United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023 No. 21

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 1, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE CAREY 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.

RECOGNIZING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

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, on the first day of February, to recognize Career and Technical Education Month.

During this month, we highlight the impact of CTE programs, programs that can be referred to as learn-to-earn. These programs are for learners at all levels. We recognize the role of CTE in supporting industry seeking to fill positions in high-demand, high-skill, and high-wage jobs and career fields.

My appreciation for CTE came at a very early age. My father, coming out of the Navy, went through a CTE program, which led him to a job as a tool and die maker. Eventually, he decided to start his own business, which became quite successful.

As co-chair of the bipartisan House Career and Technical Education Caucus and a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I have always supported and will continue to support CTE programs that provide learners of all ages with career-ready skills.

From agriculture to the arts, from marketing to manufacturing, CTE programs work to develop America's most valuable resource: its people.

A one-size-fits-all approach to education is not an effective way to prepare students for the workforce. We are doing students a great disservice when we only promote what is considered a traditional college experience.

CTE has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certification and hands-on skills that they can use right out of high school, in skill-based education programs, or in college.

Mr. Speaker, CTE Month recognizes the benefits of a skills-based education and the valuable contributions CTE students make to the American workforce.

Congress recognized the importance of CTE when we passed the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which helps to close the skills gap by modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs and connecting educators with industry stakeholders. This bill was later signed into law by President Trump in 2018.

While this is a major milestone, there is still much more work to be done. That is why I will continue to put forward commonsense pieces of legislation that update and promote workforce development throughout our Nation.

These include: The Counseling for Career Choice Act, which ensures that high school students are made fully aware of their career and educational options prior to graduation, including non-degree certificate programs, internships, apprenticeships, and 2-year and 4-year degree programs.

There is also the Skills Investment Act, which enhances tax advantaged savings accounts for educational expenses so American workers can use the accounts to pay for skills-based learning, career training, and workforce development.

Lastly, the Cybersecurity Skills Integration Act, creates a $10 million pilot program within the Department of Education to award competitive grants to education-employer partnerships for the development, implementation, and/or expansion of postsecondary CTE programs that integrate cybersecurity education into curricula preparing students for careers in critical infrastructure sectors.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my fellow colleagues to join my co-chair, Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon, and me on the bipartisan House Career and Technical Education Caucus as we work to restore the rungs on the ladder of opportunity for all.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the first day of Black History Month and to honor the

Printed on recycled paper.

Greensboro Four for exemplifying this year's Black History Month theme: Black Resistance.

Black history is American history, but it is important to remember that this isn't ancient history. The Greensboro Four, also known as the A&T Four, sparked the sit-in movement in 1960, just 63 years ago today.

Think about that. Only six decades ago, during my lifetime, Black Americans in the South were forced to use different water fountains, eat at separate lunch counters, go to different bathrooms, and, most of all, suffer the indignity of second-class citizenship.

That is why on February 1, 1960, four courageous Black students from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, my alma mater, Ezell Blair, Jr., David Richmond, Franklin McCain, and Joseph McNeil, sat down at a Whites-only lunch counter and asked to be served. In doing so, the Greensboro Four changed the United States forever.

The sit-in movement spread to cities across the South where Black resistance against segregation, discrimination, and Jim Crow eventually led to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which outlawed segregation in public accommodations.

It is with great pride today that I recognize the A&T Four and every American who joined the sit-in movement to protest the racism of the Jim Crow South and eventually changed public policy.

These protests against injustice led to civil rights and voting rights for Black Americans, as well as equal protection under the law.

Whether it was at that Woolworth's counter or on a bus in Montgomery or in a jail cell in Birmingham or a bridge in Selma, Alabama, or on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial or a Baptist Church in Atlanta or in a St. Louis, Missouri, courthouse before the Civil War or at a slave rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in the antebellum South, Black resistance has nourished and slowly but surely worked to perfect American democracy.

We, as a Nation, have a responsibility to learn from our past and work diligently to carry on the legacy of these four men and all of our ancestors in the movement by ensuring equal rights for all of the people and protecting the civil rights we all fought so hard to win.

Black history is more important than ever. If it wasn't so important, they wouldn't try to stop us from teaching it. Last month, Florida schools announced they would not teach an advanced placement course in African-American history. The State of Florida's letter to the college board claimed the course ''lacks educational value.'' I disagree.

We can't afford to remove critical thinking from our curriculum. Our students won't understand American history without understanding African-American history.

Those who don't understand history, Mr. Speaker, are doomed to repeat it. That is why this February, all Americans must recommit to teaching Black history in our homes, our schools, our churches, on TV, on Twitter, and, yes, even in the Halls of Congress.

We must be unified and unafraid to say ''Black'' and to teach our history and heritage. Because if we don't remember the Greensboro Four, Rosa Parks, Martin Luther and Coretta Scott King, John Lewis, Hattie McDaniel, Frederick Douglass, Harriet and Dred Scott, Nat Turner, Harriet Tubman, and countless others, someday, somewhere, someone will have to endure what they endured to win, yet again, the rights and the respect they fought for. That is why for me, every month, Mr. Speaker, is Black History Month.

REMEMBERING DEVIN WILLOCK AND CHANDLER LeCROY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tragic passing of Devin Willock and Chandler LeCroy of the University of Georgia. Following the Georgia football national championship parade, Devin and Chandler were in a tragic accident that claimed their lives.

Devin played offensive line for the Bulldogs and was a key part of their national championship run this past season. Devin will be remembered by all as a kind soul that loved his family, the game of football, and his teammates.

Chandler graduated from the University of Georgia in 2020 with a master's degree and then went on to work as a recruiting analyst for the Bulldogs. Members of the Georgia football staff spoke about her passion for Georgia athletics and how she always went above and beyond in her work. Her warm spirit and love for her beloved Bulldogs will be remembered by all.

I know that I speak for the entire First District, for the State of Georgia, and for the Bulldog Nation when I say that we will miss Devin and Chandler, but I know that their legacy will live on.

RECOGNIZING HINESVILLE, GEORGIA

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hinesville, Georgia, for being a great place to live, work, and raise a family.

Recently, Hinesville was erroneously named as one of the most miserable places to live in all of the State of Georgia. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, Hinesville is not only one of the best cities in the First District of Georgia, but it is arguably one of the best cities in all of the State.

Hinesville is one of the fastest growing cities in all of southeast Georgia. It is home to Fort Stewart and the 3rd Infantry Division, the largest Army installation east of the Mississippi River.

Across the city, Spanish moss gracefully drapes from the magnificent oak trees. There is a farmers market every Thursday and countless festivals throughout the year.

Hinesville is a wonderful community, full of southern hospitality and a relaxed way of life. The only thing miserable about this city are the attitudes of people who won't give it a fair shake. I am proud of Hinesville. It is a great city.

HONORING COACH PAUL JOHNSON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legendary college football coach Paul Johnson for his induction into the College Football Hall of Fame.

Utilizing his patented spread offense, Johnson compiled a career record of 189–99 in 22 seasons. In 11 seasons at Georgia Tech, he had a record of 82–60. His 82 wins are fourth-most in Tech history.

Johnson is responsible for two 10-win seasons and one 11-win season at Tech. He led the Jackets to nine bowl appearances and three Atlantic Coast Conference Championship games. Johnson received ACC Coach of the Year honors three times in his career and National Coach of the Year honors twice.

When he stepped down at Tech at the end of the 2018 season, his 189 career victories ranked fourth among NCAA Division I FBS head coaches.

While I may be a Georgia Bulldog, I want to congratulate Coach Johnson for his legendary career and his induction into the College Football Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING OLYMPIA CAFE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Olympia Cafe located in Savannah, Georgia.

The Olympia Cafe has been ranked in the top 10 percent of restaurants worldwide by a popular online travel company. Owner Nick Pappas started the restaurant in Savannah over 30 years ago. Before opening in the city, he had been told numerous times that Savannah was not the best place to open a cafe. However, those people were wrong. Pappas has found the perfect location.

Olympia Cafe regularly hosts famous movie celebrities and worldwide travelers. He is proud of the restaurant's award because it relies on customer reviews, which reflects the cafe's hard work.

I would like to congratulate Pappas and everyone at the Olympia Cafe for winning this wonderful award.

□ 1015

CENTRAL HUDSON OVERCHARGING

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring voice to my constituents who have been screwed over and ripped off by our utility company, Central Hudson.

My colleagues here may never have heard of Central Hudson, but the people of the Hudson Valley know them all too well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the farmer in Ulster Park, New York, who received such a massive utility bill, $16,585, 17 times her normal bill, that she actually contemplated suicide. She described the debt, which put her at risk of losing her family farm, as a guillotine hanging over her head.

I rise for the single mother in Kingston who told me she is afraid to cook for her four kids because turning on the stove means facing a gigantic gas bill.

For the mayor of our city of Newburgh, who received a bill of $708,000 for a single month of electricity at his three-bedroom family home; for senior citizens on a fixed income who had their entire checking accounts wiped out by an autopay withdrawal.

I could tell hundreds more of these stories and still not scratch the surface of this incredible corporate ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker, we rely on our public utilities for a necessary service. They exist for the public good. They are built on a foundation of public trust.

Central Hudson, and its CEO, Mr. Charles Freni, have irrevocably broken this trust. Since my calls for an investigation into Central Hudson's disastrous billing practices almost a year ago, we have received more than 11,000 formal complaints. A New York State Department of Public Service report revealed Central Hudson's billing system was riddled with hundreds of programming errors, leading to nearly 5,000 customers not receiving their bills, 8,000 customers overcharged, and more than 30,000 customers whose autopay was billed incorrectly, costing them over $16 million.

I want to be clear. I do not fault the hardworking employees of Central Hudson. They begged for additional training. They suggested improvements to this system. They worked hours and hours of overtime. They wanted to do the right thing for the people of the Hudson Valley, but Central Hudson and its CEO clearly did not.

Just 2 weeks ago in response to this devastating Public Service Commission report documenting their systemic failures, Central Hudson doubled-down on their deflection, their denial, and their deception. Rather than taking ownership of their failures, they claimed that no customers were overcharged and that nobody lost any money.

Give me a break.

Central Hudson's leadership deliberately chose to sweep these problems under the rug. Why?

Because now owned by a multibillion-dollar and multinational corporation, they chose to put profits over people. At the same time as customers'—my constituents'—bills were skyrocketing and bank accounts were literally being emptied out, their revenues were up over 30 percent and their profits—surprise, surprise—they are up, too.

Central Hudson has had opportunity after opportunity to own their mistakes and take accountability, but time and again they have failed to do so.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no excuse for this. At a time when our families are facing tremendous economic pressure, the last thing they need to worry about is their bank accounts being emptied out just because they tried to power their home.

Because of these failures and because of Central Hudson's continued unwillingness to take accountability, today I am calling on Central Hudson's CEO, Mr. Charles Freni, to do the right thing for our community and to resign.

We need a new leader who will come in, improve service, finally fix these systemic problems, and start the critical work to rebuild trust with our community. That is what the people of the Hudson Valley deserve.

DOCTORS KNOW BEST

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the Freedom for Healthcare Workers Act that has been submitted and we will soon vote on.

As an ER physician who has treated thousands of patients, who has been exposed to COVID thousands of times, and watched nurses and midlevels and healthcare workers of all kinds complain about the government's involvement in healthcare, I wanted to address this topic.

I believe I am the only Congressman who has actually been an ER doctor in the pandemic. My last shift was December 28. I intubated a patient and saw three critical patients. Several of them had COVID. Nobody was admitted for COVID, though.

Back to the point, though. During this pandemic we started off with no vaccination. Meanwhile, most of us were exposed regardless of what PPE we had, and it was limited at times to people who had fevers, who had symptoms even before we knew what COVID was. A lot of us got sick and developed immunity naturally.

Then the government stepped in. Although well-meaning, a lot of times government officials think they have the answer to everything, including things they really don't know about. What they will do is cherry-pick the experts that agree with them to say this is what experts believe, and that is why all healthcare professionals should believe this also. That is not how we make progress in medicine. As a matter of fact, it stifles innovation and progress.

At one time we had a President, President Garfield, who was shot, and it was poor practice in medicine where doctors probed his wound and made him septic that caused him to die. There was a dissenting opinion by Dr. Lister—you may have heard of Listerine—who believed in antiseptic but he was scoffed at and belittled because he was the outlying person. Imagine where we would be if government stepped in and said: Our experts said you don't need to wash your hands before you probe wounds. We would still be in the Dark Ages of medicine.

I beg the government to stay out of the way of healthcare progress. To stay out of the debate of healthcare professionals because, quite frankly, very few people in Congress understand medicine the way healthcare professionals do. They haven't been to medical school, and even those who have, they haven't been in medicine for a long time. Quite frankly, the Doctors Caucus is seldom relied on for healthcare policy, which is a shame.

If you haven't been to medical school, if you haven't taken your boards, if you haven't been through a residency, if you haven't seen tens of thousands of patients, you shouldn't be telling doctors who have a dissenting opinion what to do.

There is no standard of care based on government. It is based on physicians having a good decision, trying different things, and finding out what works. That is how medicine has progressed in America; far beyond any limitations that we have in foreign counties.

We are the leaders of innovation and healthcare. We should consider our healthcare professionals when we make decisions and not consider government first when it comes to standard of care.

If you want to require healthcare professionals to have a vaccination, why do you think the government understands that requirement better than the very healthcare professional who not only treats this but was exposed to it, who has natural immunities, and who understands the side effects; not only of the disease but of the vaccination.

Once again, I submit to you that it is time to let healthcare professionals make their own decisions, especially when it comes to their own lives. They are the ones that put their lives on the line during the pandemic. They are the ones that treated the sick patients. They are the ones that know best whether a vaccination will benefit them or harm them, not a government.

I must also remind you that our Constitution is based on individual rights, not on a collective governance by politicians telling people what to do in things they don't know about.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we support the Freedom for Healthcare Workers Act.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENTS OF ANGELO K. TSAKOPOULOS

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

Ms. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the lifetime achievements of Angelo K. Tsakopoulos.

Mr. Tsakopoulos' story is a story of the American Dream. Angelo immigrated to the United States from Greece at the age of 15. He worked hard. He didn't have a whole lot but went into the real estate business to help pay for his education at California State University, Sacramento. He built a real estate company.

Angelo helped shape Sacramento over his life. The Sacramento Bee has identified Mr. Tsakopoulos potentially as the most influential Sacramentan since John Sutter. His contributions, not just to our community but to philanthropy, to education, and to the arts are outstanding.

Mr. Tsakopoulos also never forgot his roots in Greece. This Monday he will receive lifetime recognition for his service to Hellenism. He established multiple foundations and organizations to celebrate the values and the culture of his homeland.

He also, through his family, continues to do public service through his daughter Eleni who is our Lieutenant Governor in California. On Monday, February 6, all of us in Sacramento, the United States, and all Greek Americans recognize the contributions of Angelo Tsakopoulos and his family; contributions to preserving Greek culture.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the first day of Black History Month to recognize the importance of studying African-American history and Black history in the United States.

It is incredibly important for us to recognize Black history and teach it not only to our young students from elementary school to middle school to high school, but to all Americans. We have to understand the good and the bad. We have to understand the legacy of slavery, Jim Crow, and mass incarceration.

We need to understand—as I stand her on the floor of the House of Representatives in the United States Capitol, a beacon of democracy and freedom—that this is a building that was built by enslaved people. It is important for us to understand that because we need to recognize that and get better at teaching that to future generations of Americans.

We also need to recognize the accomplishments of a few individuals: the moral character of our former colleague, John Lewis, who really was the moral backbone of this institution; the first President that I served under, Barack Obama, the accomplishments, not just as President but as a great human being, father, and husband; my close friend, the first female Vice President, the first African-American Vice President, the first Asian-American Vice President, Vice President KAMALA HARRIS who is a role model for my daughter and future women across the spectrum in the United States; and our good friend, the minority leader of the Democratic Party, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, someone who we are all proud of.

Let's understand African-American history. Let's teach it. Let's not try to erase the parts that we don't want to teach. If we don't teach Black history, we will be condemned to repeat some of those mistakes. We need to learn from the past, and we need to get better. Let's teach it to all of our students.

HONORING KEN COOLEY

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Assemblyman Ken Cooley for his decades of service to Sacramento County and the State of California.

Ken served in the California State Assembly for 10 years representing the Eighth Assembly District, which covered the eastern half of Sacramento County.

Assemblyman Cooley started his public service career in Sacramento as the chief of staff to the State assemblyman, and later as chief counsel to the Assembly Finance and Insurance Committee.

He was elected to the Rancho Cordova's first city council in 2002 and twice served as mayor to Rancho Cordova. Ken was a constant presence and continues to be a constant presence throughout our community.

I have had the privilege to go to many events with Ken, and he is a close friend. He is an Eagle Scout, as well, and his commitment to Scouting helped recognize youth achievement through the Boy Scouts of America.

The City of Rancho Cordova and all of us in Sacramento County are better off thanks to his hard work and determination, and I wish him all the best in the next chapter of his life.

AMERICANS HAVE THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Americans have a fundamental right to keep and bear arms that shall not be infringed.

The unelected bureaucrats at the ATF do not have the constitutional authority to ban guns and violate the Second Amendment rights of American citizens.

I am proud to join my colleagues to fight to block Joe Biden's pistol brace gun ban and also to fight to defund the ATF.

□ 1030

In Illinois, Governor Pritzker signed an unconstitutional gun ban that violates the Second Amendment rights of my constituents. Joe Biden and J.B. Pritzker's policies released dangerous criminals and defund the police, and then they want to take our Second Amendment right to defend ourselves.

I am a proud member of the House Freedom Caucus and the House Second Amendment Caucus. We are united in our opposition to these unconstitutional attacks on the rights of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I will always stand for our constitutional rights and protect our Second Amendment rights in Congress.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Social Security coverage is an earned benefit. In January, Social Security beneficiaries began to see an 8.7 percent cost-of-living increase, the largest since 1981. This COLA covers retirees as well as workers who become disabled and surviving children under age 18 whose working parents died.

For nearly a century, America has honored the sacred insurance promise intergenerationally. Those who work throughout their lives will benefit from the fruits of their labor.

Yes, this historic cost-of-living adjustment will help Americans manage their cost of living to pay bills and put food on the table. In addition, millions of Medicare users will now only pay $35 per month for insulin. This cost savings will benefit hundreds of thousands of Ohioans.

The Social Security COLA along with affordable insulin are being championed by congressional Democrats. We know the foundation of financial stability for over 66 million retired Americans is their earned social insurance benefits. Respecting their lives and their work, Democrats will always honor Social Security and vote to protect it and to strengthen Medicare.

FUND NEW GREAT LAKES AUTHORITY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to also call upon President Biden to fund the new Great Lakes Authority in the administration's fiscal year 2024 budget request.

With support from our Great Lakes colleagues, the Great Lakes Authority was authorized in the fiscal year 2023 omnibus appropriations bill and signed into law on January 2, 2023.

Across America, regional development instrumentalities like this have existed for decades. Until now, the Great Lakes region was the one major region left out of our Nation's toolkit for regional cooperation, reinvestment, and revitalization.

Launched initially with Federal resources to drive economic and environmental recovery, this authority now exists and aims to become self-sufficient sooner rather than later. This new year brings new opportunities for public-private partnerships across our Great Lakes region for investment and revitalization.

The Great Lakes Authority will harness the region's strengths, which include stewardship of the largest body of freshwater on the continent and on

Earth. Our region is home to America's industrial and agricultural strength. We have hardworking men and women who manufacture the majority of automobiles and trucks this Nation manufactures, as well as, of course, farmers in our agricultural heartland who feed us all. We have these massive production assets in this region.

Finally, the wealth of the region has allowed for an array of educational and corporate institutions, as well, which now can be mobilized together to reboot and repurpose the region's recovery from massive job outsourcing and, frankly, outright neglect that has damaged its potential for far too long.

Investing to strengthen the Great Lakes heartland will usher in a new era for our communities. It is time to fund the Great Lakes Authority to be the key economic development engine that becomes self-supporting through public-private partnerships that make a lasting impact.

Onward Great Lakes Authority.

There is no time like the present to launch a stronger and more hopeful future for every community across our precious region.

PROTECTING WOMEN'S AND GIRLS' SPORTS

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, sports and athletic competitions provide essential opportunities for women to thrive at every stage of their life, as children in youth sports and as teens in high school and in college, in order to live a healthy and productive life.

As a former competitive athlete, an equestrian, a basketball player, a golfer, and, yes, the teenage curling champion of 1975 in my hometown, I know the unparalleled opportunities that sports offer to women and girls.

Competitive sports give women a chance to learn new skills, to develop lifelong friendships, and to challenge themselves to compete at the highest levels. Title IX and the banning of discrimination against women in sports made so much of this possible for me and countless other women.

Today, these opportunities are under threat. Joe Biden's Department of Education and State agencies across the Nation are allowing, even encouraging, biological men to participate in women's sports. This is fundamentally unfair. It deprives women and girls of what so many of us fought for decades to achieve: equal opportunity to train, to compete, and to excel in athletics.

We witnessed this past year, during the NCAA women's swimming championship, a phenomenal female athlete robbed of her title by a biological male. This is not an isolated incident. The tragedy is playing out in countless other sports and athletic leagues across our Nation.

Today, we take a stand, with compassion for all, in defense of women's sports to stop this dangerous precedent.

I am honored to be joined by an amazing group of outstanding women athletes who are in our Chamber today and are courageously standing up for women in all sports across our Nation and all women athletes.

This is why I am so honored to cosponsor Representative GREG STEUBE's Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act and to announce its introduction today in honor of National Women and Girls in Sports Day.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the legislation. This bill will make it a violation of Title IX for biological men to compete in sports designated for women or girls. Further, it sensibly defines sex based on one's biological designation at birth.

This bill isn't just anti-woke. It is actually pro-science. This bill will protect opportunities for women and girls to compete fairly on the athletic field and in life without interference from woke agencies or politicians who are making up definitions of sex and gender as they go, all to fit toxic political agendas and ideologies.

Women have fought hard over the years for equality of opportunity, and it is essential that we protect these opportunities we cherish today for generations of women and girls to come.

The Republican majority has pledged to protect women's sports, and today, we are delivering on that promise with Congressman STEUBE's bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce Mr. STEUBE's bill today.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC SCHEME HURTS WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the work of Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is to advance the well-being, security, and economic growth of the American people.

Let me define for you, Mr. Speaker, who the American people are. For all of us as Members of Congress, that looks very different.

For me in my district, it means the young entrepreneur who is eager and excited about starting a new business, a startup company.

It is the middle-aged couple who have government jobs and who have worked diligently, scrimped and saved to buy a home, and are now looking for financing and support to send their children to college.

It is the veteran who has served this country and now has to navigate through the bureaucracy of the Federal Government to get those rights and privileges that, having served this country, he or she deserves.

It is the senior citizen and the retiree who are always watching their budget to make sure that they have enough to meet all of their bills and somehow get by.

Those are the people and the families whom I fight for. I know that, on my side of the aisle, those workers, parents, seniors, and young people are whom we, as Democrats, are fighting for. While we may come from different families with different standings, beliefs, and statuses, that is whom we all should be working for in this Chamber.

Presently, however, the House Republican economic scheme will only hurt working American families, whom we say we are here to support. As Congress, as the House of Representatives of the people, we must, in partnership with the President, continue to enact legislation to protect the financial security of American working families.

That is why I am directly calling on my colleagues, the Republican Conference members, to begin the work of legislating for the American people—the majority of Americans, not the performative politics required by an extreme social media fringe—with legislation to help work out the best possibilities to solve the growing challenges that our families, the American people, face every day.

The current Republican-led plan to cut taxes in favor of the wealthy does not help lower- and middle-income families. Instead, it increases our national deficit and makes inflation worse.

The dismantling of Social Security will be devastating to retirees, who have paid into that system and believe that it is something that they are going to have to live out their best days yet.

Likewise, allowing for prescription drug prices and health insurance premiums to rise while simultaneously allowing for an increasing energy bill and student loan payments only make it harder for families to financially stay afloat and take care of their health.

In the last Congress, the 117th Congress, President Biden and House Democrats forged extraordinary progress, working in a bipartisan manner in the other Chamber, for American working families with many consequential new laws.

They include the American Rescue Plan, which kick-started the fastest and strongest jobs recovery in modern times, creating more than 10 million jobs in just 2 years; the infrastructure law, which put Americans back to work while simultaneously rebuilding our roads, bridges, ports, and water systems; the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which deploys stronger tools to keep guns out of dangerous hands; the PACT Act, which ensures that veterans who are exposed to toxic chemicals while protecting our Nation can access the healthcare services they need; the CHIPS and Science Act, which will power American preeminence in science, innovation, and manufacturing, strengthen our national security, and bring jobs back to

America for decades to come; and the Inflation Reduction Act, which slashed prescription drug costs and lowered healthcare premiums, delivering the most consequential climate action in history and reducing the Federal deficit.

