this body start to give a damn about people trying to survive?

We chase shiny objects here all the time that get us on television and that make us look popular, or we can look outraged.

These are families in our neighborhood. I accept it is pages of math, but behind this math are people who are out there trying to survive.

Mr. Speaker, have you gone out and tried to buy eggs lately? I accept that is an outlier. But for the majority of our brothers and sisters in this country, you are poorer today than you were at the end of 2019, and in this, you are poorer today than you were 1 year ago.

I say to my brothers and sisters on the left that we have gone through this multiple times. We know you are not going to take responsibility, step up, and accept the responsibility for the crazy spending you pumped into the economy. Then, you created incentives not to participate in the labor force, detaching work from the morality of being there, and just also the good economics. Then, we wake up and people are poorer. Then you look at us saying: Well, we need to subsidize more.

We are looking at data on the Joint Economic Committee and Ways and Means Committee that some of this will cascade through us as a society for decades.

Mr. Speaker, we all grew up understanding the concept of the elegance of compounding interest. I get a little bit today, but then I build on that and build on that. It is the same thing in your life. You build a skill, you get paid a little bit more, and then you build a skill.

What happens when you basically create a barrier to your participation in the labor market? You have lost that compounding of life. Now, we are seeing in some of the economic literature that our brothers and sisters are going to be poorer for the rest of their lives because of economic policies that set off inflation and then crushed other things such as productivity.

I am going to get to productivity in a moment.

This chart is very recent. We were just looking at some of the cost-of-living indexes, and you do this whole deflator calculation. I am trying harder to make the charts readable. Apparently, one of the complaints I get on YouTube all the time is: ''Schweikert, I can't read your charts.'' I am trying.

Here is 2019. We were hitting this amazing spike in basically your wealth. The pandemic hit. This is where we spent a fortune subsidizing. This collapse here is your ability to buy things because your wages may have gone up, but they didn't go up as fast as inflation, meaning you are poorer. The dollars you have are less valuable.

Who is the beneficiary of this? Who benefited by you getting poorer? Here is the dirty little secret here in Washington, D.C. Borrowers. Borrowers benefit when your dollars become worth less.

Who is the biggest borrower? Seriously. Play with me for a moment. Who is the biggest borrower? Have you seen this thing called the debt clock? The United States Government is sitting around $31.5 trillion.

□ 1930

Here is the great scam, and you are all party to it: The dollars we are going to pay back the national debt are less valuable. We stripped it from you. We stripped it from your savings. We stripped it from things you are going to have to buy in the future. We devalued you and your life and your savings, and we are going to pay back the debt in deflated dollars. Biggest wealth transfer in human history.

How many people have come behind this microphone and at least attempted to apologize for what we did to working people in this country?

That is why you are going to see some crazy calculations come out over the next few months of debt to GDP. It is because we devalued the dollars we are going to pay back the debt.

Now, you and I are going to—it is a technical economic term—get screwed. I am sorry for the folks who have to keep track of what I say.

The reality of it is, as in interest rates now, we pay higher interest rates because we have devalued the U.S. dollar functionally through inflation. You are devaluing your savings.

As interest rates go up, we are now looking at some data that says in 25 years, if interest rates stay where functionally they are going right now, 100 percent of U.S. tax revenues go just to cover interest. There is no more military, no more Social Security, no more Medicare, there is nothing left because we are just covering interest. In 10 years, the United States functionally has a structural $2 trillion a year deficit.

When our brain trust comes in here and—sorry, I have got to stop being so mean. Let's back up a little.

When we come in here and we talk about our desires, we are going to balance the budget in 10 years, incredibly noble. Absolutely necessary. But $1 trillion of that shortfall is interest. We have got to pay our debts. We have got to pay the interest on our borrowing.

$1 trillion is mostly—it is a tiny bit of Medicaid, but mostly it is Medicare.

What are you going to do, not pay for medical expenses?

I am going to walk you through some solutions, and then I am going to spend the next few weeks coming behind this microphone every week we are here and trying to give solutions. There are solutions. I have got to get us all to think differently.

You need an economy that is growing at a breakneck speed. You have got to grow the size of the economy because that grows tax receipts, it grows participation in the economy, it grows Social Security. And then we need to change the single biggest component in debt—healthcare costs. That is the punch line I am going to show over and over and over and over and over.

The shortfall in Medicare is 75 percent of the next 30 years' shortfall. And it is $114 trillion. It is going to be reset. We are going to get new CBO numbers in a couple weeks, and I would bet you it is closer to $120 trillion, $130 trillion in today's valuation, so constant dollars. We are going to add 75 percent of that which is just the shortfall in Medicare.

The brain trust here keeps saying: Well, let's do ObamaCare. ObamaCare was a financing deal. It is to subsidize this group, make this group pay. We are sinners, too, on my side. Those of us on the conservative side, we tried coming up—now, it was a much more efficient and much better distribution, but it still was a financing solution: Make this side pay and this side will be subsidized. Medicare for All is just a financing bill. None of those things change what we pay. If we don't change the structural costs, the future is pretty dark.

So, look, you are poorer today than you were a year ago, even according to Jason Furman. You are poorer than you were 2 years ago, 3 years ago.

How do we fix it?

First, I am going to give you a little bit more of how deep the problem is. I would have done this chart differently, but we were doing this in a rush because we were trying to do updated numbers. Why this is important is productivity growth is crashing.

You all remember your high school economics class?

What are the two things that functionally are your paycheck? The rise in your paycheck is functionally two things: It is inflation—well, that doesn't get you anything. When you get a bigger paycheck for inflation, you are just trying to keep up. The second thing is productivity. You get paid more because you got better, faster, more efficient, more expert at what you do, or the capital equipment you are making something on, or you are using made you more productive.

We saw after the 2017 tax reform, and one of the dirty little secrets is much of that economic boom we got and those tax revenues that came with it was from expensing. It wasn't the individual tax cuts, though we loved that, but it was because businesses, organizations were incentivized to buy the best, fastest, most efficient piece of equipment because you needed to do that to be able to compete.

Expensing is a timing effect. This may be a little geeky, but let's say you go out and buy a piece of equipment, and you make widgets. Remember, we all talked about widgets. You get to depreciate it over 7 years. We changed the tax law so now you get to depreciate it this year. It is still depreciation, it is just a timing effect, whether you depreciate it over 7 years off your taxes or you take it off in this year. It is a timing effect on when we get the taxes.

The elegance of the expensing side was I bought the capital equipment, and I got more productive. Two years later, my competitors are doing the same thing. I need to buy the next piece of capital equipment. Now I need to buy the next piece of capital equipment. If you look at it on a horizon of time, it makes the entire economy, the entire society healthier, wealthier, more productive. By doing that, you actually get tax revenue growth.

Think of that, you get tax revenue growth over the horizon because you let businesses say, I made a capital investment to become more effective, more productive, and over the horizon we end up with a bigger economy, meaning we have more tax receipts.

Why wouldn't we stop the reductions that are happening right now in expensing?

Because when you look at this chart, you realize, we have got a productivity crisis. We have flatlined.

A few years ago, you know, we were running a point and a half productivity growth, meaning every year we basically got about 1.8 percent more productive than the year before. Then we hit the 1980s and through the mid-2000s, and we were less than 1 percent productivity growth. Real problem.

We are falling below 0.6 percent productivity growth since 2010. The only spike we had is that time after the December 2017 tax reform where suddenly, for that little time before COVID, we saw that investment in capital goods. If we could have just kept it going. But we went through the pandemic, and now this year there is no more 100 percent expensing. Now, I think you get to expense 80 percent, next year it is 60 percent. It goes down. We are going to lose that tool that incentivized that capital equipment.

Why that is important, I will do this in the coming weeks. The demographics of the United States is the primary driver of future debt.

Remember, I was talking healthcare?

It is also one of our greatest headwinds in productivity.

If we are getting older as a society, we have got to figure out how to encourage our older populations, would you be willing to stay in the labor force? What incentives can we do?

We have this freakish thing that I can't figure out, males under 35 aren't entering the labor force as they should, and we can see it in our productivity numbers. We have got to deal with the reality, and a lot of this makes people unhappy when I do these presentations, but it is the math.

So once again, let's go back to why this is important. This chart now is almost 2 years old. We are going to get an update in a couple weeks; and I promise you, it will be uglier. This is a combination of CBO numbers, and I think this one even—yeah, this one is CBO and I think it even had some OMB, and others on it. Punch line, we are functionally going to borrow $114 trillion from today through the next 30 years.

If you are a young person, we are about to destroy your economic future. Look at the gray hair. I have a 7-month-old boy we are adopting. When my 7-month-old boy is 25 years old, his tax rate will have to be double—double—what I pay, just to maintain baseline, and that is because of this.

Medicare has an $80.5 trillion deficit over the next 30 years, shortfall.

We do Social Security over here. Just assuming that 10 years from now, if anyone bothers to look at even the CBO update from just a few days ago, in 10 years, because they moved up the date because the COLA actually took away a year of actuarial life, you have got a 23 percent cut. If you read it, every year the cut gets a little bigger because the demographic mismatch because Social Security exists on today's receipts.

So is this place also ready to allow senior poverty to double in the country? That is what this is talking about.

But yet I was so angry last week when I came behind the microphone—I am trying not to curse here—because the left and the press were saying: Republicans are talking about cutting Social Security.

No. We are talking about trying to find some way to save it.

Do you understand? You can't pretend the math isn't there because the math will win.

Does anyone care? This is the math.

In 10 years, according to CBO from just a couple days ago, Grandma is going to take a 23 percent cut in her check, and year after year it is going to get bigger unless we do something big.

Now, you look at Social Security, up until last week I was the senior Republican over Social Security, so I am pretty good at the math. We have one actuarial dataset that if you do the 75-year life, which is how you actually look at Social Security, it is like $500 trillion short over the 75-year window. It is more than the wealth of the world.

Every day we don't do something here because it is politically distasteful because you are going to walk out the door and the press is going to run up to you and say, well, Democrats are saying a rumor that you Republicans intend to cut it.

We are trying to find a way to save it. You have weaponized it.

Then you want to know why this place runs away from the issue?

This is one of the things where if we don't hold hands and jump off the cliff together, you have just screwed over grandma and everyone else heading toward retirement.

These numbers aren't fake. This is your future.

Then I got up here last week. And I want to double-check; there was someone very smart. I do look at most of the comments. This one has had 300,000 views on YouTube since last week. Thank you for those who are insane enough to watch this because a year ago I would have like 12 people, and I couldn't even get my family to look at this stuff.

When we look at all—this is for the average, the couple that pays into Social Security, they will pay in over a lifetime—so let's just use, I think it is based on, the 40-quarter formula—about $625,000. You are going to get back about $698,000, and that is in constant dollars, so you get a little spiff.

You would make a hell of a lot more money if 20 or 30 years ago we had allowed workers to take a little sliver of their Social Security and put it in the market, you would have been much wealthier, but that became a political war. Remember, AARP and the Democrats beat the crap out of President Bush for even talking about it.

The question we had on YouTube was, is this both sides? Is this the employer contribution and the worker's contribution?

Yes, it is both sides. When we look at these numbers it is the total in. Social Security, you get back most of your money.

The folks on there who say, well, for Social Security and Medicare, just give me back my money, and I will be happy, we would take that deal as a government in a moment. We will give you back every dime if you promise never to take another dime of Social Security and Medicare.

Here is the punch line: On Medicare, remember three-quarters of Medicare comes out of the general fund. The tax portion of your FICA is just the little portion we call Medicare part A. It is hospital and some doctor there.

□ 1945

So the average couple will only pay about $161,000 in a lifetime. That is someone who is retiring right now; $161,000 in Medicare taxes, and they are going to take out 522. See the 1-to-5 ratio? This right here is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt over the next 30 years. It is healthcare costs.

How many Members of Congress are stupid enough to get behind this microphone and tell the truth? But it is the truth. It is the math. And you can't pretend.

And you read the comments and you want to just reach out and say, I know the political classes lied to you for years but you have got to stop living in the lunacy world.

Well, get rid of salaries for Members of Congress.

Okay. It pays for 28 minutes of an entire years' worth of borrowing.

What would you like to do with the rest of the year?

Well, let's get rid of foreign aid.

Okay. You just got rid of a couple weeks of borrowing for an entire year.

People don't see the scales. It is hard to do 14 zeros in your head, but we have been trying to put this together, even all sorts of the Democrat proposals.

Well, go to a 70 percent tax rate. Great, we took care of another 6 weeks of borrowing.

The political class has been unwilling to tell the truth. Republicans get up: Oh, well, we will get rid of waste and fraud and foreign aid.

The Democrats: Well, rich people don't pay enough taxes.

You lay them all out, you don't get near the borrowing. And understand, the borrowing doubles in 10 years because of the structural deficit driven mostly by what I was showing there. And you start to look at the math. This is all the entitlements. Yes, there is other crap that are mandatory spending. These are earned entitlements. You earned it. You worked a certain amount of quarters. You hit a certain age.

You see the chart. It is everything. These over here, this is Federal retirement. This is veterans benefits. Those are also earned.

We call them mandatory because it is a fixed formula but you can't pretend this isn't real. What scares me also on this—I know this chart is almost unreadable—we mapped out the Congressional Budget Office's modeling. And it would just show you they are almost overly optimistic all the time, that the numbers historically come in much worse than the models we get, because it is hard to predict the next pandemic, the next recession, the next war. So be careful, because often the Congressional budget numbers we get, are the best-case scenario.

Now, I am just going to do this really quickly. If I came to you right now and said, okay, healthcare is the vast majority of all future debt. Change the price of healthcare. Well, the moral thing is legalize technology, legalize the type of technology where you can take care of yourself, but it also cures.

There are amazingly wonderful things happening. And I am going to do more of this over the coming weeks. The optimism that, if we would actually understand, instead of just moving the pieces around on the table, Oh, we will cut this but we will shift it to the State. We will cut this, and we will shift this to the individual. That is not a cut. The spending stays the same as the size of the economy.

There is a reason you didn't go to Blockbuster Video last weekend. There was a technology revolution. You no longer get that silver disk. You hit a button at home.

We are on the edge right now of curing stunning numbers of cancers. What would happen in healthcare when you start to see that, when you actually start to see ideas like this?

Not too far from here, I think it is 60, 70 miles, there is a co-op going up here in Virginia that is going to make eight types of off-patent insulin, and they are going to do it less than the subsidized price than the Democrats passed last year. As a matter of fact, what the Democrats did almost screwed up the co-op's model.

How do we encourage more competition? If you want to crash the price of pharmaceuticals, get everyone and their cousin making pharmaceuticals.

Remember, the vast majority of drugs you and I consume of pharmaceuticals are off-patent. Humira is off-patent; the most expensive drug in our society. We are waiting for that competition to come in to start to crash that price.

The other things that are happening around us, when we start to see early Phase 1's, that there are paths that are having remarkable opportunities to cure our brothers and sisters. I have come here and done entire presentations on the stem cell CRISPR treatment for diabetes. I am going to end on this:

Diabetes is 33 percent of all healthcare spending. It is 31 percent of all Medicare spending.

I know it is hard. I know it means changing. The six people cured right now are on type 1. Type 2 is difficult. It has some real societal implications and would be the most moral, compassionate thing we could do as brothers and sisters here, to put the resources in. And maybe a decade from now you could crash the deficit by curing our brothers and sisters and changing their lives.

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

AERIAL FIRE RETARDANT TO PROTECT HUMAN LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that I associate myself with the remarks from the gentleman from Arizona and hope that many people listen to his important messages that he provides for us.

Mr. Speaker, standing here in front of, what some would say, a beautiful picture, this is a photo of a fire that occurred near Grand Coulee Dam in my district about 1½ years ago to help depict something that I want to bring some attention to this evening in this Special Order.

My friend from Montana, Mr. ROSENDALE, and I, and several others, will be talking about something that is critical to the people in the Western United States. The communities across this country who will be absolutely devastated if a radical environmental group gets its way in a courtroom in the State of Montana.

Now, for those of you who may be unfamiliar with the Western part of the United States, let me just tell you a couple things.

In many parts of the West, it gets very, very dry. And in the summertime, that dryness is coupled with extreme heat. And this can—although it makes for some gorgeous, beautiful days, but you may have heard it often leads to catastrophic wildfires that devastate forests, lives, property, and even full communities.

Now, fire in the forest is a natural occurrence and it is an important part of that forest's lifecycle. But as many of us have been saying for many years, and many of you know, much of our forest has been poorly managed, if managed at all. There are decades of buildup of dead trees, and brush, that are on our forest floors so that fires in recent years have been truly catastrophic, leaving swaths of our National Forest, nothing but ash, dead trees, blackened trees laying all over the Earth, scorched Earth that cannot produce another crop of trees.

In my district, in Okanogan County, the Whitmore fire back in 2021, burned through almost 60,000 acres destroying several structures on the Colville Indian Reservation and had as many as 500 residences under level 2 evacuations. It was devastating.

But through the hard, backbreaking work of firefighters doing everything that they absolutely could do to protect those communities, I am happy to say that no lives were lost and it was successfully contained.

I think I can say that everyone in this room agrees that we have to do something about these catastrophic fires. And also, I think I can say that when faced by fire, we can all agree that we must utilize every tool in our toolbox to help prevent those fires from endangering human lives.

I cannot say the same about a group that calls themselves the FSEEE. For some reason, this organization, the FSEEE, have decided to use a provision of the Waters of the United States Rules, or WOTUS, and put the lives of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people, at risk by removing one of the most important tools that we have to fight fires in the West, and that is, aerial fire retardant.

For those who don't know, aerial fire retardant is dropped around a wildfire's edges in an effort to contain its spread and allow ground crews, those that are fighting fires by hand, the time that they need to help extinguish the blaze. Firefighters calls this painting the box, and use the respite that the retardant line gives them to safely build a defensible line to hold the fire.

Aerial fire retardant is generally considered non-toxic but the Forest Service prohibits placing these fire retardants directly into water bodies or into buffer zones that surround water bodies with one allowed exception: to protect human life and safety.

Between 2012 and 2019, less than 1 percent of Forest Service retardant drops were made into water that was allowed under this exception.

According to the FSEEE, by protecting human life and safety, the Forest Service has violated the Clean Water Act for discharging aerial fire retardant into navigable waters without an NPDES, or a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit.

Even though the regulations for administering the NPDES system specifically state that fire control is exempted and communications from EPA dating back all the way to 1993 indicate a permit was not required for firefighting efforts.

Now, if this group wins this case or even receives an injunction, the Forest Service and other firefighting organizations would be prevented from aerially dropping fire retardant nationwide during the coming 2023 fire season, and even beyond, until they acquire this permit, the NPDES permit, which as many of you know, can literally take years to secure.

Now, if you haven't already connected the dots, this would be catastrophic for Western communities who routinely experience wildfires.

The 2023 fire season, if you didn't know, has already started in the drier parts of the country. It has already burned through over 11,000 acres this month, January, alone. The FSEEE claims to be doing this for environmental reasons. I asked them:

How environmentally friendly is it to release millions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere when these fires can't be controlled?

How environmentally friendly is it to have burned soil, ash choke our rivers and our streams?

How environmentally friendly is it to wipe out entire ecosystems, plant life, wildlife, the trees, the birds, the wild animals?

And even if the FSEEE were able to prove me wrong on every single one of these points, is all this worth the cost of human life?

Firefighters risk their lives to protect our communities, other people, and our forests, and we should listen to them when they tell us that fire retardant makes their job safer, and it truly is an essential tool to protect lives.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in truly utter disbelief that I even have to make this statement. That, no, the value of a human life is far beyond that of some possible incidental disruption to aquatic ecosystems that would be equally, or more accurately, more damaged by the toxic runoff of ash following a wildfire.

□ 2000

We did ensure that fire retardant remains available to our firefighters for this 2023 fire season and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to my friend from Montana, Mr. ROSENDALE, who is co-leading this Special Order with me, for his comments from his great State.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, i thank Representative NEWHOUSE for chairing the Western Caucus and bringing this very important issue and lawsuit to light.

Let me begin by quoting President Dwight Eisenhower when he said farming looks mighty easy when you live a thousand miles away from a cornfield and use a pencil for a plow.

The problem that we face on a regular basis across our Nation is that far too many individuals who are completely removed from the issues are making decisions about how to address them. This is exactly the case when we look at the current lawsuit against the United States Forest Service.

First, let's shed a little bit of light on the litigants, the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics. As Representative NEWHOUSE described them, the FSEEE is not a group of Forest Service employees. They are a radical group out of Oregon whose goal is to stop humans from properly managing forests while lining their own pockets with taxpayer dollars after a settlement.

The result? Severe air and water quality degradation and the risk of thousands of lives and livelihoods.

Fire retardant is a vital and effective tool for Montanans and rural communities, slowing the spread of fires and minimizing damage.

Wildfires burned more than 7.5 million acres across the United States in 2022. This number could easily be doubled or tripled if not for the use of safe and effective fire retardants that the litigants are suing to prohibit the use of.

Anyone who has visited the site of a wildfire, even years afterward, recognizes the devastation and destruction

they cause, both short and long term. The soil is rendered sterile because of the immense heat generated, resulting in no productive vegetation growth for years after the fire. This lack of vegetative cover then leads to major erosion problems and a dramatic reduction in water quality, severely damaging the fisheries, and the elimination of food and habitat for wildlife.

On top of that, the reduction in air quality during wildfires is so severe that anyone who hasn't lived through it couldn't even comprehend the effects on a community.

I have driven through these smoke-choked areas in broad daylight and had to use my headlights because the visibility was reduced so dramatically because the smoke was so thick.

I have spoken with young and old alike who have been hospitalized due to severe respiratory conditions as a direct result of the smoke and the particulate that is produced by these wildfires.

In Montana, we see thousands of acres burn every single year, and these wildfires pose a major threat to our way of life. We see property destroyed and crops decimated. It cripples our economy and slows our tourism.

Montana is proud to have a dedicated team of first responders and pilots who fight tirelessly to contain these wildfires utilizing these retardants. Because of their ability to utilize this tool and mitigate fire risk, ways of life in rural communities are preserved, and those who choose to live in remote areas are able to do so safely.

Wildland firefighters work to protect communities and forests from the spread of wildfires, and the aerial application of fire retardant has proven to be the most effective method of containment.

This method is crucial at a time when government regulations tie our hands in regard to proper forest management. If it were not for these draconian regulations, fewer fires would be burning, and much of the retardant complained about would not even be necessary.

Montanans have a proud tradition of responsible stewardship of our land and water resources. A simple review of State and private land conditions, as compared to the Federal lands of Montana, will prove that.

The claims by environmentalists that our efforts to contain wildfires are harming our watersheds are blatantly false. According to the Forest Service's environmental impact study, 1/100th of 1 percent of all fire retardant drops spilled into the water. This was done either inadvertently or under the allowed exception to protect life and safety. This is because our first responders follow already-existing rulings prohibiting the delivery of fire retardant directly into bodies of water.

We recognize the need for clean water. It is obvious that keeping our water clean is very important for our agricultural industry, our energy production, critical infrastructure development, and certainly for all of our citizens.

I also ask those who allege these claims to remember that wildfires do not discriminate. They spread wherever there is fuel and, if left unchecked, can and will further threaten protected water and lands.

The consequences of a future ruling preventing the use of fire retardants are especially dire for Montana. If this were to happen, catastrophic wildfires would threaten thousands of lives, millions of dollars in assets, with immeasurable destruction to air, land, and water quality.

This lawsuit is a continuation of the radical environmentalists' agenda that has been waging war against Western and rural communities. Simply put, these environmentalists literally want to watch the world burn. I won't stand by silently and allow that to happen.