All of this progress can continue if we continue to work to legislate and not to perform for cameras and social media. To work for the American people is incumbent on us all—Democrats, Republicans, all of us—to work together to protect the health, security, and freedom of American families.

ANTI-SEMITISM: NEVER AGAIN

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

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me, just for a start, say that hatred and discrimination against any marginalized community are wrong, whether it be an ethnic minority, LGBT, a person with a disability, and women and girls.

Today, I want to focus on something that is personal to me.

My family was blessed. My grandfather came over to this country from Poland just before the rise of Hitler, and he saved his brothers and sisters by bringing them over. Too many people were not so blessed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and start my comments by saying, ''never again,'' as I address the growing concern of anti-Semitism in my home State of Florida and across the country.

□ 1045

This rise in anti-Semitism is deeply concerning, particularly given the lessons of the Holocaust, where we lost 6 million Jews and millions of others who were murdered by the Nazis in one of the worst human atrocities in the history of the world. These were precious lives who were tortured, gassed, shot, and treated as less than human.

It is terrifying that we find ourselves today having to defend the fact that it even happened. So we say ''never again'' to remind the world that we just didn't wake up one moment to gas chambers and genocide; it was a slow and deliberate effort, dehumanizing Jews and others, fomenting fear and normalizing extremism and prejudice.

Today, Holocaust denial and anti-Semitism is on the rise. Incidents of anti-Semitism reported—and this is just reported—to the Anti-Defamation League have risen by 34 percent in their last report. There were over 2,700 incidents that were reported in a year: Harassment, assaults, Molotov cocktails thrown at synagogues, defacing Jewish cemeteries, I could go on and on. The point is, it is clear that anti-Semitism is real.

In my own community in Palm Beach County, which is home to tens of thousands of Jews, this past January there were Nazi symbols projected on buildings and hundreds and hundreds of anti-Semitic flyers thrown into the yards of people.

Mr. Speaker, I say what should we do? What must we do?

Combating anti-Semitism is everyone's responsibility. There is something for all of us to do to promote a more inclusive and respectful society.

Let me just give a to-do list. It is not necessarily inclusive, but some things that we should all take to heart.

Believe it or not, a significant number of our young people don't have any understanding of the Holocaust; and so, of course, education and awareness about the Holocaust and the history of anti-Semitism and the harm it causes, education is something that is very important.

All of us must speak out and condemn anti-Semitism wherever and whenever it occurs, whether it is using your voice, your Facebook page, your Twitter, writing letters to the editor. If you see something, you must say something.

We should be working with our great partners across different sectors and levels of government to combat anti-Semitism and protect our Jewish communities, partners like the ADL, the American Jewish Committee, and many others.

We have to keep our houses of worship safe, not just synagogues, but churches and mosques. People must be free in this country to go to a house of worship and feel safe.

We must support the laws and policies that protect people and communities from discrimination, extremism, hate crimes, and improve hate crime reporting and prosecuting hate crimes.

Mr. Speaker, let me just refer to a magnificent hero in my community, Ben Ferencz, the last living Nuremberg prosecutor, who tells us that creating a world of tolerance and compassion would be a long and arduous task, a task we must all take up in words and actions.

Mr. Speaker, we must build bridges between different communities through dialogues and collaborations that can help to reduce prejudice and foster mutual respect, and it means standing against hatred aimed at other often marginalized groups.

And we must protect the safety and security of Israel, the homeland of 46 percent of the world's Jews.

As I conclude my remarks, I want to highlight the story of Ben Ferencz, a magnificent hero from my community.

Ben, who at 103 years old, is the last living Nuremberg prosecutor and was recently bestowed the Congress' highest honor, a Congressional Gold Medal.

As World War II engulfed Europe, after graduating from law school, Ben enlisted in the U.S. Army.

He was transferred to a unit responsible for gathering evidence of Nazi war crimes.

He later took that evidence to the chief Nuremberg prosecutor, and at 27 years old, Ben was appointed the lead prosecutor of the biggest murder trial in the history of the world where he convicted 22 Nazi leaders for their roles in the deaths of over 1 million people.

Ben went on to spend his life pursuing peace and justice.

CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on the Biden administration to close the disposable e-cigarette loophole. I commend this administration's work to curtail youth e-cigarette use. Youth usage of cigarettes and vaping is at a historic low, but the FDA's guidance issued by the previous administration in January 2020 that prohibits flavored e-cigarettes does not apply to any of the disposable e-cigarette products currently on the market.

It is important to note that non-disposable products with cartridge inserts are already banned by the FDA, but the loophole on disposable e-cigarettes has allowed a surge in youth usage, according to the Centers for Disease Control 2022 National Youth Tobacco Study. The study shows that usage is up by 2,000 percent since 2019.

It is a dangerous oversight that can easily be fixed by closing the Trump-era loophole. Disposable e-cigarettes are single use. They are not meant to be refilled or recharged.

Right now, in smoke shops and corner stores around the country, you might see dozens of disposable e-cigarette products in flavors like iced apple mango, strawberry, pineapple, and even lemonade. These products are sleek, affordable, pocket-sized, and highly accessible to our youth.

The President can take immediate action by closing this Trump-era loophole. The future and safety of American youth depends on this.

REJECTING AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY IS WRONG

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, last week Florida Governor Ron DeSantis' administration blocked a new advanced placement African-American history course from being taught in Florida high schools, arguing that the course violates State law and is historically inaccurate.

The DeSantis administration's rejection of the AP course is unfathomable, unsound, and unacceptable. Instead of improving and expanding on the quality of education for Florida high school students, this administration's extreme agenda aims to roll back the clock by denying its students the right to explore the painful, complex, and rich history of African Americans in our country.

The rejection of this course is an attempt to erase from our memory the truth about how hate and bigotry has destroyed our Nation's moral fabric and ushered in one of the darkest moments of United States history.

Governor Ron DeSantis claimed that he wants to protect students from

''woke indoctrination,'' but what he really wants to do is to deny the truth by making bigoted relics and policies more digestible for future generations.

It is only when we acknowledge and learn from our past that we can embrace the present and confidently shape our future.

This blatant attack on the importance and value of African-American history and culture fails to move our States and our country forward. It is these theatrics and schemes by the GOP that cripple our Nation's growth and exemplify a poor reflection of who we are as a nation.

America's diversity is, in fact, its greatest strength, and every culture has to be respected and celebrated.

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 53 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Intercede in our lives, O Lord, even as we offer prayers of intercession for others. While we offer our petitions and thanksgiving for our leaders and all who are in authority, with our voices we also pray for those who have no voice, for those who have no hope, and for those who don't know how or what to pray in the moments they are now enduring.

Hear our prayers for the individuals we know and name in our hearts who are grieving loss or suffering illness. For too many who are mute with pain and despair, may the prayers from our lips reach You on their behalf.

Hear our prayers for our communities and our country who are fractured by the tragedies of violence in all its forms. For the many cities and neighborhoods disrupted with animosity and distrust, may the prayers we offer together in this place bring forth a comity to be found only in You.

Hear our prayers for the war-torn countries around the world and for their citizens who suffer from abuses of power, the deprivation of religious liberties, and the brutal oppression of human rights. For these who are prohibited from praying, may our prayers be louder and stronger than the adversary who seeks to silence them.

You alone are sovereign, O God. May our faith be found righteous before You that our prayers would be powerful and effective on behalf of Your people.

In the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY'S WORLD CAMPUS

(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 Penn State University's World Campus on 25 years of online learning.

In 1998, Penn State World Campus launched its first online courses. Since then, those initial courses have expanded to more than 175 degrees and certificate programs, and almost 34,000 students have graduated with a Penn State degree they earned online.

Through the past 25 years, the leadership of World Campus has remained dedicated to helping students to reach their goals. The creation of World Campus allows students to find success in a flexible way. Students who wanted a Penn State degree but could not go to a campus have access to an extensive selection of associate, bachelor's, and master's degree programs.

In fact, Penn State World Campus is ranked number five on Military Times ''Best for Vets'' list and named ''Guard-Friendly'' by the Pennsylvania National Guard Associations.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud Penn State alumnus, the World Campus gives students of all backgrounds and ages the ability to be able to find success and join the extensive Penn State community.

Congratulations, Penn State World Campus, we can't wait to see what the next 25 years have in store.

We are.

RAISING THE NATION'S DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about what has been and should always be a bipartisan issue, raising our Nation's debt ceiling.

Raising America's debt ceiling ensures we do not default on our financial obligations to those we have borrowed from and prevents economic catastrophe in the process. Don't take my word for it.

Listen to American businesses, economists, and financial institutions who know the drastic consequences a debt default would have for the U.S. economy and working Americans.

The business roundtable, which represents the CEOs of some of the Nation's largest companies, has said about raising the debt limit: ''Failure to lift the Federal debt limit to meet U.S. obligations would produce an otherwise avoidable crisis and pose an unacceptable risk to the Nation's economic growth, job creation and financial markets.''

If you don't want to take their word for it, I recommend heeding these words:

''The full consequences of a default—or even the serious prospect of a default—by the United States are impossible to predict and awesome to contemplate.'' Those are the words of President Ronald Reagan.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S PR STUNT TO TOUR SMALL BUSINESS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Vice President traveled to North Carolina to tout the Biden administration's so-called accomplishments in helping our Nation's small businesses.

Well, the American people can see through the Vice President's PR stunt and know sky-high inflation, worker shortages, and supply chain disruptions are nothing to celebrate.

I have been a small business owner for 52 years and still am, and I know these economic headwinds job creators are facing firsthand.

The reality is small businesses are worse off due to this administration's disastrous policies and out-of-control Washington spending.

As the chairman of the Small Businesses Committee, I welcome anyone who wants to celebrate entrepreneurship and recognize our great small businesses.

However, no amount of media events will change the dire reality Main Street continues to experience under

this administration's 2-year crackdown on job creators.

More needs to be done to unleash the full potential of Main Street, and the direction must change before anyone goes on a victory lap or asks for a trophy.

In God We Trust.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, the first day of Black History Month to honor Black history as American history.

Black history is about the sung and unsung Black heroes and sheroes who have contributed to our Nation's progress—from the Revolutionary War to the fight against COVID and everything in between.

Therefore, we say thank you to the Black Americans who stand for justice, for voting rights, for women's rights, for saving Black lives, for better healthcare, climate reform, and education. I believe whether it is teaching AP Black history courses or standing on this House floor—that when we acknowledge the unique struggle of Black Americans through history—we grow closer to our Nation's highest ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will take time this month to learn and truly understand Black history is American history.

FENTANYL CRISIS

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, deceptive drugs made of fentanyl are killing young people and destroying lives in southern California and across our Nation at an alarming rate.

In California, fentanyl is responsible for one out of every five youth deaths.

The top source of fentanyl is the U.S.-Mexico border, and last year, 60 percent of fentanyl found in 2022 was at southern California ports of entry in San Diego and Imperial counties near my district.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department seized more than 400 pounds of suspected fentanyl, and nearly 400,000 pills suspected to contain fentanyl during the first 10 months in 2022.

I will keep fighting for solutions to secure our border and prevent these drugs from entering our schools, streets, neighborhoods, and homes.

ADDICTION CRISIS IN EVERY COMMUNITY

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the addiction crisis that continues to impact just about every community and every family across this country.

Many of us have lost neighbors, friends, and loved ones. Despite significant efforts at all levels of government, recent statistics show the problem is worsening.

My hometown of Manchester saw a 22 percent increase in opioid-related overdoses last year and a 41 percent increase in opioid-related deaths. We must do more to confront this crisis to support those who are suffering from substance use disorder and to stop the trafficking of fentanyl and its analogues.

These substances, which authorities are now finding in nearly all illicit drugs, have only made this crisis more and more deadly.

That is why last week, alongside Representatives DAN NEWHOUSE and TONY GONZALES, I reintroduced the Save Americans from the Fentanyl Emergency Act. Our bill would permanently schedule all fentanyl-related substances as Schedule I drugs. This would ensure that law enforcement retains an important tool to get these deadly drugs off the streets and hold traffickers accountable. It will help save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER OKLAHOMA CITY ASIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mrs. BICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the launch of the Greater Oklahoma City Asian Chamber of Commerce, which will empower businesses and support the economic growth of the Asian community in Oklahoma.

The Asian community is one of the fastest growing populations in the Nation and in Oklahoma, with nearly 50,000 Asian residents and more than 5,300 businesses in the greater Oklahoma City metro area, resulting in $203 million in payroll and $1.2 billion in sales.

Clearly, the Asian community has fostered great innovation and boosted our local economy. I am proud to serve such a vibrant community and am grateful for their remarkable contributions to the district.

Thank you to the incredible leaders and entrepreneurs who have created this new chamber that will benefit the community and beyond.

I am particularly grateful for the leadership of Scarlet Le-Cao and her vision in starting the Greater Oklahoma City Asian American Chamber of Commerce. Her leadership will be vital for years to come.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF PAUL WOODS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the incredible life and service of World War II veteran Paul Woods.

Mr. Woods joined the United States Army in 1941. During the war, he bravely fought for America's freedoms abroad and racism at home.

Mr. Woods is known to say: ''A bullet knows no race, rank, or status. We were all brothers on the battlefield.''

On February 20, Mr. Woods will celebrate his 100th birthday. It is my honor to celebrate this American hero and to thank him for his selfless service on behalf of a grateful Nation.

RECOGNIZING SHARON JOHNSON'S 35 YEARS OF SERVICE

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today to honor an incredible woman, my deputy chief of staff, Sharon Johnson. Today marks Sharon's 35 years of service to Mississippi's Third Congressional District.

Sharon was born and raised in Louisville, Mississippi, and began her career in Washington, D.C., under the legendary G.V. Sonny Montgomery and has served our district under all three Members of Congress since: Congressman Chip Pickering, Congressman Gregg Harper, and now I am blessed that she has been a member of my team since day one.

Over the past 35 years, Sharon has proven to be a true asset to the people of Mississippi's Third Congressional District. Her unwavering commitment to service and community has earned her the respect and admiration of those who have had the privilege of working with her.

Today, we honor Sharon and celebrate her service. I am hopeful that Sharon's record of public service will inspire future generations of young women to consider this important work.

On behalf of Mississippi's Third Congressional District, I extend my sincere thanks to Sharon Johnson for her 35 years of unwavering service.

□ 1215

HONORING GREENSBORO FOUR

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, on this day 63 years ago, four courageous North Carolina A&T students, Franklin McCain, Jibreel Khazan, Joseph McNeil, and David Richmond, staged a sit-in at the Whites-only lunch counter

of the Woolworth Department Store in Greensboro, North Carolina, after they were refused service.

They came to be known as the Greensboro Four. In the days to come, their peaceful protest grew as they were joined by students from Bennett College and Dudley High School.

Their courageous actions inspired over 700,000 people across the Nation to participate in sit-ins, sparking a revolution that moved our Nation forward in the fight for civil rights.

Today, as we celebrate the first day of Black History Month, we remember their legacy, which is honored at the International Civil Rights Center and Museum that is in that very Woolworth's building in Greensboro.

I am proud to co-lead a resolution with Congresswoman ADAMS to encourage States to include the Greensboro sit-ins in school curriculums.

HONORING JAN LENTZ

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a lifelong public servant and valuable member of the Texas-11 team, Mrs. Jan Lentz.

For 7 years, Jan has devoted her time and talents to our district as a constituent services aide. She previously served with the VA, West Texas Counseling and Guidance, and many other organizations and has led a veterans support group for over 15 years, most of this as a volunteer.

Jan's impact on our community exceeds everything beyond words, and her service has extended far beyond our district. She has literally impacted thousands of lives, veteran lives and family member lives, and so many in need in our community.

Over the years, Jan has secured countless benefits for veterans and has impacted thousands of veteran families. Last year alone, she returned over $100,000 in taxes back to constituents.

Jan is someone who we all wish we could be.

As she moves into the next phase of her life in retirement, we want Jan to know that we are grateful for her service. We are grateful for what she has done for our community, veterans, and so many people in need.

I say thank you to Jan from the bottom of our hearts, from our team, our district, and the State of Texas. We all wish Jan good luck in retirement.

COMMENDING PENNSYLVANIA HERO BENJAMIN STEIDINGER

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the 1-year anniversary of the heroism of Benjamin Steidinger, of Germansville, Pennsylvania.

When Benjamin saw smoke coming from a house across his street, he didn't just call 911. He climbed up a ladder to the second story, knocked out a window, and crawled across the floor, where he rescued two women, a baby, and a dog from the smoke and flames.

Benjamin thought he might not make it out of that house alive, but he put his life at risk in sacrifice for others. He is among the best of us.

Today, I commend Benjamin for representing and living out the values of our community: grit, determination, and courage in the face of immense challenges.

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Seventh District, we thank Benjamin for his courage.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY J. BENEZETTE

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

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great man, Deputy J. Benezette from the Cass County Sheriff's Office who recently received the Life Saving Award.

Deputy Benezette was on his way home from an extra duty assignment at the sheriff's office and heard a dispatch call. An incident had happened nearby, and he answered that call for service.

Deputy Benezette got on the scene, where two motor vehicles were involved in an accident. One vehicle was completely overturned and had water pouring into it. With two people trapped inside and one struggling to keep her head above water, Deputy Benezette was able to quickly rescue both of them, saving a life and preventing a drowning.

His actions show dedication to duty under the most extreme circumstances, and he has been recognized with the Life Saving Award by his department.

Deputy Benezette serves Cass County and our Fourth District faithfully. He is a hero for our community and will be our guest at the State of the Union Address next week.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him and every member of our law enforcement community across America for the service they do for us.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS RAISE TAXES ON FAMILIES, CUT BENEFITS FOR SENIORS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 83rd anniversary of the first Social Security check being issued. Since then, Democrats have worked to protect and strengthen Social Security, which has kept seniors from poverty and helped ensure a secure economic future for working Americans.

This year, Social Security beneficiaries received an 8.7 percent cost-of-living adjustment, the largest increase in decades.

While 70 million Americans are benefiting from this increase today, Republicans are working hard to slash Social Security and Medicare. To add further insult to injury, the Republican economic scheme includes a 30 percent sales tax that will impact every American family.

Our children, our families, and our seniors do not deserve to carry the undue financial burden of Republican tax breaks for large corporations and billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to realign their priorities and start working for the people.

FAILING DEMOCRATIC POLICIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a result of failing policies by Biden and the Democrat-led Congress, American families continue to feel the impact of 40-year-high inflation in their pocketbooks. Last year, the cost of everyday products and services rose exponentially, destroying jobs.

Since Biden took office, there has been a $10 trillion increase in spending above projections, $2.5 million increase on interest payments on growing Federal debt, $1.9 trillion on the American Rescue Plan, $745 billion on the inflation expansion act, $3.4 trillion on the infrastructure investment act, and $1 trillion in Biden executive actions.

This irresponsible spending has hurt all Americans, and we must address it. The newly elected House Republican majority, ably led by Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY, is committed to creating jobs and a government that is accountable to the people. We must reestablish fiscal sanity.

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

Just yesterday, another terrorist was caught crossing the southern border.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SAFE WITH REPUBLICANS

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 days, I have heard repeatedly the other side of the House say that Republicans want to cut Social Security or reduce spending on Social Security and reduce benefits from Social Security.

I will call that a lie. Just because you repeat it multiple times does not

make it a fact, Mr. Speaker. I actually asked around my entire delegation, my entire caucus: Does anyone want to reduce spending on Social Security? Not one person said yes. As a matter of fact, everybody said no.

As a caucus, we have discussed this multiple times, both on the floor and in conference, and we have all unanimously said that we are not going to reduce spending on Social Security.

As a matter of fact, I will challenge anybody who says differently to show me in writing where this secret document exists or where the secret statement exists because I haven't seen it.

I want to take this opportunity to express that just because you say it doesn't make it fact. The fact is that no Republican is talking about reducing spending on Social Security as a caucus.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the 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. 84

Resolved, That the following named member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Guest, Chair.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO COMPOSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 12, as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78, the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with not more than 19 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 8 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 9, DENOUNCING THE HORRORS OF SOCIALISM; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 76, REMOVING A CERTAIN MEMBER FROM A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ethics or their respective designees.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who is my good friend, 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. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 provides for consideration of two resolutions under a closed rule. They are H. Con. Res. 9 and H. Res. 76.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying resolutions.

H. Con. Res. 9 is a simple resolution denouncing the horrors of socialism in all forms and opposes the implementation of socialist policy here in the United States.

This resolution should not be controversial. Socialism is a harmful ideology that is opposed to everything the United States stands for. Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin both described and demonstrated how socialism is a transition period between capitalism and communism.

We have seen this time and time again. Socialist ideology creates a concentration of power that leads to communist regimes, totalitarian rule, and brutal dictatorships that deprive their citizens of basic freedoms and human rights.

We have seen the horrors of communism through the tens of millions killed by regimes in China, the Soviet Union, North Korea, Cambodia, and elsewhere, horrors that some of my colleagues across the aisle refused to even condemn yesterday during the Rules Committee hearing on this.

Even today, hundreds of thousands of Russians, Chinese, Cambodians, Koreans, Cubans, and Venezuelans have fled from murderous communist dictatorships and have legally resettled here in the United States. They are a living testament to the barbarity of these socialist regimes and the promise of the American Dream.

It is essential for Congress to condemn the atrocities committed in the name of socialism and prevent any socialist policies from being implemented in the United States.

Additionally, the rule before us provides for consideration H. Res. 76, a resolution that would remove Representative ILHAN OMAR from her seat on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Representative OMAR has a repeated history of making deplorable and despicable anti-Semitic remarks and does not deserve to sit on the committee directly overseeing U.S. international policy, partnerships, and national security.

In fact, the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a Democrat, Representative Eliot Engel, claimed that such comments made by Representative OMAR have ''no place in the Foreign Affairs Committee or the House of Representatives.''

Compared to the actions taken by my Democratic colleagues last Congress, I think that we Republicans are being incredibly generous in only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Foreign Affairs Committee instead of from all her committee assignments, which we are clearly in our right to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am confused, Mr. Speaker, because after months of hearing from Republicans that they want to address bread

and butter issues, that they want to do something about the issues facing everyday people in this country, the issues that we hear about when we go home, we are here instead wasting the time of this body with two useless, stupid, political stunts which are about dividing people, distracting people.

Make no mistake, these are FOX News talking points, Tucker Carlson sound bites, press releases. That is what they are. And the reason why is clear.

When Democrats were in charge, we had one of the most productive Congresses in history. We passed the biggest climate change bill ever. We passed the biggest infrastructure bill since the interstate highways were built. We passed a bipartisan gun violence bill, stood up to greedy corporations, lifted kids out of poverty, and brought jobs and manufacturing back to America.

What are Republicans doing? What are they pushing instead of kitchen-table issues?

Conspiracy theories, nationwide abortion bans, a 30 percent national sales tax on groceries and gas, cuts to Social Security and Medicare, giveaways to billionaire corporations so they can cheat on their taxes; that is the kind of garbage that they are wasting the American people's time on.

H. Con. Res. 9 claims to denounce the horrors of socialism. What is this, the Red Scare?

I have to say, this is about the stupidest bill I have ever seen. Just a stupid, stupid, stupid bill.

Let me just say to my Democratic colleagues, vote however you want on this. It doesn't matter because it does nothing at all.

Oh, it denounces Pol Pot. Of course, we denounce Pol Pot. I have never heard anyone say anything nice about him.

We denounce Stalin. I didn't know that that needed a resolution.

We denounce Kim Jong-Un. Well, not all of us actually, because, in fact, if I remember correctly, it was the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, who said he fell in love with him, who talked about how talented he was, who called him a great leader, who bragged about their chemistry.

Did any of my Republican colleagues speak up when a brutal tyrant named in this resolution was applauded on the world stage by the President of the United States? Did they denounce that?

What is interesting, Mr. Speaker, one name I notice was missing from this list: Vladimir Putin. What is up with that?

I mean, we condemn Lenin and Stalin but not Putin? Is that a Trump thing? Did he put in a call? Seriously, why is Putin left out?

By the way, this isn't just a stupid bill, it is a badly written stupid bill. It lays out all of these awful people and then says, ''We are rejecting the implementation of socialist policies in the United States of America.''

Nobody, not a single person so far, has been willing to clarify for me what exactly that means, what the hell they are talking about.

Are we talking about public schools here? Fire departments? Roads?

What about Medicare and Social Security?

Republicans have called Medicare and Social Security socialist programs for years.

We would just like a little clarification here, and we got none last night in the Rules Committee. None. We even tried to include an amendment to clarify that the language here does not imply cuts to Social Security and Medicare. Every Republican, every single Republican on the Rules Committee voted ''no.'' There is our answer. There is our answer.