This case needs to be thrown out. Please join me in fighting these misguided lawsuits, which strive to gain revenue from taxpayers at the expense of property and the lives of people across Montana and the rest of the country.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. ROSENDALE, I appreciate that, especially coming from the State of Montana. Your State, just like mine, has seen record catastrophic fires over the last several years.

Thousands of acres have been destroyed throughout the Western United States, millions of dollars of damage, lives lost, and communities that have been totally destroyed. Untold numbers of wildlife have been lost. These fires have literally changed the landscape of our national forests for generations.

The carbon dioxide being emitted from these devastating fires surpasses the auto emissions in just 1 year. The smoke from these fires has even recently come as far as Washington, D.C. I had hoped that that would get people's attention.

We are dealing with that on a regular basis all summer long in the communities that I represent and that Mr. ROSENDALE represents, causing health issues and tainting agricultural crops. It truly is an issue that is hurting our quality of life.

If this court case is lost, the situation is going to get much worse. We cannot let this happen.

To help tell the story that we are facing in the Western United States, another Western Caucus member from the great State of Idaho, the Gem State, Mr. RUSS FULCHER, is here.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the State of Washington and my colleague from the State of Montana and I share some very similar concerns and some very similar demographics, so I am here to rise in opposition to the attempts to ban any kind of aerial fire retardant.

Currently, the Forest Service is facing litigation that, if its opponent is successful, could result in the loss of this critical firefighting tool.

Aerial fire retardant helps slow the spread of wildfires and creates a barrier between the fire and unburned fuel load. This makes it easier for ground crews to access and extinguish fires. It can be applied quickly in hard-to-reach areas where the ground crews cannot get access.

Additionally, aerial fire retardant can help protect homes and other structures, as well as reduce the amount of smoke produced by the fire.

We are seeing the catastrophic results of years of neglect and mismanagement by the Federal Government. It comes in the form of more frequent and more destructive wildfires. These fires not only do more harm to people and property but also to nature itself.

If I can be very clear, our Federal resources are overwhelmed. In my own State, two-thirds of the land mass, or nearly two-thirds, is Federal land. They simply don't have the capacity to manage these lands, and so they don't.

That results in wildfire, and we need every tool in the toolbox we possibly can access to fight it.

As we prepare for the 2023 fire season, we must maximize these tools at our disposal in order to better fight the fires that threaten our local communities, economies, environment, and health.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. FULCHER, thanks for relating your experiences in the great State of Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, fires are a huge problem in this country. We have been working hard over the time I have been here in Washington, D.C., to make this problem better.

This action, if this court decision moves forward, as we think it might, is going to take us back years. It is going to make the problem considerably worse. We must not let this happen.

I thank Mr. ROSENDALE from Montana for helping lead this Special Order and Mr. FULCHER from Idaho for sharing with us his thoughts from his home State. I thank members of the Western Caucus, almost a hundred of us strong in this Congress, for focusing on this issue and bringing to the attention of the American people how important this court decision could be for the future of our national forests.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
January 31, 2023.

Hon. CHERYL L. JOHNSON
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. JOHNSON: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce for the

118th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
Chair.

RULE 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Rules of the Committee. —The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (the ''Committee'') and its subcommittees so far as is applicable.

(b) Rules of the Subcommittees.—Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as is applicable. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each subcommittee of the Committee.

RULE 2.—BUSINESS MEETINGS/MARKUPS

(a) Regular Meeting Days.—The Committee shall meet on the fourth Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., for the consideration of bills, resolutions, and other business, if the House is in session on that day. If the House is not in session on that day and the Committee has not met during such month, the Committee shall meet at the earliest practicable opportunity when the House is again in session. The chair of the Committee may, at his or her discretion, cancel, delay, or defer any meeting required under this section, after consultation with the ranking minority member.

(b) Additional Meetings.—The chair may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to that call of the chair.

(c) Notice.—The date, time, place, and subject matter of any meeting of the Committee (other than a hearing) shall be announced at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting. In no event shall such meeting commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which members have notice thereof.

(d) Agenda.—The agenda for each Committee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours in advance of such meeting.

(e) Availability of Texts.—No bill, recommendation, or other matter shall be considered by the Committee unless the text of the matter, together with an explanation, has been available to members of the Committee for three days (or 24 hours in the case of a substitute for introduced legislation). Such explanation shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the matter to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(f) Waiver.—The requirements of subsections (c), (d), and (e) may be waived by a majority of those present and voting (a majority being present) of the Committee or by the chair with the concurrence of the ranking member, as the case may be.

RULE 3.—HEARINGS

(a) Notice.—The date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee shall be announced at least one week in advance of the commencement of such hearing, unless a determination is made in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner.

(b) Memorandum.—Each member of the Committee shall be provided, except in the case of unusual circumstances, with a memorandum at least 48 hours before each hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the hearing and (2) the names of any witnesses.

(c) Witnesses.—(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the chair of the Committee of a written statement of his or her proposed testimony to provide to members and staff of the Committee, the news media, and the general public. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the chair. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of the argument. The chair of the Committee or the presiding member may waive the requirements of this paragraph or any part thereof.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, the written testimony of each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts or foreign government contracts and payments related to the subject matter of the hearing received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. The disclosure shall include (i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(d) Questioning.—(1) The right to question the witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes for the questioning of witnesses until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to question witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to question a witness until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose. The chair shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee or relevant subcommittee, as the case may be.

(2) The chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than 30 minutes for each side. The chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by motion, may also permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than 30 minutes for each side.

(3) Each member may submit to the chair of the Committee additional questions for the record, to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the clerk of the Committee no later than 10 business days following a hearing. The chair shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witnesses and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record. After consultation with the ranking minority member, the chair is authorized to close the hearing record no earlier than 120 days from the date the questions were transmitted to the appropriate witnesses.

RULE 4.—VICE CHAIR; PRESIDING MEMBER

The chair shall designate a member of the majority party to serve as vice chair of the Committee, and shall designate a majority member of each subcommittee to serve as vice chair of each subcommittee. The vice chair of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, shall preside at any meeting or hearing during the temporary absence of the chair. If the chair and vice chair of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting or hearing, the most senior ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at the meeting or hearing.

RULE 5.—OPEN PROCEEDINGS

Except as provided by the Rules of the House, each meeting and hearing of the Committee for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing, shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, consistent with the provisions of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 6.—QUORUM

Testimony may be taken and evidence received at any hearing at which there are present not fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee in question. A majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for those actions for which the House Rules require a majority quorum. For the purposes of taking any other action, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

RULE 7.—OFFICIAL COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a)(1) Documents reflecting the proceedings of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form on the Committee's website and in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(e) of the Rules of the House not more than 24 hours after each meeting has adjourned, including a record showing those present at each meeting; and a record of the vote on any question on which a record vote is demanded, including a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting.

(2) Record Votes.—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. No demand for a record vote shall be made or obtained except for the purpose of procuring a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum.

(b) Postponement of Votes.—In accordance with clause 2(h)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the chair of the Committee or a subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee, may (A) postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and (B) resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(c) Archived Records.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4 of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise

available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee. The chair shall consult with the ranking minority member on any communication from the Archivist of the United States or the Clerk of the House concerning the disposition of nonconcurrent records pursuant to clause 3(b) of the Rule.

RULE 8.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Establishment.—There shall be such standing subcommittees with such jurisdiction and size as determined by the majority party caucus of the Committee. The jurisdiction, number, and size of the subcommittees shall be determined by the majority party caucus prior to the start of the process for establishing subcommittee chairs and assignments.

(b) Powers and Duties.—Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairs shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the chair of the Committee with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(c) Ratio of Subcommittees.—The majority caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party members for each subcommittee and the chair shall negotiate that ratio with the minority party, provided that the ratio of party members on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the majority than that of the full Committee, nor shall such ratio provide for a majority of less than two majority members.

(d) Selection of Subcommittee Members.—Prior to any organizational meeting held by the Committee, the majority and minority caucuses shall select their respective members of the standing subcommittees.

(e) Ex Officio Members.—The chair and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

RULE 9.—OPENING STATEMENTS

(a) Written Statements.—All written opening statements at hearings and business meetings conducted by the Committee shall be made part of the permanent record.

(b) Length.—(1) At full committee hearings, the chair and ranking minority member shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement, and may designate another member to give an opening statement of not more than 5 minutes. At subcommittee hearings, the subcommittee chair and ranking minority member of the subcommittee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for an opening statement. In addition, the full committee chair and ranking minority member shall each be allocated 5 minutes for an opening statement for themselves or their designees at subcommittee hearings.

(2) At any business meeting of the Committee, statements shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the chair and ranking minority member (or their respective designee) of the Committee or subcommittee, as applicable, and 3 minutes each for all other members. The chair may further limit opening statements for Members (including, at the discretion of the chair, the chair and ranking minority member) to one minute.

RULE 10.—REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND OTHER MATTERS

All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of receipt by the Committee unless: (1) action is taken by the full Committee within those two weeks, or (2) by majority vote of the members of the Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. In the case of legislation or other matters within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, the chair of the Committee may, in his or her discretion, refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees for concurrent consideration, or may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and also refer the matter to one or more additional subcommittees for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), either on its initial referral or after the matter has been reported by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction. Such authority shall include the authority to refer such legislation or matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chair, with the approval of the Committee, from the members of the subcommittees having legislative or oversight jurisdiction.

RULE 11.—MANAGING LEGISLATION ON THE HOUSE FLOOR

The chair, in his or her discretion, shall designate which member shall manage legislation reported by the Committee to the House.

RULE 12.—COMMITTEE PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFF APPOINTMENTS

(a) Delegation of Staff.—Whenever the chair of the Committee determines that any professional staff member appointed pursuant to the provisions of clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who is assigned to such chair and not to the ranking minority member, by reason of such professional staff member's expertise or qualifications will be of assistance to one or more subcommittees in carrying out their assigned responsibilities, he or she may delegate such staff member to such subcommittees for such purpose. A delegation of a member of the professional staff pursuant to this subsection shall be made after consultation with subcommittee chairs and with the approval of the subcommittee chair or chairs involved.

(b) Minority Professional Staff.—Professional staff members appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, who are assigned to the ranking minority member of the Committee and not to the chair of the Committee, shall be assigned to such Committee business as the minority party members of the Committee consider advisable.

(c) Additional Staff Appointments.—In addition to the professional staff appointed pursuant to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee shall be entitled to make such appointments to the professional and clerical staff of the Committee as may be provided within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee. Such appointee shall be assigned to such business of the full Committee as the chair of the Committee considers advisable.

(d) Sufficient Staff.—The chair shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee.

(e) Fair Treatment of Minority Members in Appointment of Committee Staff.—The chair shall ensure that the minority members of the Committee are treated fairly in appointment of Committee staff.

(f) Contracts for Temporary or Intermittent Services.—Any contract for the temporary services or intermittent service of individual consultants or organizations to make studies or advise the Committee or its subcommittees with respect to any matter within their jurisdiction shall be deemed to have been approved by a majority of the members of the Committee if approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee. Such approval shall not be deemed to have been given if at least one-third of the members of the Committee request in writing that the Committee formally act on such a contract, if the request is made within 10 days after the latest date on which such chair or chairs, and such ranking minority member or members, approve such contract.

RULE 13.—SUPERVISION, DUTIES OF STAFF

(a) Supervision of Majority Staff.—The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the chair who, in consultation with the chairs of the subcommittees, shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as they determine is appropriate.

(b) Supervision of Minority Staff.—The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

RULE 14.—COMMITTEE BUDGET

(a) Administration of Committee Budget.—The chair of the Committee, in consultation with the ranking minority member, shall for the 118th Congress attempt to ensure that the Committee receives necessary amounts for professional and clerical staff, travel, investigations, equipment, and miscellaneous expenses of the Committee and the subcommittees, which shall be adequate to fully discharge the Committee's responsibilities for legislation and oversight.

(b) Monthly Expenditures Report.—Committee members shall be furnished a copy of each monthly report, prepared by the chair for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year by the Committee and subcommittees, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

RULE 15.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Any meeting or hearing that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by radio or television or still photography, subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The coverage of any hearing or other proceeding of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the chair of the Committee, the subcommittee chair, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or other proceeding and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House.

RULE 16.—SUBPOENA POWER

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the chair of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The chair shall notify the ranking minority member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the chair shall consult with the ranking minority member at least 72 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority. The chair shall report to the members of the Committee on the issuance of a subpoena as soon as practicable but in no event later than one week after issuance of such subpoena.

RULE 17.—TRAVEL OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

(a) Approval of Travel.—Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have

been approved, travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chair. Travel may be authorized by the chair for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations that involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the chair in writing the following: (1) the purpose of the travel; (2) the dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made; (3) the location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and (4) the names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b) Approval of Travel by Minority Members and Staff.—In the case of travel by minority party members and minority party staff members for the purpose set out in (a), the prior approval, not only of the chair but also of the ranking minority member, shall be required. Such prior authorization shall be given by the chair only upon the representation by the ranking minority member in writing setting forth those items enumerated in (1), (2), (3), and (4) of paragraph (a).

RULE 18.—WEBSITE

The chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purposes of furthering the Committee's legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee's activities to Committee members and other members of the House. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website for the purpose of carrying out official responsibilities, including communicating information about the activities of the minority members of the Committee to Committee members and other members of the House.

RULE 19.—CONFERENCES

The chair of the Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the chair considers it appropriate.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–282. A letter from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard for Gates and Enclosures [Docket No.: CPSC-2019-0014] received January 26, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–283. A letter from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard for Infant Swings [Docket No.: CPSC-2013-0025] received January 26, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–284. A letter from the General Counsel, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Annual Inflation Adjustment [Docket No.: NTSB-2023-0001] (RIN: 3147-AA24) received January 26, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–285. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0989; Project Identifier AD-2022-00468-E; Amendment 39-22236; AD 2022-23-09) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–286. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; AIRBUS [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1235; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00475-T; Amendment 39-22273; AD 2022-25-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–287. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0995; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01365-T; Amendment 39-22269; AD 2022-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–288. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0463; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00895-T; Amendment 39-22245; AD 2022-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–289. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1155; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00655-T; Amendment 39-22243; AD 2022-24-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–290. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0890; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00391-T; Amendment 39-22242; AD 2022-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–291. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0677; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-01378-T; Amendment 39-22230; AD 2022-23-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–292. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0881; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00424-R; Amendment 39-22233; AD 2022-23-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–293. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0015; Project Identifier AD-2021-00832-R; Amendment 39-22252; AD 2022-24-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–294. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) (Type Certificates Previously Held by Messerschmitt-Bolkow-Blohm (MBB), and Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (ECD)) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1070; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00686-R; Amendment 39-22247; AD 2022-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–295. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MarS A.S. Parachutes [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1476; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00508-Q; Amendment 39-22244; AD 2022-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–296. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1158; Project Identifier MCAI-2022-00771-E; Amendment 39-22246; AD 2022-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–297. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0906; Airspace Docket No.: 21-ASO-27] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–298. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Manchester, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1472; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AWA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–299. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brookings Airport, Brookings, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2022-1031; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ANM-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–300. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0932; Airspace Docket No.: 21-AEA-22) (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–301. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Christmas Valley Airport, OR; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0571; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ANM-46] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–302. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0940; Airspace Docket No.: 21-ASO-26] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received January 18, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 75. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID–19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs (Rept. 118–1). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. CASTEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 642. A bill to reform the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 643. A bill to establish the total number of Representatives at a number that provides that the average number of constituents represented by a Member from any State is equivalent to the number of constituents represented by the Member from the least populous State and to apportion Representatives among the States accordingly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and House Administration, 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. BONAMICI (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 644. A bill to protect borrowers of Federal student loans during the transition period following the end of the COVID-19 student loan repayment pause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. CASE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 645. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permanently authorize the use of certain funds to improve flexibility in the provision of assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. OGLES, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HUNT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. FRY, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mrs. BICE):

H.R. 646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and certain other weapons from the definition of firearms for purposes of the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 647. A bill to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MANN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FINSTAD, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 648. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BABIN, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 649. A bill to establish the National Commission on Domestic Terrorist Attacks on the United States by Antifa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 650. A bill to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L'Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 651. A bill to require the designation of composting as a conservation practice and activity, and to provide grants and loan guarantees for composting facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 652. A bill to provide grants to reduce the amount of food waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 653. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 654. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to add a work-study program for off-campus community service at selected after-school activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 656. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include child development and early learning as community services under the Federal work-study program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to clarify the career services provided to adults and dislocated workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 658. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to award grants to eligible entities to carry out or expand youth apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 659. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 660. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BACON, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. OGLES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. CLINE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FRY, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 661. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 662. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2023 to improve disaster relief funding for agricultural producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 663. A bill to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 664. A bill to require certain reports relating to defense access roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, 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 Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 665. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide authority to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration to provide a cash award to Administration employees with foreign language skills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 666. A bill to clarify the rights of certain persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KEATING, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 667. A bill to provide for a 3-day waiting period before a person may receive a handgun, with exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CHU, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BUSH, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CASE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 668. A bill to provide for the protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and interconnected Federal lands and waters, including Voyageurs National Park, within the Rainy River Watershed in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 669. A bill to restrict the first-use strike of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MOLINARO (for himself and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 670. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a clearinghouse on intellectual disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 671. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make various reforms to Social Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ELLZEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. NEHLS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. SELF, Mr. LUTTRELL, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas):

H.R. 672. A bill to establish trust funds relating to border security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MOYLAN:

H.R. 673. A bill to amend Public Law 106-504 to allow certain land in Guam to be transferred to previous recorded owners of that land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 674. A bill to codify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain landscape-scale forest restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. PALLONE (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 675. A bill to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from granting a license or United States market access for a non-geostationary orbit satellite system if the license or grant of market access would be held or controlled by an entity that produces or provides any covered communications equipment or service or an affiliate of such an entity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 676. A bill to amend the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to collaborate with State and local governments and Indian Tribes on vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, research planning, and similar activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements to Health Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 678. A bill to eliminate the position of the Chief Diversity Officer of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PEREZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. RYAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 679. A bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform

Act of 1998 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to waive the matching funds requirement under the specialty crop research initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the deduction for State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 681. A bill to reauthorize the READ Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. DUNN of Florida):

H.R. 682. A bill to facilitate access to electromagnetic spectrum for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLE, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 683. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and require review of certain agricultural transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, 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. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 684. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit the award of Federal funds to institutions of higher education that employ instructors funded by the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 685. A bill to direct the President, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to develop and carry out a strategy to seek reimbursement from the People's Republic of China of funds made available by the United States Government to address the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 686. A bill to require the continuation in effect of export controls with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 687. A bill to require certain actions relating to the United Nations Human Rights Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 688. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State to require aliens applying for certain visas to disclose if they receive funds from the Government of the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 689. A bill to prevent allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for countries that are perpetrators of genocide or state sponsors of terrorism, and to prevent United States tax dollars from directly going to the Taliban or other terrorists or terrorist-harboring nations; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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 Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 690. A bill to impose sanctions on persons engaging in transactions in Afghanistan rare earth minerals; 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 Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 691. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Kata'ib Sayyid al-Shuhada; 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 Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 692. A bill to amend the International Financial Institutions Act to provide instructions with respect to the U.S. policy on co-financing arrangements at the multilateral development banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 693. A bill to limit the detailing of directors of medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs to different positions within the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.J. Res. 23. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the Senate is made more representative by adding twelve Senators to be elected nationwide through ranked choice voting, and providing for twelve Electors at-large for President and Vice-President, who shall cast their ballots for the respective winners of the national popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMER (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. MACE, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. FALLON, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LATURNER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BUSH, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KEATING, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARSON, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BALINT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ROSS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MENG, Mr. STANTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. CROW, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CHU, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MANNING, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. MFUME, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BROWN, Ms. WILD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Res. 76. A resolution removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H. Res. 77. A resolution embracing the goals and provisions of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. COLE:

H. Res. 78. A resolution providing for a certain total number of members on certain select committees and subcommittees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LIEU:

H. Res. 79. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H. Res. 80. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 81. A resolution calling on the President to support the creation of a Special Tribunal for the Punishment of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 82. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need to designate Nigeria a Country of Particular Concern for engaging in and tolerating systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom, the need to appoint a Special Envoy for Nigeria and the Lake Chad region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. CASTEN:

H.R. 642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Reforms the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Government Reform

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Student loans

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK:

H.R. 645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Veterans Affairs

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution states: Congress shall have the power ''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 of officer thereof.''

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation is solely about the National Firearms Act.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Purusant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Modify Natural Gas Act to remove LNG export permitting process

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish an independent commission to investigate Antifa involvement in the 2020 riots

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Resolving land disputes with the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

composting

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Food waste

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The Transition-to-Success Mentoring Act is a mentorship bill related to Education.

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The Students Helping Young Students Act is a mentorship bill related to Education.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper

The single subject of this legislation is:

The purpose of the bill is regarding workforce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary, and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

The Congress shall have power . . . 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.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The purpose of the bill is regarding workforce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

The Congress shall have power . . . 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.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The purpose of the bill is related to workforce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Gun Violence Prevention

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 4 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require immigration authorities to keep undocumented immigrants in custody if they are accused of killing someone or inflicting serious bodily injury.

By Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida:

H.R. 662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is granted the authority to introduce and enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill amends the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2023 to improve disaster relief funding for agricultural producers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: ''[The Congress shall have the power . . .] 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. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 14 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN

H.R. 665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution:

Congress shall have the power . . . ''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.''

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill gives authority to the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to pay a cash award to an employee who maintains proficiency in a mission-critical language or who uses a foreign language in the performance of official duties.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 666.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 667.

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; . . .''

The single subject of this legislation is:

Gun violence prevention

By Ms. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill permanently withdraws over 234,000 acres of federal land and waters within the Rainy River Watershed adjacent to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from mineral leasing.

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Foreign Affairs

By Mr. MOLINARO:

H.R. 670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

Healthcare

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

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;

The single subject of this legislation is:

Border Security

By Mr. MOYLAN:

H.R. 673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article one of the United States Constitution Congress has the power to enact this legislation.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To Amend Public Law 106–504

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the India Tribes

The single subject of this legislation is:

Commercial satellites.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Ocean Acidification

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States 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 any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation eliminates the role of chief diversity officer at the Department of Defense and prohibits federal funds from being obligated to establish this position or anything substantially similar.

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Agriculture

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America

The single subject of this legislation is:

Improving Affordability

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill facilitates access to electromagnetic spectrum for commercial space launches and commercial space reentries.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To protect U.S. agricultural land and businesses from malign foreign influence.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit the award of Federal funds to institutions of higher education that employ instructiors funded by the CCP.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the President, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to develop and carry out a strategy to seek reinbursement from the People's Republic of China of funds made available by the United States Government to address COVID–19.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the continuation in effect of export controls with respect to Huawei Technologies Co.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require certain actions relating to the United Nations Human Rights Council

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State to require aliens applying for certain visas to disclose if they receive funds from the Government of the People's Republic of China or the CCP.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To precent allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for countries that are perpetrators of genocide or state sponsors of terrorism, and to prevent US tax dollars from directly going to the Taliban or other terrorists or terrorist-harboring nations.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To impose sanctions on persons engaging in transactions in Afghanistan rare earth minerals.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To impose sanctions with respect to KSS.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 114 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The VACANT Act requires the VA to limit temporary vacancies for Directors of VA Medical Facilities to 180 days and requires the VA to notify Congress of its plans to fill those vacancies.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.J. Res. 23.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

The single subject of this legislation is:

Government Reform

By Mr. COMER:

H.J. Res. 24.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution, in that the legislation addresses legislation governing the affairs of the District of Columbia, to which Congress has the power ''to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States . . .

The single subject of this legislation is:

District of Columbia election law

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.J. Res. 25.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this legislation is to rescind the time limit placed on the equal rights amendment.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mrs. LUNA and Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 24: Mr. MCCORMICK.

H.R. 40: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 53: Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 82: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. MOLINARO.

H.R. 139: Mr. ROSE and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 152: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 168: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 192: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 211: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 212: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 223: Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Mr. MANN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 231: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 239: Mr. MULLIN and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 309: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 356: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H.R. 382: Mr. YAKYM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KILEY.

H.R. 386: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 396: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. TOKUDA.

H.R. 398: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 428: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 451: Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 453: Mr. BURLISON.

H.R. 474: Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 480: Mr. STEWART, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 484: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 494: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 496: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 497: Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DUARTE, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 501: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 506: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 508: Mr. BACON and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 536: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 537: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 558: Mr. YAKYM and Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 562: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 584: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 589: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 597: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 603: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 604: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 615: Mr. OWENS, Ms. HAGEMAN, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 621: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.J. Res. 13: Mr. MORELLE and Ms. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MAST, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. STRONG, and Mrs. HOUCHIN.

H. Res. 8: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.

H. Res. 27: Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 42: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 59: Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Ms. MACE.

H. Res. 69: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOLINARO.

H. Res. 72: Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability in H.R. 140, the Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2023 No. 20

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of love, enlarge our horizons. Give to us this day perspectives that go beyond pessimism and negativity. Lord, enable us to lift our eyes to You, our provider, sustainer, and friend. May we refuse to permit today's challenges to make us forget how powerfully you have led us in the past.

Bless our legislative branch today with Your wisdom. Help our Senators to follow the path that leads to the fulfillment of Your purposes. Inspire our lawmakers to focus on the priorities that will cause justice to roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 31, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Constitution charges the Senate with giving advice and, if we choose, providing our consent to the President's judicial appointments.

The President nominates somebody whom he thinks ought to serve on the Federal bench, and then the nominee comes here to the Senate for a job interview. Sometimes these job interviews make news because they go spectacularly well.

When the Judiciary Committee subjected now-Justice Amy Coney Barrett to a battery of questions a little over 2 years ago, she literally dazzled the country with her force of intellect. At one point, hours into a hearing, after being asked multipart questions about the finer points of constitutional law, now-Justice Barrett was asked to hold up the notepad she had been provided to keep everything straight, and it was completely blank. She hadn't even touched it.

Justice Barrett is an intellectual outlier by any standard, but she is an appropriate stand-in for the judicial nominees whom Republican Senators confirmed from 2017 through 2020. As one left-leaning analysis admitted in 2020, ''based solely on objective legal credentials''—''solely on objective legal credentials''—the last administration's average pick for the Federal bench had ''a far more impressive résumé than any past president's nominees.'' They had more circuit court clerkships, more Supreme Court clerkships—objectively, more experience in the Federal judiciary.

Under President Biden, though, with his nominees, well, you might say things have gone somewhat differently.

Last week, our colleague on the Judiciary Committee from Louisiana, Senator KENNEDY, was quizzing a panel of President Biden's nominees, and he decided to try some very simple questions that should have been beyond basic for anybody nominated to serve as a U.S. district judge. He asked one nominee, currently a superior court judge in Spokane County, WA, to simply explain what article V of the Constitution says. That would be the article that explains how the Constitution gets amended. Here was the nominee's response:

Article V is not coming to mind at the moment.

Senator KENNEDY came back with another, even more basic question. He asked:

How about article II?

As high schoolers across America learn each year, article II sets up the Presidency and the executive branch. It establishes the President's powers, including the power to nominate the person for the vacancy in question. But this sitting judge drew another blank.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Article II wasn't coming to mind either—goodness gracious.

Then she flunked yet another question about legal philosophy, and, then again, she flunked still another question about the most controversial Supreme Court case this term.

Apparently, when this particular nominee had been asked to list the top 10 most impactful cases she had litigated in court, she could only come up with 6. At no stage of her professional career has the judge focused on Federal law. At no point had she ever even appeared in Federal court.

So get this. In one of these six most significant cases she took, she lost to a defendant who forewent legal counsel and took the risky step of representing herself. This wasn't some rooky mistake either. The nominee was over a decade out of law school when she lost to an unrepresented party in one of her biggest cases.

Is this the caliber of legal expert with which President Biden is filling the Federal bench—for lifetime appointments? Is the bar for merit and excellence really set this low?

For years, now, Washington Democrats' rhetoric about judicial nominations has often treated actual qualifications as an afterthought. Democrats were not particularly impressed or moved by top-shelf professional excellence or the academic brilliance that the last Republican administration's nominees possessed, literally, in spades. And, apparently, they don't count those qualities as particularly high priorities now that they are the ones doing the nominating.

The American people deserve an impartial judiciary that is full of the finest legal minds our country has to offer. The American people deserve the best and the brightest.

Alas, but sadly, the Biden administration's questionable constitutional judgment is not limited to some of their judicial nominations. In one important constitutional case after another, the Biden administration and his lawyers have come down on the wrong side of the American people's rights and liberties and have gotten slapped down in court as a result.

This last year, for example, in the Bruen case, the Biden administration threw its weight behind unconstitutional New York State restrictions on the Second Amendment that plainly violated citizens' rights to keep and bear arms. President Biden sent one of his top lawyers to help with the oral arguments, but the Democrats got the Constitution backward and lost the case.

In West Virginia v. EPA, President Biden went all in trying to defend massive unconstitutional overreach by his own Environmental Protection Agency. His Solicitor General argued the case herself, but the administration lost badly. The plain meaning of our laws and our Constitution actually won out.

In Carson v. Makin, President Biden fought to maintain unconstitutional anti-religious discrimination in school voucher programs. Again, he lost, and the American people and their Constitution won.

Washington Democrats had their blatantly unconstitutional vaccine mandate for the private sector tossed out by the Supreme Court. They had their obviously illegal top-down mask mandate for transportation tossed out by a district judge. Oh, and, by the way, when the judge was nominated, Democrats howled that she was unqualified. But with a Supreme Court clerkship under her belt, she had incomparably more experience in Federal court than the nominee who failed Senator KENNEDY's bar exam.

Over and over, on issue after issue, this Democratic administration sides against the American people, against the Constitution, and against the rule of law.

The American people deserve an administration that respects their rights and liberties, that understands our Constitution, and that chooses both policies and nominees accordingly.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it only took 2 years—2 years—for the President to acknowledge the crisis that has been raging along our southern border almost since the day he took office. Over those 2 years, we have seen record numbers of migrants attempting to cross our southern border. We have seen record numbers of migrants die—die—attempting the dangerous crossing of our southern border. We have seen the Border Patrol overwhelmed, border cities overwhelmed, and dangerous drugs continue to flood across our border and reach communities around our Nation.

Yet, for months and months, the President did essentially nothing. In fact, he acted as if the crisis didn't even exist. I am glad that, at long last, the President seems to be acknowledging this crisis, even if his recent visit to the border was scripted and controlled.

But it is appalling to think of how much human misery could have been avoided if the President had lived up to his national security obligations and addressed the border disaster many months ago. I suppose it is not a surprise that the President wasn't eager to acknowledge just how bad things were because that might have drawn extra scrutiny to the President's border policies, policies that played a substantial role in creating this crisis in the first place.

From the moment he took office and even before, President Biden made it clear that border security was at the bottom of his priority list. On his very first day in office, President Biden rescinded the declaration of a national emergency at our southern border. He halted construction of the border wall. He revoked a Trump administration order that called for the government to faithfully execute our immigration laws. And his Department of Homeland Security issued guidelines pausing deportations except under certain conditions. And that was all on his first day in office.

Well, needless to say, the effect of all this was to declare to the world that the U.S. borders were effectively open, and we have seen the result: 2 years of soaring illegal immigration. Since President Biden took office, there have been more than 4.5 million attempted illegal border crossings. Now, to put that number in perspective, that is roughly equal to the entire population of South Dakota, plus the entire population of Delaware, Wyoming, Nebraska, and then some.

Last month, 251,487 migrants were apprehended attempting to cross our southern border, the highest monthly number ever recorded. And, of course, these numbers just refer to individuals Customs and Border Protection managed to apprehend. There have been a staggering 1.2 million known ''gotaways'' since President Biden took office, individuals that the Border Patrol saw but were unable to apprehend.

President Biden has talked about wanting a safe, orderly, and humane immigration system. Well, up until now, he has failed on all fronts. Encouraging illegal immigration as the President's policies have done is the very opposite of compassionate and humane. There is nothing compassionate about policies that encourage people to attempt the dangerous trip across our southern border, to run the risk of exploitation and disease and exposure and death; nor is it compassionate to condemn border cities to dealing with a never-ending flood of illegal immigration and other cross-border illegal activity.

On top of all that, the kind of unchecked illegal immigration we have been seeing is an open invitation—an open invitation—to drug traffickers, human smugglers, and other dangerous individuals.

Our Nation is currently in the midst of a serious fentanyl crisis. In fact, right now, fentanyl overdose is the leading cause of death of U.S. adults between the ages of 18 and 45. And where is all this fentanyl coming from? Well, most of it is being trafficked across our southern border. And I would be very surprised if the chaos at our southern border isn't facilitating that trafficking.

And—let's be clear—drug trafficking across our southern border doesn't just affect border States; it affects communities around our country. I have

talked to sheriffs in South Dakota, almost as far from our southern border as you can get, who are dealing with fentanyl that has been trafficked across the border from Mexico. Last year, Minnehaha County Sheriff Mike Milstead estimated that 90 percent—90 percent—of fentanyl and methamphetamine in our State, the State of South Dakota, comes through Mexico. Again, I would be very surprised if the chaos at our southern border hasn't facilitated that trafficking.

Our country has been shaped by immigrants from around the world, and I am a strong supporter of legal immigration. I have repeatedly introduced legislation to open up opportunities for individuals to come from abroad and to work here in the United States when employers can't secure enough domestic labor. But immigration has to be legal. It has to be legal for security reasons, for humanitarian reasons, and because we have a responsibility to uphold the rule of law.

I am thankful that the President finally seems to be, at least halfheartedly, acknowledging our border crisis and he has recognized his error in rescinding a number of policies that successfully took pressure off the border. Now let's see how he follows through.

There are definitely things Congress can do to strengthen our border security, deter abuse of our asylum system, and provide resources to those serving on the frontlines against trafficking and smuggling. We can also find ways to address some of the economic factors that influence illegal immigration by leveraging legal pathways to allow immigrants to fill jobs that American employers are struggling to fill.

But the fact of the matter is, while there are things Congress can do to help, the President of the United States doesn't need an act of Congress to move forward on securing the border. The President just needs to enforce the law. For the sake of our national security, our overwhelmed border communities, and the individuals tempted to make the dangerous journey across the border, let's hope he does so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the past few days, we have seen a number of headlines with surprising announcements about the impact the Biden administration's new border policies have had. Reuters, for example, ran a story last week titled ''U.S. arrests of Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan and Venezuelan migrants plummet.''

Dallas Morning News had a story titled ''Biden administration says illegal border crossings already falling under new policies.''

The Wall Street Journal ran a story over the weekend with the headline ''Migrant Arrests Fell by Roughly Half in January After New Enforcement Measures.''

Well, by reading those headlines alone, you might assume that the administration had finally done something it has refused to do over the last 2 years, and that is to take action to address the migration crisis, the humanitarian and public safety crisis that has been occurring at our southern border. You might think that they started using authorities they already had under existing law to enforce those laws at the southern border and deter would-be migrants from making the dangerous journey north. Well, if you made those assumptions, you would be wrong. That is not the case at all.

As we know, the border has been operating at a state of crisis for at least the last 2 years. Last year alone, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 2.4 million migrants, completely shattering previous records. Last month, we broke the record for monthly encounters. The Agency logged more than a quarter of a million—more than 250,000—border crossings in December alone.

Here is the ugly little secret that the Biden administration so far has failed to acknowledge: Vice President KAMALA HARRIS talks about going to Central America, talks about root causes of the migration crisis, and Secretary Blinken talks about root causes, assuming that this is a regional matter affecting Mexico and Central America and that it is primarily people who are coming to the United States strictly for economic reasons or to flee violence. But the fact of the matter is, people are coming from all over the world to our doorstep and seeking asylum.

A couple of weeks ago, we had a bipartisan congressional trip to El Paso, an urban area. We then went to Yuma, AZ, which is a sleepy little agricultural community right there along the border of Arizona and California. The acting Border Patrol chief told us that they had people from 176 countries, speaking 200 languages, seeking asylum, coming to the Yuma port of entry.

You might ask, how in the world is that possible? That doesn't sound like root causes; that sounds like a global network of human struggling that is exploiting our asylum laws to gain entry into the United States.

Well, Senator MARK KELLY from Arizona, who was with us, said: Well, Mexicali, which is a relatively large city in northern Mexico, just across the border from Yuma, has an airport, and presumably people are flying into Mexicali from disparate places around the world because they know that if they show up at this port of entry in Yuma, they are likely to gain entry into the United States by claiming asylum, and they know that because of the backlog in asylum cases, their case is not likely to be heard for literally years and that if they did ultimately appear in front of an immigration judge, their chances of successfully gaining asylum, according to the legal standard under American law, was about 10 percent. So it doesn't surprise anybody that many of them don't show up for their court hearing but simply hope to evade detection and be able to permanently settle in the United States.

This is what the Border Patrol calls ''no consequences'' associated with illegal immigration. What they have told me and anybody else who will listen is that if there are no consequences to coming to the United States and exploiting our asylum system or illegally coming to the United States, then people are going to keep coming.

Indeed, that is what we have seen with an absolute lack of deterrence because of nonenforcement and because of the Biden administration border policies. People all over the world are taking advantage of the Biden administration's weak policies. They are crossing our southern border at an alarming rate, imposing huge burdens on the border communities in States like mine, like Texas, that do not have the resources to meet the demands of this crisis.

It wasn't that long ago that Del Rio, TX, a small community of 35,000 people, had 15,000 Haitians arrive in their city and claim asylum. As it turned out, many of those Haitians had been living in South America, having fled Haiti previously, but they had been living more or less peacefully in South America. But because they saw an opportunity to come to the United States and exploit this same asylum system, they showed up in Del Rio, TX—35,000 people—15,000 of them, overwhelming the capacity of that small city to deal with them.

Until recently, the administration saw two options when it came to migrants. Option No. 1 was to use the authority granted under title 42 to expel these individuals to Mexico. Of course, title 42 is a public health title that has been in place because of COVID. Option No. 2 was to parole them. Basically, that means to grant them permission to enter the United States, where they would await immigration court proceedings, which, as I said, because of the backlog, because of the sheer volume, will take years.

Under the administration's so-called new plan, there is now another option for Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans. So that is four countries. There is a new option for people coming from those four countries. It apparently doesn't apply to the other 172 countries that the Yuma Border Patrol

chief has said that they have encountered. But under the administration's new plan, there is an option for Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans that will allow them to remain in the United States legally for 2 years and receive work authorization.

What more of a magnet do you need for people to come to the United States than to give them a work permit and to say: You can stay here legally for 2 years while you await your court proceeding. All they have to do is submit information online before crossing the border and wait for the administration to give them the green light.

Well, the Border Patrol, in educating me and others about what is happening at the border, they talk about push factors and they talk about pull factors. The push factors, we all understand. That is poverty, violence, people wanting a better life. We don't begrudge people who want a better life, want a piece of the American dream, but we do—we should—insist they come to the country through legal means, not illegal means, not exploiting vulnerabilities in our asylum system.

But there is no greater pull factor than this idea that there will be no consequences to coming to the United States, that you will successfully make your way into the United States, into the interior, and you will be able to stay. That is the ultimate pull factor, and that is the reason there is zero deterrence under President Biden's open border policies. Apparently he wants to continue that when it comes to people coming from these four countries.

Well, there are several problems with this plan that I alluded to. First of all, it is not a solution to the open border policies that currently exist. It doesn't discourage migrants from making the long, dangerous journey; it just artificially lowers the numbers.

Here is what I mean by that. Before this so-called new policy, if a migrant from one of these four countries was apprehended at the border, they would be encountered by the Border Patrol and either removed under title 42, repatriated, or paroled into the country.

Every month, Customs and Border Protection reports a total number of migrants released into the United States, giving us an understanding of just how big, what the magnitude of this crisis truly is. Last month, for example, more than 130,000 migrants were paroled into the United States. One hundred thirty thousand were given the paperwork to move into the United States.

The administration has taken a lot of heat for the fact that it is engaging in catch-and-release at an unprecedented pace. Basically, what that means is that rather than being detained while your asylum status is determined—and, as I said, the vast majority will not ultimately qualify if they appear in front of an immigration judge—catch-and-release just makes this worse.

Rather than stop the practice and actually detain and remove migrants without legitimate asylum claims, the Biden administration came up with this new policy to, in effect, cook the books. The 30,000 migrants a month who enter the United States as part of this new program won't even be included in the monthly statistics that have become a huge political albatross for President Biden. If migrants enter the United States on a legal basis, which is exactly what this program provides, they will never be tallied as part of the migration crisis.

They have taken 30,000 people and said: OK, we are going to make your entry into the country legal—so, by definition, it is no longer illegal immigration—by a wave of the magic wand.

In short, this new policy lets the administration roll out the welcome mat for tens of thousands of migrants while making it seem like the numbers have actually gone down, which they have not.

Problem No. 2 is that any progress is all but guaranteed to be temporary.

According to the administration, we have seen a 97-percent drop in the number of illegal crossings for migrants from these four countries, and, as I said, these are just 4 of the 176 countries represented by the folks who show up at the one Yuma Border Patrol crossing currently. So it is just four countries.

It appears, now, that there are thousands of migrants who would have previously arrived at the border who are now waiting for the Biden administration to approve their online application. But what happens after those 30,000 spots are filled? What happens when it takes months rather than weeks for migrants to receive the green light?

I can tell you exactly what will happen. Migrants from these four countries will start coming across the border illegally once again.

Will they be expelled under title 42? Will they be paroled into the interior? Only time will tell. But one thing is for sure. Once the line gets too long, we will be right back where we started, only with an added challenge: There will be a new population of tens or even hundreds of thousands of people living and working in the United States on what is supposed to be a temporary basis. As Ronald Reagan once noted, there is nothing so permanent as a temporary government program.

Third, the new program normalizes migrants coming to the United States based on facts that would not qualify them under our current laws for asylum. The administration's description of urgent humanitarian reasons that would qualify a Haitian migrant for the program, for example, points to gang violence, the aftermath of an earthquake or a cholera breakout that worsened political, economic, and social conditions. Now, we can all agree that these are terrible conditions, but they don't meet the standard for a valid asylum claim.

That leads to perhaps the biggest problem of all: that the administration circumvented—did an end run—around Congress to implement this policy, which has basically teed up an even bigger headache.

President Biden is following in the footsteps of President Obama by creating a new category of immigrants without consulting with or getting the agreement of Congress. As we saw with President Obama and the deferred action for childhood arrivals, his use of Executive action 10 years ago has now created more problems for this population of young people who came here as children and who are now adults because the courts have so far said that President Obama didn't have the authority to do what he purported to do.

By the way, if you go back and do an internet search and see what President Obama said shortly before he granted this deferred action for childhood arrivals, I think he said, perhaps as many as 17 times—I could be off a little bit—that he did not have the authority. He said he did not have the authority to do what he ultimately did, and, unfortunately, now the courts are agreeing with him, putting the livelihood and future of these young people in jeopardy.

It has been more than a decade since DACA was established, and the fate of these young people is still being litigated in court. It is a terrible circumstance to find themselves in, and this won't be any different.

The Biden policies will allow migrants to live and work in the United States for 2 years, and then what? Well, will they leave voluntarily? I doubt it. Will they be apprehended and removed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement? No, I doubt that. Or will this be another group of migrants who will live in the shadows?

There is no question that our immigration system is broken. I have yet to find a person—a responsible person—who thinks our immigration system is working the way it should. It is big, it is outdated, it is inefficient, and it is not serving our Nation's interests well. But if the President wants to undertake immigration reform, as he says he does, this is not the way to go.

By end-running Congress to try to establish new categories of immigrants, he is poisoning the well. He is making it harder for us to do what many of us would like to do, and that is to take on the monumental task of securing the border and creating a legal immigration system that serves our Nation's interests and one that we can be proud of.

But, by poisoning the well, the President is not gaining new allies. He is just ensuring that more people will resist any potential legislation that we might take up soon. So despite what the initial data may suggest, what the spin doctors here in Washington have been selling to the news media, which has gullibly been accepting that, as if this is somehow a big deal for a negative trend in terms of illegal immigration, it is not so. The President hasn't

solved the problem. He has just swept it under the rug, and he has, arguably, made it worse.

This crisis is complex, but the solution isn't. The administration needs to engage with Congress and enforce our immigration laws that are on the books and those that are being exploited by the international criminal networks that are smuggling people into the United States on a daily basis.

We need to work together to address those gaps that are being exploited. If migrants from any country see that the United States is quickly detaining and removing people who do not have a legal basis to remain in our country, the flow of illegal immigration will drop dramatically. That is the only viable path forward and where the administration should focus its time and effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

BRISTOL BAY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the Biden administration and their historic step to permanently protect Bristol Bay, AK. More than a decade after the Pebble Mine was proposed, the Environmental Protection Agency, today, is finalizing a Clean Water Act protection that will permanently protect Bristol Bay. No company will ever be able to stick a mine on top of some of the best salmon habitat in the world.

Salmon fishermen from Alaska and from my home State of Washington will continue to earn their livelihoods from Bristol Bay salmon, as they have for generations. No Bristol Bay salmon will ever have to swim through toxic soup just to get to its spawning grounds.

This scientific decision today by the Environmental Protection Agency puts a final nail in this mine's proposal.

It is difficult to understand and to really know the importance of Bristol Bay. In an average year, 40 to 60 million sockeye salmon swim into or out of the bay. Last year was a blockbuster run. Nearly 80 million sockeye salmon returned to Bristol Bay.

That is why Bristol Bay is known as the holy grail of salmon. Today, Bristol Bay salmon fisheries are a $2.2 billion annual industry. They support over 15,000 jobs in the Pacific Northwest and nationwide, and that is through commercial fishing, recreational fishing, tourism, seafood, restaurants, shipbuilding, and other associated industries.

I know the Presiding Officer knows this well because northern California also benefits from these salmon sectors and the salmon industry.

Salmon are one of the most important products that we in the Pacific Northwest have. It is the symbol of our region. So Bristol Bay salmon, being a powerhouse and supporting nearly half of the sockeye salmon harvested around the globe, is certainly worth fighting for.

So, as you can imagine, when a mining corporation decided to try to build a mine in the headwaters of this most powerful salmon run on the planet, fishermen in my State and in many other States were outraged. Estuaries and mines really don't mix, and they certainly don't belong together at the headwaters of one of the most important salmon runs and spawning grounds in the Nation.

For fishermen, the destruction wrought by Pebble Mine would have swept away their businesses and their way of life, and they certainly raised their voices and came to ask me and others in Washington for help.

In 2011, I was proud to stand with fishermen and Tribes from my State and from Alaska to speak out against Pebble Mine and to call for permanent protections under the Clean Water Act if the science showed that the mine would have irreversible impacts on salmon. Well, sure enough, the science is damning, and that is what is being released as part of this decision today.

In 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency found that more than 185 miles of streams and over 3,800 acres of wetlands would be permanently damaged or destroyed by Pebble Mine due to its toxic waste and habitat destruction, and that is just if the mine operated the way it was supposed to. That wasn't considering the kind of degradation that could happen if an accident happened. Those statistics don't account for a potential mine disaster that could really wipe out this irreplaceable ecosystem.