Here is what I think: I think this is about scaring people, and it is about dividing people, and it is about distracting people.

That brings me to our next resolution, which removes our colleague Congresswoman ILHAN OMAR from the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I mean, the hypocrisy here is staggering. It literally takes my breath away.

Congresswoman OMAR has apologized for the things that she said. She said she wants to be an ally in the fight against anti-Semitism. She even voted to condemn anti-Semitism. Every Democrat did, as well.

You know who voted ''no''? Twenty-three Republicans. Twenty-three Republicans voted against condemning anti-Semitism. Maybe the gentleman can explain whether or not they should be removed from their committees.

Then we gave our colleagues on the Rules Committee the chance to add an amendment to their socialism resolution condemning the mass murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazis, also known as the National Socialist German Workers' Party.

Guess what? They all voted ''no.'' They all voted ''no.'' Oh my God. Wow.

I keep hearing this both sides stuff, trying to make false equivalencies, saying the Democrats opened the door to removing her. Give me a break.

Congresswoman OMAR never posted a video pretending to kill another Member of Congress. She never advocated putting a bullet in the head of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. She never had dinner with Neo-Nazis Nick Fuentes and Kanye West. She never spoke at a white supremacy conference. She never said that she would have won January 6 because she was armed. No, those are things Republicans have done and have said.

I will ask again, why aren't those Members being removed, too?

Please, to my friends on the other side, please spare us the absurd comparisons and lectures about anti-Semitism. Republicans refuse to condemn anti-Semitism. Republicans refused to add an amendment condemning Nazis to this socialism resolution. Republicans have been silent while members of their Conference say things that are blatantly anti-Semitic and appear beside Holocaust deniers and bigots.

These are awful, awful bills designed to divide and distract people. I get it. I mean, I get why. I would want to divide and distract people, too, if my agenda was as extreme as the agenda that the Speaker of the House is now advocating for.

They have spent their entire time in power so far pushing for higher gas prices, higher middle-class taxes, higher inflation, and higher drug costs. They are screwing working families, screwing poor people, and using stupid BS like this to distract from their plans to reward billionaire corporations and hurt working families.

In the middle of it all, they are threatening to trigger a default if we don't cut Social Security and Medicare. We can waste all the time in the world on these resolutions—and on the socialist resolution, again, I don't even care. This is such a waste of time. People can vote any way they want. I have just made it a habit to always vote ''no'' on stupid bills. This is a waste of our time and a waste of the American people's time.

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

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

I remind my good friend from Massachusetts that I don't think you will find anybody on this side of the aisle or in this Chamber that is more of a hawk on Russia than me, and I would gladly condemn Vladimir Putin. Let's not forget, Putin is a Communist. This is a man who started his career as a KGB agent, so this resolution clearly covers Vladimir Putin. We all condemn him.

Additionally, I remind the gentleman that the first time I ever spoke on the House floor—I waited weeks to speak as a freshman. The first time I spoke, though, was on anti-Semitism. I spoke to condemn the shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Squirrel Hill, Pennsylvania. I remind my friends across the aisle that we have been mischaracterized by some of the comments that were just said.

But let's talk about who won't condemn socialists. We had a ranking member, Democratic ranking member in the Rules Committee hearing yesterday who was given the chance to condemn. She would not do it. She was given a chance to condemn Putin, would not do it; a chance to condemn Pol Pot, wouldn't do it; and a litany of other socialists and Communists. I just remind my friend from across the aisle that Members on his side refuse to condemn socialists and Communist dictators.

I find it rich that there is a question over the definition of socialism. Remember, for the last 2 years, my friends across the aisle couldn't even define the term ''woman.'' We had that rigmarole where they couldn't define ''woman'' and refused to acknowledge

science, that there were different sexes. Now they split hairs between the difference between socialism and communism? It is absolutely laughable.

Let's just define ''socialism,'' since we are here having this debate. Socialism is a political and economic theory of social organization which advocates that means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned by the community as a whole, and it is not me saying that socialism leads to communism. That is Marx saying that. That is Lenin saying that. Part of their entire theory was you had a transition period between capitalism and communism. That transition period they called, again, Lenin and Marx, they called that socialism. Let's be very clear what we are talking about. Let's not play games with language, especially when you can't even define incredibly basic terms that even kindergarten students could define.

Let's talk about what Representative OMAR has said, talking about that because I think it is important to put this in context.

In February of 2019 Representative OMAR tweeted, ''It's all about the Benjamins baby'' in reference to American support for Israel. She said that AIPAC was buying U.S. Representatives. House Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the entire Democratic leadership actually condemned Representative OMAR for these anti-Semitic comments.

Then, again, just to show this is a pattern, this isn't some one-off incident: February 27, 2019, she doubled down on her stance at a forum in Washington, D.C., when she said, ''I want to talk about the political influence in this country that says it is okay for people to push for allegiance to a foreign country.''

Clearly, she is going back to the trope that Jewish Americans have a dual loyalty between the United States and Israel. That offended Chairman Eliot Engel, who at the time was the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and he said, ''It is unacceptable and deeply offensive to call into question the loyalty of fellow American citizens because of their political views, including support for the U.S.-Israel relationship. We all take the same oath. Worse, Representative OMAR's comments leveled that charge by invoking a vile anti-Semitic slur.'' Again, that is not me saying that. That is a former Democratic chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Further, in March 2019, Representative OMAR trivialized the terrorist attacks of September 11 that killed just about 3,000 U.S. citizens by describing it as, ''Some people did something.'' Her words.

In 2021, a few months before the death of 13 servicemembers during the botched withdrawal from Afghanistan, Representative OMAR compared servicemembers of the United States and the Israel Defense Forces to terrorist groups like Hamas and the Taliban. She tweeted, ''We have seen unthinkable atrocities committed by the U.S., Hamas, Israel, Afghanistan, and the Taliban.''

To think that a Representative here in this body would equate the Israel Defense Forces and American servicemembers to Hamas and the Taliban speaks volumes. It is unacceptable. That person should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representative OMAR's Democratic colleagues sent a statement asking her to clarify those remarks because it was offensive and misguided. Again, the words of my colleagues across the aisle about Representative ILHAN OMAR's words, and she refused to apologize.

In May of 2021, Representative OMAR accused Israel of committing war crimes following days of conflict between Israel and Hamas, where Hamas was launching rockets into Israel that saw thousands of missiles fired indiscriminately at Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, killing civilians. She described Israel's defensive posture as war crimes, saying nothing about the terrorist attacks of Hamas.

So spare me the false outrage over her comments. She has proven time and time again that she should not be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SALAZAR).

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to bring up H. Con. Res. 9, denouncing the horrors of socialism.

Why am I bringing this resolution to the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

Because young people in America are being brainwashed by the news media and academia into believing that socialism is an economic model for the greater good of all Americans. The problem is that they are falling for it. They are believing it.

Here is the proof: Almost 40 percent of Gen Z and millennials think ''The Communist Manifesto,'' written by Karl Marx, the father of Marxism, is a better defense of freedom and equality than the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, one of the creators of the American experiment, American exceptionalism, and the document which gave birth to the most prosperous and resilient democracy in the history of the world, ours, the United States of America.

Worse yet, a recent poll shows that 40 percent of Americans of all ages, not only the youth, 40 percent believe that socialism is good, while 33 percent of them say that they are likely to support a member of the Democratic Socialists of America, the organization that has shaped the ideology of many of our colleagues with the poison of neo-Marxism. If you go to the Democratic Socialists of America website, you will read their neo-Marxist positions with pride.

□ 1245

I represent the 27th District in Florida, the city of Miami, a bastion of hundreds of thousands of Cubans, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans who have fled, who have escaped from the despicable horrors that you cannot imagine produced by that ideology.

So why did the Venezuelans flee? Well, because Venezuela—why would they do that, if Venezuela has almost 20 percent of the world's oil? In other words, that means the largest reserves of oil in the world. The Venezuelans have more oil than the Saudis in Saudi Arabia. In the 1950s and 1960s, they had the same GDP as Germany. Now, inflation is 156 percent a year, the third largest in the world.

The average Venezuelan has lost 15 pounds for lack of food. In the last 20 years, over 7 million Venezuelans have escaped the democratic socialist paradise to anywhere they could go. That is more people than have fled the violence in Syria. So that indicates that socialism is more devastating than a civil war.

Another country who has lost everything is Nicaragua. In the 1970s, it was the breadbasket of Central America. Then the Sandinistas arrived, Daniel Ortega took power under the guidance of Fidel Castro in Cuba. He expropriated almost 30,000 properties in a few years. Right now, their citizens are poorer than they were in 1977. Ortega promised democratic socialism but delivered a dictatorship.

In the last Presidential election, seven people dared to run for President, and he put them all in jail. Still today, they are either under house arrest or in jail.

Every socialist is a dictator in disguise.

In Cuba, after 60 years of living the socialist paradise, the average Cuban, 70 percent of Cubans eat only once a day. The average Cubans makes $23 a month. That is 40 cents a day. And the retirees, the seniors, make $12.

Cuba, in 1960, had the highest per capita income in the hemisphere, and it was comparable to Italy. We know that because there is hunger—hunger is a very powerful motivator.

So today, Cubans by the thousands throw themselves to the sharks in the Straits of Florida looking for freedom and hoping to get to the district that I represent on this floor. That is just in this hemisphere.

In China, 55 million died. In Cambodia, 1 million. In the USSR, 10 million froze to death in the Gulags.

Socialists are in the business of power, and it only takes one generation to believe their false promise and lose their freedom. It is a lie that socialism will solve your problems, economic or social.

Democratic socialism is socialism, and socialism is always socialism.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this evil ideology take hold in this country. We are in the United States, the stronghold of freedom. That is why we must pass this resolution.

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

I listen to this debate, and I get more and more confused.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that Vladimir Putin was not put on this list because he is a Communist, yet the gentleman mentioned communism several times.

The gentlewoman just talked about the Communist Manifesto, and I am looking at the list of people that are mentioned. Among them is Pol Pot, who I think everybody believes was viewed as a Communist.

So again, I am trying to figure out why wasn't Putin included on this list. Did somebody get a call from the Mar-a-Lago prison line that you couldn't put Putin on this list? I don't quite get it.

Again, I am also just stunned that last night, I mean, we offered the Gottheimer amendment. The language basically said that fascism led to the murder of 6 million Jewish people by the Nazi regime.

Everybody on the Republican side voted ''no.''

Again, we asked for some clarification on really what the guts of the bill were, which is the resolved clause.

What are you talking about? What policies are you against here in the United States? We asked to make the Takano amendment in order, which would have basically said that Social Security and Medicare would be exempt from any cuts if this was not what the intention was. Every one of the Republicans—every one of them—voted ''no.''

There was a gentleman who just came down on the floor saying, ''I don't know why everybody is saying Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare.''

You know why? Because of what happened last night in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, last night in the Committee on Rules, the Democrats offered an amendment that would clarify that any opposition to socialist policy implementation in the United States does not include existing Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

My Republican colleagues voted against it. We want to give them a second chance to get this right.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to include this important amendment and give every Member on the floor the opportunity to clarify that existing Federal programs like Social Security and Medicare are not under attack by this new Congress. Forgive us if we are concerned by rhetoric from many Members on the other side of the aisle past and present, give us pause.

Republicans have called Social Security a socialist program. I remember when Newt Gingrich wanted Medicare to wither on the vine.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 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 and other programs provide, should be a priority for this Congress. As my Republican colleagues demand reckless cuts in exchange for paying for our Nation's bills, we on the Democratic side are going to remain unified in doing everything we can to protect these important programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the amendment sponsor, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to rise today to offer an amendment which was a clarifying amendment, which would have clarified what the resolution before us today meant by the words ''socialist'' and ''socialism.''

None of us have any objection to, in fact, embrace the whereas clauses that we condemn egregious examples of totalitarian authoritarianism and the excesses thereof. But we are very concerned about what the resolved clause means and the way ''socialism'' is defined. There are many ways to look at socialism.

My amendment simply was to clarify that the implementation of any opposition of socialist policy in the United States does not include Federal programs such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.

But you know what? Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules last night blocked my amendment. The rejection of my amendment sends a clear message to the American people under this Republican majority.

Social Security and Medicare and veterans benefits are not safe because they construe those to be socialist programs.

This resolution being considered today is really ridiculous. It dishonestly conflates any effort to improve the lives of Americans with the violence of totalitarian Communist regimes. Without my amendment, it could only be read as an attack on Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' benefits.

The programs my amendment specifies helps veterans receive healthcare, aid struggling families who have fallen on hard times, and support millions of Americans by ensuring they receive the benefits they have spent their life working and paying for.

Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and efforts to end veteran homelessness are programs every Member of this body should be proud to support. But instead, my colleagues on the other side have spent years attempting to undermine and dismantle them, and they are doing it again with this so-called resolution. This so-called anti-socialism resolution is simply the latest volley in an assault that goes back decades.

Despite these attacks, the programs my amendment defends are overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Americans know that these policies work. They are practical. They are beyond ideology. They are simply common sense. The people want us to join together to bolster and expand them, not to denigrate and defund them and play stupid games to distract and propose red herring amendments such as this to get us off the track of working for the American people.

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

We all know why we are here today. We are here to condemn socialism. Let's not play games. We know what socialism is.

Despite knowing what socialism and communism is, you are going to see Democrat after Democrat come down here on the floor and refuse to vote to condemn socialism and communism.

Let's talk about what that means. Mao Zedong, in the socialist revolution in China, you had 55 million people starve to death in the wake of famine and devastation caused by the so-called Great Leap Forward in China.

You are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Let's talk about Joseph Stalin. By the way, a history lesson: FDR, a Democrat, would refer to Joseph Stalin as ''Uncle Joe'' when he was trying to make this ruthless thug more palatable to the American people.

Again, a Democrat praising Joseph Stalin; but I digress.

Under Stalin, tens of millions died in the Bolshevik revolution.

At least 10 million people were sent to the Gulags in the USSR; and millions starved to death in Ukraine due to forced famine. Pol Pot eliminated one-fourth of the population in Cambodia.

Again, you are going to have Democrats come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

Due to socialist and totalitarian policies, over 75 percent of Venezuelans currently live in poverty. Only 3 percent of Venezuelans consider themselves food secure. This was the largest GDP in South America before Chavez took over, and now they are literally eating their pet dogs to stop starvation.

Marxist socialist policies and communism regimes are responsible for hundreds of millions of deaths worldwide. Again, my Democratic colleagues

will come to this floor later today and refuse to condemn it. It is truly astounding.

Mr. Speaker, 3.5 million have starved to death in North Korea just since the 1990s alone. In the current Communist regime in Cuba, the government continues to repress and punish virtually all forms of dissent and public criticism as Cubans endure the worst economic crisis seen in decades.

Again, Democrats will come to the floor and refuse to condemn that.

During Castro's rule, thousands of Cubans have been incarcerated in abysmal prisons; thousands more were harassed and intimidated; and entire generations were denied basic freedoms.

Again, my Democratic colleagues, some of them will refuse to condemn that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD), my good friend.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of confusion today, a lot of bewilderment, a lot of dismay from my friends on the other side of the aisle on exactly why we are here today.

I am here to tell you it is a shame we have to be here today, that we have to publicly put everyone on record to denounce socialism. I rise today in somber support of this resolution, a resolution to denounce the evils, the horrors of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, this is a somber issue because our Nation was founded on the principles of liberty and freedom, enshrined in our founding documents as the thesis of our very Nation.

However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here have made light of the horrors of socialism and at times have advocated for this radical ideology to the point that the youth of our Nation have been deceived.

□ 1300

They have begun falling away from the true ideals of the freedoms on which our Nation was founded, that being liberty and democracy.

Let me clear up some of this confusion for our good friends: This cannot happen. We can never let it happen again.

Socialism has created famine, mass murders, and the killing of over 100 million humans around the world.

Many of the worst crimes in history were committed by socialist ideologues: Stalin, Mao Zedong, Castro, Kim Jong-un, and Maduro.

Yes, I am here today to tell you that we also condemn categorically any form of socialism, including Vladimir Putin.

This history cannot be forgotten, as socialist regimes have indefinitely led to the destruction of personal liberties and are still a constant threat.

Future generations must be taught. They must understand the horrors of socialism.

So, we stand here today. It is a shame we have to be here to do this, to teach this lesson, to denounce the horrors of socialism, and to protect the freedoms of our great Nation and take a stand for personal liberty.

Our young people have been led astray. Our Nation has been blinded to some degree, and it is time to lift the scales off those blind eyes. It is time that every American take a stand.

It is time to tell the truth. The truth is the only thing that matters, and the truth is that socialism is evil.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a strange debate. I am glad the gentleman said that he personally condemns Vladimir Putin, but it still doesn't explain why Putin is not on this list.

I mean, if everybody condemns Vladimir Putin, then why isn't he on this list? There are other communists on this list. If we are going to condemn communism, fine, but communism isn't mentioned in this resolution.

People were talking about supporting capitalism, and capitalism isn't even mentioned in this resolution.

This is a stupid resolution that was written poorly to begin with.

Again, I would say to my colleagues that we gave you an opportunity to expand the list to include the National Socialist German Workers' Party, which is the Nazis, who are responsible for the killing of 6 million Jews, and everybody voted ''no'' on the Republican side. I just can't get my head around why that was such a controversial addition.

This is an interesting back and forth on history. By the way, when I go home, people are not bringing up Stalin and Lenin and Pol Pot all the time. They are bringing up Putin, and they are concerned about what he is doing in Ukraine.

Maybe the reason Putin is not on this list is because the other side of the aisle is divided in their support to help protect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. Maybe that is what we are going to see coming down the road, in terms of budget cuts.

I include in the RECORD a piece by Roll Call titled: ''House GOP overlooks internal anti-Semitism, points at Democrats.''

[From Roll Call, Dec. 1, 2022]

HOUSE GOP OVERLOOKS INTERNAL ANTISEMITISM, POINTS AT DEMOCRATS

(By Rachel Oswald)

House Republican leaders on Capitol Hill are declining to condemn and punish antisemitism within their own party, preferring instead to argue that Democrats have the prejudice problem.

This comes amid the rise and mainstreaming of antisemitic rhetoric in the United States in recent months, including by major entertainers and top athletes, not to mention a sharp uptick in the last year of assaults on American Jews. Hate speech, threats and violence against American Jews are at their highest documented level in decades.

The issue came into focus in the last week after former President Donald Trump welcomed to his Mar-a-Lago club in Florida for dinner the well-known white power leader and antisemite Nicholas Fuentes, an organizer and speaker at many ''Stop the Steal'' protests after the 2020 presidential election.

''Anyone who engages in antisemitic tropes or makes antisemitic remarks should face the consequences of his or her actions. It's not enough to just call out someone on the other side of the aisle when it meets your political aims,'' Jonathan Greenblatt, CEO of the Anti-Defamation League, said in a statement. ''Frankly, what we need to see more of, is leaders of both parties standing up to antisemitism within their own ranks.''

Some Republican leaders like Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky denounced Trump's dinner with Fuentes while others, such as House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy of California, offered milder criticism.

''I don't think anybody should be spending any time with Nick Fuentes. He has no place in this Republican Party,'' said McCarthy to reporters outside the White House on Tuesday. He went on to defend Trump, claiming the former president was ignorant of Fuentes' well-known racist and antisemitic views when he had him over for dinner.

At the same breaking-bread affair, Trump also hosted the hip-hop superstar Kanye West, who now goes by Ye and drew national scorn in recent weeks for verbal attacks on Jews on social media.

''I condemn his [Fuentes'] ideology. It has no place in society at all,'' said McCarthy, who is struggling to lock down the votes he needs from his caucus to become the next House speaker in January. Like other Republicans, McCarthy has stopped short of directly saying Trump has supported antisemitism with his actions.

In part to boost support for his candidacy with the conservative House Freedom Caucus, McCarthy has promised if he becomes speaker he will hold a House floor vote to remove Rep. Ilhan Omar, D–Minn., from the Foreign Affairs Committee. As a freshman lawmaker in 2019, Omar was roundly criticized for comments that elevated common antisemitic tropes about dual loyalty and Jewish influence over American politics.

Notably, however, House Democratic leaders led the criticism of Omar and she apologized. Though there have been other moments of tension in the ensuing years between Omar and the House's Jewish Democrats over her criticism of Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, she hasn't repeated the antisemitic tropes she made in early 2019.

The expected next chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Michael McCaul, said he would likely support Omar's removal from the panel.

''The Foreign Affairs Committee has always been very pro-Israel, pro-Jewish, and I don't think she's a perfect fit,'' the Texas Republican said on Tuesday.

Omar in a statement rebuked McCarthy and House Republican leaders.

''Whether it is Marjorie Taylor Greene holding a gun next to my head in campaign ads or Donald Trump threatening to 'send me back' to my country . . . this constant stream of hate has led to hundreds of death threats and credible plots against me and my family,'' she said of Taylor Greene.

''Instead of doing anything to address the open hostility towards religious minorities in his party, McCarthy is now lifting up people like Marjorie Taylor Greene, Emmer and so many others,'' Omar said. ''If he cared about addressing the rise in hate, he would apologize and make sure others in his party apologized.''

In contrast to Omar, some House Republicans haven't apologized, repeating antisemitic conspiracy theories and amplifying Holocaust deniers—including in the last year.

'KEEPING THAT PROMISE'

McCarthy indicated he sees removing Omar from the panel as fair play for the treatment Taylor Greene and Gosar received from House Democrats. . . .

''Last year, I promised that when I became Speaker, I would remove Rep. Ilhan Omar from the House Foreign Affairs Committee based on her repeated antisemitic and anti-American remarks. I'm keeping that promise,'' McCarthy said in a Nov. 19 Twitter post.

Gosar was also removed from his committee assignments a little over a year ago as punishment for circulating an animated video depicting him killing Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D–N.Y. . . .

Though he reportedly privately reprimanded Gosar for publicizing the video, McCarthy didn't support taking away his committee assignments, nor did the rest of the GOP House caucus save for two members.

Rep. Tom Emmer, R–Minn., who earlier this month won a contested caucus election for the position of majority whip in the next Congress, made a similar reference in a letter he sent as National Republican Congressional Committee chairman that accused Bloomberg, Soros and Steyer of having ''bought'' control of Congress for Democrats.

''One of the most popular unfortunately antisemitic tropes is the idea that Jews are pulling the strings,'' said Rabbi Jill Jacobs, the executive director of T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights.

''People aren't expected to know everything about antisemitism, but when something gets called out the right response is, 'Thank you for letting me know. I didn't know that. I won't do that again.' We have not seen that from McCarthy and others. We have just seen deflecting and rejecting,'' she added.

And Rep. Elise Stefanik, R–N.Y., the No. 3 House Republican, this year ran a series of Facebook ads through her campaign committee that accused Democrats of supporting citizenship for millions of undocumented immigrants in order to ''overthrow our current electorate and create a permanent liberal majority.''

HATE AND VIOLENCE

That phrasing echoes the ''great replacement theory,'' a far-right idea that is itself rooted in antisemitic tropes.

''When you look at white nationalist online chatter, it's very much all about this supposed Jewish plot. We saw it in the person who murdered Jews in a synagogue in Pittsburgh,'' said Jacobs, referring to the 2018 antisemitic terrorist attack at the Tree of Life synagogue that killed 11 people. ''His rationale was that Jews were bringing in refugees to destroy America.''

Antisemitism has been rising among both the far right and the far left, although experts said it is the far right that is statistically more likely to commit violent acts against Jews.

Last year, the Anti-Defamation League, which tracks and condemns antisemitism, documented 2,717 antisemitic incidents in the United States, a 34 percent increase over the prior year and the highest number recorded since the organization began its monitoring work in 1979. That figure included 88 incidents of violent assault, a 167 percent increase from 2020.

In New York City last month, police arrested two young men, one of whom said he ran a white supremacist Twitter group and had been posting threats to imminently shoot up a synagogue. According to news reports, the duo appeared to have recently been gathering weapons and ammunition for the thwarted terrorist attack.

Democrats and progressives are still divided over how to calibrate criticism from their side of the aisle about the Israeli government's human rights abuses of the Palestinians without crossing the line into antisemitic tropes.

''To fight antisemitism, you really need people from across the political spectrum. If you look at the violence against Jews in the last three or four years, it mostly comes from the extreme right. But if you know anything about antisemitism you know that it could someday come from other parts of society,'' said Ira Forman, a former special envoy to monitor and combat antisemitism in the Obama administration. ''Democrats should be calling out Democrats and liberals and Republicans ought to be calling out conservatives.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Republican leaders have repeatedly declined to condemn and punish anti-Semitism, hate, and violence pushed by Members within their own party.

Again, I don't care how people voted. This is a meaningless, ridiculous waste of time, but my particular concern with this resolution is not all the whereas clauses. It is the resolved clause.

Many of us are concerned because of the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle because so many of you have referred to Medicare as a socialist program and Social Security as a socialist program.