So despite the clear science, the mining company has continued to claim that protecting Bristol Bay is a partisan government overreach. Their executives believe that stripping all the gold and copper out of Bristol Bay is a worthy goal, more important than our wild salmon or more important than the generations of Washington and Alaska fishermen who earn their livelihood from that.

Protecting our fishing economy should not be a partisan issue, and that is why Congress created a fail-safe Clean Water Act provision called section 404(c). This provision says that if disposal or dredging in a waterway would destroy fisheries, municipal water, or have other serious impacts, the Environmental Agency could step in to stop the project.

It is a simple concept, really: Let's not destroy a profitable, sustainable industry that keeps the water clean for the sake of just temporary extracting.

Still, this authority in 404(c) isn't used lightly. Since 1972, millions of Clean Water Act permits have been approved, compared to only 14 times that this provision has been used to stop major projects like the one today that is being stopped at Pebble Mine.

Republican Presidents have used this Clean Water 404(c) authority 11 times. Let me say that again.

It has only been implemented 14 times in our history, and 11 times it was used by a Republican President. Ronald Reagan alone used the Clean Water Act 404 authority 8 times.

So there was a time when people believed in this conservation. They believed in making sure that we preserve what is so unique about our planet.

To sum it up, a multinational corporation thought that it could go to one of the most iconic salmon runs on the planet and decimate those jobs that we rely on in Bristol Bay and tear a hole in the culture of our Northwest fabric. And fishermen and we here said: No.

I am proud of the scientific work done by the Environmental Protection Agency under President Biden, the University of Washington, and so many of the environmental partners that fought so hard to stop this project.

I am proud to have stood with the fishermen and Tribes of Bristol Bay in saying we need to protect this unique place forever.

I want to thank some of our greatest champions: The United Tribes of Bristol Bay, the Bristol Bay Native Corporation, and the fishing families in Alaska and Washington.

I want to thank my staff, Nikki Teutschel, Amit Ronen, and Jeff Watters, who, through a decade, all continued this fight to make sure that every administration was listening to this cause.

It seemed like a ''David and Goliath'' many times, this battle, but we know today that the voices of fishermen at Bristol Bay provided the leadership that we needed to preserve this area forever and said no to this project.

Fishermen know that the Pacific Northwest salmon is worth more than copper, and today, salmon is even worth more than gold. It is our Pacific way of life, and thanks to this administration, it will be protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic whip.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it took 15 votes for KEVIN MCCARTHY to become Speaker of the House of Representatives. It may not have been historic, but it was a sight to behold. To finally become Speaker, KEVIN MCCARTHY made all kinds of commitments to the MAGA extremists in his Republican Party.

One of the promises he made to the hard-right holdouts in order to become Speaker was that House Republicans

would use their razor-thin majority in the House to try to freeze Federal spending in fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2022 levels. Let me bring that down in plain English. This means cutting $130 billion out of the Federal budget that Congress just passed last month—$130 billion is nothing to sneeze at.

Now, how are they going to do it? What is on the Republican agenda in terms of cuts? Speaker MCCARTHY won't say and neither will the House Republicans. What they have said is they plan to use the debt ceiling as leverage to try to get their way.

What is the debt ceiling?

Let me give you an example. Last night, you went to a restaurant with your family. You had a wonderful meal, and you paid for it with your credit card. In a couple weeks you are going to get a bill from your credit card company saying now it is time to pay for that wonderful meal. That is our debt ceiling.

If we don't pay those bills on a timely basis, it raises the question as to whether we are credible or reliable, and those people who loan us money, if they worry about whether the United States is going to pay its debts, they are going to demand higher interest rates to protect their purchase of U.S. securities. That is the bottom line.

We have never—underline ''never''—defaulted on our national debt and debt ceiling in our history. As a consequence, the United States enjoys a solid reputation for financial stability. Well, Speaker MCCARTHY has decided to put that on the chopping block.

Let's get right up to the eleventh hour and see if we are going to extend the debt ceiling. It is within his power to stop it, and that is his threat. What we have said to him is: If you have something, a plan for cutting spending or raising taxes, which is unlikely—if you have a plan for cutting spending, be honest with us and tell us what it is.

Some of the proposals are incredible. There is an actual proposal to create a Federal—that is national—sales tax of—listen—30 percent. A 30-percent sales tax. So if that loaf of bread cost five bucks at the grocery store—and in Springfield, some of them do—instead of paying $5, you will pay $6.50. Did you think prices were already going up for food in the grocery store? Tack on 30 percent and see how it feels.

And the problem with this is not just the notion of a national sales tax of 30 percent; the problem is, who will pay it. Do you think the richest people in the world give a toot about grocery bills? They don't. But folks who are struggling paycheck to paycheck, trying to feed hungry kids, do. They can tell you week to week what is going on in the grocery store, and it is not very encouraging.

So one of the Republican plans for reducing Federal spending is creating a national sales tax of 30 percent. I am not making this up. This is one of the proposals which Speaker MCCARTHY has agreed to call as part of his response to the debt of the United States. MAGA Republicans are threatening to use the credit worthiness of the United States as a bargaining chip in a political debate here on Capitol Hill. And, I am sorry to say, if they go the direction we expect they will, it will go beyond a national sales tax.

They are talking about cuts in some of the most important entitlement programs in our budget. What are those programs? Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits. The list goes on. And it gets down into the heart of this economy. It gets down to whether or not the vast majority of retirees in the United States of America will have enough money to get by. Food bills are going up, the gasoline bills have gone up in the past, and this idea that we are going to cut Social Security benefits—the Republicans are on the wrong track.

Refusing to pay America's bills for the first time actually won't cut the national debt. It will end up in increasing interest rates and will increase the debt by $80 to $150 billion, and that is just a start. Millions of Americans can lose their jobs, and it can push us into a recession if we default on the debt. Workers with 401(k) plans will see huge losses in their retirement savings, and a new 30-year mortgage on a home will cost an additional $130,000, on average. Are people going to buy homes? Not likely. But people who own homes will see the values of those homes diminished, all because of this reckless strategy of confrontation by Speaker MCCARTHY.

One-quarter of our entire national debt—that is $8 trillion worth of debt—was accumulated during the administration of Donald Trump. One-fourth of the entire debt of the United States in its 230 years of existence—one-fourth of it—was accumulated in those 4 years. Of course, there was money spent on the COVID crisis. I understand that. But there was also a $2 trillion tax cut under President Donald Trump. Who got the tax cut? Most of it went to the wealthiest people in America and the biggest corporations. It is the tried and true Republican approach—cut taxes on the rich and hope for the best.

The last time the United States had a balanced Federal budget, incidentally—was it under a Republican President? No, it was a Democrat, Bill Clinton. The fiscal year 2001 Federal budget had a $128 billion surplus. Remember what Republicans' fear about the deficit was back then? They told us. The Republicans claimed that paying down the national debt too quickly would hurt the economy. They were critical of us in either direction—either too much debt or not enough.

So instead of using the fiscal year 2001 surplus as a downpayment on the national debt, Republicans—you guessed it—passed a huge tax cut in those days overwhelmingly benefiting rich people and powerful corporations. They said, and they always say this: Those tax cuts will pay for themselves—the same bogus claims they make about all their big tax cuts for the wealthy. Instead, 7 years later, the last budget George W. Bush sent to Congress contained a $1.4 trillion deficit.

The same thing happened when Ronald Reagan was President. Republicans passed huge tax cuts for the wealthy and promised that they would pay for themselves. If we could just get the rich a little richer, then working families would be better off. Instead, they produced the biggest budget deficit that America had ever seen.

So do they have a credibility gap on that side of the aisle when it comes to deficits? They sure do.

Rich Lowry, the editor-in-chief of the National Review, once the ''Bible'' of American conservatives, commented on what the MAGA strategy means. In an op-ed last week, he wrote:

> It's very strange not to seriously pursue a deeply held goal when you have unified control of Washington, then to insist on trying to achieve much of it in one fell swoop when you barely have control of one chamber in Congress.
>
> But here we are. This is the Republican pattern.

In the last fiscal year, under President Biden and a Democratic majority, we actually reduced the deficit by $1.4 trillion, the largest 1-year drop in American history under President Biden.

Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce the cost of healthcare, prescription drugs, and energy for American families, and to strengthen our Nation's energy independence with safe, new energy solutions.

The Inflation Reduction Act also cuts the deficit by more than $300 billion. We are not ignoring the problem. We are trying to address it seriously—the smart way to reduce the deficit: cut where you can, invest where you must, and make sure it is fair for middle-class and lower income families, not a boondoggle for the superrich in America.

President Biden kept his promise to not raise taxes on anyone making under $400,000. Democrats added a 15-percent minimum tax for wealthy corporations. It just was hard to take that these wealthy corporations and profitable corporations were paying nothing on taxes—that is right, nothing—leaving the middle class to pick up the tab in America.

Compare that to the new MAGA majority in the House. During their first week on the job, House Republicans proposed to increase the budget deficit by $100 billion by making it easier for wealthy individuals and big corporations to cheat on their taxes.

Think about this: The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says that the IRS has 2,284 fewer skilled auditors to handle the sophisticated returns of wealthy taxpayers than it did in 1954. Seventy years ago, we had fewer auditors.

I believe the vast majority of Americans does their level best to file an honest tax return and pay their fair share of taxes. It boils my blood and theirs, too, to think that the tax cheaters are getting off the hook because the cops are not on the beat.

Historically, Republicans have taken away those auditors; have taken away the checks of the big, wealthy individuals and corporations. And they, of course, are tempted to cheat. Why let that happen when the vast majority of American families is doing the right thing? House Republicans just voted for a bill that will add $100 billion to the deficit to take away these auditors. That is not the way to balance a budget, and it is not fair to American taxpayers.

If that is not enough, as part of the deal, Speaker MCCARTHY also promised MAGA hard-liners that the House would vote on that jumbo-sized national sales tax, which I spoke about. As Grover Norquist, who is quite a conservative and quite a man on the issue of taxes, said: It is a political gift to Biden and the Democrats to consider a national sales tax. Well, we say: If this is a gift, no thanks.

In the last 2 years, America's economy broke records and created 11 million jobs—the strongest job creation in the history of this Nation. The Nation's unemployment rate is near a 50-year low. Gas prices are finally coming down. Inflation is just starting to ease, and the deficit is going down. We need to keep the country and economy moving in the right direction, not devastate Social Security and Medicare and certainly not impose a national 30-percent sales tax.

Speaker MCCARTHY is meeting with President Biden tomorrow for the first time since he became Speaker. He needs to show up not just with platitudes but with a plan, in writing, as to what the Republicans want to put on the table.

What is the Republican plan? Are they going to cut Social Security and Medicare? Mr. MCCARTHY said ''no, no way,'' on a Sunday talk show this weekend, but the math doesn't add up for his fiscal goals unless he goes after the entitlement programs.

If you are going to do that, Speaker MCCARTHY, be honest with the American people. Are the Republicans planning to slash money for education? healthcare? veterans? transportation? clean water? In the first two decades of this century, thanks in large part to the National Institutes of Health, cancer deaths went down by almost one-third in the United States—saving an estimated 3.5 million lives. Are we going to cut medical research, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker MCCARTHY and MAGA Republicans need to level with the American people.

Speaker MCCARTHY, my ask is very simple: Put your plan on the table.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NATO

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to highlight the need to strengthen our alliances as bad actors around the world continue to threaten peace and global stability.

In August, my Senate colleagues and I took a critical step to bolster our defense by ratifying Finland and Sweden as NATO members. This was the right action to take. It is time for all remaining NATO member countries to follow this example and approve expanding our Transatlantic Alliance by adding two very valuable and reliable partners.

In just a few short weeks, we will be marking a grim milestone of the 1-year anniversary of Russia's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine. Russia's brutal actions in Ukraine, coupled with its increasingly escalatory rhetoric and continued aggression, have shown us and our allies that we must strengthen our collective ability to maintain global stability. Given their proximity to Russia, Finland and Sweden are investing in their capabilities to prevent a similar attack.

The Finns have demonstrated their willingness to enhance NATO's military strength by significantly increasing military spending above NATO's requirements, participating in joint military training exercises, and strengthening its air power with upgrades to an F–35 fleet under the Foreign Military Sales program.

Finland has been one of NATO's most active partners and a strong contributor to NATO-led operations and missions in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq. The Finns have also delivered crucial support to Ukraine by providing hundreds of millions of dollars in military aid in addition to providing critical humanitarian assistance.

Finland's large, well-trained ground force and increasingly capable air force are interoperable with NATO. The Finns also have extensive experience in monitoring Russian activities along their 833-mile shared border, and its addition would make defending the Baltic States so much easier.

Earlier this month, I visited Finland and met with defense leaders who reaffirmed their commitment to bilateral cooperation and the value they would bring to NATO. As a member of NATO, I have no doubt Finland would be a net contributor of security, not a taker.

I strongly urge remaining members to join the U.S. and approve Finland's and Sweden's accessions to NATO to confront evolving security challenges and the ongoing threat posed by Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO THE SAINT JAMES ACADEMY TROJANS AND JIMMY PERRY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today, I want to begin by recognizing a former colleague of mine and some of Alabama's student athletes.

The Saint James Academy Trojans in Montgomery, AL, recently won the Class 3A Football State Championship for the first time in the school's history. The team, no doubt, put in many long hours on and off the field to prepare for this great, historic achievement. Winning is always fun, but the lessons learned about dedication, discipline, and perseverance will stay with these young men and coaches forever.

I also want to extend a special congrats to the Trojans' coach, Jimmy Perry, on the State championship and on his recent retirement announcement. What a way to go out.

I first met Coach Perry when I hired him in 1999 to be the director of football operations at Auburn University. It was clear then that he had a very bright future ahead of him in the world of coaching, and it is fitting that his coaching career has ended with this historic victory.

So congratulations to Coach Perry and his team at Saint James Academy. I wish them all the best and the coach all the best in future endeavors.

BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, last week, I spent time on the floor urging my colleagues to prioritize freedom in the 118th Congress. By learning from the mistakes of overregulation in the past, we can focus on creating a brighter future and a more prosperous future for all Americans.

We should be doing everything we can to fix the problems created by the government and get Americans back on their feet by unleashing our economic potential and opening doors of opportunity. Unfortunately, too many here in Washington are still focused on growing the size of government and adding regulations they say will save the environment. However, very rarely does making the government larger benefit the American taxpayers and the American citizens of this country.

For decades, fans of Big Government have used climate change warnings to grow their power—for decades, for as long as I can remember. They have claimed we are near the edge of a climate cliff—a prediction they know is impossible to prove and has never come true. Of course, they claim the only solution to this cooked-up crisis is for you, the American taxpayer, to sacrifice even more of your freedoms to tackle this so-called climate dilemma. This sacrifice won't come from the elites, who flew their private jets to Switzerland just a few weeks ago—the ones who are crowing about this. They flew, just a couple of weeks ago, to lecture, while they were there, the working families of this country. No. These sacrifices are expected to be made by average, hard-working American taxpayers. That is what they want.

They want you to give up your affordable gas for imported fuel that is

triple the cost. They want you to give up your ground beef for overpriced and underwhelming meat substitutes. They want you to give up affordable, abundant clean energy we could produce right here in America for the enormous cost of green energy policies. They even want you to be banned from cooking on gas stoves because how you cook in your own kitchen is now the government's business. They want our farmers to cut back and worry about emissions while they are focused on feeding the country and the rest of the world, which is a huge priority. Most importantly, they expect you, the American taxpayer, to foot the bill for their radical climate agenda—obviously.

Well, I think I speak for most Americans when I say: No way. We should say ''no way'' to overpriced electric cars that are made with cobalt, processed and sold by China, and plugged into a charger that is powered by fossil fuels anyway. How do we come up with electricity? By fossil fuels.

We should say ''no'' to fake meats—products that taste as bad as their price and that will eventually kill our livestock producers' way of life. What are we trying to do—put our farmers out of business? Exactly. That is what the climate agenda is about, even though, as we all know, our food security is national security, and we should be promoting domestic food production by protecting our Nation's farmers in every possible way we can—in every way.

We should say ''no'' to unreliable energy sources and the skyrocketing utility bills we are seeing today because America cannot operate and achieve economic success without fossil fuels. It is impossible. I don't know what we are trying to prove. We will come back, but, hopefully, it is not at the sacrifice of the American taxpayers.

We should say ''no'' to trillions and trillions of taxpayer dollars spent on an agenda that is based only on the rantings of failed candidates like Al Gore and John Kerry, global elites at a ski resort, and a European teenager who needs to go back to school and learn to read and write and learn math and stay out of politics at her age. That agenda is based solely on fearmongering and unproven theories—unproven—but that is how the left likes it. That is how they use fear—to push policy. Their agenda ignores reliable clean energy sources, like nuclear and natural gas that should be viable, but that does not fit their narrative. That is the reason they don't talk about it.

They know nuclear energy—nuclear energy—is the answer, but the climate change group who continues to bark about this, they don't want answers. They don't want to talk about nuclear because the problem itself is too valuable for their pocketbooks and politicians' ambitions. Instead, their narrative has created a growing—growing—group of Americans and people around the world who now genuinely believe they should live in fear every day. We are teaching it in our schools, we are teaching it in clubs, and it is wrong. These are the folks who throw soup at famous paintings while gluing themselves to the wall and shut down city streets and major highways, calling themselves climate activists.

For standing here on the Senate floor calling this out, some may call me a climate change denier, so I want to be clear. As a conservative, I believe in protecting our environment, conserving our natural resources, and doing what we can to make sure Americans live in a clean, safe environment, in clean communities that will last for generations to come. But I do not believe that we need to give up our livelihoods, our way of life, our access to affordable food and energy because of false claims that we are just a few years away from extinction. These claims are simply not true, and repeating them is dangerous. Instead, I believe we should be investing—investing heavily—in American energy production because we already produce some of the cleanest energy on the face of the Earth.

Giving up our cars, our farms, and our affordable gas prices will do nothing—will do nothing—to stop the changing climate. It has done it for millions of years, and nothing we can do is going to stop that. In fact, in recent years, the United States has only been responsible for about 11 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions—11 percent. In comparison, China, a country with zero plans to cut back, is responsible for 27 percent of global emissions. China's total emissions of greenhouse gases in 2019 were more than our country and every developed country in the world combined.

Our adversaries, like the Chinese, have no plans—they have no plans—to cut back their usage because their economies are growing thanks to affordable energy. In 2020 alone, China invested almost $475 million in coal projects. That was in addition to the 1,100 coal powerplants they already have in use—almost four times the number we have in the United States. Guess what. They are building 350 as we speak. They are not slowing down. Their emissions level will continue to increase rapidly.

Meanwhile, our country's emissions have fallen by about 17 percent since 2005, thanks—now, think about this—thanks in part to our turn to abundant, cleaner sources, such as natural gas, of which we have a 200-year supply already under the ground in this country as we speak. We couldn't use it in 200 years. But we refuse to dig for it, and we refuse to use it.

Not only can we produce the world's cleanest natural gas, we also have the ability to produce the cleanest nuclear power in all of the world—the cleanest. We have refused to use it. We want to import the dirtiest oil, refine it here in our country, and pollute our country because we are too stubborn to use our own.

That will eventually change. It always goes back around. We will use our energy and in just a short period of time. But the climate extremists running the current administration's energy policies would rather beg foreign countries and make deals with dictators whose countries produce all that dirtier oil. It makes no sense.

Blaming the United States for a global problem we didn't create is unfair to whom? The American taxpayers.

Importantly, the energy that we can and should produce at home is terrible for our own economy—that is what they are saying. It makes no sense.

We have to be able to do two things at once: Help our economy thrive and promote innovation that leads to cleaner energy production. We can do two things at one time, but a cult-like obsession with climate alarmism is making us weaker and poorer in the name of a problem created by politicians.

I am calling for commonsense solutions. Let American companies produce more energy. Recognize the benefits of clean energy, like natural gas and nuclear—that is the answer. Stop scaring people into depression by warning of the great climate extinction. Fear is a terrible thing to use. It is not true.

We should focus on solutions that will actually help our people. Last year, I introduced the Restoring American Energy Independence Act. This bill would have reversed President Biden's shutdown of American energy and returned American energy to full production. Of course, it went nowhere with a Democrat-controlled Senate. It didn't get to first base. I hope to see this legislation and other sensible energy solutions put forth in this Congress.

Sooner or later, we are going to use common sense, we are going to start looking after our country and the American taxpayer, and we are going to get off this high horse of thinking we have all the answers, when we do have them here, and it is our American energy.

I hope to see this legislation and other sensible energy legislation and solutions put forth in this Congress. We have to do something. We can't keep punishing the American citizen and the American taxpayer, because if we keep our energy policies woke, we are going to go broke. This country is going to go flat broke. We are going to lose our farmers, we are going to lose small businesses, our prices are going to continue to rise, and it seems like nobody cares.

We better start taking care of the American people. If we unleash domestic production, we can produce clean energy, we can make it more affordable, and we can make life a lot simpler and better for the American people and also our allies. Let's wake up and smell the roses.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about our economy.

The President has been doing a lot of bragging these days about the economy. Last week, it was Virginia. Later this week, it is Philadelphia. He is in New York City today. He is going to be here on Capitol Hill, down the hall, in the House, next Tuesday night, for the State of the Union.

You know, the American people that I talk to—and looking at statistics and poll numbers from around the country—the American people just don't believe the President has anything to brag about, not when you look at the economy that is facing our Nation today. Two-thirds of people in polls out this weekend say that they disapprove of the way Joe Biden is handling the economy—disapprove, doing a bad job, the country heading in the wrong direction. And it is really a problem when 70 percent of the people think the country in which they live, the county they love, is heading in the wrong direction.

Why would they say it? Well, they took a look at their own personal situation, because the average American family has lost more than $10,000 to higher prices since Joe Biden took office just 2 years ago, and, now, what we are seeing across the country is more and more signs of the economy slowing down.

Last week, we found out that the economy had slowed down at the end of last year. Last year, the economy grew at only a rate of 2.1 percent for the entire year. The White House predicted that it would be 3.8 percent, so much below what the President and the White House had predicted. Actually, they missed it by almost half. And this is just the latest in a long list of disappointments that have affected the people all across the country over the last 2 years.

We found out Friday that consumer spending has dropped again. This week, working families are now getting another punch to the gut. Economists are predicting that the Federal Reserve is likely going to raise interest rates again in just 2 days. More rate hikes are going to make it even more expensive to borrow money. It is going to slow the economy down even further.

Over the last year, we have seen the largest rate hikes in 40 years. The average rate of new mortgages doubled since Joe Biden became President. Credit card interest are at an all-time high. Higher rates, harder to buy a home, harder to buy a house, harder to pay off credit card debt—it is no surprise that mortgage applications recently hit their lowest level in 25 years. They say they can't afford it at these rates.

This is very bitter medicine for the American people to take because they have been living through the worst inflation in 40 years. So why do we have the worst inflation in 40 years? Well, it is obvious. It is the massive spending done by the Democrats on a strictly party-line basis and the fact that the Democrats shut down American energy. You talk about a one-two punch—trying to kill the American energy industry and massive amounts of spending on top of it, inflation at a 40-year high, people suffering all around the country.

Now, economists are predicting another recession coming this year. What does that mean? Well, it means more pain for people, more punishment for families who are just trying to get by or trying to put food on the table, and food prices have skyrocketed again.