We asked you last night simply to reassure us, and we had an amendment. You heard the amendment—Mr. TAKANO spoke about it—that none of this has anything to do with Social Security and Medicare. Guess what, everybody? They all voted ''no.''

That is what our concern is about, and people can say whatever they want on this. I mean, I can't believe, with all that is going on in the world, we are spending a day talking about this, but whatever.

This is the new Republican list of priorities, and there is no wonder why a poll just came out showing that the majority of American people do not share the views, values, and priorities of this current Republican House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear that people in Massachusetts are not talking about communism. Do you know where they are talking about communism? Places like south Florida. Places like Miami.

It is because, unlike those in Massachusetts, they have experienced communism. They have experienced socialism. Ask any Cuban refugee.

That is why you have individuals here like MARIO DIAZ-BALART, like MARIA SALAZAR, like CARLOS GIMENEZ who represent those districts.

This is an issue for a lot of Americans because they never want to see the horrors of socialism and communism here on our shores.

It is not just Cuba. Let's talk about China because my friends across the aisle always hesitate to criticize and condemn China. It is quite remarkable.

China has deprived 1.4 billion human beings of their fundamental human rights. Since March 2017, China has detained and persecuted 1.8 million Turkic Muslims, the Uyghurs.

They put them in so-called political reeducation camps. We all know what those are. Those are death camps. Those are gulags. The Chinese have them in their western province. The world is silent on it, and my colleagues from across the aisle refuse to condemn socialism.

Those Uyghurs are being held in the western province without due process. They are being forced to engage in labor and forced organ harvesting. They are suffering atrocities like torture, and yet again, my Democrat colleagues will refuse to condemn socialism today.

The CCP hasn't just violated the rights of the Uyghurs in western China. They have also subjugated Tibet.

It used to be a cause celebre for my friends across the aisle to talk about freeing Tibet. When I was growing up in the 1990s, you saw the bumper stickers everywhere. Where is that outrage now from my Democratic colleagues? Why won't they call out China?

In Tibet, the CCP has engaged in severe repression of the Tibetans' unique religious, cultural, and linguistic heritage and is engaged in gross human rights violations in Tibet, including but not limited to extrajudicial detentions, disappearances, and torture.

Elsewhere, the CCP is widely alleged to be a major harvester and trafficker of forcibly acquired organs. Organ harvesting targets minorities, including the Falun Gong, Uyghurs, Tibetan Muslims, and Christians in China.

Yet, where is the outrage from my friends across the aisle? Why won't they condemn socialism here today on the House floor?

The CCP attempts to eliminate minority peoples through forced abortion and sterilization. Where is the outrage from across the aisle?

There are 30 million more men in China than women due to forced abortions and the one-child policy, the result of Big Government socialism. Yet, again, my friends across the aisle will refuse to condemn socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK), my good friend and a good doctor.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why there is some confusion. I understand why we can get distracted by foreign nations and communism, which most of us agree is a bad thing.

What I think is enlightening, though, is how we opened. What was stated, in my understanding or recollection, was that it was just said that the last Democratic-controlled Congress was the most effective and productive in recent history, which you just agreed to.

The standard that the statement was made and measured by, though, shows

why we are having this discussion, why my Democratic colleagues are confused.

They equate record spending, record debt, and unprecedented control by government over private business as success. That is why they are confused about what this bill is about and why it is germane.

They do not understand what socialism is or, worse, don't recognize that their policies are in direct support of socialist leanings. Their policies have continuously placed government in a position to control businesses, picking winners and losers, deciding what is moral and immoral, and continue to advance the idea that government somehow should have been empowered to solve the very problems that it created.

To clear up things and create less confusion, we are trying to counter a movement that is moving toward something we have never been, a socialist nation.

We are a unique government created by the people, for the people, empowered to protect, not to provide for, and not to determine the outcome of people's endeavors.

We are uniquely positioned to benefit our citizens by empowering them, not through more government. I believe that we the people are far more valuable than we the government. That is why we speak against bigger government and socialism.

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

To the gentleman who just spoke, who talked about record debt, yes, we worry about that, as well. I would remind him that 25 percent of this Nation's debt was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

Let me repeat that: A quarter of our Nation's debt in all of our history was accumulated in the 4 years of Donald Trump.

If increasing debt is the standard where you say a President failed, then there is no question that the previous President, Mr. Trump, was a miserable failure.

Let me say to my colleague from Pennsylvania who brought up China—again, I am having trouble following this debate. I will not be lectured by anybody on commitment to human rights in China. I co-chaired the Congressional-Executive Commission on China. I co-chair the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

I authored the bill, the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, by the way, which died in a Republican Senate. We managed to get it passed in a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate.

I have passed major legislation on behalf of the Tibetan people.

By the way, this is all happening now under President Xi of China. I am looking in this resolution, and there is no mention of President Xi.

We are debating issues that aren't even in this resolution. I mean, this is nuts.

I do want to get back to the other bill, the bill that my colleagues are bringing to take Representative ILHAN OMAR off the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I read in some of the publications that, to get votes, the Republican leaders apparently promised some of their Republican Members who were concerned about this process that there would be some due process put in place.

I include in the RECORD the statement released yesterday by Representative SPARTZ about what supposedly is in this resolution.

[Press Release, Jan. 31, 2023]

SPARTZ ISSUES STATEMENT ON OMAR: I WILL SUPPORT RESOLUTION WITH EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER RULES AND DUE PROCESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, Rep. Spartz issued the statement below on the resolution to remove Rep. Omar from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

''I appreciate Speaker McCarthy's willingness to address legitimate concerns and add due process language to our resolution. Deliberation and debate are vital for our institution, not top-down approaches,'' Spartz said. ''The rule of law, freedom of speech, and due process are fundamental to our Constitutional Republic. Our founding fathers understood that pure democracy is dangerous and can lead to the tyranny of majority, mob rule and dictatorship. As to my fellow conservatives, I think setting a precedent of allowing an appeal process for the Speaker's and majority-party removal decisions is particularly important to freedom-loving legislators who usually are on the receiving end of issues like this.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. The statement touts due process language that was supposedly added to the resolution. I have to admit, I am completely lost here.

There is nothing—let me repeat that, nothing; one more time, nothing—in this resolution that provides due process.

Don't take my word for it. I have a nice quote here for people to follow along with me. There is a quote in Politico today: ''The whereas clause added merely references an existing process and in no way begins an appeal procedure or guarantees her committee seat will be reconsidered. It is nonbinding and not actionable.''

That is according to a senior GOP aide in a comment that they made to Politico. To whoever that senior GOP aide is, let me just say thank you for your candor. I think it is appreciated.

To people like the gentlewoman from Indiana and others who somehow think that they negotiated some sort of due process here, you didn't get anything. If you think you did, then you are a cheap date.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate the long list of reasons that these resolutions are a waste of time. Quite frankly, they are an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Let me be clear: The socialism resolution is useless. It does nothing. It does not matter. Who the hell cares how anybody votes on it?

We are here for one reason, and we are here for one reason only. My Republican colleagues are pushing an extreme far-right agenda that benefits the rich and powerful and screws over working families and everyone else.

They are not paying attention to the problems of everyday people, and that is clear based on the recent polling that has come out that shows just how out of touch they are with where people are at all around this country.

They are not paying attention to the kitchen table issues that people anguish over every night. I can assure you, and I don't care what part of the country you come from, people aren't sitting around the table talking about Pol Pot.

Anyway, that is what my Republican friends think is a national priority. I mean, we are talking about socialism in this resolution, but we are not talking about a definition or what it is. Are we talking about public schools? Are we talking about roads? Are we talking about Social Security?

I mean, give me a break. We have been hearing this stuff for decades and decades, Republicans saying Democrats want socialism. It is always some big, scary takeover that is just over the horizon that everyone needs to be afraid of.

□ 1315

When you don't have any good issues on your side and fear is all you have, that is what you run with, I guess. That is the Republican playbook.

You know what is funny is that the same Republicans who decry anything that government does as socialism never seem to have a problem when it comes to huge handouts for billionaire corporations. They want socialism for the rich but capitalism for the poor.

Call me crazy, but here is what I think: This resolution is not about socialism. It is about scaring people. It is about dividing people and, quite frankly, I think, based on what happened in the Rules Committee last night, it is about setting the stage to go after the social safety net in this country, which includes Social Security and Medicare.

If that wasn't the case, why in the world would my Republican friends not allow a clarifying amendment to make it clear that that was not the intent? They all voted ''no.''

When it comes to Congresswoman OMAR, a good Congresswoman who fights hard for her district and for her values, this isn't about punishing her for anything she said. It is about scoring political points.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would be condemning the folks on your side who dine with Holocaust deniers and appear at white supremacy rallies.

If this was about condemning anti-Semitism, Republicans would have accepted our amendment to condemn the Nazis who slaughtered 6 million Jews during World War II; and every one of them voted ''no.''

So please spare us the false equivalence. This is total BS, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

This is, really, a sad day for this Chamber. With all that needs to be done, with all that needs to be done, this is the priority. This is the priority, and, I should add for good measure, all of this is being brought to you under closed rules.

All the amendments that were offered, all the suggestions that were brought on this and other bills by Democrats and Republicans, were all ruled out of order. Some of this is noncontroversial stuff, all closed.

The issue with Congresswoman OMAR was brought to the Rules Committee as an emergency. An emergency? Really? I don't get it.

You shouldn't be surprised because the last time the Republicans were in charge they brought a bill to the floor as an emergency to deal with cheese curd, so I get it. Everything is an emergency, especially when it comes to messaging and making political statements.

But look, we have to get back to the people's business, Mr. Speaker. We have to get back to focusing on kitchen-table issues, the stuff that people worry about every night. This is not it. This is not it.

I really regret that we are wasting this time on these poorly crafted bills that do nothing to help anybody in this country.

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

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

Just in the spirit of rebuttal, I would like to address some of the comments made by my friend across the aisle.

The spending under President Trump; there was spending under President Trump.

But you know what? He also had a pandemic, a pandemic that we haven't seen in the last 100 years.

So where is the excuse for the $1.7 trillion that was just rammed through?

You want to talk about closed rules, things not going through regular order?

That $1.7 trillion was rammed through. It was architected—didn't even go through the Senate Appropriations Committee. It was rammed through by two Senators that are no longer here who had zero accountability to the American public.

What about Build Back Better? Where is the excuse for that?

All Build Back Better did was increase inflation, hurt workers who have wages that aren't keeping pace with inflation.

What about the Inflation Reduction Act? Where is the excuse for that and why we had rampant spending there?

There is no excuse for it.

Let's talk about China. To paraphrase Marcus Aurelius, it is not about one's words; it is about their deeds.

Let's talk about the deeds of my friends across the aisle. Three years ago or so, my good friend, the Speaker of the House, put together—he wanted to put together a select committee on China, and he was strung along by my friends across the aisle.

Finally, the Speaker had to move forward on his own as the minority Republican leader to put together the China Task Force. I was privileged to be on the China Task Force. You know how many Democrats were on that task force? Exactly zero. Zero Democrats joined that task force.

So it is quite amazing how I hear that the Democrats want to condemn China; but when they had the chance to have a select committee to address the threat of China, they won't go along with. When they had the chance to join a task force explicitly put together to combat China and their malign influences on the world, zero of them joined that task force. So spare me the talk on China. We have seen how you treated China.

Let's talk about definitions; playing these silly games that we can't define ''socialism'' and ''communism.'' We are all educated. We all know what socialism is. We all know what communism is. So spare me the fact that ''socialism'' isn't defined in this bill.

This is especially rich from the party, my friends across the aisle who, for the last 2 years, couldn't even define basic terms like what is a woman. That is not just me saying that.

Let's talk about Justice Brown Jackson. She was asked during confirmation to define a woman; and you know what her response was? ''No, I can't.''

So the party that can't define a woman now wants to sit here and say that we can't define ''socialism'' and ''communism.'' We all know what this is.

Let's talk about, lastly, Representative ILHAN OMAR and due process. I know there was a display put up regarding due process.

It is quite amazing how my friends across the aisle have now discovered the principle of due process after 4 years—I'm sorry—2 years of one-party rule here in Washington, D.C., 2 years where due process wasn't followed at all.

Where was the due process for my good friend from Georgia when she was removed from all her committees? Again, that is all her committees. We are only removing Representative ILHAN OMAR from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Where was the due process for my good friend, Dr. Gosar, when he was removed, again, from all his committees?

There wasn't one Democrat who stood up and talked about due process. But miraculously, now we have found due process when the Republicans are removing somebody from a committee, one committee, for anti-Semitic remarks, and a pattern of anti-Semitic remarks for that.

But let's just go back and talk about socialism. Let me be clear. Socialism must never take root in America. President Trump himself said America will never be a socialist Nation. These are words we should all rally around. We should all support that.

But for too long, Democrats have fought this far-left authoritarian agenda, regardless of the regimes across the globe that commit acts of violence and oppression against their own people in its name.

Experiments with socialism have led to painful human tragedy. We are talking about starvation, imprisonment, imprisonment without due process, I might add, and mass murder.

Capitalism has lifted more people out of poverty than any other system. It is capitalism that is the way out of poverty, not socialism, not communism.

Two hundred years ago, at the birth of capitalism, there were only about 600 million people in the world who were not living in extreme poverty. Today, due to the advance of capitalism, there are more than 6.5 billion people who are not living in extreme poverty. It was free-market capitalism that led the way here, not government-controlled socialism.

Since 1970, the percentage of the world's population living on the equivalent of less than $1 a day has fallen by more than 80 percent. Instead of millions starving to death due to socialism and communism, capitalism has pulled hundreds of millions of people out of despair.

Socialism and anti-Semitism have absolutely no place in America.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the previous question and ''yes'' on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 83

Strike the first section 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees.

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

''Page 3, line 4, add at the end the following:

''For purposes of the previous sentence, the term 'socialism' does not include existing

Federal programs and policies such as Medicare, Social Security, TRICARE, VA Healthcare, the VA Home Loan program, VA burial benefits, and VA homelessness programs.''.''

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN) 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 83; and

Adoption of House Resolution 83, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. 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 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. 83) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House, 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 219, nays 207, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—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
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—207

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
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)
Goldman (NY)
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)
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
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
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—8

Carey
Cohen
García (IL)
Jackson Lee
Pence
Pettersen
Pressley
Steube

□ 1355

Mses. CRAIG, JAYAPAL, Messrs. PETERS, LARSON of Connecticut, and CORREA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FRY, CRAWFORD, and CALVERT 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 adoption of the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 218, noes 209, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—218

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
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
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

NOES—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
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)
Goldman (NY)
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)
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—7

Cohen
Fulcher
García (IL)
Jackson Lee
LaLota
Pence
Steube

□ 1403

Mr. GALLEGO changed his 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.

STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 139

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 ''Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act of 2023'' or the ''SHOW UP Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. REINSTATEMENT OF PRE-PANDEMIC TELEWORK POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND LEVELS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each agency shall reinstate and apply the telework policies, practices, and levels of the agency as in effect on December 31, 2019, and may not expand any such policy, practices, or levels until the date that an agency plan is submitted to Congress with a certification by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 3.

SEC. 3. STUDY, PLAN, AND CERTIFICATION REGARDING EXECUTIVE AGENCY TELEWORK POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND LEVELS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency, in consultation with the Director, shall submit to Congress—

(1) a study on the impacts on the agency and its mission of expanding telework by its employees during the SARS–CoV–2 pandemic that commenced in 2019, including an analysis of—

(A) any adverse impacts of that expansion on the agency's performance of its mission, including the performance of customer service by the agency;

(B) any costs to the agency during that expansion attributable to—

(i) owning, leasing, or maintaining underutilized real property; or

(ii) paying higher rates of locality pay to teleworking employees as a result of incorrectly classifying such employees as teleworkers rather than remote workers;

(C) any degree to which the agency failed during that expansion to provide teleworking employees with secure network capacity, communications tools, necessary and secure access to appropriate agency data assets and Federal records, and equipment sufficient to enable each such employee to be fully productive;

(D) any degree to which that expansion facilitated dispersal of the agency workforce around the Nation; and

(E) any other impacts of that expansion that the agency or the Director considers appropriate;

(2) any agency plan to expand telework policies, practices, or levels beyond those in place as a result of section 2; and

(3) a certification by the Director that such plan will—

(A) have a substantial positive effect on—

(i) the performance of the agency's mission, including the performance of customer service;

(ii) increasing the level of dispersal of agency personnel throughout the Nation; and

(iii) the reversal of any adverse impact set forth pursuant to paragraph (1)(D);

(B) substantially lower the agency's costs of owning, leasing, or maintaining real property;

(C) substantially lower the agency's costs attributable to paying locality pay to agency personnel working from locations outside the pay locality of their position's official worksite; and

(D) ensure that teleworking employees will be provided with secure network capacity, communications tools, necessary and secure access to appropriate agency data assets and Federal records, and equipment sufficient to enable each such employee to be fully productive, without substantially increasing the

agency's overall costs for secure network capacity, communications tools, and equipment.

(b) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An agency may not implement the plan submitted under subsection (a)(2) unless a certification by the Director was issued under subsection (a)(3).

(2) SUBSEQUENT PLANS.—In the event an initial agency plan submitted under subsection (a)(2) fails to receive such certification, the agency may submit to the Director subsequent plans until such certification is received, and submit such plan and certification to Congress.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act—

(1) the term ''agency'' has the meaning given the term ''Executive agency'' in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

(3) the term ''locality pay'' means locality pay provided for under section 5304 or 5304a of such title; and

(4) the terms ''telework'' and ''teleworking'' have the meaning given those terms in section 6501 of such title, and include remote work.

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 Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 139, the Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act, or the SHOW UP Act.

This legislation is urgent. The Federal workforce needs to get back to work. Federal agencies are falling short of their missions. They are not carrying out their duties. They are failing the American people.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, most of the Federal workforce stayed home. They relied on telework because they could, but as the rest of America went back to work in person, many Federal workers did not.

The American people have suffered as a result. They have waited for months for their tax refunds from the IRS. They have waited for months for the Social Security Administration to answer their questions and provide them benefits.

Our veterans have even waited for months to get their medical records from the National Archives. The National Archives is responsible for maintaining medical records for our veterans, but our veterans could not get access to these records because the National Archives staff were at home.

This is unacceptable, and it should be downright embarrassing to these agencies.

The American people have struggled with high inflation, scarce goods, prolonged and disruptive lockdowns, and other hardships. Meanwhile, the Biden administration has showered Federal workers with perks and pay increases all while working from home, but Federal employees not being in the workplace hurt the Federal Government's ability to achieve its missions and deliver vital programs.

House Republicans have fought hard to find out just how expanded telework has decreased agencies' ability to deliver services to our constituents. We have tried to get this information from the Biden administration, but to no avail.

During the last Congress, as the House Oversight and Reform Committee ranking member, I wrote to the administration, requesting information on Federal workforce return-to-work policies. The Biden administration failed to provide adequate responses to our inquiries. Instead, it kept expanded telework policies in place long after the pandemic was over, and it used its expanded telework policies not to help our constituents but to help recruit new employees to the Federal Government.

The Federal workforce already enjoys many perks not enjoyed by the private sector, including unparalleled job stability, healthy retirement benefits, and reliable pay-growth expectations. One would have thought that, as the pandemic wound down, Federal workers would have returned to their offices just as private-sector workers across the Nation did. That is not the case.

According to the Office of Personnel Management's most recent report on telework, 47 percent of Federal workers teleworked routinely or situationally in fiscal year 2021. That was a 2 percent increase over fiscal year 2020, the year in which the pandemic struck.

According to a Federal Times report this past October, just one in three Federal workers had returned to their office full time in 2022.

Just last week, The Wall Street Journal reported that a new study by Cushman & Wakefield found only 5 percent of the prepandemic workforce returned to work in federally leased buildings in Washington, D.C., in October and November.

□ 1415

The Federal Government's abuse of telework has gotten so bad that Washington, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser has called on President Biden to suspend the telework policies for Federal workers or turn over Federal buildings in D.C. for conversion to affordable housing.

The current OPM Director has stated that Federal employees are actually getting transfers to agencies where they can telework more—not so they can serve our constituents and the American citizenry the best.

The SHOW UP Act offers a much-needed solution to the problem of Federal agencies and Federal employees putting their own comfort before our constituents' needs.

It requires Federal agencies to immediately return to prepandemic levels of telework. This ensures that from the day of enactment, priority number one for the Federal workforce will be prompt and effective service to our constituents, not increasing the perks for an already privileged Federal bureaucracy.

The SHOW UP Act also requires a governmentwide review of pandemic-era teleworking policies. This will help Congress see how much expanded telework either improved or harmed agency-by-agency effectiveness, costs, and network security across our vast Federal Government.

The bill would prevent the Biden administration from locking in higher levels of telework until Congress receives detailed plans on how mission performance would be impacted.

If the agencies' plans show increased telework would substantially improve agency performance, lower agency costs, ensure agency network security, and better disperse Federal employees across the Nation, then increased telework can then be considered as an option, but not until increased telework has been proven to better serve our constituents and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We strongly oppose this bill, which is an assault on all the progress we have made over the last several years in telework policy. Telework has strengthened private and public workplaces across the land, enhanced productivity, increased efficiency, improved the morale and satisfaction of the workforce, reduced traffic congestion, and made positive environmental changes.

When the chairman says it is time to return to work, I believe this is a misnomer because people who participate in telework are working. They are already working, and so they don't need to return to work.

This bill would take a sledgehammer to Federal telework policy and law, which the sponsors seem completely oblivious to, and you can hardly blame them because the leadership brings this measure forward without the benefit of even a single hearing in the Oversight Committee, which means Congress has not heard from the Office of Personnel Management or any of the Federal agency chiefs, and it has not heard from any Federal workers or their collective bargaining representatives. It hasn't heard from any of the stakeholders other than secondhand, I guess,

through hearsay the Mayor of Washington, D.C., who not surprisingly seems to be resistant, at least according to that report, to telework policy.

This is an arbitrary effort to roll back all of the progress that has been made under legislation and administrative rules over the last decade without any participation at all of the key stakeholders.

The bill falsely equates the development of telework as part of a balanced Federal workplace policy by OPM and the agencies with the sudden and near complete shift to virtual work in certain sectors because of the pandemic. Those are two completely different things.

This conflation produces nothing but confusion, and the bill is a wrecking ball against telework policy, which has been a critical success in so many workplaces.

Colleagues, the workplace is changing because of extraordinary new technology and a new focus on productivity and efficiency as opposed to industrial-age assembly-line seating and command-and-control work relations.

Before the pandemic, hybrid and remote work were already growing far more prevalent across professions, particularly for jobs performed in an office setting. The pandemic accelerated these dynamics not only in the Federal workplace but even more dramatically in the private sector.

From fiscal year 2019 to 2020, as we entered the pandemic, Federal telework doubled from roughly 500,000 people to more than a million. Practically overnight, traditional barriers to telework, such as technological obstacles and management resistance, began to disappear. Federal agencies implemented sweeping new guidelines as an essential tool for the continuity of government operations.

The pandemic, of course, will not last forever. Indeed, the President announced that he plans to end the public health emergency on May 11. The Federal Government will not maintain a pandemic-level telework posture in perpetuity, but we cannot ignore the lessons that we have learned over the last several years.

As OPM put it in its 2021 annual report on the status of telework, ''there is no going back.'' Enhanced demand in the national workforce and among Federal employees will continue as workers and supervisors report greatly enhanced productivity and focus from flexible work practices that reduce time wasted in endless in-person meetings, watercooler gossip sessions, and the proverbial BS sessions that overcome so many people's offices.

According to a survey by The Conference Board, 82 percent of companies are going to offer hybrid work options to employees going forward, and the number of private companies willing to let at least some portion of their workforce go fully remote has tripled to an astonishing 36 percent.

In another survey, 63 percent of employees rated the value of 2 to 3 days being able to work from home as equivalent to a pay raise.

To remain competitive with the private sector with which we compete, the Federal Government must offer reasonable telework options. OPM says it will, observing that we must appreciate the sea change in the American labor market.

Telework saves money, helps the government recruit top talent, reduces traffic gridlock, makes environmental sense, and ensures a continuity of operations at agencies that Americans rely on every single day. It is a lifeline for people who have disabilities or are immunocompromised, and it offers dramatically expanded opportunities for people living in more rural areas to enter and sustain a career in the Federal service.

We cannot enter a time machine and simply wish away the utility of telework in recruiting and retaining new generations of Federal workers. We should embrace telework as part of a balanced workplace policy to promote employee satisfaction and overall mission outcome.

OPM Director Kiran Ahuja offers a clear-eyed vision for the future in her annual report saying, ''Federal agencies must continue to embrace workplace flexibilities, such as telework, to remain competitive for top talent. Decisions about telework, however, must be driven by delivery of mission. We all work for the American public, and how we best serve them needs to be the paramount consideration.''