The American dream is moving further and further out of reach for many, many American families. According to the Gallup poll group, faith in the American dream recently hit an all-time low. How could that happen? Record numbers of people, surprisingly, believe that their children will have a lower standard of living than they have had. That is not the way my parents looked at me when I was growing up or your parents did, Mr. President, when you were growing up. The American dream was about a better next generation. Parents today don't see that for their kids because they see what they see going around their communities and this country.

Many young people are giving up on their hope to buy a home someday. Families trying to get ahead are having a harder time, and many are falling behind.

It didn't have to be this way. Oh, no, this is the result of the decisions that Joe Biden made and the inflation that Joe Biden and the Democrats have brought about this country.

Remember, when Joe Biden took office just 2 years ago, inflation in this country was virtually nonexistent. A typical 30-year mortgage went for less than 4 percent. The lockdowns from the pandemic were coming to an end. The economy was ready to take off. And then in March of 2021, with every Democrat voting for it and every Republican voting against it, Democrats printed $2 trillion and added it to the national debt.

Republicans warned the Democrats: Don't do it. Don't do this. Don't put the money. Don't spend the money. Don't add it to the debt.

We said it would cause inflation, and it wasn't just Republicans who were saying it. Democrats' own economic experts warned them: Don't spend the money. It is going to jazz up the economy to the point of more money in. Prices are going to go chasing it, and prices will go up.

Democrat advisers, like former President Obama's advisers—Larry Summers, Jason Furman, and Steve Rattner, to just to name a few—Democrats in Washington, in this body, on this side of the floor, ignored the whole thing, refused to listen. NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats in the House said we don't want to hear it. They put their fingers in their ears.

A month after President Biden signed the bill, inflation climbed. We have been suffering the consequences ever since.

President Biden said: No, no, it is transitory. No, it is not inflation.

He had a hundred excuses. It was here, and it was here to stay, and the Democrats caused it.

To add problems on top of this, Democrats also raised taxes on nearly every tax bracket. Of course, this was a direct violation of the promises Joe Biden made to the American people. Democrats raised prices anyway.

Joe Biden went and gave an inaugural address where he talked like he was going to work together. It is not what happened.

He went to the White House and killed the Keystone XL Pipeline and went far, far to the left, raising taxes on American energy, raising taxes on natural gas. Natural gas powers about half the homes in the United States. Taxes on coal went up a billion dollars. That means everybody is paying higher prices.

It is strangling our economy. It is strangling our energy production. It is wrong for the Nation.

You look at Joe Biden. He is smiling away like things are going well, completely out of touch with the families all across the country.

We are still producing a lot less oil today than we were before the pandemic, and gas prices have gone up about 40 cents already this year. They are predicted to go to over $4 a gallon by March because of the attack on American energy by this administration and this President.

Democrats have taken a sledgehammer to our economy on each and every side: higher taxes, higher spending, higher gas, less American energy. It is a Democrat policy in a nutshell. That is the Democrat economic policy: higher taxes, higher spending, higher debt, less American energy. It is a policy for failure, a policy for pain for American families.

I guess that is why, right now, today, in the United States Joe Biden is the least popular Democrat President in the last 60 years—the least popular. So instead of bragging, instead of going to New York and pounding his chest, as he did in Virginia and he is going to do in Pennsylvania—instead of bragging, he ought to be apologizing to the American people. He does owe the American people an apology for the damage and

the destruction that he has inflicted because of his radical leftwing policies.

His policies caused higher prices, caused higher interest rates, caused slower growth, caused much pain and much stress. So the American people are taking a look right now at the Biden economy, and they are not liking what they see. People want their money back. They want their future back. They want a future for their family.

So if Joe Biden won't apologize, which is what he should do when he comes to Congress next week for the State of the Union, then he should at least announce that he is going to change course, try to make things better, announce that he is going to stop this reckless spending that has brought us these problems, announce that he is finally going to unleash American energy so energy is affordable, available, and reliable.

That is what the American public is asking for and demanding. Working families in this country cannot afford any less.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I saw some exciting news this morning, and it said that General Motors announced it is making a $650 million equity investment in Lithium Americas to develop the Thacker Pass Mine in Nevada. Now, this has been talked about for 10, 12, 13 years, but it is time to do something.

According to GM, this represents ''the largest-ever investment by an automaker to produce battery raw materials,'' and that is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act was meant to do. It is a tangible result because of that, and now, we have to make sure we follow through.

GM's CEO, Ms. Mary Barra, even said:

> Direct sourcing critical [electric vehicles] raw materials and components from suppliers in North America and free-trade agreement countries helps make our supply chain more secure, helps us manage cell costs, and creates jobs.

This is really what we are dealing with. We are dealing with—basically, China has a captive market. I had a hard time understanding why our administration was going down a path of transitioning into electric vehicles as quickly as they intended and wanted to do without having our own secure supply chain.

China right now has 80 percent of the world's anode production, which is the positive and negative part of the battery that makes the battery work; 80 percent of the world's battery material processing, which is the processing of raw material that makes the batteries that run the vehicles we have; 60 percent of the world's cathode production; and 75 percent of the world's lithium ion battery cells.

I am old enough to remember—and maybe the Presiding Officer might be, too—that basically in 1974 I was standing in line waiting to buy gas, if it was my turn to buy gas, to go to work. I don't intend to stand in line to wait for China to send a battery to make my car work. I just won't do it. So this is why we are moving in the direction we are.

China has worked long and hard on cornering this market and done a very, very thorough job.

We have seen firsthand what Russia has done to the EU—to Europe, our allies—and most importantly, to Germany. They have used their production of energy—inexpensive, cheap energy—and let Europe and mostly Germany put their guard down and become totally dependent. Then Putin weaponized energy against them and put them in a heck of a stranglehold. Then basically decisions were being made about what they could do.

Well, the first thing they did was basically eliminate their dispatchable, dependable fuel, whether it be the coal-fired plants, which they had a desire to do, but they actively worked quicker than they had anything to replace it with and became more dependent. They got rid of their nuclear plants because their extreme environmental community wanted none of that; they wanted to go absolutely clean and green.

There will be a time probably—hopefully in our lifetime; maybe not, but in our children's lifetime—that all of this might be transitioned into a new carbonless fuel, but right now, we need an ''all of the above'' energy policy.

But they became totally dependent on cheap Russian gas, and they realized only after the invasion that they had made a mistake. Well, now they are scrambling to revive the very same coal-fired powerplants they shut down prematurely and bring back the nuclear reactors that they are going to need for a while.

People talk about the social cost of greenhouse gases, and I agree, there is a social cost, but we are not even talking about the geopolitical cost of inaction, being energy secure. That is really what this is all about.

The Inflation Reduction Act that we worked so hard on and every Democrat voted for in the House and the Senate, as the Presiding Officer knows, has been touted as an environmental bill. That is all you have heard. You have not heard the word from our administration talking about energy security.

The United States is the superpower of the world, and to remain that status, you have to have energy independence and be secure in your own energy sources.

If you recall, when all this happened and the invasion of Ukraine by Putin and basically the challenge we had and the high rising of oil prices to gasoline prices to everyday workers going back and forth—in my State, there is an awful lot of transit that goes on to secure your jobs. What had happened during that period of time, our administration started saying: Well, maybe we can reduce the sanctions on Iran.

I said: You have the most prolific terrorist supporters in the world, and you want to lift sanctions so they can put more product into the market and make more money or have more revenue to wreak more havoc on humankind? I don't think that should be, I don't think that is a good idea, and I sure can't sign up for something such as that.

Then we allowed Venezuela, which basically has very little oversights on their environmental emissions—but we released that, and now they are putting product in the market.

Now, if we are so concerned about the environment, which we all should be, then shouldn't we basically look at what is going on? Is America just turning a blind eye and saying: Out of sight, out of mind.

We are asking other parts of the world to do what we won't do. We asked the Gulf States—Saudi Arabia—to produce more oil, put more oil into the marketplace, because that would stabilize the oil price, bring the price of gasoline down. We never asked our friends in Texas. We never asked our friends in Alaska. We never asked our best trading partner Canada to do more for us. We were seen asking other people—and pretty drastic measures, if you would, by other nations—to do something we didn't want to do for ourselves. I thought that was unattainable, it was just unrealistic, and it did not show the leadership of the superpower of the world.

Again, I will repeat this, and I will continue to repeat it: You will not maintain this status of being a superpower unless our allies look to us for help when they need it. We didn't have the energy to even be independent ourselves, let alone be able to help our allies as quickly as they needed it. We are getting up to speed now, we are coming back, and that is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act was intended to do.

If we don't establish a domestic supply with the God-given resources that we have—we produce oil, we produce coal, and we produce natural gas environmentally better than anyplace else in the world. In the IRA, that bill was designed to have two tracks. For 10 years, we would have certainty that we would be energy independent by using everything above, and that means relying on the fossil fuels that we need, and we have, but we are going to do it better and cleaner than we have ever done it before. We put more money in carbon capture, sequestration, and utilization than ever before. We put more technology and fees on methane emission, which we know is harmful to the environment, than ever before. So basically we are leading the world and going to find the new technology we can share that makes the environment better. But if you can replace the dirty production of fossil with the cleaner production from the United States, that is

truly helping the environment. It is something that the leaders and the superpower of the world should be doing. We weren't in that position. We are fighting to get back.

But I have to watch now, after we passed a piece of legislation we all voted for—we are getting different interpretations from Treasury and other Agencies that have oversight, which is so wrong. That is not their job, to interpret what they want in a piece of legislation; their job is to basically enforce what we wrote in the legislation. And we said that we will be independent, that we will have our own supply of critical minerals. We will have our own supply, basically, and we are not going to have to depend on China for car batteries or anything else we need to run our economy. That is what we should be fighting for, and that is what we should all be considering that we should be doing.

The IRA is crystal clear. What the Department of the Treasury did is wrong. The law was very clear. By December 31 of last year, 2022, they were supposed to have the rules and regulations of how they would enforce the bill that we wrote. Well, guess what. They didn't. Now, guess what happened.

Let me explain to you how the law worked before. Before we did what we did with the IRA, the electric vehicles, the supplement that we gave, $7,500, from 2008 after the crash of the economy, the banking crash that we had—there was a bill passed in 2008, a recovery bill, that was going to give $7,500 credit to any manufacturer—I mean, any manufacturer—that sold an electric vehicle in the United States of America. Now, once they saturated and sold 200,000 cars, it was over; they got no more credits.

So let's look at our big manufacturers in the United States. We have General Motors, OK, we have basically Ford, and we have Toyota. Let me just tell you what has happened. So we are going to set the record straight because I had a discussion with my dear friend and colleague from Michigan, the Senator from Michigan, and we talked about that, and I think there was some misinterpretation or misspeaking about what has really happened.

As of last year, Tesla and—no, 2018. So that bill went into effect in 2008, and by 2018, Tesla and General Motors reached their cap of 200,000 cars. They weren't getting anymore $7,500 if they sold a Tesla and if they sold a General Motors electric vehicle. And guess what. It didn't slow down the sales any. Tesla kept right on. They are past the million mark now and still going strong. So people want the product. We didn't have to give them Treasury or give them taxpayers' money to do it. General Motors hit their 200,000. Toyota reached theirs last year. Ford reached theirs September of last year. So all the major manufacturers. If we had not done the inflation reduction bill and put in new guidelines, all the people who would have gotten the $7,500 credit from American taxpayers were all foreign manufacturers sending electric vehicles to America. That is not right.

But now what happened is they picked and chose. So the Secretary of the Treasury—and we have had a conversation. We agree to disagree, and I disagree stronger than anyone's ever disagreed on something that they are doing that they shouldn't be doing. They are doing it wrong, and I will continue to fight and hold them accountable.

Last week, I introduced a bipartisan bill with Senator BRAUN that would do one simple thing. It would implement the law as intended by putting the sourcing provision in effect immediately, whether Treasury chooses to issue guidance or not.

I cannot pressure them to do their job on time, but I can do this: We can do our job. We wrote a piece of legislation, and we can make sure it takes effect when it was supposed to when they haven't done their job. They failed to do it. What we are going to say is, fine, and you implement it exactly the way you wrote the law.

What they are trying to do is this. They said: We don't have rules and regulations, but from January 1—and still going on—they are going to continue to give $7,500 to everybody again. So they are opening it back up to General Motors. They are opening it back up to Tesla. They are opening it up to Toyota, to Ford. To everybody, it is opened up to start getting $7,500 again.

Now, what they did, they chose out of our bill—the Inflation Reduction Act—they said: Yes, but if you make more than $150,000, you are not qualified. That is exactly what is in our bill. But they said they don't have rules and regulations, but they took that part of it. They said: Well, if you buy a sedan that costs more than $55,000, you don't qualify for the 7,500. If you buy a pickup truck that is more than 85,000, you don't qualify. That is all in our bill.

If you can't write your rules and regulations, but you can pick and choose what you like in the bill, that means you don't want to enforce the bill the way it was written. That is what we should not tolerate. That is not what anybody in this body should ever tolerate, to let the Agencies do exactly what they think they want to do to appease whomever they are trying to appease versus what we passed and the intent of what we passed.

That is what I am upset about, and that is why we are going to continue to fight.

And as it stands right now, they are cherry-picking, and they have completely cherry-picked, and other Agencies will do the same. This selective implementation is going to create a disadvantage for some automakers while giving more flexibility to others by allowing this to happen.

It is beyond being not right.

So let me tell you what we are going to do to make sure that the American people understand.

If you believe that we were wrong in passing that piece of legislation, then speak up. If you believe that we were wrong in saying that we should not be dependent on China, but you want to continue to have China dominating the market, you want them to have total control in a market that we are moving—it is the first time in the history of the United States that we have ever had to rely on a foreign supply chain for our transportation mode, whether it is trains, whether it is planes, whether it is automobiles, any form of transportation. We have been able to not have to depend on another foreign supply chain because we were able to do it in the United States.

We have allowed a lot a manufacturing to leave. We are bringing it back now.

So what we said basically in the bill was: You get $3,750 credit toward an electric vehicle you bought from an American manufacturer, when the vehicle was manufactured in North America. That is the culmination between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, which is what NAFTA, which is what the USMCA, the new bill, that is what we do, has been moving those vehicles back and forth.

If it is manufactured here, you get 3,750. You get the first 3,750 if the selection of all the rare earth materials are selected from either North America or from countries that we have a free-trade agreement. And the reason that is done, we want to make sure that we have a secure channel for these rare earth minerals it takes to process and manufacture the battery.

So the processing, as far as the selection of the rare earth minerals, they have to come from either North America or our free-trade agreement countries. That gives us a solid supply. We are not dependent on China or Russia or any other nation that does not have our best interests and is not a democracy, does not have the same beliefs that we have for human rights and everything else that we do. We have that first, and then basically, it has to be manufactured in North America. Then you get the other 3,750.

So we use the $7,500 as the carrot to reimplement ourselves into the manufacturing and self-reliance of our transportation mode. That is simply it.

I would hope everybody watching, listening, or anything else, as far as trying to get the knowledge of what we have done and what we have tried to do and what we are intending to make sure happens—which is to hold this administration, hold basically the Treasury Department and every other Agency that thinks that they can free will and just make up what they want and do what they want and pick regulations that they think that they would rather implement rather than implementing the law.

That is where we are. That is what I want is to set the record straight. First

of all, all the automakers in America who hit the 200,000 cap, this was a new lease on life for them—the IRA, selecting it, and I would quote, and I am going to read again from Mary Barra, who is the CEO of General Motors:

[The] [d]irect sourcing [of] critical EV raw materials and components from suppliers in North America and free-trade-agreement countries helps make our supply chain more secure, helps us manage cell costs, and creates jobs.

Now, that is one of our largest manufacturers of automobiles in the United States of America. If she thinks it is good for her company, if she thinks it is good for the American citizens and the car buyers in America, then it should be good enough that the bill should be implemented the way it was intended to. What we are going to do is reestablish ourselves: major manufacturing; not being reliant; superpower of the world—maintain that; have the energy sources; use our fossil, clean as anywhere in the world, for the next 10 years, as we are investing $369 billion for the new technology of carbonless or carbon-free energy. Then that is leadership. That is what the world needs. That is what the world expects from the United States, and if we are going to maintain this world power, be the superpower of the world, we must maintain that leadership.

And it is tough at times, but we can do it. We have always done it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 184

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 184) 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 27, 2023, immediately following the prayer and reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR LANKFORD TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of January 31, 2023, appoints the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD, to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 27, 2023.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 23–0A. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 17–65 of April 4, 2018.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23–0A

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or CAPABILITY (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C)), (AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Spain.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 17–65.

Date: April 4, 2018.

Implementing Agency: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On April 4, 2018, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 17–65, of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of seventeen (17) CH–47F cargo helicopters with customer-unique modifications, twenty-one (21) Common Missile Warning System (CMWS) AN/AAR–57A(V)8, and forty-two (42) Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) Inertial Navigation System (INS) (EGI). Also included were mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer-unique modifications, communication, Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE), and navigation equipment including AN/ARC–231 Multimode radios, AN/ARC–201D SINCGARS radios, AN/ARC–220 High Frequency (HF) Radio, Identification, Friend or Foe (IFF), AN/AAR–57A(V)8, and the Radar Signal Detecting Set (RSDS), AN/APR–39A(V)1, special tools and test equipment, ground support equipment, airframe and engine spare parts, technical data, publications, MWO/ECPs, technical assistance, transportation of aircraft and training, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value was $1.3 billion. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $900 million of this total.

This transmittal notifies the addition of the following MDE items:

—One (1) CH–47F Cargo Helicopter with customer-unique modifications;

—Two (2) Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS) AN/AAR–57A(V)8

—Two (2) Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) Inertial Navigation Systems (INS) (EGI)

Also included are equipment and services to support the new CH–47F cargo helicopter, as well as support the upgrade/remanufacturing of the previously notified, seventeen (17) cargo helicopters from CH–47D to CH–47F configuration, to include: mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer-unique modifications; communications equipment: Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) and navigation equipment including: AN/ARC–231 Multimode radios, AN/ARC–201D SINCGARS radios, AN/ARC–220 High Frequency (HF) radios, Identification Friend or Foe (IFF), AN/AAR–57A(V)8, and the Radar Signal Detecting Set (RSDS); AN/APR–39A(V)1; special tools and test equipment; ground support equipment; airframe and engine spare parts; technical data; publications; Modification Work Order/Engineering Change Proposals (MWO/ECP); technical assistance, transportation of aircraft and training; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total value of the new items is $91.3 million, but will not cause an increase in the total estimated program cost. The total estimated case value will remain $1.3 billion with MDE remaining $900 million of this total.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided as the additional MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The proposed sale will support Spain's capability to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. This additional aircraft will also enhance Spain's commitment and contribution to NATO in providing a Combat Aviation Brigade.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the

U.S. national interest to assist Spain in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The statement contained in the original AECA 36(b)(1) transmittal applies to the MDE items reported here.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 25, 2023

NORWAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to mark the new security cooperation agreement through the Department of Defense's State Partnership Program between the Minnesota National Guard and the Kingdom of Norway, which will be celebrated in Minnesota on Saturday, February 4, 2023. This partnership will provide a key avenue to deter aggression and assist in both of our nation's national security while broadening and deepening our long-standing relationship.

Norway has been critical to Minnesota's heritage and culture ever since the first Norwegian settlement was established in Spring Grove back in the early 1850s, a few years before Minnesota officially became a State. Today, Minnesota is the proud home of more than 860,000 Norwegian Americans. Some of our most beloved Minnesotans have been of Norwegian ancestry, including my late friend and mentor, Vice President Walter Mondale. At the end of last year, we had the honor of welcoming Her Majesty Queen Sonja to Minneapolis to celebrate the opening of Norway House's new Innovation and Cultural Center.

In addition to our cultural heritage, Minnesota and Norway share a strong, time-tested military relationship. In 1973, Norwegian Home Guard's Major General Herluf Nygaard invited the chief of the National Guard, Major General Francis S. Greenlief, to visit their Home Guard. What came out of that meeting was the Norwegian Reciprocal Troop Exchange, also known as NOREX.

Through this program, members of the Minnesota National Guard and the Norwegian Home Guard have gotten the opportunity to participate in field training exercises with an appropriate emphasis on winter tactical training. For Minnesota guardsmen, it has meant skiing through the mountains of Norway and sleeping in tents and snow shelters. For Norway's soldiers, it has meant winter training at Camp Ripley. Every participant is taken in as a guest by a local family, making NOREX a true cultural exchange.

For 50 years, the program has strengthened the militaries of both our nations while fostering goodwill and lifelong friendships. This new State Partnership Program brings with it the opportunity to build on that progress while offering reassurance to our friends throughout the globe and deterring our foes. This partnership will promote and deepen trust, familiarity, and interoperability between Minnesota and Norway.

Norway is one of Minnesota's best friends around the world. They have stood with us. We have stood with them. And we will continue to stand together. Our friendship is unshakeable. Our progress toward initiating this new State Partnership Program is a testament to that.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for myself as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and for Senator Lankford, vice chairman of the committee, that the Annual Report of the Select Committee on Ethics for calendar year 2022 be printed in the Record. The committee issued this report on January 31, 2023, as required by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
January 31, 2023.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

118TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (the Act) calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report no later than January 31st of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported below is the information describing the Committee's activities in 2022 in the categories set forth in the Act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee—92. (In addition, 10 alleged violations from previous years were carried into 2022.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 72.

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 8.

(3) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry: 22. (This figure includes 10 matters from previous years carried into 2022.)

(4) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry that resulted in an adjudicatory review: 0.

(5) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee dismissed the matter for lack of substantial merit or because it was inadvertent, technical or otherwise of a *de minimis* nature: 15.

(6) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee issued private or public letters of admonition: 1.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction: 0.

(8) Any other information deemed by the Committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the previous year:

In 2022, the Committee staff conducted 24 Member and office campaign activity briefings; 15 employee code of conduct training sessions; 2 public financial disclosure clinics, seminars, and webinars; 10 ethics seminars and customized briefings for Member DC offices, state offices, and Senate committees; 1 private sector ethics briefing, and 1 international briefing.

In 2022, the Committee staff handled approximately 8,966 inquiries (via telephone and email) for ethics advice and guidance.

In 2022, the Committee wrote approximately 778 ethics advisory letters and responses including, but not limited to, 584 travel and gifts matters (Senate Rule 35) and 160 conflict of interest matters (Senate Rule 37).

In 2022, the Committee received 4,031 public financial disclosure and periodic disclosure of financial transactions reports.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SCOTT LABARRE

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life and career of my dear friend Scott LaBarre on the sad occasion of his death after a battle with cancer. Scott passed away surrounded by his family on Saturday, December 10, 2022.

From his days as a college student until a few months before his death, Scott, who went blind as a youth, fought tirelessly for the rights of blind people and other people with disabilities.

Born and raised in Minnesota, Scott attended the Colorado Center for the Blind, a world-renowned rehabilitation training program for blind people, and ultimately established his law practice and his family in the Denver area.

His legal work focused in the areas of employment law, disability rights, and international copyright policy. He held several leadership positions within the American Bar Association and the National Federation of the Blind—NFB—most recently as NFB's general counsel.

He served as chair of the board of the Colorado Center for the Blind, led the National Association of Blind Lawyers, and helped establish and guide the Jacobus tenBroek Law Symposium, the premier conference for practitioners and students of disability law.

His impact will continue to ripple across the world because of his leadership in securing the Marrakesh Treaty, an international agreement permitting the cross-border sharing of books in Braille and other accessible formats, which was ratified by this body.

Scott conducted all of his work with confidence, humor, and a joyful spirit. Going forward, I will miss his presence in the halls of the Senate when the National Federation of the Blind visits Washington each year, as well as my many other interactions with him.

I am sure that many of you also encountered Scott, and I know you will join me in lifting up his wife Anahit and their children, Alex and Carter, as they cope with this devastating loss.