That means telework does not make sense for every worker in every office or every activity. If you are guarding the Capitol, obviously you need to be present. If you are researching groups that were involved in the insurrection against the Capitol, you might be able to work part of that time virtually. Processing paper tax returns at the IRS may indeed require in-person work.

I will note that although people are blaming the problems with IRS responsiveness on telework, that does not make sense to me. Telephone work is something that can be done from the office, home office, or somewhere else, which is why we have been, on our side of the aisle, invested in increasing staff at the IRS because our constituents are so frustrated with being left on the phone and not getting answers returned about when they will be getting their IRS refund.

In the Inflation Reduction Act, we added 5,000 new positions for people on the phones to respond to our constituents. I know that some of our colleagues across the aisle have opposed additional funding for IRS positions, and that is surely a far more likely culprit than whatever telework policies are in place over at the IRS.

The Biden administration's telework guidance seeks to strike a balance between getting people who need to be in person back in the office safely and helping agencies design their post-pandemic telework plans to build off the prior successes of this policy.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, let me state a simple fact that has evidently been forgotten in Washington: The Federal workforce's primary imperative should always be to promptly serve the American people.

Unfortunately, what the American people have experienced over the past 2 years is the exact opposite of what they deserve. Thanks to the Federal Government's pandemic-era telework policies which were instituted by bureaucrats in Washington, delay and disarray might as well have become hallmarks of Federal agencies and departments.

According to a Federal Times report from October of last year, just one in three Federal workers has returned to his or her office in a full-time capacity. It is abundantly clear that something must change, and House Republicans have the solution.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to serve as a cosponsor of H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, that is sponsored by Oversight and Accountability Committee Chairman JAMES COMER. Under this legislation, the Biden administration would be prevented from cementing pandemic-era telework policies for the Federal workforce until it provides Congress with a viable plan to avoid the negative impacts of remote work.

Yet again, House Republicans are acting on our commitment to the American people to ensure a government that is accountable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the entire Federal workforce returns to its in-person capacity and fulfills its responsibilities to the American people. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 139.

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

I will tell you a story about a couple that both work for the Federal Government. Earlier this month, the spouse of an Army servicemember, seeking approval to go work overseas for the State Department, contacted the Oversight Committee because she was being forced to decide between quitting her very successful Federal career for the State Department or returning to Washington, D.C., to continue her Federal service without her husband and her two children.

Her agency was fighting desperately to maintain her expertise and was perfectly fine with her performing her duties from overseas with her husband, who is in the Army who was being relocated over there.

Luckily, we were able to help make sure that her overseas telework request was approved.

Now, is that someone who is not really working? Do we want to tell her to get back to work?

Her situation is common for thousands of families in the Federal workforce where you have one member who is in the military who is being relocated, the other who might be working at a site in Washington who is now able to work out the terms of service under the telework policy, but that is precisely an element of the policy that will be crushed by the legislation that has been brought forward without the benefit of a single hearing in the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Despite the fact that our colleagues have said that they will only bring legislation to the floor after there has been a hearing—and we are just a few weeks into the session—this legislation comes forward without hearing from anybody like this constituent who was being put in such a tough posture or the Directors of the agencies or the head of the Office of Personnel Management who is in charge of actually supervising and coordinating overall telework policy and making the annual report to Congress.

Telework is a vital tool for the government to recruit and retain and grow the talented workforce we need to make the Federal Government work. It ensures that Federal workers can serve the Nation even during disasters. Again, it was the preexisting telework policy that established the infrastructure that made for such a relatively smooth transition when we got into the pandemic.

I have to say that denials of telework for the spouses of military personnel are still common, and they are consequential, and they would be pervasive if the legislation passed. I hope that all our colleagues will reject this and at the very least send it back to the Oversight Committee for some real hearings so we can talk about what this really means.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

□ 1430

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is about common sense. For 2 years, our constituents have been calling our office and wondering why the IRS, the Social Security Administration, and the VA aren't answering their phones, why can't they get in-person meetings with Federal workers, why they have to talk to a robot on the phone for hours, or wait for months on end just for an email update on their case.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are going to stop the lackadaisical policies of the Biden administration. The SHOW UP Act is a wonderful bill that I am proud to support. It is going to make an end to COVID an actual reality.

Federal workers should do the same thing that the private sector industry has done, which is they have gotten back to work for over 18 months, in large measure. It is time the Federal workers get back to work and start serving the American people to their full capacity.

This bill requires Federal agencies to return to the 2019 pre-pandemic telework levels within 30 days; reasonable, commonsense. The bill requires that Federal agencies show Congress how pandemic-era telework impacted their missions. Finally, the bill requires new oversight for agencies that seek to expand telework.

This oversight will help save money and create jobs outside the D.C. beltway. It is important to stress that this bill is not some radical notion. We are not ending all telework. We are just snapping back to 2019 pre-pandemic levels and ensuring a reasonable pathway for agencies to retain telework employees and, under the right conditions, allow for expansion of telework.

The bottom line is the pandemic is over. The American people need Federal Government to function. And in order to do that, we need our workers back. The IRS has failed to give Americans their refunds in a timely manner for 3 years running, and as late as last year, still had 12.4 million returns to process.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans Affairs Administration has hundreds of thousands of backlogged claims. As for the Social Security Administration, The Washington Post states, ''More than 1 million disabled Americans, many of them poor and elderly, are waiting months or years to hear whether they will receive benefits. Processing times have doubled in some States and almost tripled in others.''

So long as the American people are not getting the services this government is mandated to provide, we are not operating a government for, by, and of the people.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to address two points. One, let's grab the bull by the horns with this IRS point. The President's budget included $80 billion to increase staffing and to update technology at the IRS so our constituents can get their calls returned. If you are waiting for your IRS tax refund, that is something that you have planned on. That is part of your family budget. If it is stuck somehow, it is extremely frustrating for people not to be able to get through.

Now they, bizarrely to my mind, blame telework for this, and they oppose the $80 billion. I think they say that will create 75,000 or 100,000 new IRS agents who will be chasing working-class people around the country.

On the contrary, we have a report showing the $80 billion will produce $200 billion in new revenue and it is rich people who are the ones who are being protected by the refusal of my colleagues to invest in the IRS.

Telework is a complete distraction. It is an absolute red herring. It has nothing to do with whether or not you want to invest in the IRS or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME), my colleague.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Mr. RASKIN, for yielding this time.

A couple quick things. H.R. 139 is an overly broad proposal that stretches across the entirety of the Federal Government workplace to say that each and every telework policy, practice, and procedure implemented in response to the global health crisis must end immediately in 30 days because a majority of the House of Representatives says so.

Well, let's remember that in the word ''telework,'' the last four letters are w-o-r-k. People who telework are working. They are working day in and day out. And they have been working through the crisis, working to get us back to where we need to be.

The bill says that the rest of America must then take time to study the majority of our edict today to see if it made sense in the first place.

Now, if that is not a classic case of putting the cart before the horse or the tail wagging the dog, I don't know. I do know that this is not how a deliberative body, particularly this Chamber, should operate. We should at least have a hearing on this, bring in the proper agencies, review this in a real sort of way, and then figure out what we do. To act this way creates a real problem. The solution, I think, is looking for a problem, and this is not the place it ought to be.

We have not talked with OPM. We have not talked with Federal agencies. We have really not talked with the IRS. We just condemn them. You have to remember, the 5,000 IRS agents we were trying to put in place on this side of the aisle were to augment what they were doing. The IRS has been slow in terms of responding. This was an effort to speed that up.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky's First District, Mr. COMER, and I, I think, want to get to one thing, and that is the idea of greater productivity, but I would ask that we think about another way to try to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Department of Defense Inspector General report dated March 30, 2021. The full report can be found at: https://www.dodig.mil/reports.html/Article/2557812/ evaluation-of-access-to-department-of-defense-information-technology-and-commun/.

[March 30, 2021]

RESULTS IN BRIEF—EVALUATION OF ACCESS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATIONS DURING THE CORONAVIRUS DISEASE–2019 PANDEMIC

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evaluation was to determine the extent to which DoD Components provided access to DoD information technology and communications during the coronavirus disease–2019 (COVID–19) Pandemic.

BACKGROUND

In May 2006, the President issued the National Strategy for Pandemic Influenza Implementation Plan that requires Federal agencies to develop plans to maintain information technology and communications systems to continue operations during a pandemic. In response, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security (ASD[HD&GS]) issued the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza (DoD Implementation Plan) in August 2006 to ensure the continuity of essential functions in the event of a pandemic. The DoD Implementation Plan states that during a pandemic, special consideration must be given to social distancing in the workplace through teleworking. DoD Components' pandemic plans should include the use of laptops, high-speed telecommunications links, and other systems that enable personnel to perform essential functions while teleworking. The plans should also include the requirement to test telework procedures, the impact of Government-wide mandated telework on internal networks, and backup plans for communications infrastructure.

Apart from DoD pandemic planning, the DoD Telework Policy states that telework will be actively promoted and implemented throughout the DoD in support of emergency preparedness. The policy recognizes that during a pandemic, essential and non-essential personnel and Service members may be asked to telework; therefore, periodic telework exercises are required to ensure its effectiveness in continuing operations and an efficient transition to telework in the event of a pandemic.

In response to the COVID–19 pandemic, DoD Components began transitioning to maximum telework in mid-March 2020. On March 18, 2020, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum stating that DoD Components could execute their pandemic plans, or portions of their plans, at any time to ensure the ability to perform their essential functions.

To determine the extent to which DoD Components provided access to DoD information technology and communications during maximum telework in response to the COVID–19 pandemic, we administered a 43-question survey to a sample of DoD military and civilian personnel. In August 2020, we invited 269,282 DoD military and civilian personnel to respond to our survey to share their teleworking experiences from March 15 through August 26, 2020. We received a total of 56,057 responses, comprising 7,323 military and 48,734 civilian personnel, for a 20.8 percent overall response rate. We also conducted interviews with officials from the DoD Office of the Chief Information Officer, the DoD COVID–19 Telework Readiness Task Force, and the Offices of the Chief Information Officer for 10 DoD Components to obtain their perspectives on the infrastructure established to support the increased number of teleworking personnel.

FINDING

According to the 54,665 respondents who reported their telework status, the DoD transitioned 88.2 percent of respondents to full- or part-time telework from March 15, 2020 through August 26, 2020, during the COVID–19 pandemic. Of the 11.8 percent of respondents who continued to work on site, the most common reasons provided by survey respondents for not teleworking were that their work could not be performed while teleworking, or they were not eligible to telework. Of those who teleworked, survey respondents reported problems accessing DoD Component networks, voice and video teleconference applications, and identified shortfalls in Government-furnished equipment available to DoD personnel when their Components first transitioned to maximum telework in mid-March 2020. However, the problems cited in survey responses lessened over time as the DoD increased its network availability and capacity, added voice and video conferencing applications, and purchased and distributed computer and communications equipment.

Based on the results of the survey and interviews with DoD officials, the DoD's initial challenges occurred because some DoD Components had not fully tested whether their information systems could support Government-wide mandated telework and had not conducted telework exercises with their personnel before March 2020 as required by the DoD Implementation Plan and the DoD Telework Policy. Therefore, some DoD Components were unprepared for the network and communications limitations, as well as equipment and application shortfalls, uncovered by the transition to maximum telework. While the Marine Corps, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) were able to immediately transition to maximum telework, the Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS), and Defense Health Agency (DHA) faced challenges during the transition.

The ability of DoD personnel to perform essential and non-essential tasks while on maximum telework depends on DoD Components' ability to provide enough network capacity, communication tools, and equipment to enable the DoD's essential and non-essential personnel to stay mission-ready and productive while in a telework status. Some teleworking personnel reported that they found their own alternative solutions including the use of unauthorized video conferencing applications and personal laptops, printers, and cell phones to complete their work because some DoD Components were unprepared for maximum telework. However, using unauthorized applications or sharing DoD information over improperly secured devices, even temporarily, increases the risk of exposing sensitive departmental information that could impact national security and DoD missions.

Overall, DoD Components and the majority of survey respondents expressed positive maximum telework experiences. Specifically, 88.1 percent of survey respondents stated that their productivity level remained the same or increased during maximum telework, regardless of their Component's initial telework challenges. Many survey respondents reported a desire to telework regularly in the future (37,146 responses) and expressed appreciation for commuting less often (27,711 responses), better work-life balance (25,508 responses), and more flexible work hours (22,461 responses).

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the ASD(HD&GS) revise the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza to update planning assumptions with the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel, align the DoD Implementation Plan with the DoD Telework Policy, and require DoD Components to update their plans to include revised assumptions regarding telework for personnel and the resources required to support the teleworking workforce.

We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD[P]), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, establish management oversight procedures to verify that DoD Components have performed the testing, training, and exercise requirements of the DoD Implementation Plan and the DoD Telework Policy. The oversight procedures should assess the ability of DoD Components to support Government-wide mandated telework, including the results of tests of network and communications systems and telework exercises with personnel.

MANAGEMENT COMMENTS AND OUR RESPONSE

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (DUSD[P]), responding for the USD(P) and the ASD(HD&GS) did not respond to the recommendation to require DoD Components to update their Pandemic Plans to include revised assumptions regarding telework for personnel and the resources required to support the teleworking workforce. Therefore, the recommendation is unresolved. We request that the ASD(HD&GS) provide comments on the final report.

The DUSD(P) did not agree or disagree with the other two recommendations in the report. However, the DUSD(P) stated that the ASD(HD&GS) would work with the Joint Staff and the U.S. Northern Command to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel in the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, which will replace the DoD Implementation Plan for Pandemic Influenza, and align the plan with the DoD Telework Policy. In addition, the DUSD(P) stated that the ASD(HD&GS) would also work with the Joint Staff to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel in the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases.

Furthermore, the DUSD(P) stated that her office would support and advocate for oversight procedures to verify that DoD Components performed the testing, training, and exercise requirements of the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases, the DoD Telework Policy, and the Pandemic Plans. Therefore, the recommendations are resolved, but will remain open until the ASD(HD&GS) updates the Functional Campaign Plan—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases and the Global Integration Framework—Pandemics and Infectious Diseases to include the use of telework for essential and non-essential personnel and USD(P) provides oversight procedures for verifying that DoD Components performed the required testing, training, and exercises.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, based on 56,000 respondents to its survey, 88 percent of the Department of Defense respondents found telework accommodations increased their overall productivity. This is not my imagination. This is how thousands and thousands of them responded in the survey.

A similar 2021 survey conducted by the American Federation of Government Employees, which represents 700,000 Federal employees all across the country, found that 62 percent of them surveyed thought significantly that their productivity had been increased while teleworking based on what their previous levels were.

So Federal workers are performing for the American people and have been under the most difficult circumstances even before we got to COVID. I know that because I, like many of you, had a chance to speak to so many of them.

As the chair of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, this particular issue is welcomed before the subcommittee. I will convene hearings next week so that we can figure out where we are in a bipartisan way and move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I would make one point. Federal workers are not here in Washington, D.C., alone. That is the misnomer. Federal workers are in everybody's district in this entire Congress. They are looking to us to try to find a way to help them, not to punish them in 30 days. We are not going to save money on gas. We are not going to save money on energy. We are just going to go back to where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge that this measure be defeated.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, in short, the pandemic is over. It is time for Federal employees to go back to the office.

I find it interesting in this debate that one of the things that is occurring right now is that the President's budget is due next week. We are in the middle of this calamity around debt ceiling which the President, by the way, has led us to. His budget is due next week, and he is telling everybody he needs another month.

I wonder if this is because some of his own budget staff aren't in the office. This is something that should have been done long ago. If the President was doing his job being the leader of the executive branch, those employees would have been back. Since Congress is the body responsible for appropriating funds to the executive branch and the President does not do his job of making sure it is working effectively, then Congress does have a responsibility to make sure that these employees come back and get back to work. Life has been happening here in the people's House.

A couple of things: It has already been said about the IRS delays. It is shocking that right now it takes 2 to 4 months to get assigned an agent. If you call the IRS, you won't get a call back for 4 weeks.

It is also important to understand that right now it takes 30 days for USCIS to respond to a Congressional inquiry. There are many backlogs at the VA; some of them almost 2 years, 197,000 backlogs. How is that affecting the men and women who have served our country with honor and with dignity?

Mr. Speaker, this is simple stuff. Most of the American people have gone back to work. All we are saying is let's go back to pre-pandemic protocols which does have telework provisions throughout all of the Federal agencies. It is clear, looking at the backlogs that have occurred through COVID–19 and continuing, the extended telework situation in the Federal agencies is not working for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should be supporting this legislation. This is good legislation. It will help all of the American people and, frankly, help the President probably pass his budget on time.

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

Mr. Speaker, they complain about delays at the IRS and then they oppose funding to assist the overwhelmed workforce at the IRS, which is staggering under the weight of all of these obligations.

This is the first time I have heard that telework was the source of the problem, but apparently, that is what it is this week. Of course, we haven't had a real hearing so we have had no witnesses on it; somebody has apparently just dreamed that up.

It has just been linked to the debt ceiling. Interesting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle has voted to lift the debt ceiling three different times under Donald Trump, who increased the debt of the United States single-handedly by more than 20 percent. All of the debt of the United States under one President. More than 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the issue at hand.

Members of Congress make very strange opponents of telework policy, not because we don't work hard, because I think we do work hard, but we use telework all the time.

Members of Congress might be in their district office working. They might be at a town hall meeting working. They might be here on the floor. They might be in a committee meeting, a subcommittee meeting. They might be meeting with constituents somewhere else.

And I dare say the vast majority, if not all of us, engage in telework. We wouldn't say to them, ''Get back to work and stop teleworking.'' We understand that that is part of an overall telework policy.

If people have employees who they think are abusing telework, well, they have got a problem with that employee or they have a problem with their supervisor. But to my experience and knowledge, as someone who, I admit, may have been a little curmudgeonly, in the way we are hearing some of the Members are today, when the COVID–19 crisis started, the employees who are super productive at work will be super productive at home.

In my case, that is almost all of them. In fact, I think it is all of them. If you have an employee who blows off their assignments at work and doesn't turn them in, they will do the same thing if they are working from home. That is a question of supervision. The real issue is, why all of a sudden they want to turn against a decade of progress on telework policy and start affixing to it all of these other problems.

For that, I don't understand, other than people seem to want to blame the Federal workers for everything. Those workers belong to all of our districts. They are all across the country. Eighty percent of Federal workers are not in Washington, D.C., Maryland, or Virginia. They are all over the country, working everywhere from military bases to Indian reservations to public health service. You name it.

These are our people. These are American citizens, and they deserve something a lot more than the implied contempt of suggesting that if they use telework, they are not really working.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for this day for quite a while. Whenever I go back to my district, I talk to my staff back there. Again and again, we hear stories that they want something done with the VA; they want something done with the IRS. It can't get done. They are behind.

It is time for people to get back to work. When I think of my district, I think the vast majority of people, their work schedule never changed even in the teeth of the epidemic.

Obviously, in Wisconsin, there are a lot of cheese factories in my district. Man, I would go home every night and there would be people there at 11 p.m., 12 a.m., 2 a.m. All of a sudden, we hear how horrible it is for Federal employees to have to go in.

In the current situation, what it tells you is—and this is true of many other programs, as well—the government works for the benefit of the government not the benefit of the people.

□ 1445

That is why people on that side of the aisle are trying so hard, so desperately hard today, not to have people come in.

I talk to a lot of employers all over my district. There were times that any given number of their employees worked from home, but they know it is not the same thing. Why in the world the government should be operating on a separate schedule, I don't know.

I will give you an example. The National Personnel Records Center is an egregious example. The NPRC is a large warehouse containing paper records of military members from before World War I to the 1990s. Veterans need access to these records in order to receive VA healthcare, disability pay, and home loans.

Despite these records existing in paper form only, the NPRC still decided to have its employees work remotely, a perfect example of the employees' interests put ahead of the

public's interest. This time, the public is veterans.

You can't copy paper records from a warehouse if no one is there to pull the records to make copies to satisfy the request.

These employees were paid, but since they were not at the NPRC, they were unable to fulfill their duties, and veterans were forced to wait to receive their benefits.

The SHOW UP Act will require these Federal agencies to return to pre-COVID levels of telework.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. By the way, I don't bring this up back home. We are talking about it today, but I think it is such an insult to all the people back home, many of which are whole factories that never took any time off, to be told that they have to wait for the Federal Government because their people are, I mean, my goodness, still at home almost 3 years after this thing.

Do you know any private businesses that are still having their people stay at home?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

We often hear Republicans want to roll back the clock—roll back the clock on abortion rights to 1973 before Roe v. Wade, roll back the clock on teaching the history of American slavery to, I don't know when, 1860, 1619?

This bill actually rolls back the clock. It is right there in the text. The bill mandates ''each agency shall reinstate and apply the telework policies, practices, and levels of the agency as in effect on December 31, 2019.''

Which begs the question: What was the state of Federal telework in 2019? President Trump's administration had across-the-board limitations to telework at major Federal agencies that had made progress before, like the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture.

The overall telework participation rate had recorded its first drop since the enactment of the Telework Enhancement Act authored by myself and Mr. SARBANES of Maryland.

We had not yet experienced the onset of the global pandemic, which forced us overnight to move the Federal Government to a posture of substantially enhanced hybrid work. We deployed telework as the critical continuity of operations tool it should be. We procured the IT and IT security we needed. Supervisors figured out how to manage hybrid work.

At the height of the pandemic, 75 percent of the Federal workforce was, in fact, working remotely.

Not everybody is going to continue to telework full time, nor should they. Federal telework participation rates have already decreased substantially as more Federal employees move back in person.

The most recent telework survey showed that 47 percent of Federal employees teleworked in the last fiscal year, but the fact remains that increased availability of telework is here to stay in the private as well as the public sectors.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics found that 80 percent of U.S. businesses expect increased telework levels to continue after the pandemic. That is in the business community.

That is the nature of the workforce of the future. We should be embracing the productivity and employee satisfaction gains realized through telework.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have done just that, but unfortunately, we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

We should be using a measured approach to determine where hybrid or remote work might not be the best fit. I know I have done that in advocating for more in-person work at the IRS, processing paper tax returns; at the State Department, responding to passport applications; and at the National Archives, fulfilling veterans' document requests, all of which require in-person functioning. I have supported it, as have my colleagues.

I have also offered a telework legislation bill, the Telework Metrics and Cost Savings Act.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this would help measure cost savings and focus on using telework effectively, but this bill is sort of a one size fits all, come back to work no matter what.

Let me say to my friend from Wisconsin that I had a constituent die from COVID because there were no protocols in his Federal workplace.

There ought not to be any more casualties to COVID. We ought to have systematic protocols in place. That is what I think has to precede this kind of legislation we are considering on the floor today.

I thank my friend from Kentucky for introducing this bill.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over. Joe Biden has said so. I don't know why he is waiting until May to do something about it, but the pandemic is over.

It is time for the Federal Government to get back to work. It is far past time for the policies of the Federal Government to reflect this reality and the policies of hardworking Americans and for Federal employees to show up and get the job done.

In my district, the Bureau of Land Management headquarters was a hot topic of debate because this administration's—one of their first actions, they wanted to take that from my district and move it back to Washington, D.C. Why the haste? Why so fast to do this?

No one is going to work. The building is empty. They didn't have anywhere to bring the employees to a new building here. In fact, the employees that they did relocate to Washington, D.C., still only show up to work 1 day a week.

According to one disturbing report by the Federal Times, just one in three Federal workers has returned to their full-time job.

Equally disturbing, a leaked memo from January 2021 to the then-chief of staff of the Department of Health and Human Services showed that between 20 and 30 percent of the Department's employees did not log in to work on any given day between March and December 2020.

This negatively impacts all of our constituents.

The VA has been incredibly slow to fulfill records requests so that our veterans can get the care that they need, the care that they deserve.

The Social Security Administration faces a massive backlog of appeals.

As of last month, the IRS had a backlog of 2.5 million returns from 2022 that are still unprocessed.

This Republican-led Congress is moving to end Biden's emergency powers. He won't do it at the executive level.

We have created these agencies. We fund these agencies. Now, we are demanding that these Federal employees get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support it. I urge adoption.

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

The gentlewoman makes an interesting argument. Of course, if physical presence in Washington is necessary, then that agency never should have been stripped from Washington and relocated in Colorado in the first place.

One could say that entire workforce is calling in or not really working because the entire office has a telework policy.

Obviously, she has carved out an exception for that. She thinks they can be effective, even though they are not in Washington, D.C.

Look, Mr. Speaker, this has been not just a closed rule but a closed process. There was no hearing in the Oversight and Accountability Committee. Despite the fact that those hearings have been promised, there has been no hearing about it.

Let me tell you one of the things we would learn if we actually had a hearing about it. The bill contemplates rolling the clock back to 2019 for every Federal agency. Well, what would that mean for one small agency, the Federal Communications Commission, which has decided upon a plan to reduce its leased office space with a savings of

$119 million precisely because of the existence of telework, saying we don't need all that space?

Now, since we rolled the clock back and presumptively say you can't do that, we are going to be costing the taxpayers $119 million a year because they have to go back to their prepandemic plan simply because we have this one-size-fits-all, categorical, cookie-cutter approach undertaken without any hearings.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office similarly would be forced to abandon its $12.5 million a year in savings in leasing costs made possible because of reduced consumption of office space by telework.

Do we really want to say that we hate telework so much, that we distrust our own workers so much, even though the studies show that it is yielding benefits in office productivity, that we are going to force the taxpayers to pay more money for more expensive office space in downtown Washington, D.C.?

We haven't even looked at the question because there was no hearing because there was just a rush to get this to the floor so we could tell workers who are already at work to get back to work.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague across the aisle, they need to get back to work. Only in Washington, D.C., and only with this President are we operating with COVID as a national emergency.

The only national emergency coming out of Washington is the economic disaster from the failed economic policies and the reckless spending of my colleagues.

It has created an inflationary firestorm, and people can't sustain it. Soaring interest rates, an economy teetering on recession, and $5 trillion of debt that have us dangerously close to the precipice of a debt crisis is an emergency.

Our constituents across America have to go back to work. They have to take their kids to school. Somebody has to teach them. Somebody has to save a patient or serve a customer. They don't live in this fantasy world of Washington.

My colleagues, unfortunately, have used the public health emergency in large part not to protect the public from COVID but to promote the big spending, Big Government bailout agenda.

What I am talking about is this, in the name of COVID, bailing out student loans that cost taxpayers a trillion dollars, bailing out schools that don't open their doors to their students. Bailout after bailout, that is what this is about.

While Democrats are jamming us with all these bailouts in the name of COVID, taxpayers can't get their Social Security benefits and their tax returns or their passports. You heard the stories.

Here is my question. It is a simple one. How can the people's government serve the people if the people in the government don't come to work? That is the question from my constituents in west Texas. Here is the answer. It can't. It doesn't.

If hardworking Americans don't have the luxury of not coming to work and teleworking for the rest of their lives, then the Biden administration and our government employees should do the same. Get back to work. Do your job. Serve the customer because that is what you signed up to do.

We are here to hold them accountable, with all due respect.

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

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues seem to betray no understanding at all of what Federal telework policy is.

To say that the workforce is not going to the office and it is time to get back to work simply suggests they don't know that every agency, every commission, every department makes its own decisions about this as part of the complete workplace policy, going job classification by job classification, defining when it makes sense and when it doesn't make sense.

That is the way that it works, but they want to have a broad-brush, one-size-fits-all, straitjacket policy where they just decapitate a decade of progress, using the pandemic or the end of the pandemic as the excuse for doing that.

To repeat: This is not a Washington problem. The vast majority of the Federal workforce is spread out across the country.

The hardworking people we see in front of us today who work for the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and for the House are just a small example of the workforce located in Washington, which is a tiny minority of the Federal workforce which is all over America.

That flexibility has been given to Federal workforce supervisors all over the country to deal with. They would clearly try to elevate what I think is a frivolous talking point over the cost savings that have been created because of telework policies. They would elevate it over the increased job performance and job satisfaction that is being demonstrated in studies around the country. They would elevate it over the clear success of telework within the private sector.

□ 1500

Oftentimes, my colleagues will say we have to be more like the private sector. It is the private sector that has been leading the way here. The Federal workforce has been very much in the rear guard doing it.

In any event, remember that they are conflating two completely different things. One is the Federal telework policy that has evolved over the last decade, and the other is the pandemic.

It is true that the pandemic response was made far more efficient because there was an infrastructure in place in order to make telework possible. Those pandemic policies can be reversed without destroying all the policies that have developed over the last decade.

There are an incredible number of unintended consequences that are exacerbated by the fact we have not had a single hearing on this question, which is of fundamental importance to hundreds of thousands and millions of people across the country.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members to debate. I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman is prepared. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The title of this bill, the SHOW UP Act, consists of the Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act. I understand that in Washington—this really is a Washington problem—there is always a search for the perfect acronym over the actual meaning of the language, but this title does some real violence to the English language.

I don't know what an ''unproductive problem'' is. I certainly don't know what a ''productive problem'' is. I wonder whether the person who wrote that was working on telework or wrote it at the office. To me, it makes no difference. Somebody should have said that doesn't really make any sense for a title for Federal legislation.

In any event, the point is that Members of Congress, as everyone should know, are able to be very effective, often being in two places at the same time. You might be at your district office, or you might be at a townhall meeting in your district, but you call into a meeting with your chief of staff and your legislative staff, or you call in to have a meeting with subcommittee staff or what have you. I don't understand the sudden effort to demonize technology and all the advances that we have made.

I don't take this to be serious legislation. There was no hearing on it. There seems to be no effort to convince anyone that it is serious. I hope we can do better in the days ahead.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding and for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

When you look across the country, people have worked hard to get their lives back in order, to get their small businesses back up and running. States pushed to open up again because they knew that the health of their people, the mental health, the ability for kids to get back in school, was so critical.

Of course, data is out there all around but especially amongst our young kids. Many millions of young kids in America lost a year-plus of learning because of virtual learning. Not being in the classroom just wasn't the same. Those communities that made the effort to open back up again were able to provide a much higher level of education than those schools that went out of their way to shut down. Damage was caused to so many.

As you see most of the country now back at work, they look at Congress and say: Why isn't Washington back at work?

When you look at Federal agencies that are there to provide a service for the 330-plus million people all across this great Nation, Mr. Speaker, those people expect that when they pick up the phone and call those agencies—if you are a military veteran who served this Nation, you surely showed up for work. You showed up, in fact, overseas, in some cases, risking your life, receiving injuries. You want to get your military record so you can be eligible to go get the healthcare you deserve. When you call the VA and they can't get your healthcare records because there are still people not at the office—those are things you can't do remotely—those veterans wait for help. That hurts people.

You have millions of people who are trying to get basic services like a passport. Maybe they are trying to go on their honeymoon; or they are waiting for a loved one to come back home that they haven't seen who lives overseas, and they have been waiting for years; or they want to go visit a relative and have waited 6 months in some cases. We get calls to our offices on these problems, people who have been waiting over 6 months to get a passport renewed.

That is something you cannot do remotely. If you call that office and somebody is at home, they are not able to process your passport from their home, so you have to wait and wait and miss dates and deadlines.

When you see what is happening with so many other people who are counting on the Federal Government to take care of their needs, they wonder why they haven't gone back to work when they have had to go back to work.

You saw the President wanting to hire 87,000 more IRS agents. There are many IRS agents that aren't showing up for work. We still get calls to this day from constituents, hardworking people who live paycheck to paycheck who filed their tax returns in 2021 who still haven't gotten their checks back. They are wondering why somebody is sitting at home not able to process that payment. Why do they have to wait over a year to get their money back from their government?

The answer is not to double the agency and hire another 87,000 people. It is to let people go back to work.

This bill just says to show up to work to do your job, to serve those millions of people who are paying your salaries and counting on you to get the job done.

This should have been done a long time ago. I am glad we finally are getting this bill brought to the floor. I thank the gentleman for bringing it.

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

This legislation asks every Member to answer a simple question: Do you put the needs of your constituents first, or do you put the preferences of Federal bureaucrats first?

We know that expanded telework during the COVID–19 pandemic harmed agency service to our constituents across multiple vital agencies. Instead of fixing those problems and making sure they never happen again if increased telework needs to continue in certain cases, the Biden administration is just blindly doubling down on Federal telework across the board—not to improve service to our constituents, but to dangle a shiny perk in front of existing Federal workers and prospective new Federal hires.

My bill ensures that a new expectation is set for our Federal Government's workforce: that you need to return to your agencies and get the job done for the American people.

Federal telework should only be utilized when it has been proven to improve agency performance, lower agency costs, ensure agency network security, and better disperse the Federal workforce across the Nation.

In the meantime, it requires Federal agencies to reimplement pre-pandemic policies, which were working just fine.

Under this bill, we will know that, whether we have increased Federal telework or not, it will only be to ensure that Federal agencies and their employees provide the best quality of service to our constituents and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 139, the SHOW UP Act, which was introduced by my good friend from Kentucky, the Chairman of the Oversight and Accountability Committee, Mr. Comer.

Millions of Tennesseans show up to work every day. However, more than half of federal government workers, who are expected to serve the American people, still aren't showing up for work. This has led to extremely long wait times and delays in services.

Veterans who showed up to work and served our country can't get their proper VA benefits. Families are waiting months for their passports. And in my district, a father waited for more than 8 months to receive his tax return. The entire time, he was left in the dark by the IRS.

Tennesseans deserve better, Mr. Speaker. The pandemic is over, and it's time to get back to work. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the SHOW UP Act.

Mr. SANTOS. Resolving casework is one of the most important services provided by our offices.

I was shocked to learn that my predecessor left behind numerous unresolved cases—but, in retrospect, perhaps I shouldn't be so critical. Maybe the simple reason is they were unable to solve constituent issues because he and his staff were hampered by the fact that agency personnel, were either unavailable, or, those who were, simply didn't have the resources available for them to process requests. Why? Because they are working from home.

Our functional system of government, how we get things done, was built to support a government workforce where our people come into an office, work together, in one place, face to face.

Around that infrastructure, we have businesses (or perhaps I should say we had businesses) that were built to support that workforce—small businesses, such as coffee shops, restaurants, dry cleaners, etc.

Most industries, who instituted telework policies during the pandemic have returned or have begun to return to their respective workplaces. And like the government, those businesses were designed around an in-office workforce.

This bill does not eliminate telework; it simply returns the workforce to the policies that were in place in 2019.

And perhaps, with the report, that this bill requests from the OPM, there is a good chance some agencies will show that telework or other arrangements make sense.

Fine.

But as of today; we the oversight body, do not have that data.

Let's reset—analyze where we've been and then move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R.139.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. COMER. 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 will be postponed.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 75, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on March 13, 2020, in Proclamation 9994 (85 Fed. Reg. 15337) is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 7.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 7, which terminates the March 13, 2020, national emergency declared for COVID–19 under the National Emergencies Act, or the NEA.

The time has come to move past the COVID–19 pandemic. It is no longer a global emergency as it was nearly 3 years ago. It is that simple.

President Biden said, in his own words, ''The pandemic is over.'' He said that last September, and our Senate colleagues, with a bipartisan vote, agreed by passing a resolution last Congress, on November 15, 2022.

The NEA was intended to provide emergency authorities to the President to respond to extraordinary situations in which the President must act quickly. We are no longer in that spot.

The national emergency was declared by President Trump at the beginning of the pandemic, nearly 3 years ago, in March 2020. At that time, it was a new virus. The American public and the world at large had little information, and we had to get a handle on the spread of COVID–19.

Today, we are in a vastly different spot. We have treatments. We have better methods to track COVID. We have a better understanding of the virus itself, and the Federal Government has spent trillions combating the virus and protecting the economy from the fallout of the global shutdown.

At this point, there is no longer a need for the declaration to utilize the extraordinary authorities provided under the NEA. It seems that the White House agrees with this, too, but just thinks we need to wait until May 11.

That logic and math just doesn't seem right to me. Consider this: The declaration is scheduled to end on March 1 of this year, so the President is suggesting he does intend to, once again, extend the emergency. That is why Congress needs to act on this resolution.

It is simple. Absent the President ceding these emergency powers, it is incumbent on Congress to rein in the executive branch to ensure these powers are not abused and that these authorities do not continue in perpetuity.

America should be fully open. Our kids should be back in the classroom. Our families should be back at work. Here in the House, we are starting by removing this emergency declaration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 7, a resolution to terminate the COVID–19 emergency declaration, a resolution introduced by Representative GOSAR.

The coronavirus pandemic has been a public health and economic calamity for our country. We lost over 1 million of our fellow citizens to this deadly virus in wave after wave of devastating news for families. Entire industries have been forced to shut down and then restart from a standstill. Others have had to entirely reimagine the way they do business, costing billions of dollars in the process.

The impact of the pandemic was inequitable in the extreme. The digital divide grew even wider as those with internet access could work from home or go to school from home while others were left behind. Transportation workers, healthcare workers, law enforcement, and grocery store workers were all unable to work from home, leaving them at an elevated risk during a very dangerous time.

But thanks to actions of the previous Congress, including the American Rescue Plan, the CHIPS and Science Act, the Inflation Reduction Act, and the bipartisan infrastructure law, we are well on our way to robust recovery from this dark chapter of our Nation's history.

However, our work is not done. New variants continue to emerge, taking a toll on our workforce and exacerbating the labor shortage facing many businesses. Healthcare workers are still on the front lines of this pandemic. Last week, they saw nearly 4,000 Americans die from COVID.

Terminating the emergency declaration now sends the wrong message and could have consequences for public health and safety. In my State alone, we had over 4,000 cases in last week.

The uncertain impact of long COVID, particularly on those with preexisting health conditions, adds a layer of complexity to our path to normalcy.

With these complex issues still facing businesses, local leaders, and the American people, it would be harmful and irresponsible to force a premature end to the flexibility offered by the Presidential emergency declaration from March of 2020.

President Biden has no intention of using these emergency powers forever. We know that because he announced his intention to end the COVID–19 national emergency on May 11. This May deadline provides time to develop a strategic and a thoughtful plan regarding the termination of these authorities. There is no need for Congress to act now before the President acts on this issue. Forcing an end to the emergency declaration without regard to the consequences is shortsighted and wrong.

There are many examples where a rushed move to end the national emergency declaration could have unintended negative consequences for the U.S. Ending the emergency declaration would roll back the enrollment and payment deadlines for individuals who have lost their jobs to sign up for COBRA or pay COBRA premiums. This will mean burdensome deadlines on consumers who get healthcare coverage from job-based plans, including laid-off workers and their families.

Ending the emergency declaration will reverse efforts to address mass incarceration and prison crowding by terminating the CARES Act home confinement provisions. This makes it difficult for the Bureau of Prisons to protect inmates who are at high risk of serious illness or death from COVID–19.

Ending the emergency declaration will end video court proceedings. This is inefficient and will cost marshals time and money if they resume transporting inmates back and forth to court.

Ending the emergency declaration will cut preplanned sickness benefits and unemployment benefits for rail workers. It is wrong to cut these earned benefits when rail workers need them most.

Ending the emergency declaration will also threaten Victims of Crime Assistance funding, or VOCA funding, a critical lifeline for individuals and children dealing with the aftermath of being a victim to crime.

The administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an orderly end on May 11, aligning with its commitment to give at least 60 days' notice prior to termination. I think this is a sensible and reasoned approach that Congress should support.

We shouldn't be using an ax when a scalpel will do. Rushing this resolution to the floor is the wrong approach, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the pandemic is over.

At least that is what we were told by President Biden several months ago in a September interview. Yet here we are almost 5 months later, and the White House has failed to roll back the emergency declaration.

In fact, it wasn't until House Republicans scheduled a vote to do just that, to terminate that declaration, that President Biden announced that he would actually end it on May 11. What he really did was announce that he was giving our friends on the other side of the aisle a little bit of political cover to vote ''no'' on this bill. Instead, they would rather continue to watch the American economy suffer for an additional 3 months while we continue this unnecessary declaration of an emergency.

I am glad President Biden has followed House Republicans' lead on this, but why wait months?

We can vote to end it right now, today.

We have already let this measure drag on for nearly 3 years, signifying an egregious abuse of Presidential powers. These emergency powers have been used to harm our economy and exacerbate our supply chain problems, and the President is content to allow that to happen for another 3 months.

Our supply chain doesn't need this to continue anymore. It needs to end now. It is time for us to stop living in the past. Americans are ready to move forward. They are tired of hearing mixed messages that the pandemic is over but still seeing all of the consequences of these emergency declarations and implementing COVID regulations.

Let's finally deliver on this promise that the end isn't near; it is right here, right now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying resolution.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just note that there is no record that the national emergency exacerbated supply chain problems in the U.S. There is every record in evidence that COVID exacerbated supply chain problems in the U.S., bringing our economy to a standstill, and in my view, every evidence that the investment in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the CHIPS and Science Act are doing exactly what they needed to do, to bring our economy back. There is no evidence otherwise. Just saying that for the record.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 7, legislation I introduced requiring the Biden administration to finally end the outdated and abusive COVID national emergency declaration.

Nearly 3 years have passed since President Trump rightfully declared a national emergency concerning the COVID pandemic. The factual basis for this declaration was apparent then.

As time has progressed and as we have learned about this virus, we know that it is no longer a national emergency. Since President Trump's initial declaration, the House of Representatives has not once voted, let alone debated, whether to terminate this national emergency or keep it as required—let me repeat that—required under the National Emergencies Act.

The National Emergencies Act requires Congress to review termination or continuation of a national emergency no later than 6 months after its implementation and at least every 6 months thereafter. Yet, former Speaker PELOSI repeatedly blocked my attempts to simply debate about the merits of extending or terminating the COVID national emergency declaration, despite the law requiring its review. That would make it almost four to six times we should have had this debate during that time.

What type of representative body cannot even discuss a national emergency?

Until now, the House of Representatives has failed to perform its most basic constitutional duty: checking the powers of the executive branch and the power of the purse.

In contrast, companion legislation has twice passed the Senate, most recently with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Last September, Mr. Biden declared the pandemic is over, cases are down, America has opened back up. This hardly sounds like a country under a national COVID emergency. Yet, Joe Biden continued to extend the COVID national emergency simply to force Americans to live under extreme measures that deprive us of our freedoms.

Just this week, Mr. Biden issued a Statement of Administrative Policy opposing H.J. Res. 7, implying to veto the legislation. This action stands in stark contrast to the recent promises that Biden would end the COVID national emergency in May.

Let's not forget that Mr. Biden once promised the American people that there would be no Federal COVID vaccine mandates. Yet, he soon lied and mandated COVID vaccines for millions of Americans.

We simply cannot trust if and when Biden will keep his word. The evidence is to the contrary.

It is time to end this emergency declaration now. If passed through the House today, the National Emergencies Act requires the Senate to expeditiously vote on my resolution within 18 calendar days.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and send it to the Senate. Do your due diligence. Do what the law requires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, thank you for that announcement.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity and would just tell the body and everybody listening: Not since World War II, and that crisis that our country had to deal with, has the cause of socialism and Big Government been advanced more than during the declaration of this national emergency.

People might disagree with me, but let me make it real for you. The Federal Government and State governments used this national emergency to stop people from working in their businesses, stop their businesses cold and force them to inject something into their body if they wanted to go to work, if they wanted to go to school, if they wanted to travel. If that is not Big Government and oppression, I am not sure what is.

People say, well, what does it matter?

Well, there are more than 120 special statutory authorities granted to the administration that are now going to go away. Everybody says: Well, he is going to do it on May 11. Well, he said last September he was going to do it then.

What is taking so long?

The rest of the country knows that the pandemic is over, and they know that the national emergency should be over, as well. They know that part of the 122 special statutory authorities includes allowing the President to suspend a prohibition on testing chemical and biological substances on unwitting human subjects—think about that—or allowing the President to shut down or take over radio stations or freeze any asset or financial transaction.

Indeed, the pandemic is over. The President announced it last September. The Senate, just in November, just a couple months ago, voted to end it overwhelmingly.

For anybody that is concerned about title 42, the statute governing title 42 does not make any mention of the emergency declaration.

It needs to be ended. It needs to be ended now. Americans need to be free and not oppressed by this Federal Government and these extraordinary powers that have advanced the cause of socialism like no other time in our history.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note that everyone is looking forward to the day when COVID–19 is a distant memory. But we have to work toward that day cautiously and steadily, and the emergency declaration should not be terminated until there is time to conduct a careful review on science. It should not be terminated on the whim of any one Member of Congress.

The administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an orderly end on May 11, aligning with their commitment to give at least 60 days' notice prior to the termination. I think it is a sensible and reasoned approach that Congress should support.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, so the national emergency declaration was on March 13 of 2020, nearly 3 years ago.

This legislation we are talking about today passed the Senate twice with the votes of nearly two-thirds of the Senators. But the former Speaker repeatedly blocked the resolution from coming to the floor in the House.

The President is granted more than 120 special statutory powers—statutory, which usually means passing a law—through the national emergency declaration, all of which he continues to wield as long as this emergency is in place.

The President has extended the emergency twice, which would otherwise have automatically terminated on the anniversary of the first declaration.

These powers are meant for the time of actual emergency. President Biden himself has said the pandemic is over in his ''60 Minutes'' interview in September of 2022.

This administration has continually abused these powers and used the national emergency to enact liberal policies without the approval of Congress. These are things that probably wouldn't pass muster in Congress, because I don't think a lot of my colleagues would want to vote for them on the record.

Since the emergency was first declared, the Federal Government has spent over $6 trillion in response to COVID–19. Students have lost invaluable time learning in school facilities. Countless businesses closed down that aren't coming back. Families have been separated from loved ones during holidays and at hospitals, unable to see dying loved ones and not even able to have a funeral for them. Heartless.

□ 1530

Nurses and docs, at one point called heroes, start to be called goats because they don't necessarily want to take an experimental vaccine.

We have Jekyll and Hyde ideas coming out of the administration now—thinking like, well, we are going to sue to make people wear masks again on planes and trains at the same time he is saying we are going to end it all in May. It is crazy. We are going in the wrong direction.

Why don't we pass this legislation that the President won't do himself and put the power back into the hands of the people here that are elected by the people.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that if we are going cite President Biden's comment that the pandemic is over, will the House also agree with the President that there will be no cuts to Social Security and Medicare?

Will the House also agree that President Biden has said that the economy has turned around, creating 11 million jobs, and the economy is robust?

If we are going to pick and choose what the President says to make any one argument, then let's look at the totality of the President's record, in fairness to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. LARSEN for allowing me this time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill before us, H.J. Res. 7.

I am pleased that President Biden announced this week that he will end the COVID–19 national emergency declaration on May 11. This will provide a reasonable path to winding down the pandemic measures without leaving States and cities caught off guard with sudden shifts in their budgets.

COVID was a once-in-a-lifetime emergency, and an abrupt end to the spending under the emergency declaration would cause chaos for Americans. The wind down aligns with the administration's previous plans to give cities, States, businesses, and taxpayers at least 60 days' notice prior to the termination of the emergency declaration.

Mr. Speaker, this is sensible policymaking, and it is a welcome change from the prior administration's frantic, poorly-considered, and dangerous approach to any sort of emergency, including COVID.

I agree with the President's plan to wind down the emergency declaration, and I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with this plan, as well. Why?

Because this bill was rushed to the floor without allowing our committee to review it, without soliciting input from any of the cities or States that would be impacted. Nobody has been working with the Senate or the White House to find a solution that makes sense.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the majority knows that abrupt shifts are bad. Yet, they are free to vote for a bill which they know would cause chaos. They also know that it won't be considered by the Senate.

I can forgive a messaging bill; we all do that from time to time. What is so galling about the bill before us today is that it shows just how far outside the mainstream the Republican Party is.

The American people want commonsense solutions that protect our economy, not a far-right agenda driven by the most extreme voices in their party. It is the same voices that brought us yesterday's anti-vaccine bill.

Who knows what other secret promises the Speaker made to the extremists to secure the gavel?

Let's get the bill over with because we all know that it is not going anywhere.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we can then get on to debating the majority's economic plans, like a 30 percent national sales tax or holding the debt limit hostage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' so we can stop wasting time with this nonsense and get back to the work for the American people.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible what the other side of the aisle is saying. They said this bill was rushed to the floor.

Do you remember when this was invoked, the National Emergencies Act? March 13, 2020. After that we were told 15 days to slow the spread. How many days are we up to? Does anybody over there know?

It is over 1,000 days. What has happened in that period of time? How did we get to this position?

The law that Congress passed that was invoked by the former-President and extended by this President, the National Emergencies Act, requires at least every 6 months you vote on whether to extend it. We did not follow the law under the former Speaker.

They used the Rules Committee to prevent this bill from coming to a vote and then the claim that the Senate would need time to deal with this. The Senate has already passed this. The bipartisan Senate passed 61 to 37.

I expect there would have been a lot of votes here but the President came in to try to save their skin. The gig is up, but he wants to keep the music going a little bit longer.

Mr. Biden says that he wants to honor his commitment to give 60 days' notice before ending it because he issued this statement of administrative policy. He only issued this when this bill came to the floor; but he is going to honor his commitment to 60 days' notice.

Why is he taking 100 days? If anybody over there can do the math for me. May 11—is that 60 days from now?

No, it is more like 100 days from now, roughly.

The notion that this was rushed to the floor is ridiculous. Biden wants to keep it going. He wants to spend money under his emergency authorities, which he shouldn't have right now. It is very irresponsible with the debt limit looming and with us in extraordinary measures.