I take comfort in the knowledge that Scott leaves a legacy encompassing not only his many accomplishments, but his impact on the hundreds of blind people whom he personally mentored and the millions who will benefit from his efforts for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BRAD GIOIA

● Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of Senator BLACKBURN and myself to honor the legacy and impact of Brad Gioia's 29 years of service as the head of school for Montgomery Bell Academy.

Since Brad was called to serve the MBA community nearly three decades ago, he has grown the preparatory school into a world-renowned institution. MBA's mission is to ''provide each student with the tools to reach his maximum potential as a gentleman, a scholar, and an athlete.'' Brad Gioia has dedicated himself to fulfilling this mission. Senator BLACKBURN and I are honored to recognize his great service.

During the past 29 years, Brad has grown MBA's student population by two-thirds, increased the school's budget by 1,100 percent, and quadrupled the school's endowment. Most impressively, he has developed the comprehensive Wilson Grant program, which has sent hundreds of students to study and serve others all over the world.

Throughout his tenure, Brad has been a constant figure of support, dedication, and commitment to the students of MBA. He created a culture of support where all boys are celebrated when they excel, whether it is in academics, athletics, music, art, debate, mock trial, service, or theater. The strong sense of community that Brad Gioia built at MBA will reverberate for decades to come, and our community is forever grateful for his selfless service to the thousands of young MBA men over the years.

His dedication to the MBA community and the greater Nashville community will be missed, and his legacy will not be forgotten. On behalf of Senator BLACKBURN and the entire Nashville community, I thank you for your tireless years of service as the head of school for Montgomery Bell Academy. We wish you, Minna, Christopher, and Gabby all the best as you enter the next chapter of your life.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 290. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes.

H.R. 298. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 342. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 500. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to postpone the date of payment or satisfaction upon redemption of certain securities in the case of the financial exploitation of specified adults, and for other purposes.

H.R. 582. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. Guthrie of Kentucky, Mr. Dunn of Florida, Mr. Bergman of Michigan, Mrs. Wagner of Missouri, Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania, and Mr. McCormick of Georgia.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 290. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 298. An act 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 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 342. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 500. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to postpone the date of payment or satisfaction upon redemption of certain securities in the case of the financial exploitation of specified adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 582. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 184. 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.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–146. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Internet Communication Disclaimers and Definition of 'Public Communication' '' (Notice 2022–22) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–147. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to fifteen (15) legislative recommendations received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–148. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to fifteen (15) legislative recommendations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–149. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Somalia'' ((RIN2120–AL78) (Docket No. FAA–2022–27602)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–150. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–151. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 569'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 31462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–152. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4036'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31459)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–153. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4038'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31461)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–154. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4040'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31464)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–155. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4039'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–156. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) (Type Certificates Previously Held by Messerschmitt-Bolkow-Blohm (MBB), and Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (ECD)) Helicopters; Amendment 39–22247'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1070)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–157. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–22233'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0881)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–158. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22243'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1155)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–159. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22245'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–160. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22269'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0995)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–161. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–22274'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1574)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–162. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22251'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0799)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–163. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Yabora Industria Aeronautica S.A.; Embraer S.A) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22256'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1489)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–164. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22254'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–165. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22253'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0471)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–166. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39–22281'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–167. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22260'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0985)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–168. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22264'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1237)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–169. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22262'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0993)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–170. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; ATR–GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes; Amendment 39–22272'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0395)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–171. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22277'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1576)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–172. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22278'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1167)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–173. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22258'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0833)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–174. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22259'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1168)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–175. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22261'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0882)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–176. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22275'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1236)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–177. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22249'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0588)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–178. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22271'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1061)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–179. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22255'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1054)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–180. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22276'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0978)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–181. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. (Type Certificate Previously Held by WALTER Engines a.s., Walter a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.) Turboprop Engines; Amendment 39–22279'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1239)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–182. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Yabora Industria Aeronautica S.A.; Amendment 39–22266'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1568)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–183. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22265'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1567)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–184. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22270'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1571)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–185. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22267'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1569)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–186. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22268'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1570)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–187. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22289'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1306)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–188. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39–22288'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0465)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–189. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22284'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1649)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–190. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39–22293'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1658)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–191. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22292'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1657)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–192. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22286'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1248)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–193. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22285'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0981)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–194. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes; Amendment 39–22290'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1238)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–195. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Improving 911 Reliability; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications'' ((PS Docket Nos. 15–80, 13–75 and ET Docket No. 04–35) (FCC 22–50)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–196. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In the Matter of Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties to Reflect Inflation'' (DA Docket No. 22–1356) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–197. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22246'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–198. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–199. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0940)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–200. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Route T–266; Juneau, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1106)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–201. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route; and Revocation of the Pawnee City, NE, Low Altitude Reporting Point in the Vicinity of Pawnee City, NE'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0712)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–202. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–203. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0858)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–204. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeast United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–205. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeast United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–206. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Domestic VOR Federal Airway V–356; Mile High, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0027)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–207. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Federal Airway V–573 and Area Navigation (RNAV) Route 398 in the Vicinity of Sulphur Springs, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0617)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–208. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Manchester, NH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–209. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Christmas Valley Airport, OR; CORRECTION'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–210. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brookings Airport, Brookings, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1031)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–211. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled '' Modification of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Boozman Yellowstone International Airport, MT; CORRECTION'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0764)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–212. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; East Hampton and Montauk, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1545)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–213. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishmen of Class E Airspace; Christmas Valley Airport, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0571)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–214. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Montpelier, VT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0376)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–215. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class C Airspace; Manchester, NH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–216. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Butts Army Airfield (AAF) (Fort Carson) Airport, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0797)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–217. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Montpelier, VT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0376)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–218. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace; Fort Belvoir, VA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1447)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oneonta, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1073)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–220. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 4(A–4); Anaktuvuk Pass, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0078)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–221. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Proposed Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue (B–79); Annette Island, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0109)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–222. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 7 (B–7) and Green 9 (G–9); Bethel, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–223. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 7 (G–7); Nome, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0301)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–224. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 15 (G–15); St. Mary's, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0162)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–225. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 6 (A–6); St. Mary's, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0299)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–226. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Red 1 (R–1) Vicinity of King Salmon, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0765)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–227. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 17 (G–17); Atqasuk, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0539)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–228. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 5 (A–5) and Blue 4 (B–4); Bettles, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0172)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–229. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 26 (B–26); Fort Yukon, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0110)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–230. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 37 (B–37); Level Island, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0312)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–231. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Red 51 (R–51); Level Island, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0120)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–232. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 2 (A–2); Northway, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0120)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–233. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 8 (B–8); Shishmaref, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0300)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–234. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 18 (G–18); Point Lay, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–235. A communication from the Program Analyst, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In the Matter of Process Reform for Executive Branch Review of Certain FCC Applications and Petitions Involving Foreign Ownership'' ((IB Docket Nos. 22–271 and 18–313) (FCC 22–74)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–236. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Norwell, Massachusetts'' (MB Docket No. 22–376) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–237. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Memphis, TN'' (MB Docket No. 22–146) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–238. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Television Broadcasting Services; Chicago, Illinois'' (MB Docket No. 22–546) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the

President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–239. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule; Technical Amendments; Miscellaneous Amendments'' ((RIN2120–AL53) (FAA–2022–1355)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–240. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting, pursuant to Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the Office's annual reports containing recommendations regarding the applicability to the legislative branch of Federal laws and regulations concerning workplace rights, safety and health, and public access, received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committees on Rules and Administration; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–241. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting, pursuant to Section 301(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the Office's annual reports regarding covered payments from the account described in section 415(a) of the Act that were the result of claims alleging a violation of part A of title II of the Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–2. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan requesting the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of Michigan's statue of Lewis Cass with a statue of Coleman A. Young as part of the National Statuary Hall Collection and to take other actions related to this request; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 23

Whereas, Congress authorized the creation of the National Statuary Hall Collection in 1864 to provide an opportunity for each state to honor two distinguished people with statues at the U.S. Capitol Currently, Lewis Cass and Gerald Ford represent the state of Michigan in the collection. The statues were placed in the U.S. Capitol in 1889 and 2011, respectively, and

Whereas, Federal law establishes a process by which states may request the replacement of a statue located in the National Statuary Hall Collection. The first step in the process is the state legislature adopting a resolution identifying the statue to replace and the person to be honored with a new statue, selecting the entity responsible for choosing the sculptor, and directing the method of obtaining funds to cover the necessary costs of the replacement. Federal law also requires that the state's governor submit a written request to provide a new statue to the Architect of the Capitol along with a description of the location in the state where the replaced statue will be displayed after it is transferred, and a copy of the resolution authorizing the replacement, and

Whereas, A statue of Lewis Cass was placed in the U.S. Capitol on behalf of Michigan in the late 19th century in recognition of his service to the state of Michigan and United States Lewis Cass served as a Governor of the Michigan territory, U.S. Senator from Michigan, U.S. Secretary of War, U.S. Secretary of State, and U.S. Ambassador to France during his career, and

Whereas, Honoring Lewis Cass with a statue in the National Statuary Hall Collection is no longer consistent with the values of the people of Michigan While Lewis Cass was an accomplished public figure, he played a prominent role in the implementation of President Andrew Jackson's Indian removal policy, was a proponent of allowing states and territories to permit slavery, and enslaved at least one person himself, and

Whereas, Coleman A. Young was the first African-American mayor of Detroit and one of the most accomplished leaders in Michigan's largest city's history. Young served his country as a bombardier and navigator with the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II. He demonstrated an early interest in justice and fairness, spearheading a protest against the exclusion of Blacks from segregated officers' clubs. Young became a union activist after the war and was elected to the Michigan Senate serving for nine years. The people of Detroit elected him as their mayor for the first time in 1973, reelecting him four times over the next two decades. Young was known for championing needs of the city's Black community and for building coalitions among its business leaders. Under his leadership, the city saw the completion of a number of major projects, such as the Renaissance Center, Detroit People Mover, and Joe Louis Arena. Young's contributions to the city of Detroit, and our entire state make him deserving of a place in the National Statutory Hall Collection, and

Whereas, The Michigan Statuary Hall Commission will select the sculptor and secure funding for this project; Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives Concurring)*, That we request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of Michigan's statue of Louis Cass with a statue of Coleman A. Young as part of the National Statuary Hall Collection; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Governor to communicate approval of this replacement to the Architect of the Capitol and to sign an agreement with the Architect of the Capitol to replace the Lewis Cass statue with one of Coleman A. Young; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby establish the Michigan Statuary Hall Commission. The commission will select an artist to sculpt the statue of Coleman A. Young. The commission shall be made up of five members, with one member appointed by each of the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senate Majority Leader the House Minority Leader, and the Senate Minority Leader; and be it further

Resolved, That the costs of this entire project, including the costs of creating, transporting, and placing both statues at their respective locations and the costs related to ceremonies that may be held in Lansing and Washington, D.C., will be paid for by donations and other funding secured by the Michigan Statuary Hall Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Architect of the Capitol, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the members of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 155. A bill to ensure that employees of the Internal Revenue Service are brought back to their offices until the backlog of income tax returns has been eliminated; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. LEE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THUNE, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 156. A bill to expand the use of E–Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 157. A bill to prevent the misuse of drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 158. A bill to increase United States jobs through greater United States exports to Africa and Latin America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for mandatory restitution or civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 160. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 161. A bill to extend the Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 162. A bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National

Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and certain other weapons from the definition of firearms for purposes of the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 164. A bill to prohibit the consideration of COVID–19 vaccination status in determining eligibility for organ donation or transplantation, and in providing services to Medicare or Medicaid beneficiaries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 165. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal and local funds to impose or enforce a COVID–19 vaccine mandate in District of Columbia schools, and to repeal the Coronavirus Immunization of School Students and Early Childhood Workers Regulation Amendment Act of 2021 enacted by the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 166. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave for the spontaneous loss of an unborn child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 167. A bill to prohibit vaccination mandates for COVID–19; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 168. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and require review of certain agricultural transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 169. A bill to prohibit certain COVID–19 vaccination mandates for minors, and to require parental consent for COVID–19 vaccination of minors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 170. A bill to establish a Joint Select Committee on Afghanistan to conduct a full investigation and compile a joint report on the United States withdrawal from Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 171. A bill to prohibit the consideration of patients' race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, vaccination status, veteran status, or political ideology or speech in determining eligibility for COVID–19 treatments and vaccines distributed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 172. A bill to terminate any existing mask mandates imposed by the Federal Government, to prevent the implementation of new mask mandates, to preserve individual liberty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KING, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 173. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage or firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 174. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 175. A bill to codify certain public land orders relating to the revocation of certain withdrawals of public land in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. SMITH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 176. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 177. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide grants to reduce the quantity of food waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 178. A bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 179. A bill to require the designation of composting as a conservation practice and activity, to provide grants and loan guarantees for composting facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 180. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2023, to improve disaster relief funding for agricultural producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 181. A bill to protect individual liberty, ensure privacy, and prohibit discrimination with respect to the vaccination status of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 182. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 183. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to add a work-study program for off-campus community service at selected after-school activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 184. 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; read the first time.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the program for direct housing loans made to Native American veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 186. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from promoting, supporting, or contracting with abortion entities, or otherwise expanding access to abortions on Federal lands or in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the trade or business expense deduction for the reimbursement of employee costs of child gender transition procedure or travel to obtain an abortion; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 188. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to select and implement landscape-scale forest restoration projects, to assist communities in increasing their resilience to wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 189. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to require the contractual provision by large issuers of procedural privileges with respect to certain shareholder claims relating to board and management accountability for ''woke'' social policy actions as a condition of listing on a national securities exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 190. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit exports of crude and refined oil and certain petroleum products to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ,

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 191. A bill to eliminate the position of the Chief Diversity Officer of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 192. A bill to criminalize the intentional destruction of roadways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 193. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect students from racial hostility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 194. A bill to prohibit the disbursement of Federal funds to State and local governments that allow individuals who are not citizens of the United States to vote in any Federal, State, or local election; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 195. A bill to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L'Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 196. A bill to prohibit the declaration of a Federal emergency relating to abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 197. A bill to permanently enact certain appropriations Act restrictions on the use of funds for abortions and involuntary sterilizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VANCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROMNEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. BRITT):

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 20. A resolution condemning the coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained, promoting accountability and justice for those killed by the Burmese military, and calling for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to improve the workforce of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 18

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 18, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 37

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 75, a bill to ensure equal treatment for religious organizations in the Federal provision of social services programs, grantmaking, and contracting, and for other purposes.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 81, a bill to provide a moratorium on all Federal research grants provided to any institution of higher education or other research institute that is conducting gain-of-function research.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to protect social security benefits and military pay and require that the United States Government to prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 111

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 111, a bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100-word plain language summary of the proposed rule.

S. 122

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to establish the Payroll Audit Independent Determination program in the Department of Labor.

S. 127

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to prevent unfair and deceptive acts or practices and the dissemination of false information related to pharmacy benefit management services for prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 2, a concurrent resolution commending the bravery, courage, and resolve of the women and men of Iran demonstrating in more than 133 cities and risking their safety to speak out against the Iranian regime's human rights abuses.

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 2, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 158. A bill to increase United States jobs through greater United States exports to Africa and Latin America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 158

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 ''Increasing American Jobs Through Greater United States Exports to Africa and Latin America Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. INVESTMENT, TRADE, AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a comprehensive United States strategy for public and private investment, trade, and development in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean.

(2) FOCUS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall focus on increasing exports of United States goods and services to Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean by 200 percent in real dollar value

by the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the President shall consult with—

(A) Congress;

(B) each agency that is a member of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(C) the relevant multilateral development banks, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the respective United States Executive Directors of such banks;

(D) each agency that participates in the Trade Policy Staff Committee established;

(E) the President's Export Council;

(F) each of the development agencies;

(G) any other Federal agencies with responsibility for export promotion or financing and development; and

(H) the private sector, including businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and African and Latin American and Caribbean diaspora groups.

(4) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress the strategy required by subsection (a).

(B) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(b) SPECIAL AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EXPORT STRATEGY COORDINATORS.—The President shall designate an individual to serve as Special Africa Export Strategy Coordinator and an individual to serve as Special Latin America and the Caribbean Export Strategy Coordinator—

(1) to oversee the development and implementation of the strategy required by subsection (a); and

(2) to coordinate developing and implementing the strategy with—

(A) the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(B) the Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs or the Assistant United States Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, as appropriate;

(C) the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs or the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, as appropriate;

(D) the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(E) the United States International Development Finance Corporation; and

(F) the development agencies.

(c) TRADE MISSIONS TO AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—It is the sense of Congress that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce and other high-level officials of the United States Government with responsibility for export promotion, financing, and development should conduct joint trade missions to Africa and to Latin America and the Caribbean.

(d) TRAINING.—The President shall develop a plan—

(1) to standardize the training received by United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers, economic officers of the Department of State, and economic officers of the United States Agency for International Development with respect to the programs and procedures of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the Small Business Administration, and the United States Trade and Development Agency; and

(2) to ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) all United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers that are stationed overseas receive the training described in paragraph (1); and

(B) in the case of a country to which no United States and Foreign Commercial Service officer is assigned, any economic officer of the Department of State stationed in that country receives that training.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.—The term ''development agencies'' means the United States Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Trade and Development Agency, the United States Department of Agriculture, and relevant multilateral development banks.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The term ''multilateral development banks'' has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c)(4) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(4)) and includes the African Development Foundation.

(3) TRADE POLICY STAFF COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Policy Staff Committee'' means the Trade Policy Staff Committee established pursuant to section 2002.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee'' means the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727).

(5) UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—The term ''United States and Foreign Commercial Service'' means the United States and Foreign Commercial Service established by section 2301 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721).

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 174. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 174

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 ''Conservation Reserve Program Improvement Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) STATE ACRES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT.—Section 1231(d)(6)(A)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(d)(6)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) land that will be enrolled under the State acres for wildlife enhancement practice established by the Secretary; and''.

(b) COST SHARING PAYMENTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1234(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''establishing water'' and inserting the following: ''establishing—

''(A) water'';

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) grazing infrastructure, including interior cross fencing, perimeter fencing, and water infrastructure (such as rural water connections, water wells, pipelines, and water tanks), under each contract, for all practices, if grazing is included in the conservation plan and addresses a resource concern.''.

(2) REENROLLMENT OF LAND WITH GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—Section 1231(h) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LAND WITH GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—On the expiration of a contract entered into under this subchapter that covers land that includes grazing infrastructure established with cost sharing assistance under section 1234(b)(1)(B)—

''(A) the Secretary shall consider that land to be planted for purposes of subsection (b)(1)(B); and

''(B) that land shall be eligible for reenrollment in the conservation reserve, subject to the requirements of this subchapter.''.

(c) MID-CONTRACT MANAGEMENT FOR ACTIVITIES NOT RELATING TO HAYING OR GRAZING.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MANAGEMENT.—Section 1232(a)(5) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(5)) is amended by inserting ''(as defined in section 1231A(a))'' after ''management''.

(2) MANAGEMENT PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) MANAGEMENT PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make cost sharing payments to an owner or operator under this subchapter for any management activity described in section 1232(a)(5), except for those management activities relating to haying or grazing.''.

(d) PAYMENT LIMITATION FOR RENTAL PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(g)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''$50,000'' and inserting ''$125,000''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 188. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to select and implement landscape-scale forest restoration projects, to assist communities in increasing their resilience to wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the Wildfire Emergency Act, bipartisan legislation that Senators PADILLA, DAINES, WYDEN, and I are introducing today, to help address the threat of catastrophic wildfire throughout the West.

Wildfires have always been a part of life in California and other Western States, but climate change and drier forests have increased the threat of catastrophic wildfire. The new fire season is nearly year-round, and the wildfires themselves are more destructive as they spread faster and burn hotter.

The new reality of the wildfire threat requires transformative action to protect our forests and neighboring communities. Our bill would do just that, empowering Federal, State, and local land managers to make both our forests and infrastructure more resilient.

The most recent National Climate Assessment, conducted by leading scientists from the research community and across the Federal Government, found that the number of acres burned in the Western United States is double what would have burned without climate change.

My home State of California knows this all too well as it is the epicenter of this destructive phenomenon. The top three worst wildfire seasons in California were all in the last 5 years, including the largest single wildfire in California history in 2021. Since 2017, wildfires have burned more than 11 million acres, killed nearly 200 people, and destroyed more than 32,000 homes.

Worryingly, these wildfires are predicted to only grow worse as climate conditions continue to change, and the Federal Government has not yet adequately responded. Important investments in wildfire resilience were included in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Inflation Reduction Act, which were enacted in the last Congress, but stakeholders are nearly unanimous in supporting additional policy changes to improve the pace and scale of wildfire resiliency treatments.

At the same time, the urgency of this crisis should not prompt Congress to vitiate important environmental safeguards. Throughout my time in the Senate, I have consistently championed the preservation and careful stewardship of our treasured forests, and this bill will be no different.

Our Wildfire Emergency Act is the result of a considered approach to the wildfire crisis and includes feedback from conservationists, public and private stakeholders, and the U.S. Forest Service.

First, it would provide the U.S. Forest Service with a pilot authority to leverage private financing options to increase the pace and scale of forest restoration projects. These projects would involve a collaborative approach to forest management to ensure that the forests are protected.

This conservation finance model would be a new way of implementing forest restoration work, but the principle at its core is that forests are vital to a healthy environment and populace. Forests provide shade and wind breaks, stabilize steep mountain slopes, and help purify our water. These benefits have tangible value, and the financing model we develop here would make those benefits plain for all to see.

In addition, the bill makes energy resilience a priority across the Federal Government. It would help develop and fund backup power for critical infrastructure like drinking water or hospitals, and put a renewed focus on wildfire detection and monitoring. As vulnerable as our forests are, it takes just one spark to ignite an entire mountain. The sooner our firefighters can detect and respond to these fires, the better our chances of preventing more communities from devastation.

In addition, the bill would provide grants to low-income households to make fire-resilient upgrades to their homes. Thanks to home insurance regulatory changes taking place in California, wildfire retrofits could also help lower insurance premiums and reduce the financial burden on rural homeowners. The bill would also make grants available to low-income communities to help involve them in planning and implementing forest restoration projects on the lands surrounding their homes.

Lastly, our bill recognizes that the forest management workforce is also in crisis. The U.S. Forest Service and Department of Interior have experience chronic staffing shortages in wildland firefighters for years. And even though the bipartisan infrastructure law and Inflation Reduction Act provided historic levels of funding for forest conservation work, the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts an overall decline in the forest conservation workforce in the next 10 years.

To address these issues, our bill would create new funding sources for forest management education and firefighter training. It would also establish a prescribed fire training center in the Western United States, to train the next generation of firefighters and forestry technicians in the landscapes where their skills are most needed.

The simple reality is that wildfires will continue to happen in the West. They are an integral part of the West's ecology, even if climate change has exacerbated their scale and intensity. Our job must be to prepare for these wildfires to the extent we are able, to use the best available science to make our forests more resilient, and ensure that our communities remain safe.