The reality is he wants 100 more days to shove money out the door and to waste money that hasn't been guarded very well or audited. It has been 1,000 into 15 days to slow the spread. It is time to end this emergency now.

Mr. Speaker, I support Mr. GOSAR's bill.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, back in September, President Biden said the pandemic is over. In early January, he extended his public health emergency for COVID for the twelfth time. Now he says the public health emergency will end May 11.

The emergency's been ended, then extended, then expired, when all of us know that it hasn't existed for months.

I guess we can say now that COVID will magically disappear in May because he says so. Who knows? We might even get new guidance tomorrow. I guess the Americans should watch out.

The American people—regardless of what was said on the other side of the aisle—are tired of this. They want to get back to business as usual. The American people are fed up with shutdowns that killed our jobs and restricted our rights.

We are going to end this madness now; we need to, that is why I am a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are fond of quoting the President and saying the pandemic is over. I just hope they will also agree with the President that we have had the 2 strongest years of job growth in history the last 2 years. We have had the lowest level of unemployment in 50 years. We have a new record low unemployment for Black and Hispanic Americans and record low unemployment for people with disabilities.

I hope as they are picking and choosing what they choose to agree with the President on, that they look at these facts, and also come out and agree with the President that these are also the facts.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 3 years since the first national emergency declaration was issued related to the COVID–19 pandemic on March 13, 2020.

Since then, the Federal Government has authorized over $6 trillion in response to COVID–19. Our children have suffered severe learning loss due to school closures, and countless small businesses have been forced to permanently close their doors.

The Democratic Party has used and abused the national emergency authorization to push their unpopular, radical agenda, like the eviction moratorium, student loan forgiveness, and reckless spending that has led to skyrocketing inflation that is impacting my constituents today—your constituents today.

When they go to the grocery store and are paying $9, $10, $11 for 12 eggs, this is a problem. They also put unconstitutional vaccine mandates in place to put healthcare workers and our military servicemembers, serving in all branches of our military, out of work.

COVID is over. Yet, nearly 3 years later, more than 35 National Emergencies Acts are still in effect, and the current administration is continuing to abuse more than 120 special statutory powers only meant for times of emergency.

Even Joe Biden said the pandemic is over. We agreed with that long before he said it, and we are happy he is finally saying it. It is far past time to put an end to this abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Representative GOSAR, for his strong leadership on this issue. I am proud to be cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly support it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the administration has a plan to bring the national emergency declaration to an early end on May 11, aligning with its commitment to at least 60 days' notice prior to termination. This gives time for a deliberate and sensible wind down of the national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 7, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in closing, last year President Biden acknowledged that the pandemic is over, as has been pointed out.

There is no compelling need for the President to continue exercising the extraordinary authorities under the NEA. The Senate, on a bipartisan basis, agreed in November, and here in the people's House I think it is time that we do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this joint resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 75, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. 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 will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TENNEY) at 4 o'clock and 31 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:

Passage of H.R. 139; and

Passage of H.J. Res. 7.

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.

STOPPING HOME OFFICE WORK'S UNPRODUCTIVE PROBLEMS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Balderson	Bishop (NC)
Alford	Banks	Boebert
Allen	Barr	Bost
Amodei	Bean (FL)	Brecheen
Armstrong	Bentz	Buchanan
Arrington	Bergman	Buck
Babin	Bice	Bucshon
Bacon	Biggs	Burchett
Baird	Bilirakis	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
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
Harder (CA)
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
Schrier
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
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—206

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
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
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
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
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
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
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Boyle (PA)
Cohen
García (IL)
Jackson Lee
Pence
Steube

□ 1654

Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. COSTA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO A NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON MARCH 13, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 197, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—229

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
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
Davis (NC)
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
Gallego
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
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)
Lee (NV)
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
Moskowitz
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pappas
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Sherrill
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

NAYS—197

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
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
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
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
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Goldman (NY)
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)
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 (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
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—7

Boyle (PA)
Cohen
De La Cruz
García (IL)
Jackson Lee
Pence
Steube

□ 1705

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. AGUILAR. 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. 87

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Takano, Ms. Adams, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Norcross, Ms. Jayapal, Ms. Wild, Mrs. McBath, Mrs. Hayes, Ms. Omar, Ms. Stevens, Ms. Leger Fernandez, Ms. Manning, Mr. Mrvan, Mr. Bowman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Sherman, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Keating, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Bera, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Titus, Mr. Lieu, Ms. Wild, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Omar, Mr. Allred, Ms. Spanberger, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Kim of New Jersey, Ms. Jacobs, Ms. Manning, Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Dean of Pennsylvania, Mr. Moskowitz, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kamlager-Dove.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Bera, Ms. Stevens, Ms. Sherrill, Mr. Bowman, Ms. Ross, Mr. Sorensen, Ms. Salinas, Mrs. Foushee, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Jackson of North Carolina, Mrs. Sykes, Mr. Frost, Ms. Caraveo, Ms. Lee of Pennsylvania, Mr. Lieu, Mr. Casten.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Golden of Maine, Mr. Mfume, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Landsman, Ms. Perez, Mr. Thanedar, Mr. McGarvey, Ms. Scholten, Ms. Chu, Ms. Davids of Kansas, Mr. Pappas.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRANE). 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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, February 2, 2023.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMPOSE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of H. Res. 12, as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78, and the order of the House of today, the Select Subcommittee on Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of not more than 21 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.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 29

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H. Res. 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

COVID NATIONAL EMERGENCY MUST END

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House for passing the Pandemic is Over Act, the Freedom For Health Care Workers Act, the SHOW UP Act, and for ending the national emergency.

I was in the New York State Assembly when the COVID vaccine mandate was passed, and I argued vociferously against it. Even then we knew it would cause irreparable damage to our healthcare facilities, forcing thousands of healthcare workers out of their jobs, and we were right. That is why it is so important for Congress to take this step and right that wrong.

Another refrain I hear over and over again from my constituents is that we need to end the national emergency declaration. We get calls every day in my office from small business owners, teachers, carpenters, and other constituents who simply don't understand why we haven't fully reopened our State and country.

COVID cases have dropped dramatically across the country, and the number of cases today compared to the same date last year are down over 600,000 cases. The fact is that this no longer constitutes a national emergency, and we should absolutely end the declaration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to pass these important pieces of legislation and encourage the administration to accelerate their timeline on this important matter.

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

(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 celebrate Black History Month. This month, we celebrate the tremendous contributions of African Americans to the growth of our Nation.

Just one example of that contribution is the beautiful edifice that we are in today. It was built by people who were uncompensated for their work, but it is a beautiful testament in our Nation's example.

Black History Month started as Negro History Week in February of 1926. That week was chosen because it included the birthdays of President Lincoln and famed abolitionist Frederick Douglass.

In 1976, they expanded it and created Black History Month.

Today, African Americans make a difference in every aspect of American life and highlight the fact that the African-American story is the greatest success story in our Nation's history.

□ 1715

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, the order of the House of January 9, 2023, and notwithstanding the requirements of clause 11(a)(1)(D) and clause 11(a)(4)(A) of rule X, of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. TURNER, Ohio, Chair

Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio

Mr. STEWART, Utah
Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas
Ms. STEFANIK, New York
Mr. KELLY, Mississippi
Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
Mr. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
Mr. GALLAGHER, Wisconsin
Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
Mr. HILL, Arkansas
Mr. CRENSHAW, Texas
Mr. WALTZ, Florida
Mr. MIKE GARCIA, California
Mr. HIMES, Connecticut
Mr. CARSON, Indiana
Mr. CASTRO, Texas
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
Mr. CROW, Colorado
Mr. BERA, California
Ms. PLASKETT, U.S. Virgin Islands
Mr. GOTTHEIMER, New Jersey
Mr. GOMEZ, California
Ms. HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania
Ms. SPANBERGER, Virginia

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STRATEGIC COMPETITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 11, 118th Congress, as amended by section 1(b) of House Resolution 78, 118th Congress, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party:

Mr. GALLAGHER, Wisconsin, Chair
Mr. WITTMAN, Virginia
Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Missouri
Mr. BARR, Kentucky
Mr. NEWHOUSE, Washington
Mr. MOOLENAAR, Michigan
Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
Mr. DUNN, Florida
Mr. BANKS, Indiana
Mr. JOHNSON, South Dakota
Mrs. STEEL, California
Mrs. HINSON, Iowa
Mr. GIMENEZ, Florida
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Illinois
Ms. CASTOR, Florida
Mr. CARSON, Indiana
Mr. MOULTON, Massachusetts
Mr. KHANNA, California
Mr. KIM, New Jersey
Ms. SHERILL, New Jersey
Ms. STEVENS, Michigan
Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Massachusetts
Ms. TORRES, New York
Ms. BROWN, Ohio

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(a)(1)(B)(1) of House Resolution 5, 118th Congress, as amended by 1(d) of House Resolution 78, 118th Congress, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic:

Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio, Chair
Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, New York
Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Iowa
Mrs. LESKO, Arizona
Mr. CLOUD, Texas
Mr. JOYCE, Pennsylvania
Ms. GREENE, Georgia
Mr. JACKSON, Texas
Mr. MCCORMICK, Georgia
Mr. RUIZ, California
Mrs. DINGELL, Michigan
Mr. MFUME, Maryland
Ms. ROSS, North Carolina
Mr. ROBERT GARCIA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WEAPONIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 12, 118th Congress, the second order of the House of today, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, of the following Members to the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government:

Mr. JORDAN, Ohio, Chair
Mr. ISSA, California
Mr. MASSIE, Kentucky
Mr. STEWART, Utah
Ms. STEFANIK, New York
Mr. JOHNSON, Louisiana
Mr. GAETZ, Florida
Mr. ARMSTRONG, North Dakota
Mr. STEUBE, Florida
Mr. BISHOP, North Carolina
Mrs. CAMMACK, Florida
Ms. HAGEMAN, Wyoming
Ms. PLASKETT, U.S. Virgin Islands
Mr. LYNCH, Massachusetts
Ms. SÁNCHEZ, California
Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia
Mr. GARAMENDI, California
Mr. ALLRED, Texas
Ms. GARCIA, Texas
Mr. GOLDMAN, New York

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES MACDONALD

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

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Charles MacDonald, an outstanding public servant who has left an incredible legacy across the State of Louisiana.

Dr. MacDonald dedicated his career to education—working as a high school teacher and principal before becoming an administrator at the University of Louisiana Monroe.

After working 17 years on ULM's campus, Dr. MacDonald won a seat in the Louisiana House of Representatives. While serving in the legislature, he authored the bill that created the Taylor Opportunity Program for Students, or TOPS, a scholarship program which has enabled hundreds of thousands of Louisiana's best and brightest to obtain a college education. I was fortunate to be one of the first recipients of the program over 25 years ago.

To this day, Dr. MacDonald's work in higher education continues, as he currently serves on the Louisiana Board of Regents.

He has been a mentor and friend to so many, including myself, helping guide young educators on their career paths, and we are so thankful.

Mr. Speaker, today the House honors an outstanding Louisianian, Dr. Charles MacDonald.

SUPPORT REPRESENTATIVE OMAR

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Representative from Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District in support of my colleague, Representative ILHAN OMAR, of Minnesota's Fifth Congressional District. Together, we are the Twin Cities.

Representative OMAR, alongside of our colleagues, Representatives SCHIFF and SWALWELL, have been unfairly targeted for removal from committees, despite their valuable experience, their expertise, and their perspectives.

The American people elected us to solve problems, to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and lower everyday costs. But, instead, there is prioritizing of issues that the Republicans are engaged in as a political stunt—no better than their extreme MAGA members who traffic in hate and violent threats.

My fellow Minnesotans and I see this for what it is: a petty vendetta that not only undermines our democracy, but it puts the safety of those Members at risk. Minnesotans and all Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support Representative OMAR and vote ''no'' on H. Res. 76.

CENSORSHIP OF CONSERVATIVE VOICES FROM BIG TECH CORPORATIONS

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring more attention to the censorship of conservative voices from Big Tech corporations, particularly with DIRECTV and AT&T's decision to remove Newsmax, the second conservative-leaning news channel in 12 months, from their programming lineup and their customers' televisions.

The fact that conservatives have this very important outlet stolen from them is simply unacceptable. This is just another great example of the Big

Tech censorship that we have seen time and again and we should not stand for this as Americans.

The American people deserve to hear all sides of political discussions to be able to form their own opinions on any given issue. Corporations should not have free rein in dishing out their woke agendas to censor content their paying customers consume. I will fight to get more answers on this as a member of the House Oversight and Accountability Committee.

DIRECTV and AT&T will be hearing from many of my colleagues and constituents that are on our side in this argument, as well as their customers from around the country to reverse this decision and prove to the American people that they are advocates of the First Amendment, not an obstacle for a fair and balanced political program.

ROLLING BACK PANDEMIC EMERGENCIES

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of responsibly ending the COVID–19 emergencies and in opposition to showmanship that would unnecessarily disrupt American's access to healthcare.

President Biden has committed to end the COVID–19 public health and national emergency designations by May 11, choosing an orderly, predictable wind down over the disruptions and dislocations proposed by House Republicans. Their actions this week could immediately kick tens of millions off their health insurance, leaving nursing home residents without staff to care for them, and cut off telehealth services for people struggling with mental illness.

Governing requires planning and deliberation. Unfortunately, Republicans have put messaging over substance. We can and will keep schools open and make sure government officials are delivering for constituents while sustaining flexibilities and efficiencies from the pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose these measures and support President Biden's responsible drawdown of emergency authorities.

BIDEN'S BORDER CRISIS

(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, as Biden's border crisis continues to cost American taxpayers billions per year, I rise today to introduce my first bill, the Border Security Investment Act.

This legislation will target the millions of immigrants who entered our country illegally, use American resources, don't pay taxes, and then proceed to send money back to foreign countries.

More specifically, it would place a 37 percent user-based transaction fee on remittance transfers made through money service businesses where the remittance originates in the U.S. and is sent back to one of the top five nations of origin for illegal immigration.

Revenue collected is placed under two trusts; both for border security. In the first trust the funds will be used by the Federal Government specifically for salaries and wages for Customs and Border Protection, physical barriers, and detection technology only. The second trust is allocated to reimburse States for their expenditures for border security enforcement measures.

Any unspent money under this legislation from these two funds exceeding $50 billion is allocated to the Treasury solely for the purpose of reducing national debt.

While there is still plenty of work to be done, this bill is a first step in securing our border, keeping our communities safe, and working toward a balanced budget.

PROTECT OUR WATER

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

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am on the House floor today to talk about an element that sustains us all—water.

My home State of Michigan is surrounded by four out of the five Great Lakes—our Nation's largest freshwater reserve. The Great Lakes region is home to 51 million jobs and has a GDP of $6 trillion. It is an economic powerhouse.

Yet, despite the abundance of freshwater surrounding us, many of our constituents do not have access to reliable and safe drinking water. PFAS and lead contamination continue to be an issue for many West Michiganders. The Great Lakes are home to one of our Nation's most incredible landmarks but are under dire threat from climate change.

We must protect our freshwater supply nationally and internationally. The Great Lakes contain 90 percent of the United States' freshwater supply and 20 percent of the global supply. We have to work with urgency to protect this precious resource.

The importance of water nationwide cannot be understated. It is an environmental matter, an economic matter, and a matter of national security.

This week, I am launching my work on the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water and the Environment where I will work to protect this vital resource, and I invite my colleagues to join me.

ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IS THE ENGINE OF PROGRESS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, America has always been a Nation of trailblazers. From the automobile to the iPhone, the entrepreneurial spirit of the American people is the engine of progress that moves our world forward toward a better tomorrow.

As we chart a course toward rebuilding the world's greatest economy, we must ensure that this engine has the fuel it needs to get us where we want to go.

That is why earlier today I introduced the Startup Act, alongside my colleague from California (Mr. DESAULNIER). This bipartisan bill equips entrepreneurs and future entrepreneurs with the training and resources they need to start a business, create jobs, and grow our economy.

Having built several small businesses from the ground up, I know just how difficult that process is. I wonder how many Americans never make that leap simply because they don't know where to start.

The Startup Act is about removing barriers to entrepreneurship and expanding access to programs and tools that will help countless people turn their version of the American Dream into a reality.

□ 1730

THURSDAY LUNCHEON GROUP

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Thursday Luncheon Group, which was founded in 1973 to elevate the voices of African Americans in U.S. foreign policy.

Since the early days of the State Department, patriotic African Americans have raised their hands to join our diplomatic service only to find their pathways too often narrowed by bigotry. In the face of this discrimination, early trailblazers like Ambassador Terence Todman, a six-time career ambassador and founding member of the Thursday Luncheon Group, successfully pushed the State Department to root out segregation and expand opportunities for all employees.

Today, the Thursday Luncheon Group plays an active role in promoting African-American representation at all levels of the Department.

As I have worked to increase opportunities for underrepresented groups in foreign policy, my efforts have been guided by the counsel of the Thursday Luncheon Group and other employee affinity groups.

Congratulations to the Thursday Luncheon Group on their golden anniversary. I look forward to working with TLG and similar groups to recruit and retain a diverse diplomatic corps that proudly promotes American values at home and around the world.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARCY GOODYEAR

(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 Marcy Goodyear.

Marcy was born in 1971 in East Point, Georgia. She moved to Albany in 1974, where she attended Westover High School.

In 2009, after living in Albany for many years, Marcy found her way to Darien, Georgia, located in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Marcy loved traveling and spending time with friends and family. She enjoyed working at Skippers' Fish Camp with her family as well as her time as a city councilwoman with the city of Darien.

Marcy's smile was infectious, and she never met a stranger. She will be dearly missed by all of those who knew her.

On behalf of myself and everyone in the First Congressional District, our thoughts and prayers are with Marcy's family and friends.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SELMA POLICE OFFICER GONZALO CARRASCO, JR.

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, we are mourning today the loss of Officer Gonzalo Carrasco, Jr., who, sadly, was shot and killed in the line of duty yesterday protecting the citizens of Selma, California. Selma, California, is a wonderful community of about 30,000 people in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley.

Officer Carrasco was a son of farmworkers, a graduate of Reedley High School, and worked constantly to increase his opportunities to become a police officer. He also, sadly, was preparing to become a father.

He served with the Selma Police Department for 2 years and did all he could to protect the community.

His service, bravery, and sacrifice will never be forgotten. It is a sad day for the people of Selma.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his family, the Selma Police Department, and the people in the valley.

May he rest in peace. God bless him. We owe him a debt of gratitude.

HONORING WAR HERO CHRISTOPHER MARIAN BALLABAN

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

Mr. SANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor Mr. Christopher Marian Ballaban, a constituent, war hero, and Holocaust survivor in New York's Third Congressional District.

Last Saturday, on January 28, Mr. Ballaban reached his centennial, and I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this token of my appreciation for his long and heroic journey.

Christopher was born in Poland and joined the Polish resistance against the Soviets at the young age of 16. Throughout his entire life, he was held in multiple slave camps throughout Europe.

After escaping the final camp, Christopher eventually joined the British Army and fought against Nazis in Germany and other enemy forces.

Finally, in the early 1950s, he found his way home to the United States. I could not be more honored to have a man of such valor residing in the district that I represent.

Let this serve as a public declaration of respect and admiration for Mr. Ballaban and his amazing family. I would like to extend the happiest of birthdays to Christopher, and I hope that our paths cross soon.

CONDEMNING BLOCKADE OF LACHIN CORRIDOR

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

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Azerbaijani Government's blockade of Lachin Corridor, the only road connecting Artsakh's Armenian population to the world. Today marks the 52nd day of the blockade.

My district is home to one of the first Armenian communities in southern California and was formed by survivors of the Armenian genocide. Now, in the face of Azerbaijan's aggression, many of my constituents fear a second genocide.

Last week, I spoke with a constituent who was stuck behind the blockade and who reported a dire situation: Over 100,000 Armenians have been denied access to food, fuel, and medicine, and the region has been left without heat or power this winter. If this continues, I fear a humanitarian catastrophe.

We must make it clear to Azerbaijan that imposing its will on the Armenian people by force is unacceptable. I call on the administration to ensure that aid reaches the people of Artsakh.

Today, my thoughts are with those suffering under these inhumane conditions, and I reaffirm my commitment to ensuring that Azerbaijan is held accountable for its aggression against the Armenian people.

SOCIALISM IS A FAILED IDEOLOGY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, socialism has failed everywhere it has been tried and has caused millions of deaths over the last century.

In 1932 and 1933, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin engineered a man-made famine in Ukraine that killed more than 3 million people. In 1938, 1 million people were executed by the Soviet Union's secret police in a campaign of organized terror.

From 1960 to 1962, over 50 million people died in Communist China during Mao Zedong's Great Leap Forward. Again, from 1966 until 1976, over 3 million people were killed by Chairman Mao's Cultural Revolution.

In Cambodia, communist dictator Pol Pot killed 2 million people, 25 percent of his country's population.

Almost 2 million North Koreans have been killed by that country's communist government.

These are just a few of the examples of socialism leading to mass death and suffering for innocent people. These deaths are a feature, not a bug and not an anomaly.

Socialism never works, as its critics must be silenced by force. It might sound attractive going in, but people who have voted it in usually have to fight their way out of it.

Let's be on the side of victims of socialism, the tens of millions of them, and speak out and condemn it in all its forms.

BLACK HISTORY IS AMERICAN HISTORY

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this day, the first day of Black History Month, unfortunately during a moment of unprecedented assaults on truth by those desperate to rewrite America's history.

In this troubling time of banned books and canceled curriculums, it is with great urgency that I stand before you, Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the profound history of our Nation that far too many far-right zealots are fighting to conceal.

This is a special month, defined in equal parts triumph and tragedy, and centered in pride and appreciation because our African-American forebears rose above oppression and helped create the greatest nation the modern world has ever seen.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, only the ashamed and the afraid hide from history. Black Americans never have and never will, for ours is a story of victory over adversity, determination in the face of uncertainty, and the courage of our convictions.

Our story is America's story. Let us never forget, let us never concede, and let us never be silent when we say that Black history is American history.

STOP EBT CARD ABUSE

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I go about my district, I like to meet with the average Wisconsinite to see what is on their mind. It is so much more illuminating than hanging around Washington and meeting with lobbyists.

Whether I stop in convenience stores or food stores, which I do between my meetings, inevitably the talk turns to abuse of the EBT card. I hear stories again and again of people selling EBT cards for 50 cents on the dollar, which apparently means that some people don't need them. Another complaint is some clerks are able to look at the card, or it turns up on the receipt how much money they have left on the card, and there may be thousands of dollars there, which is also a problem.

I thought: What can we do to prevent some of this abuse? We have introduced a bill called ID for EBT Card, in which a person's photograph would have to appear on the card.

When I speak to the clerks in my convenience stores, they unanimously believe that this would be a good idea and be a step toward fighting the fraud and abuse in this program.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation for another recent success for the First District of Indiana from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

Just this week, the Department of Transportation shared that the cities of East Chicago, Gary, and Hammond received funding under the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant program to develop plans for infrastructure projects designed to reduce transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries.

I am grateful for all the leaders and public servants in these cities putting in the work to successfully obtain and utilize this new Federal resource.

As we proceed, I look forward to continuing to work with all local stakeholders and my colleagues to support and promote the safety of our transportation infrastructure so that all individuals and businesses can continue to thrive and attract new economic activity to our communities.

HONORING WORLD WAR II VETERAN JESS SAENZ

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

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor my good friend, World War II veteran Jess Saenz, who was a member of the Greatest Generation. He passed away at the age of 98.

Born in 1924, Saenz was 19 and had recently graduated from Anaheim High School when he joined the military in 1943.

Jess was 1 of 50 young men from the historic Colonia Independencia, a segregated Mexican-American community in my hometown of Anaheim, California, who fought in the Great War.

Jess fought the Germans in the Ardennes of France and would later tell us his stories of how he lived in foxholes for 14 months, withstanding cold winter nights and drenching rains.

The war, he said, taught him to be responsible and made him a greater man.

Upon his return to the United States in 1946, he married Nellie, raised four children, became a carpenter, and helped build this great country.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting World War II veteran Jess Saenz, a true American hero and a member of the Greatest Generation.

□ 1745

WORKING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 118th Congress is in full swing now. We are here working full time again for the American people.

I just wanted to take a few moments tonight here on the House floor to clarify some things about how this new Congress has begun.

I point out, first, for scheduling purposes, of course, the State of the Union is next week. It is a time for the President to take stock and speak to the American people about where our country is today and where we are heading.

I hope the President is able to make good use of the opportunity, but I am afraid we are going to be subjected to more spin and few solutions to the major challenges, even the crises facing the American people.

Mr. Speaker, much has been made by the Democrats and the press about how House Republicans have kicked off the 118th Congress, but we all know the chatter is not an accurate representation of what is really going on around here.