That is why Senators PADILLA, DAINES, WYDEN, and I have introduced this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass it as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—CONDEMNING THE COUP THAT TOOK PLACE ON FEBRUARY 1, 2021, IN BURMA AND THE BURMESE MILITARY'S DETENTION OF CIVILIAN LEADERS, CALLING FOR AN IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF ALL THOSE DETAINED, PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY AND JUSTICE FOR THOSE KILLED BY THE BURMESE MILITARY, AND CALLING FOR THOSE ELECTED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT TO RESUME THEIR DUTIES WITHOUT IMPEDIMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 20

Whereas, on February 1, 2021, the Burmese military and its aligned Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP) conducted a coup against the civilian government hours before Parliament was to convene in a new session, resulting in the military junta illegally detaining State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi, President Win Myint, and members of Parliament, as well as pro-democracy activists from the 88 Generation and other civil society leaders;

Whereas, since February 1, 2021, the Burmese military has detained more than 13,000 people for exercising their rights of freedom of speech and assembly and killed more than 2,800 civilians, including children;

Whereas the Burmese military put the democratically elected civilian leadership of Burma, including President Win Myint and State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi, through sham trials for fabricated crimes and sentenced them to lengthy prison terms in order to remove them from political competition;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi was sentenced to 33 years in prison for multiple spurious charges;

Whereas the Burmese military has become the world's second largest detainer of journalists, with over 100 journalists imprisoned since the coup;

Whereas the Burmese military's actions have driven hundreds of thousands from their homes and driven thousands to flee across Burma's borders into Thailand, India, and Bangladesh;

Whereas fighting between the Burmese military and several ethnic armed groups continues, with government forces committing increasingly violent abuses against ethnic Karen, Kayah, Kachin, Chin, Rakhine, Shan, and Rohingya minority populations;

Whereas the Burmese military restricted freedom of movement, telecommunications, and the media, limiting access to information to and from Burma during the COVID–19 pandemic, which exacerbated the political crisis initiated by the February 1, 2021 coup;

Whereas senior generals of the Burmese military have been sanctioned by the United States Government for serious human rights abuses and for their role in the coup and are subject to ongoing investigations into their conduct by the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice;

Whereas, on January 28, 2021, the Union Election Commission rejected allegations by the Burmese military that fraud played a significant role in determining the outcome of the November 2020 elections;

Whereas Burma's November 2020 elections resulted in the National League for Democracy party securing enough seats in Parliament to form the next government;

Whereas Burmese military general Min Aung Hlaing has announced his intentions for Burmese parliamentary elections to be held by August 1, 2023;

Whereas, without full participation from relevant political forces in the country, including civil society groups and opposition parties, and without a robust presence of credible international observers, the results of any parliamentary election run by the military regime will not gain widespread acceptance, domestically or internationally;

Whereas, in July 2022, the Burmese military executed four male activists accused of aiding insurgents to fight Burma's army following secret trials;

Whereas, in response to the Civil Disobedience Movement's opposition protests, the Burmese military has used live fire, water cannons, and rubber bullets against peace protestors;

Whereas, in December 2021, violent reprisals against peaceful protests resulted in the

torture and subsequent deaths of over 40 civilians in Sagaing;

Whereas the Burmese military has a long history of committing atrocities against the people of Burma, including the targeting of specific ethnic groups;

Whereas, as of October 2022, over 943,000 stateless Rohingya refugees reside in Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas, Bangladesh, the vast majority of whom live in 34 extremely congested camps;

Whereas, on March 21, 2022, the United States Secretary of State formally determined that members of the Burmese military committed genocide and crimes against humanity against Rohingya in 2016 and 2017;

Whereas the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and ASEAN member states continue to play an important role in addressing the crisis in Burma, including through the provision of humanitarian assistance in Burma and by preventing junta leadership from participating in ASEAN meetings, absent progress on the 5 Point Consensus;

Whereas United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar Thomas H. Andrews and Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar Noeleen Heyzer continue to provide ongoing reporting and analysis of the dire and deteriorating situation for the men, women, and children of Burma, inside the country and as refugees, including through presentations to the United Nations Human Rights Council and the United Nations General Assembly, and through reports that document the illegitimacy of the Burmese junta and urge member states to engage in coordinated sanctions and weapon embargos against the junta;

Whereas the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar continues to collect, consolidate, preserve, and analyze evidence of serious international crimes and violations of international law committed in Myanmar since 2011, and helps to facilitate and expedite fair and independent criminal proceedings; and

Whereas, in December 2022, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2669 on Burma, the first resolution on Burma since the country was admitted as a member state in 1948, calling for the immediate end to all forms of violence and urging restraint and the release of all prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Burma in their quest for democracy, sustainable peace, and genuine ethnic and religious reconciliation, and the realization of internationally recognized human rights for all, including for ethnic and religious groups whose human rights have been violated repeatedly and who have been disenfranchised historically;

(2) calls on the Burmese military to—

(A) immediately and unconditionally release all political prisoners detained as a result of the coup on February 1, 2021;

(B) immediately restore all forms of communication, including access to the internet without surveillance;

(C) immediately end the use of violence and allow for a legal process for accountability and justice for those unlawfully detained, injured, and killed by the Burmese military;

(D) remove all impediments to free travel that have been imposed as a result of the coup;

(E) return to power all members of the civilian government elected in the November 8, 2020 elections and allow them to fulfill their mandate without impediment;

(F) allow for freedom of expression, including the right to protest, peaceful assembly, press freedom, and freedom of movement; and

(G) allow unfettered reporting from local, national, and international media;

(3) calls on social media companies to suspend the accounts of the Union Solidarity and Development Party and the Burmese military that have used their platforms to spread disinformation, fear, and threats of violence;

(4) supports the use of all diplomatic, economic, and development tools to ensure that vulnerable groups, including ethnic and religious groups, as well as all children, youth, and teachers in educational settings are safe, and schools and universities are not targeted for attacks or use by the Burmese military;

(5) expresses grave concern for the safety and security of the more than 1,000,000 internally displaced persons (referred to in this resolution as ''IDPs'') and refugees who have been displaced by the Burmese military and now face challenging conditions in camps;

(6) expresses grave concern for the 17,600,000 people of Burma who are in need of humanitarian aid, including the 1,500,000 IDPs in Burma, of which some 165,000 remain in the southeast, adding to those already displaced in Rakhine, Chin, Shan, and Kachin states;

(7) appreciates the generosity of Burma's neighboring countries, including Thailand, India, and Bangladesh, and encourages them to meaningfully assist refugees who have fled and continue to flee the Burmese military, including through the delivery of cross-border humanitarian assistance and with recognition of the protracted nature of the conflict; and

(8) calls on the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense to fully implement section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021 (division K of Public Law 116–260), the BURMA Act of 2022 (subtitle E of title LV of division E of Public Law 117–263), and any similar or successor law governing United States foreign assistance following a coup, and to immediately—

(A) impose targeted restrictions aimed at the Burmese military, military-owned or -controlled enterprises, and those responsible for the February 1, 2021 coup;

(B) work with the international community, including at the United Nations Security Council, with United States' allies in the region, and with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, to condemn the coup, delegitimize the junta and any military-run elections announced by the junta, and take steps to ensure that international economic engagement in Burma does not contribute to human rights abuses or benefit individuals connected to the coup;

(C) support conditionality on diplomatic, economic, and security relations with Burma, including using the voice and vote of the United States at multilateral development institutions, until all those detained in the February 1, 2021 coup are released and there has been a full restoration of the civilian-controlled parliament reflecting the November 8, 2020 election results;

(D) utilize the United States Government's position on the United Nations Security Council to bring about greater international cooperation in the pursuit of justice and accountability in Burma;

(E) empower and provide assistance to the National Unity Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, the National Unity Consultative Council, the Civil Disobedience Movement in Myanmar, and other entities promoting democracy in Burma through nonviolent efforts, including channeling aid through local civil society organizations along the Thai and Indian borders that are not controlled by the junta, while simultaneously denying legitimacy and resources to the junta;

(F) promote national reconciliation among the diverse ethnic and religious groups in Burma;

(G) counter support to the junta by the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation and other supporters of the military regime; and

(H) secure the restoration of democracy, the establishment of an inclusive and representative civilian government and a reformed military reflecting the diversity of Burma and under civilian control, and the enactment of constitutional, political, and economic reform in Burma.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today, on the eve of the second anniversary of the military coup in Burma, to introduce a resolution marking the occasion—and the terrible 2 years that the people of Burma have had to suffer since then. I am proud to introduce this resolution today alongside my colleagues Senators YOUNG, MERKLEY, and COLLINS.

The resolution condemns the illegitimate Burmese military coup and calls for an immediate return to democratic governance grounded in respect for civil liberties. Demonstrating our support for the Burmese people is more important than ever, as the human rights situation in Burma threatens to deteriorate even further.

Tomorrow marks 2 years since the Burmese military overthrew the democratically elected Government in Burma, on the eve of what was to have been the convening of the Parliament that was elected on November 8, 2020, and installed a repressive, authoritarian regime.

Since February 1, 2021, the Burmese military has reversed years of uneven but generally positive democratic reform. The military has engaged in mass atrocities, including by detaining over 13,000 people for exercising basic freedoms and killing over 2,800 civilians, including children. Today, over 17 million people in Burma are in need of humanitarian aid, and 1.5 million people remain internally displaced due to the ongoing violence and instability fostered by the military.

I would note that it is the same military officers now running the country who were implicated in the genocide waged against the Rohingya people, an assault that was recognized by the Secretary of State on March 21, 2022, only the eighth such determination since the Holocaust. The Burmese military continues to systemically target its most vulnerable people, including women, children, and ethnic and religious minorities. The junta also continues to silence activists and opposition parties, most recently illustrated by the 33-year prison sentence handed down to State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi after a series of sham trials.

Today, we honor those lives we have lost due to the junta's violent repression and calls upon the Burmese military to end its senseless killing of its own people.

The U.S. Senate fully stands behind those peacefully protesting for their

rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and the press. We also remain committed to free and fair elections in Burma and the peaceful and expedient transition to a civilian-led government. The United States and the international community must hold accountable human rights violators for their actions. This resolution calls on the President to impose targeted sanctions and restrictions on those responsible for the February 2021 coup and human rights abuses in Burma, including through the bipartisan BURMA Act of 2022, which I was proud to have led, and which was enacted as part of the NDAA in December.

While the February 2021 coup represents a major step backwards, the United States remains steadfast in support of a free and prosperous future for Burma. This resolution, which I am proud to introduce today, will reaffirm the United States' solidarity with the Burmese people in their quest for sustainable peace and democracy.

I would invite my colleagues to cosponsor the resolution, and I look forward to early action in the Foreign Relations Committee and by the full Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have one request for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 31, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 1; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly Democratic caucus meeting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, rollcall votes are expected during Wednesday's session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:52 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

AMANDA K. BRAILSFORD, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO, VICE B. LYNN WINMILL, RETIRED.

JEFFREY IRVINE CUMMINGS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE AN ADDITIONAL POSITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH 28 U.S.C. 133(B)(1).

MICHAEL ARTHUR DELANEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, VICE JEFFREY R. HOWARD, RETIRED.

LASHONDA A. HUNT, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE CHARLES R. NORGLE, SR., RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. SEAN M. CARPENTER
COL. MARY K. HADDAD
COL. JAMES L. HARTLE
COL. AARON J. HEICK
COL. JOSEPH D. JANIK
COL. MICHAEL T. MCGINLEY
COL. KEVIN J. MERRILL
COL. TARA E. NOLAN
COL. RODERICK C. OWENS
COL. MARK D. RICHEY
COL. NORMAN B. SHAW, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KRISTIN A. HILLERY
COL. MICHELLE L. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ELIZABETH E. ARLEDGE
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. BLAKE
BRIG. GEN. VANESSA J. DORNHOEFER
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER A. FREEMAN
BRIG. GEN. DAVID P. GARFIELD
BRIG. GEN. MITCHELL A. HANSON
BRIG. GEN. JODY A. MERRITT
BRIG. GEN. ADRIAN K. WHITE
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM W. WHITTENBERGER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. YANCY

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE MEMORY OF TRACIE ALEXANDER GOLDEN

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Tracie Alexander Golden, a mother, wife, tireless community advocate, healthcare provider, and fearless SEIU Union leader from Michigan's 12th District Strong as our community mourns her recent passing.

Tracie was a respiratory therapist who dedicated her life to helping people with severe health issues. As she spent countless hours at the hospital, working long shifts and saving lives, Tracie never once complained about the toll it took on her own health. She truly believed that her calling was to serve others, and she did so with a heart full of love and empathy. She was a selfless and compassionate woman who always put the needs of her patients and her family before her own.

Tracie's advocacy, impact and care for others was profound not only amongst her family and loved ones but also towards her patients and community. Tracie's acts of service were boundless, and she never shied away from showing up for others. Her passionate and caring spirit will no doubt live on through her family and those that she served and those that she cared for at Sinai Grace Hospital.

Tracie's sudden and tragic passing is truly a loss to our district and community. Her memory will forever be preserved in the work she led for others and the commitment she showed in service.

Please join me in honoring the life of Ms. Tracie Alexander Golden and extending our deepest condolences to the Golden family on her tragic loss. The 12th Congressional District honors her life and legacy.

RECOGNIZING MRS. SHAWNA CRIST AS THE OKALOOSA COUNTY EDUCATION SUPPORT EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mrs. Shawna Crist as the Okaloosa County Education Support Employee of the Year. Plew Elementary School is lucky to have someone like Mrs. Crist who serves the school with passion and an unwavering commitment to its success.

Mrs. Crist spent 13 years as an excellent teacher before working in education support. Her accomplishments include being selected as the Baker School Teacher of the Year in 1990 and the Teacher of the Year for Bluewater Elementary and Okaloosa County in 1994. After her teaching career, she became a full-time volunteer at Plew Elementary where she received the 2012 Senior Adult Volunteer of the Year Award.

Mrs. Crist is currently the Media Assistant for Plew Elementary, where she enjoys working to share ideas with others throughout Okaloosa County that promote the school and its students. She constantly strives to be the best and provide the best as well. I applaud her for her unwavering commitment to serving the students of Okaloosa County.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Mrs. Crist for her many accomplishments and her commitment to excellence and professionalism in the Okaloosa County School District. I thank her for her service and wish her all the best for her continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 85, and NAY on Roll Call No. 62.

OPPOSING CONSERVATIVE CENSORSHIP

HON. GUY RESCHENTHALER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with deep concerns regarding big technology companies' ongoing efforts to silence conservatives on media platforms. In the wake of the 2020 New York Post's Hunter Biden Laptop story censored by social media platforms and news stations, Americans saw firsthand the government and media collaborating to silence the truth to influence a presidential election. As a pillar of the U.S. Constitution, free speech is critical to our civil discourse, and denying viewers access to a wide array of news opinions and stories is a dangerous precedent.

Further, I am deeply troubled on February 22, 2021, some Democrat members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee used their power to push for censorship of television networks like Newsmax, Fox News, and One America News Network. This was a blatant attempt by Democrats to silence conservatives and push their thumb to influence free speech and the upcoming midterm election.

I believe all voices and political views should be fairly represented and accessible so my constituents can access a wide variety of content. That is why, on January 20, 2023, I wrote to DirecTV's Chief Executive Officer, Mr. William Morrow, regarding their contract negotiations with Newsmax to ensure both parties come to a solution. Sadly, last week, the contract between Newsmax and DirecTV expired. I urge both parties to return to the negotiating table, so Pennsylvanians do not lose access to this vital cable news channel.

Mr. Speaker, this dangerous trend and bias towards conservatives can no longer last in the public sphere. Television providers like DirecTV are uniquely positioned to ensure fair consideration in programming distributions regardless of political affiliations.

HONORING MR. BARRY FISHER'S OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EFFORTS

HON. JAMES R. BAIRD

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor my friend and this year's Certified Crop Adviser Conservationist of the Year award recipient, Barry Fisher. A French Lick, Indiana native, Barry's love for agriculture began at a young age on his family's farm. Upon graduation from Western Kentucky University in 1983, Barry began his Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) career serving in locales across Indiana where he acted as a soil conservationist in Southeast Indiana, an area agronomist for West Central Indiana, and a State Soil Health Specialist.

In 2015, Barry was one of the original members of the NRCS National Soil Health Division and was instrumental in delivering soil health training to the agency's staff across the nation. As the first Central Region leader of the newly formed Soil Health Division, he carried out one of the most successful training and outreach campaigns the United States Department of Agriculture has ever known, hosting events with tens of thousands in attendance and driving millions to web-based resources.

Since his retirement from NRCS in 2020, Fisher established Fisher Soil Health, a consulting service that provides training on advanced soil health management systems. He also continues to serve as an expert speaker and trainer, promoting the adoption of soil health practices to farmers and conservation staff.

Based on the 2022 Conservation Transect data, over two-thirds of Indiana's row crop acres are undisturbed through fall and winter months, and 1,600,000 of those acres are seeded to green living cover during those months—only 12.5 percent of those cover crop acres were seeded with financial program assistance. When the transect began measuring green living cover in 2011, there were about 184,000 acres. The increase in those covered acres can be attributed, in part, to Fisher's tireless efforts to promote and educate about cover crops and soil health.

Barry and his wife continue to operate their West Central Indiana-based farm where they employ the strategies he developed and perfected, and their farm now acts as a living laboratory to many conservation groups who travel from across the country to learn about soy health. Barry's contributions to our agriculture industry are immeasurable, and I can think of no one more deserving of this well-deserved honor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. COLIN Z. ALLRED

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 2023, I was absent during the time of votes due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 94, H.R. 500, Financial Exploitation Prevention Act.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENTS HELPING YOUNG STUDENTS ACT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce the Students Helping Young Students Act. This important legislation will invest in college students who support and mentor K–12 students at after-school activities. This legislation will make a meaningful difference in the lives of all Hoosier students, and young Americans across the country, by ensuring that college students can be compensated for the critical work of mentoring and supporting their younger counterparts. I would like to thank my Senate Colleague, Senator CORY BOOKER, for leading the companion of this important legislation.

It is an honor to represent students of all ages in Indiana's Seventh District. I am continually impressed by the many college students in my district and across the country that, in addition to their studies, help mentor and support K–12 students in after-school programs. These college students, by serving as powerful examples and mentors, continue to inspire my colleagues and I about the importance of peer mentorship opportunities. This includes the crucial role of work-study programs in helping students finance their postsecondary education.

Several examples in Indiana underscore the importance of supporting mentorship programs, both to the mentee and the mentor. The influence and investment from a mentor can improve younger student lives and outcomes. Their stories are common: in fact, at-risk youth that have a mentor are 55 percent more likely to attend college. Moreover, at-risk youth that have a mentor are 52 percent less likely to skip a day of school and 46 percent less likely to use drugs. Mentoring also increases community engagement, as at-risk students are 78 percent more likely to volunteer in their community and are 130 percent more likely to hold a leadership role in clubs or teams with a mentor in their lives. Mentoring not only helps students stay away from drugs and violence, but also live healthier lives and improve school performance. Mentees participating in mentorship programs have also performed higher on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP) tests.

Because of these unmistakable benefits, Congress must do more to support these after-school programs and their student mentors. Although after-school mentorship programs often intersect with students' courses of study and benefit the community, after-school activities are not currently considered a community service under the Federal Work-Study program. This means that college students cannot rely on compensation from Federal Work-Study for their participation in after-school activities.

The Federal Work-Study program has helped support undergraduate and graduate students, who have exhibited financial need, find part-time jobs. The Federal Work-Study program employs hundreds of thousands of undergraduate and graduate students. Across all higher education, 7 in 10 college students work at least 15 hours per week to help cover their tuition, and 1 in 4 work more than 35 hours a week. While mentorship's benefits are clear, the absence of after-school activities from consideration as work-study programs causes students with financial need to more often pursue other opportunities. This means that many students are unable to serve in mentorship roles, even if it aligns with their course of study, for financial reasons. This dynamic exacerbates the widening mentoring gap, which includes the over 9 million young people without a mentor outside their family to support their growth and education.

As a result, more work needs to be done to help compensate students who choose to serve their communities by mentoring younger students. That is why the Students Helping Young Students Act is so important. This bill incorporates work at after-school programs into the Federal Work-Study Program under community service by making participation in these programs eligible for federal funds. In short, this bill allows college students to access Federal Work-Study funds for their participation in after-school activities.

Through the Students Helping Young Students Act, after-school mentoring programs will count as community service under the Federal Work-Study program. Students can be compensated for their work, including time spent in training and travel, directly related to the program. This will allow any student who wishes to serve in their community to participate in mentorship activities, regardless of their financial background. As a result, the Students Helping Young Students Act will also help close the mentoring gap and ensure that younger students, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, have the support they need to succeed and reach their goals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill to ensure that Federal Work-Study students are compensated for their mentorship efforts. It is important that Congress supports these students in their pursuit to serve our communities. I urge the House to support this bill.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JIMMIE MASSIE III

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life and memory of James ''Jimmie'' Pleasants Massie III, who tragically passed away on January 25, 2023, at age 64. My prayers are with his family and loved ones, especially his wife, Elizabeth, and his children, Jimmie, William, Becky, and John.

Jimmie was a caring husband, father, son, brother, grandfather, friend, and so much more. He also had a strong passion for public service and cared deeply for his community. I had the honor of knowing Jimmie throughout his time in public service when he served as the Henrico County Delegate in the Virginia House of Delegates. Jimmie's colleagues and community remember and honor him as a strong leader and passionate advocate for the issues facing his community. I am personally grateful for his leadership in Virginia, and I know that our communities are stronger because of his time in office.

Jimmie was, and is, well-loved and highly respected amongst his family and community, and his memory will not soon be forgotten. I pray that his family and loved ones may be comforted as they mourn his loss. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in honoring the life and legacy of Jimmie Massie.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR WILLIAM FRAZIER

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished military veteran. Mr. Arthur William Frazier transitioned from this life on January 21, 2023, in Fort Gordon, Georgia. He dedicated his life to serving our great Nation and should be honored and celebrated for his service.

Arthur Frazier was born on July 25, 1953, to the late Hubert Same and Julia Mae ''Molly'' Frazier in Cope, South Carolina. One of 5 siblings, he developed deep roots to his community, attending school at the George Washington Carver School as well as Edisto High School. He graduated from Edisto High School in 1971, and shortly thereafter embarked on what would become a lifetime of military service.

In 1971, Mr. Frazier joined the United States Army. He was a trailblazer, becoming the first African American 1st Sergeant in the South Carolina National Guard Armory in Orangeburg, South Carolina. He was also the first African American to serve as Surface Maintenance Supervisor at the Field Maintenance Shop No. 14 in Varnville, South Carolina. Mr. Frazier received his Warrant Officer commission in 2003. From 2007 to 2008, he served a tour in Afghanistan, and honorably retired in 2013.

Throughout his 42 years of military service, he was recognized with many awards and accolades. For his domestic service, he received

the Legion of Merit, the Army Achievement Medal 2nd Award, the Army Good Conduct 2nd Award, and the South Carolina Palmetto Service Ribbon, among many others. For his service abroad, he received the Overseas Service Ribbon, NATO Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, and Afghanistan Campaign Medal.

Mr. Frazier was a man of faith and a lifelong member of Emmanuel AME Church in his hometown of Cope. South Carolina. He was an active participant in the church, serving at various times as a Class Leader, Choir Member, President of the Sunday School Department, and Financial Administrator. He is lovingly remembered by his wife of 42 years, Helen "Judy" Frazier, as well as their 3 children, Shenika Frederick, CoSaundra Rivers, Arthur "AJ" Frazier, Jr., and 5 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in recognizing the highly decorated life of service led by Mr. Arthur W. Frazier. He served his country with dignity and pride for over 4 decades. He will be sorely missed and well-remembered.

HONORING LARRY NESS ON HIS BANKING CAREER OF MORE THAN 50 YEARS

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Larry Ness on his banking career of more than 50 years in South Dakota.

As CEO of First Dakota National Bank in Yankton, South Dakota, Larry helped the company rebound once he joined over 40 years ago. Prior to working with First Dakota National Bank, Larry was a bank examiner at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Over the last 40 years, Larry and his wife Diane have dedicated an incredible amount of time, talent, and treasure to Yankton and the whole state of South Dakota. They have been among the very best citizens and community members I've ever met. Larry's leadership has left a legacy in the state of South Dakota and we are grateful for his service.

I wish him all the best in his retirement and as he continues to serve as Chairman of the Board for First Dakota National Bank.

COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF SCIO

HON. NICHOLAS A. LANGWORTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Town of Scio in Allegany County, New York.

The Town of Scio was named after the Greek Island of Scio in the Aegean Sea because in 1820, the western world was horrified by the slaying of Christians on the island. The founding fathers of the town were so moved by a speech given by Daniel Webster honoring the Christians that died and wanted to name the town Scio in memoriam. The Town of Scio was first settled at the mouth of Knight Creek and was a crucial community to the building of the Erie railroad.

Whether they are lifelong residents or new in town, the citizens of Scio love their town. A tight knit community of only 1,625, the neighbors in this town look out for each other.

Two hundred years as a community and a town is certainly a cause for celebration. I congratulate the Town of Scio for withstanding the tests of time and look forward to many more years of Scio providing a welcoming community for our friends, neighbors and visitors.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to celebrate the Town of Scio's 200th anniversary.

HONORING KAREN REINER

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Karen Reiner, who is being honored as the 2023 Citizen of the Year for Moorestown, New Jersey. This year's award recognizes a Moorestown resident who has positively impacted the quality of life for everyone in our community.

Karen's family raised her to have a deep sense of service and to look out for her surrounding community. This upbringing spurred her desire to always emulate the values she learned growing up—involvement, kindness, and service. She has dedicated her life to partnering with those in the community to create programs and environments where people know they can feel safe and respected.

Karen both co-founded and served as President of MooreUnity, a non-profit civic group centered on promoting inclusion within the community. Through her work building bridges across divides, MooreUnity has continued to support local efforts to root out prejudice and discrimination. Hosting about ten programs every year, MooreUnity provides discussion panels and workshops to learn about the damaging impact of discrimination as well as to teach people about how understanding and acceptance can bring people together in the face of injustice and hate. Karen has even helped children learn to interact with their peers as well and how to stand up to bullying and prejudice they experience or see thrust at others.

In addition to MooreUnity, Karen is also working to heal political divides within our community. Through the Moorestown Braver Angel Alliance, she has hosted multiple workshops with Republicans and Democrats to learn and implement techniques to communicate effectively and civilly despite different political beliefs. As a co-founder and active member of the Moorestown Directory Group, Karen also works to bring people together from different walks of service including nonprofits, people interested and active in civic engagement, and religious groups to name a few.

Beyond this work and these organizations, Karen also finds time to for local community service. She has served as a Girl Scout Troop leader and previously led an effort to place five kindness benches at each of the local elementary schools in Moorestown as well as the Jeff Young Park. Karen also works with numerous organizations centered on gun violence prevention including Sandy Hook Promise and Moms Demand Action.

For years across multiple sectors, Karen has made Moorestown a better place and has been an example for so many in the volunteer community. Described as an inspiration, I am proud to congratulate Karen for winning the 2023 Citizen of the Year for Moorestown, New Jersey and thank her for her continued service to our community.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNUAL NORWEGIAN RECIPROCAL TROOPS EXCHANGE

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th annual Norwegian Reciprocal Troops Exchange between the Minnesota National Guard and the Norwegian Home Guard. Known as NOREX, this annual exchange between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Norway is the world's longest-running military partnership, an enduring tradition which continues to strengthen the bonds between our two countries. Not only is this anniversary a cause for celebration, but it is particularly fitting that it occur as the Minnesota National Guard and the Norwegian Home Guard prepare to formalize this friendship as official partners in the National Guard State Partnership Program.

This month, more than one hundred Soldiers and Airmen of the Minnesota National Guard will travel to Norway and conduct winter operations training with the Norwegian Home Guard, known as Heimevernet. This unique training opportunity takes place over five days in Norway's countryside and includes skiing techniques, avalanche training, emergency food rationing, bivouac routines, constructing a lean-to, and building and lighting a fire. Meanwhile, members of the Norwegian Home Guard will travel to Camp Ripley in Minnesota, to learn joint domestic response exercises with local law enforcement.

In addition to military training, our Soldiers and Airmen will participate in cultural exchanges by spending a weekend with Norwegian host families and visiting cultural sites. Similarly, the visiting Norwegian troops will enjoy American cultural experiences such as attending a Minnesota Wild hockey game, visiting the Mall of America, enjoying walleye at a local VFW fish fry, and being the guests of honor at an official dinner hosted by the Saint Paul-based civic organization Serving Our Troops.

Of course, it is especially fitting that the Minnesota National Guard participate in this exchange. Thousands of immigrants from Norway came to Minnesota during the 1800s. Today, over 850,000 Minnesotans claim Norwegian ancestry—myself included. Minnesota has more Norwegian-Americans than any other state and these Minnesotans keep alive many proud traditions passed down from their Nordic ancestors. In Congress, I have been proud to honor Norwegian-American heritage

as a co-chair of the Friends of Norway Caucus.

Additionally, as Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense in the 117th Congress, I had the incredible privilege last year to travel to Norway to meet with senior leadership of the Norwegian Armed Forces and conduct oversight on prepositioned stocks of U.S. military equipment in country. As Vladimir Putin continues his unprovoked, unjust, and illegal invasion of Ukraine, it is more important than ever that the United States stand in support of our democratic allies. That includes those with geographic vulnerabilities to Russian aggression, like Norway.

Formalizing the Minnesota National Guard's relationship with Norway through the State Partnership Program will serve to strengthen Norway's military readiness in the face of the Russian threat. And the continuation of NOREX will enhance our own military readiness and further cooperation between the United States and a key NATO ally, all while promoting goodwill and mutual respect between our nations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the 50th anniversary of this special military and cultural partnership with a traditional Nordic salute: Skol.

RECOGNIZING THE JANUARY CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize Myrone ''Bruce'' Gaffney as my January Constituent of the Month. Bruce is a retired veteran who served in the United States Army for 17 years.

Bruce began serving in the United States Army in 1998. In 2013, while serving in Afghanistan, Bruce sustained an injury to his spine. He spent the next two years in rehabilitation at Walter Reed Medical Center, but his injury has made him one hundred percent disabled. Since 2015, Bruce has been on Social Security—a lifeline for him and so many others across the country.

I am proud to honor Mvrone ''Bruce'' Gaffney as my Constituent of the Month and announce that he will be my guest to the 2023 State of the Union. It is an honor to represent veterans in my district, and Bruce exemplifies the bravery, perseverance, and dedication that makes our community an amazing place to live. His injury has not stopped him from going above and beyond to enrich our community. In his free time, he has served on my Congressional Service Academy Panel that helps me select the next generation of men and women to attend our esteemed military service academies.

As Republicans discuss cutting Americans' hard-earned Social Security benefits, such as those Bruce relies on, I'm proud to highlight Bruce as one of my constituents whose life would drastically be affected if benefits were slashed. His expansive military background, resilience, and service to our Nation and district make me proud to honor Myrone ''Bruce'' Gaffney as my January Constituent of the Month.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARY SATTLER PELTOLA

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mrs. PELTOLA. Mr. Speaker, I briefly stepped out for personal reasons and was unable to make it back to the floor in time to vote on this bill. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 93.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on roll call No. 41.

RECOGNIZING MR. NORM PETERSON UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. HALEY M. STEVENS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the illustrious career of Mr. Norman ''Norm'' D. Peterson upon his retirement from Argonne National Laboratory. Norm has been a leader in the science, technology, and innovation realm for over 35 years, and it has been an honor to learn from and, at times, work alongside his expertise. Norm's commitment to the scientific enterprise of this nation and the policymakers who shape its work will have a lasting impact into the future. Please help me celebrate this remarkable servant of the public interest and wish him well as he embarks upon this next chapter.

Early in his career, Norm Peterson was identified as a skilled leader in the science, technology, and economic development issues. Upon the creation of the Illinois Governor's Commission on Science and Technology, Norm was selected to become its first Executive Director. In this role, he oversaw the commission's creation and administration of a technology-oriented economic development program. This comprehensive plan incorporated technology transfer projects at universities and national laboratories and investment fund allocations to support the development of start-up, technology-driven businesses, showcasing Norm's extensive knowledge of science, technology, and economic development.

Norm's career at Argonne National Laboratory began in 1987. Though the laboratory had been operational for many years prior, its scope vastly expanded over the past 35 years, with Norm playing a crucial role in cultivating Argonne's reputation of excellence during this time. Argonne National Laboratory is now one of the U.S. Department of Energy's largest national laboratories for science and engineering research, housing over 1,250 scientists and engineers working to solve our nation's most pressing challenges in energy, the environment, and national security.

The expertise that Norm brought to his work led him to become the Director of Government Affairs for Argonne, a role that he crafted himself to maximize the efforts of the lab moving into the 21st century. His skill was heavily leaned upon as Argonne directed the construction of 3 major national user facilities—the Advanced Photon Source, Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, and Center for Nanoscale Materials. In addition, he was instrumental in launching the Guest House as the first state-funded building in the national lab complex and in his work helping plan the Joint Center for Energy Storage Research and the Q-NEXT quantum center.

Stakeholders from across the country recognize Norm as a valuable resource to science and technology research efforts, earning him membership on several boards and advisory groups. He earned a place on the Editorial Board of the Journal of Urban Technology, the University of Puerto Rico Center for Advanced Nanoscale Materials External Advisory Board, and the Northern Illinois University Research Foundation Board, among others. In addition to his professional contributions, he is also a dedicated servant to youth in his community, by previously serving on the Board of Directors for the Youth Campus, providing residential and community based social services to abused and neglected children.

In his retirement, Norm and his beloved partner, Lori Clark, are eager to enjoy international travel and spend more time with his daughter, Erika Peterson, and granddaughter, Emma. The couple intends on remaining in the Chicago area as they enter the next chapter of Norm's prolific life, and despite his retirement, I am certain that we will hear more from him in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate my friend and mentor, Mr. Norman D. Peterson, for his incredible contributions toward scientific and technological advancement in our nation. Colleagues, please join me in celebrating Norm Peterson and wishing him well as he transitions into his well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING MR. ROYAL PRESTON AS THE OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLORIDA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT GAETZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Royal Preston as the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year. For several years, Mr. Preston has served Okaloosa Technical College with talent, passion, and an unwavering commitment to good education.

Northwest Florida is fortunate to have some of the best teachers in the country. The teaching profession is one of the most challenging yet rewarding professions in existence. Mr. Preston has performed his teaching duties exceptionally while also being an active and supportive member of his community.

Mr. Preston's support and outreach extend far beyond the walls of his classroom through his active involvement in his school and community. Mr. Preston worked as a building contractor, building over 200 houses and commercial projects. While Teaching Building Trades

and Carpentry for 29 years, he is passionate about sharing his craft and skills with his students. I commend him for his steadfast willingness to serve those that matter most—the students and the next generation of Americans.

I am truly proud to have Mr. Preston as a constituent in Florida's First Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Mr. Preston for his many accomplishments and his commitment to excellence, professionalism, and innovation in the Okaloosa County School District. I thank him for his service and wish him all the best for his continued success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the ''Defense Access Roads Improvement Act,'' which would make commonsense reforms to reduce congestion outside military installations. The Defense Access Roads (DAR) program is a unique partnership between the U.S. Departments of Defense (DOD) and Transportation. Under the program, the Secretary of Defense designates civilian roadways that provide critical access for domestic military installations as Defense Access Roads, making them eligible for military construction funding transferred to the Department of Transportation for road improvements off base.

Military installations anchor communities across the Nation, including Tavis Air Force Base in my Congressional district. The DAR ensures the DOD pays for maintenance, upkeep, or upgrades of roads impacted by military traffic and the constant movement of heavy equipment and vehicles.

My ''Defense Access Roads Improvement Act'' would create a new, public process for state, county, or municipal governments to petition the Department of Defense to designate new Defense Access Roads, unlocking military funding for needed roadway improvements off base. My bill would establish a new online database for designated Defense Access Roads and any outstanding federal funding requests, which improves public transparency and holds the Pentagon accountable. Lastly, my bill would also allow roads leading to commercial shipyards used by the U.S. Navy or Coast Guard to be designated as Defense Access Roads under the program, instead of just seaports as under current law.

This is a continuation of my work last Congress on the House Armed Forces Subcommittee on Readiness, which oversees all U.S. military installations and the Defense Access Road Program. I am committed to securing additional federal investment in off-base infrastructure. As a senior member of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I plan to make this legislation a top priority.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to join me in cosponsoring the ''Defense Access Roads Improvement Act.''

RECOGNIZING REVEREND DOCTOR RICHARD WHITE

HON. RASHIDA TLAIB

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to recognize Reverend Dr. Richard White of Detroit's Dexter Avenue Baptist Church on the occasion of his installation as president of the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit and Vicinity.

Reverend Dr. White was inspired by the call to the ministry at a young age. At the age of 17, he was licensed to preach at Beth Eden Missionary Baptist Church under the late Pastor Ocie Tabb, Jr. At the age of 20, he became an associate minister at Midway Baptist Church under the leadership of his father. Soon after Pastor White was called to pastor Greater Marion Chapel Missionary Baptist Church, where he remained in leadership until 2015 when he accepted the role of senior pastor at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church.

Since becoming spiritual leader, Pastor White has worked hard to strengthen Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, ministering to the spiritual needs of his flock and the surrounding community. A lifelong Detroiter, Pastor White's strong connection to the community has driven his tireless work to set a vision for the future and make strides to bring it to fruition. He has undertaken projects to beautify the area and devoted himself to growing his ministry through community outreach.

Pastor White has been elected as one of the youngest presidents of the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit & Vicinity. He also serves as the 3rd vice moderator for the Metropolitan Missionary Baptist District Association. Previously, Pastor White has served in multiple organizational capacities, including president of the Fellowship District Congress of Christian Education, second vice president of the Metropolitan District Congress of Christian Education, general secretary for the Baptist, Missionary and Educational State Convention of Michigan, treasurer and financial secretary for the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit and Vicinity, and the financial secretary for Kingdom Building Pastors and People International.

Please join me in recognizing Reverend Dr. Richard White's numerous contributions as we celebrate his new role at the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit and Vicinity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on January 30, 2023 for Roll Call Vote 94. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call Vote 94.

HONORING PETER PARUCCINI

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and memory of Peter Paruccini of Yuba City. Mr. Paruccini, a loving father and devoted husband, was a bright light in Northern California that was tragically cut short, passing away at the age of 39. His footprint on our area was one of service. The North State has lost one of its heroes.

Peter was a life-long resident of Yuba City, and although he split time between Santa Barbara and Yuba City, he always loved coming home to see the Sutter Buttes. Peter attended college at UC Davis where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in History and Political Science. Peter continued to stay in the area, choosing to teach at an underserved junior high school in Davis. This was the beginning of Peter's lifelong call to serve.

Later in life, Peter felt the call to serve our country in the military. Exchanging his teaching credentials for military boots, Peter joined the United States Army in 2006 serving as an Infantryman. During his military deployment, he stood out for dedication to serve with the utmost distinction, bravery, and honor. Peter's service is something we should all try to emulate.

Upon his return from the military, Peter found a career in law enforcement. Peter worked in both the Bay Area and Ventura County before being recruited out of law enforcement to work with a large utility company thanks to his expertise in project/product management and logistics.

My heartfelt condolences are with the Paruccini family. It is with them that Peter's memory will be kept alive. Peter was a loving father to his son, George; husband to his wife, Celeste; and son to his parents, Stephanie and Luigi. May God bless their family, and may Peter find eternal rest at last. Rest in Peace.

HONORING MS. MARY GATANAS ON HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to celebrate Ms. Mary Gatanas as she reaches a significant milestone in her life—her 80th birthday.

Ms. Gatanas has lived an impressive life up to this juncture. A strong and loving mother to Andrew and Adrienne, grandmother to Tristan, Markella and Tatum, and a devoted military spouse to Major General Harry Gatanas, Mary's selflessness and generosity are a hallmark of every relationship she has forged.

As an Army Officer's spouse through 29 years of service, Ms. Gatanas endeavored to leave her mark on every place she and Major General Gatanas were posted—a tall task considering their 24 separate moves. Nonetheless, everywhere she went, she always went above and beyond for the Army families around her.

In Germany, as a young spouse, she observed the struggles that other Army families faced finding adequate childcare amidst hectic lives as new parents in a new place. Rather than accepting the status quo, Mary put others first, creating a childcare center on base to minimize at least one stressor for these families willing to uproot their lives to serve our country.

Further down the line, on station in New Mexico on the White Sands Missile Range, now the wife of the commanding officer, she once again pushed for improvements on base. Finding that elements of a nutritious diet were hard to come by in this remote location, Ms. Gatanas fought to ensure that fresh produce and dairy products would be available to families in the commissary.

Ms. Gatanas was also an activist for military families off-base. She worked diligently to advocate for legislation that would ensure military spouses would be treated equitably in divorce proceedings when it came to accessing military retirement pay. In 1982, her efforts paid off as the Uniformed Services Former Spouses' Protection Act passed through Congress.

Amidst these impressive accomplishments, Mary never wavered on her number one priority—the up-bringing of her son Andrew and daughter Adrienne. This devotion to her loved ones has continued unfettered, as she now relishes the opportunity to shower her grandchildren, Tristan, Markella and Tatum with that same love.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that wherever Ms. Gatanas lived, she became a catalyst for change, working tirelessly to improve the lives of all those around her. She is well-deserving of our praise on this day. I wish Ms. Gatanas a very happy 80th birthday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL JOHNSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, but had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 46.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NATHANIEL MORAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 74.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE TRANSITION-TO-SUCCESS MENTORING ACT

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, as we mark National Mentoring Month, I am proud to reintroduce legislation to the Transition-To-Success Mentoring Act to help local education agencies prepare at-risk students for the transition from middle school to high school. I would like to thank MENTOR for their endorsement of this bill and Senator BOOKER for his leadership on this legislation in the Senate.

I have had many mentors at every stage of my life, whether it was my theatre teacher in school who encouraged me to be who I am and elevated the confidence in myself to pursue sports, or my grandmother who raised me and a reason I find myself following her large footsteps. Mentors are important at every stage in life and especially at a young age. Our children need to foster these mentor/mentee relationships to look up to someone bigger than themselves.

The Transition-To-Success Mentoring Act would establish a grant program for school-based mentoring programs targeted at helping at-risk middle school students transition from middle to high school. Under my legislation, participating students would develop and execute a formalized plan for success in high school and beyond, and be supported by a school faculty member or volunteer from the community known as a ''Success Coach.''

Middle school is a uniquely challenging time for students and ensuring a smooth transition from middle to high school is critical to their long-term success. School-based mentoring is innovative supplement to the traditional learning that takes place in the classroom, providing underserved and at-risk students with attention and support to keep them engaged in school. This legislation is a small step towards providing some of the most vulnerable students with individual attention to help cross the bridge towards high school, college, and career.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the need for mentors for our children by signing on to this important legislation.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S153–S177

Measures Introduced: Forty-three bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 155–197, S.J. Res. 5, and S. Res. 20. **Pages S171–73**

Washington's Farewell Address—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the orders of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 27, 2023, immediately following the prayer and reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. **Page S164**

Appointments:

Washington's Farewell Address: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of January 31, 2023, appointed Senator Lankford to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 27, 2023. **Page S164**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Amanda K. Brailsford, of Idaho, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho.

Jeffrey Irvine Cummings, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Michael Arthur Delaney, of New Hampshire, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

LaShonda A. Hunt, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

23 Air Force nominations in the rank of general. **Page S177**

Messages from the House: **Page S166**

Measures Referred: **Page S166**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S164, S166**

Executive Communications: **Pages S166–71**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S171**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S173**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S173–77**

Additional Statements: **Pages S165–66**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S177**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:52 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 1, 2023. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S177.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 52 public bills, H.R. 642–693; and 11 resolutions, H.J. Res. 23–25; H. Con. Res. 11; and H. Res. 76–82 were introduced. **Pages H574–77**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H579**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 75, providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R.

139) to require Executive agencies to submit to Congress a study of the impacts of expanded telework and remote work by agency employees during the COVID–19 pandemic and a plan for the agency's future use of telework and remote work, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 382) to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 497) to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs (H. Rept. 118–1). **Page H574**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Flood to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H513**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:49 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H518**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:17 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. **Page H529**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:19 p.m. and reconvened at 4:45 p.m. **Page H551**

Pandemic is Over Act: The House passed H.R. 382, to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 100. **Pages H531–39, H553–54**

Rejected the Moskowitz motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce by a yea-and-nay vote of 210 yeas to 220 nays, Roll No. 99. **Pages H539, H553**

H. Res. 75, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) and the bills (H.R. 139), (H.R. 382), and (H.R. 497) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 96, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 95. **Pages H520–29, H530–31**

Freedom for Health Care Workers Act: The House passed H.R. 497, to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 227 yeas to 203 nays, Roll No. 98. **Pages H539–53**

Rejected the Jacobs motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce by a yea-and-nay vote of 210 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 97. **Pages H548–52**

H. Res. 75, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) and the bills (H.R. 139), (H.R. 382), and (H.R. 497) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 96, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 95. **Pages H520–29, H530–31**

Providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 11, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President. **Page H554**

Providing for a certain total number of members on certain select committees and subcommittees: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 78, providing for a certain total number of members on certain select committees and subcommittees. **Page H554**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 79, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Pages H554–55**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 80, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H555**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H530, H530–31, H551–52, H552–53, H553, and H553–54.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Education and Workforce: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress.

AMERICAN ENERGY EXPANSION: STRENGTHENING ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''American Energy Expansion: Strengthening Economic, Environmental, and National Security''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress.

DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM; REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H. Con. Res. 9, denouncing the horrors of socialism; and H. Res. 76, removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–4, a rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 9, Denouncing the horrors of socialism, and H. Res. 76, Removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House. The rule provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 9, Denouncing the horrors of socialism, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designee. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. The rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution. The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 76, Removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House, under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics or their designee. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the resolution. Testimony was heard from Chairman McHenry, Chairman Guest, and Representatives Waters, Wild, and Moore of Wisconsin.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine the 2023 Farm Bill, focusing on trade and horticulture, 10 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee for the 118th Congress, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Lives Worth Living: Addressing the Fentanyl Crisis, Protecting Critical Lifelines, and Combatting Discrimination Against Those with Disabilities'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce, hearing entitled ''Economic Danger Zone: How America Competes to Win the Future Versus China'', 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Challenges and Opportunities to Investigating the Origins of Pandemics and Other Biological Events'', 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 1 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Biden Border Crisis: Part I'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 10:15 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Accountability, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Federal Pandemic Spending: A Prescription for Waste, Fraud and Abuse'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The State of Transportation Infrastructure and Supply Chain Challenges'', 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, February 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. Senators should expect roll call votes.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, February 1

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 139—SHOW UP Act of 2023. Consideration of H.J. Res. 7—Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Allred, Colin Z., Tex., E76
Baird, James R., Ind., E75
Carson, André, Ind., E76, E80
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E76
Gaetz, Matt, Fla., E75, E78
Garamendi, John, Calif., E79
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E79
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E75, E78
Johnson, Bill, Ohio, E80
Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E77
Kim, Andy, N.J., E77
LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E79
Langworthy, Nicholas A., N.Y, E77
Levin, Mike, Calif., E78
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E77
Moran, Nathaniel, Tex., E80
Peltola, Mary Sattler, Alaska., E78
Reschenthaler, Guy, Pa., E75
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E79
Stevens, Haley M., Mich., E78
Tlaib, Rashida, Mich., E75, E79
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E76

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.