The cameras don't capture it all. We are delighted that the C–SPAN cameras are roving about the floor now. It gives a little more personal view of what is happening here in the Chamber, but so much of what goes on outside these walls is not apparent to the American people.

Let's be plain about this. Let's put it plainly in real terms what is actually happening now. There are some real reforms that have been brought forward by the new House Republican majority.

We now have a much more open legislative process. As I explained to some friends back home over the weekend, we all remember the cartoon. I am 51 years old. We remember the cartoon Saturday mornings, ''I am just a bill on Capitol Hill,'' and it explained how a bill becomes a law. I explained to our friends from Louisiana who were in town that that has not actually been the way a bill becomes a law in this Congress for several years now.

We are getting back to that process. We are getting back to what we were taught in civics about how this is supposed to work. Bills have to be limited now to one single subject. We will no longer vote on a bill without giving Members at least 72 hours' notice to review it first. What a concept. You might have to actually read that legislation before you vote on it.

This is an important change: Any tax increase must now meet a higher threshold to pass. It was a simple majority, but now it is a two-thirds vote. That is a really important reform for the American people, given the state of the economy.

There will be no new mandatory Federal spending increases without equal or greater budget offsets. We have a $31.5 trillion Federal debt. We cannot continue on this trajectory. These reforms are really important for us.

By the way, remote voting and committee work are finally ended. No longer will you see Members phoning in their work. They have to be here. They have to come to work.

Let's contrast that with the old way of doing business. Under the previous leadership of former Speaker NANCY PELOSI—the Democrats had been in charge here for 4 years—we had bills written behind closed doors, sometimes literally by just a handful of people. The bills were loaded up with unrelated policies. These bills were unveiled, then brought for a remote vote before anybody could possibly read them, much less debate or amend the legislation.

We all know the Democrats are obsessed with having a top-down approach to legislating. I mean, they have all but shouted it from the rooftops over the past few weeks. Sure, that might have made former Speaker PELOSI's job easier, but it was not good for the American people. It was not good for the country. It was not good for this revered institution.

I suspect if you ask the American people, they would all agree. This is just common sense. We are restoring common sense here. We made commitments to America, and we are going to fulfill them.

Here is the reality: House Republicans have started this year by instituting the most positive reforms to this House in a generation. With Republicans back in charge, the status

quo, where there is no transparency, no accountability, outright disregard for regular order, is finally over, and that is a very, very good thing for the country.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are voting to end the COVID pandemic emergency order. This is one of the topics we have taken up, we have committed to the American people that we would do it when we started the Congress, and we have.

President Biden has said the pandemic is over. His press secretary says it isn't. Since the White House couldn't get its story straight, we voted now to put an end to the public health emergency declaration. Since the pandemic is over, the emergency declaration should be over as well.

Mr. Speaker, this week we are also passing the SHOW UP Act. Talk about something that is popular with the American people. This House has ended remote work in this body, the Senate did it long ago across the hall, and now we are voting to do the same thing for the remainder of the Federal Government. It is beyond time to require that the teleworking Federal employees return to work in order to remedy widespread terribly poor customer service.

Consider this: The IRS, just the IRS, they have a backlog right now of more than 8 million tax returns from 2021. Prior to widespread teleworking, the backlog was approximately just 1 million. That is an unacceptable thing. We have Federal employees at all these agencies who literally have not come to work. Well, we are going to end that. It is clear that these backlogs and customer service problems are due at least in part to ongoing teleworking policies, even as the pandemic is now in the rearview mirror.

Mr. Speaker, with Republicans back in charge, I could give you many examples of things that are going to be improving around here. That is just a couple. The House is back to work, and we intend to get the rest of the government back to work for the American people as well, whether all of our colleagues like that or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. KILEY), my new colleague on the House Judiciary Committee, to discuss another important issue from this week.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House passed the Pandemic is Over Act, terminating the national COVID–19 state of emergency.

Now, of course, the pandemic is over. It has been over for some time. Americans are well aware of this. It seems only the government has not been aware of it at the national level and in certain States in this country.

The House of Representatives passed this bill ending the state of emergency, ending the national emergency, and the President responded in a very interesting way. He agreed with us. He said: Yes, the emergency is over on May 11, which is a very interesting concept. An emergency that you can schedule to end in advance.

This is a page out of Gavin Newsom's book in California where the state of emergency there had continued month after month, year after year, and as the absurdities piled up, as California last year hosted the Super Bowl during a state of emergency.

As, by the way, the Governor refused to abide personally by the dictates issued pursuant to that emergency, eventually he was forced to say, okay, I will end it, and he decided to end it 6 months in advance. The state of emergency in California will now be lapsing on February 28, for those keeping score at home, and the national emergency will be lapsing on May 11.

This is inherently against the very concept of an emergency, to say that we can schedule it to end at a specific date in the future. It is also against the very concept of an emergency to say that it can last for 3 years.

We have in this country for now almost 3 years experienced our form of government being turned on its head. At the national level, and in particular certain States, our entire separation of powers, checks and balances, and representative government collapsed under a one-man rule.

Now that we have moved on from most of that—although there are still some remnants of the controls that were put in place still in effect—we are in a position to assess what was the outcome of all this. Yes, there was some uniformity in terms of Federal policy, but there was a great degree of difference in terms of how different States responded.

In my State of California, we had the highest level of government coercion and control throughout the entire COVID–19 experience. We had the most onerous business shutdowns, the longest school shutdowns, the worst church shutdowns. We had the most onerous mask mandates and vaccine mandates and vaccine passports.

Each and every step of the way, California had the highest level of government coercion and control, generally done via executive orders without the say of the people, without the say of the legislature, without meaningful judicial review, with 40 million people of our State expected to simply comply. That was the California experience. That was the experience to a lesser extent of many other States.

But then you had States like Florida that decided that citizens could be trusted to make decisions for themselves, that empowered local communities to govern themselves, that focused on disease control rather than population control.

We can now look, having been through this for a few years and having had very different approaches, what was the result of this difference in policy?

Well, economically speaking, California had basically the highest unemployment rate in the entire country throughout the COVID–19 state of emergency, whereas Florida had just about the lowest unemployment rate in the country throughout the state of emergency.

California has experienced student learning loss unlike anything that has ever been seen before in this country. There has been a 6 percent decline in third graders reading at grade level over the last few years, a 7 percent decline for fourth graders in meeting ELA standards, whereas Florida achieved the highest national assessment of educational progress ranking in their history across math and reading for fourth and eighth graders in 2022.

In California, to take another example, in L.A. our students lost an equivalent of 6 months of math in terms of their overall education in that period of time. We will be grappling with the consequences of this for a long, long time. California experienced an economic and educational calamity that States like Florida did not experience.

What did we get in return?

We were all told this was done for the purpose of safety. It was done in order to save lives. We can now assess that claim.

When you look at the actual numbers, there was no difference. Age-adjusted COVID mortality rates between California and Florida were a wash. It was the same, despite the unbelievable toll that the lockdowns and related policies took on the people of California.

You can also make comparisons within our State. I represent a number of counties that did everything possible to take the approach that Florida did despite what we were dealing with at the State level.

In Placer County, for example, we were the first county in the State to end the local state of emergency. We had our kids back in school earlier than anywhere else in California. We were among the first to end mask mandates and to challenge vaccine mandates, and we did everything possible to enable our businesses to remain open. All the while, we took the steps that were necessary to give vulnerable individuals the tools that they needed to protect themselves.

Now, all the while, those of us who favored trusting citizens, who favored freedom, were attacked viciously by the likes of the Governor of California, who personally attacked me by name and said that I believed it would have been better to let Californians die.

Again, you can look at the results in Placer County as compared to other parts of California. Our students did much better, our employment rate was roughly half the State average, and our public health outcomes were much better, with a COVID mortality rate about two-thirds that of the rest of the State.

The evidence now is very clear as to what approach worked and what approach didn't. Those States that tried as much as possible to maintain the structure of our constitutional form of government did a lot better than those

States that decided an emergency could be used to effectuate an indeterminate one-man rule.

But there are some who are now saying, as a recent headline in The Atlantic magazine put it, that we should simply declare a pandemic amnesty at this point. We should move on, we should forget about all of the damage that was done to our kids, who may never get the education, may never make up for the learning loss that they experienced. We should forget about the damage that was done to businesses that in many cases have been permanently lost, 200,000 businesses throughout the country that were shuttered. We should simply move on and forget about it. Forgive and forget.

Look, I am all for letting bygones be bygones, and I am willing to work with anyone who is interested in creating good policy going forward. But we do need to pause and consider how it is that this happened in our country, how did we get to a point where the appearance of a virus could cause our entire form of government to collapse?

□ 1800

Our Founders were not unfamiliar with emergencies. After all, they had just been through a war of independence and yet, they still believed that combining the executive, legislative, and judicial powers in a single set of hands, as James Madison put it, was the very definition of tyranny.

So how, well over two centuries now after the founding, did we get to a point where our institutions were so susceptible to collapse?

I think that is a question that merits serious scrutiny because it could point us in the direction of getting back to some of the founding principles that we have lost touch with.

The fact is that we have seen governmental power become more and more centralized and consolidated in recent decades in this country, and it simply became all too easy to fast-forward that process to its logical endpoint of one-man rule.

We have seen our political institutions become less and less representative, less and less self-governing institutions, and it became all too easy to make them not representative at all. Or we have seen more and more of our levers of power in government controlled by special interest groups, especially in California, my State, and so it became all too easy to let special interests completely run the show as it did when it came to the school shutdowns.

So I don't believe that we can simply move on and turn the page and forget about what happened in this country for the last few years. I think we need to give serious thought as to what led us to this point and how we can move ahead and actually now get the pendulum swinging in the other direction. That is a far more in-depth conversation than my time today would permit, but I simply would like to offer a few ideas.

The first is that we need to definitively end the emergency, not on May 11 but now, not in California on February 28, but now, and any other States that are retaining the altered legal forms that were put in place through the emergency. Along with that, we need to end all remaining mandates that exist.

We took a major step in that direction yesterday in this House by passing legislation to end President Biden's vaccine mandate for healthcare workers.

We also need to look at reforming our emergency laws, to make it so you cannot so easily declare an emergency that lasts for years and is allowed to continue indefinitely without any serious review of whether the conditions of the emergency continue to exist.

In a broader sense, I think that this is a moment where we as a country need to look at the consolidation and centralization of political power in this country. Yes, at the State level but largely at the Federal level, and especially in bureaucracies that operate outside any sort of accountability on the part of voters.

We simply have seen this happen over the course of decades in this country, and it has veered us farther and farther from the idea of self-government that was the great American innovation: the institution of self-government.

Now I am seeing encouraging signs in many ways that this is beginning to happen. For example, I am starting to see at the school board level, parents are getting involved like never before. Parents are running for school board and changing the way that local school districts operate and trying to fight against mandates from the State level that tell them how they should run their schools.

The beauty of this is that it gives parents a direct access point in terms of how their local schools are run. That is the idea of self-government, and I think that is something to build on going forward.

Finally, on the note of education, I do think we need to get much more serious in this country about civic education which used to be something that was not simply some addendum to one of your classes but was part and parcel of your entire education: what it was about, to prepare you for active citizenship, to be well grounded in what has made America such a unique country in our Nation's history, the greatest country in the world's history; what the Constitution is about; why we have institutions like freedom of speech; why the separation of powers and checks and balances are important.

I think if we start to teach these things more meaningfully in our schools, then it would reinforce our civic institutions. It would leave them less vulnerable to the sort of transformation that they were put through over the course of the last few years. And should we ever face another pandemic or whatever other threat that may come our way, I think we will be much better prepared to get through it in the way that Florida did and in the way that Placer County did. And not, unfortunately, in the way that California and many other parts of this country had to suffer through with such a high cost to so many people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California. Those are some very important insights from the West Coast. We pray that America does not make those same decisions in the other States. I am grateful for principled leadership out of California here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this week things have—the quality of intellectual thought in this country has declined to the degree that we have to bring a resolution to the floor condemning socialism, but that is the way it is.

Recently, polls have shown among young people, about half have a positive view of socialism. Now, of course these are young people whose opinions are largely gathered not by personal experience but by what their schoolteachers tell them or what they see on television, so that may be part of the problem, and hopefully, they will grow their way out of it.

Nevertheless, I do feel it necessary to make some statements as to why socialism is an inferior way to govern and is completely incompatible with people who want to live in a free society.

The first thing you need to know about socialism, of course, it leads to material goods which are not as good as those under a free market system. A lot of that means because the government controls everything, you don't have an opportunity to have competition. The poor restaurant, the poor manufacturer is never forced out of business, never forced to improve, and as a result it means a poorer society. A lot of times the material goods by themselves is one of the reasons throughout history you see people leave the Marxist, socialist sort of society and flee towards the free market system.

Cubans leaving to come to the United States. When I visit the southern border, the Border Patrol always talks about the Cubans. There are a lot of Cuban doctors coming here—wealthy by Cuban standards—but still they can become much more wealthy in the U.S.

In the old days of the Cold War, people left from East Germany to West Germany, from North Vietnam to South Vietnam to get to a country in which there are more goods and more quality. But I always feel it is a little bit wrong to overly focus on the fact that the free market inevitably means much better material wealth.

It also deals with the freedom to do anything else. When you have a socialist society, the government in a pure

socialist society employs everybody. And even in a partially socialist society, a much higher percentage of people wind up working for the government and have to work for the government.

Like all Republicans, in my political career, again and again, I have had people come up to me and tell me things privately that they can't say publicly because they work for the government.

Schoolteachers who come up to me and give a Republican perspective on things or things they may disagree with that the school board is doing. But because they work for the government, they can only talk to me quietly like they were in the Soviet Union or Communist China.

When I was in Wisconsin and we changed the laws to give more flexibility on how we deal with public employees about 12 years ago—it was under Governor Walker—all Republicans knew public employees who quietly sided with Governor Walker, but because they worked for the government, the little socialist part of America, they couldn't openly side with Governor Walker. They had to quietly whisper like we were in a Communist country.

That is what happens when you have too many people working for the government.

The Department of Natural Resources is another example of that. Again, people are coming and saying they are doing things wrong, but they dare not say so publicly because they work for the government.

Of course, in addition to employees who work for the DNR or work for the university, it is not just political beliefs that they may have to hide in the intolerance area of a very liberal political entity—I am thinking about Dane County, which is where Madison, Wisconsin is—people, again, where the government is so big, they are forced not only to hide their political beliefs, they may have to hide their religious beliefs because they are afraid that when it comes to promotions, when it comes to hiring, when it comes to firing, it could affect them negatively because such a high percentage of jobs come with the government.

It is not just that. In a pure socialist society, because there is a shortage of goods, the ability to purchase goods can also be dependent on toeing the party line. We know that in Russia, or previously Cuba, the ability to purchase things is dependent on toeing the party line. You can work all you want but unless you are a member of the party or toe the party line, you can't get the quality of goods that are there. That is inevitably something that happens when the government becomes so powerful.

Other perks are restricted if you don't toe the party line, things like travel in a socialist state. Over time, you begin to have restrictions and maybe the opportunities to travel abroad are only given to people who have displayed fealty to the state.

One of the things I am told to look out for in Cuba is—Cuba, of course, being an island nation—you would expect to have lots of boats all around the island for people to go and fish, people just to take advantage of the Caribbean. But in fact, there are very few boats because Cuba is a socialist country and they are afraid people would use those boats to leave the country. That is another trait that you have in advanced socialism.

Other things they may stamp down on you for, they restrict your free speech because they don't want anybody saying anything that might be something the government disagrees with.

If you look at Communist China, even though to a degree they have a free market, the huge government, because they are afraid of any dissent, anybody telling the truth, cracks down on churches. It seems hard to believe that you cannot openly talk about Christianity, openly talk about Christ in China, but I am afraid you can't.

You hear about Falun Gong in China saying things that maybe aren't approved by the government and therefore people crack down on that organization as well.

In any event, when young people say they are for socialism or if you have any children or grandchildren out there who say there is socialism, point out to them the inevitable lack of freedom that comes with it, that a high number of people have to work for the government. And if you have to work for the government, they can promote you or hire you or fire you based upon political beliefs, based upon religious beliefs.

In a free market system, there are really an almost unlimited number of people you can work with. There are so many different businesses in the free market system. If you don't like to work for someone else, you can always start your own business. That is something that you can't do under socialism, or they want to make it very difficult.

So I am glad that the United States Congress, at least later this week or early next week, is going to go on record saying that we don't like socialism. It should be completely unnecessary. And the fact that so many young people think socialism might be okay is really a damning indictment of the educational, both K–12 and university, system in this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. That is very well said. The evils of socialism have crept into all manner of our politics and areas of our culture.

Mr. Speaker, I will end our Special Order hour by just reminding the American people here watching and keeping track of this, that again, as I said in the opening, the Republican majority is in charge. The Congress is now fully operational and we are back to work for the American people.

Every week now, we will be passing substantive legislation that will send a message to the people that there is a new sheriff in town.

Today, in our House Committee on the Judiciary, we had an hour's long hearing on the catastrophe at the border, hearing from those who are down there contending with that situation every single day. The hearings like that one will lead us to legislative repairs for some of these problems that have been created by the Biden administration and the Democrats in charge here the last couple of years.

This week, we are voting to end the COVID pandemic emergency order at long last. We are passing the SHOW UP Act to get all these Federal employees back to work. And as Mr. GROTHMAN indicated, tomorrow we will be voting to condemn socialism.

There is going to be a dramatic change between the Republicans in charge of this House and the Democrats. We are grateful for the opportunity to lead. We will do that every day and we will make the American people proud with our policy reforms and our process reforms.

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

□ 1815

PROTECTING PISTOL-BRACED FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYDE. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year, the ATF finalized its unconstitutional rule pertaining to firearms with stabilizing braces. Under this new ATF rule, any pistol-braced firearm would be considered an illegal short-barreled rifle, subjecting these firearms to draconian regulations under the NFA, the National Firearms Act of 1934, and turning millions of law-abiding gun owners into criminals literally overnight.

Unelected antigun bureaucrats informed law-abiding gun owners possessing pistols with these braces attached that they will have only 120 days to register them once the rule is published in the Federal Register. This 120-day amnesty window started yesterday, January 31.

As we have seen across the world time and time again, what comes before gun confiscation? Gun registration. That is right. That is exactly what ATF is now demanding.

For stabilizer brace owners who do not wish to register their firearms, the ATF provides four alternatives.

The first: Turn in the entire firearm with the attached stabilizing brace to the ATF. That means forfeiting your firearm.

The second: Destroy the whole firearm. Again, another forfeiture of your firearm.

The third: Convert the pistol brace into a long-barreled rifle that does not require registration but is also much more difficult to use with a brace.

The fourth: Permanently remove and dispose of, or alter the stabilizing brace, from the firearm so that it cannot be reattached.

If gun owners who possess braced firearms refuse to register, destroy, turn in, or alter their firearm after this 120-day window, they face National Firearms Act violations, felony violations, including hefty fines of up to $250,000 and up to 10 years in prison for having an unregistered short-barreled rifle.

In other words, the ATF's rule turns law-abiding gun owners into criminals, into felons, for simply doing nothing.

That is right. If they do nothing, then after 120 days, they are in felony violation of ATF's reinterpreted law, all for simply maintaining their Second Amendment freedoms.

What exactly are these alleged hazardous stabilizing braces? A pistol brace, also known as a stabilizing brace, is simply an accessory that is attached to the rear of a large firearm in order to anchor the gun to the shooter's arm to better stabilize it, allowing them to be more accurately shot one-handed, just like what you see right here. This is a stabilizing brace.

These braces were actually designed to help disabled veterans enjoy the sport of shooting. In fact, as a Federal firearms licensee, my company has sold many of these pistol brace firearms to assist disabled veterans so they can improve their shooting capabilities and their accuracy.

Unfortunately, these beneficial braces have faced uninformed and unwarranted backlash from unelected bureaucrats for years.

In 2012, the ATF provided a letter determining that pistol braces were legal to use and to shoulder. This decision was then reversed 3 years later by the ATF. In 2015, stabilizing braces became illegal to shoulder, turning braced firearms into unregistered short-barreled rifles. The braces remained legal if held at arm's length but illegal if brought back to the shoulder. How does that make any sense?

This flip-flopped again in 2017 when stabilizing braces were once more determined to be legal to shoulder by the ATF, as long as the original design of the brace remained unmodified.

Here we are in 2023 as braced pistols are vilified yet again, declared by the ATF to be unregistered short-barreled rifles requiring registration and their owners classified as felons if they simply do nothing.

Clearly, as in most cases of unconstitutional gun control, unelected bureaucrats who have little to no knowledge of firearms or respect for Second Amendment rights are steamrolling ahead with unlawful restrictions, which will impact, estimates say, anywhere from 3 million to up to 40 million firearms across the country.

Why? To advance the less dangerous dream of disarming our Nation and dismantling our Second Amendment rights. That is what gun control is all about.

The ultimate goal is an unarmed and subjugated America. I can assure gun owners across this great Nation that I and Second Amendment-loving Republican colleagues will do everything in our power to never allow that to happen.

We are fighting this, and we are not going to give up. Congress cannot allow the ATF to brazenly disregard both our Constitution and Congress' role, its sole role in legislation, its legislative authority.

I don't know if ATF Director Dettelbach needs a copy of the Constitution to revisit the explicit language of the Second Amendment or the direct powers granted to the three branches of government, but the last time I checked, only Congress has the authority to make laws.

Let me say that again. Congress makes laws, not unelected antigun bureaucrats at the ATF or any other part of the executive branch, for that matter.

Yet, given the ATF's severely misguided decision to advance its unconstitutional pistol brace rule, I am actively leading the fight to stop this grave injustice.

We have three key tools available to us in Congress to fight the ATF's tyranny.

The first is H.R. 646, the Stop Harassing Owners of Rifles Today Act, or the SHORT Act, which I reintroduced yesterday with Senators ROGER MARSHALL and JOHN KENNEDY. This legislation repeals elements of the National Firearms Act, thereby prohibiting the ATF from registering and banning pistols with stabilizing braces.

The second element is a joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act, which we will introduce in a matter of days to block the ATF's rule from infringing on Americans' Second Amendment rights. Congressman RICHARD HUDSON, our NRCC chair, has joined me in co-leading this in the House, while Senators JOHN KENNEDY and ROGER MARSHALL will introduce the resolution in the Senate.

The third way that we can fight this here in Congress is through the power of the purse. As we write the ATF's appropriations for fiscal year 2024, we can prevent taxpayer dollars from funding this backdoor gun control through what is called a limitation amendment. As a new member on the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, I look forward to assisting in this effort.

With these three initiatives, we can work together to stop the ATF's unconstitutional overreach.

It would be better if the ATF simply decided to rescind the pistol brace rule so we would not have to take these permanent measures, but we are fully prepared to do so if they will not rescind it.

I am proud to have several of my colleagues here tonight to expose the ATF's unconstitutional rule, as well as to highlight how Congress can stop this latest form of gun control from infringing on law-abiding gun owners' Second Amendment freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for doing this today, and I thank him for leading the fight.

Yesterday, I stood on this floor fighting to protect Americans' First Amendment rights. Today, I am standing here fighting to protect Americans' Second Amendment rights. God help our Constitution.

Congress has afforded far too much deference to unelected D.C. bureaucrats in Federal agencies, and it is time, with our majority, to rein in that extreme power.

The left has talked about taking your gas stoves away, has censored your speech, and now the ATF, under the guidance of this administration, is coming to take away millions of pistols from law-abiding gun owners, individuals who own pistol braces, which were originally approved by the ATF themselves.

What has changed? What is different? What is new? I will tell you what has changed. What has changed is now we have an administration that is desperate to erode our Second Amendment rights in more and more pervasive ways as every year passes. It has continually chipped away at Americans' constitutional rights because of the lack of understanding of what the actual roots of gun violence are.

The administration is abusing the powers delegated to the ATF to illegally track gun owners, perform unauthorized compliance checks at people's homes, and now banning popular modifications that, I will say it again, they approved in the first place.

It has to stop. We are tired of it. Americans are tired of it. This has to end. That is why I am proud to join these efforts to protect gun owners across this great United States of America.

As their duly elected Representatives, we must fight back. We must stand tall. We must be tough and stand against this abuse of power on their behalf.

Let me say this: As a duly elected official and a gun owner myself, all I have left to say to the ATF is enough is enough. Our right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Mr. CLYDE. I thank my good friend from New Jersey, from one of those blue States where you don't necessarily think that there are passionate gun owners. I appreciate them.

Mr. VAN DREW. South Jersey. I am going to teach you that. South Jersey is a lot different.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), who is also the co-chair of our Second Amendment Caucus here in Congress and my good friend.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank my friend, fellow Freedom Caucus colleague, and proven fighter for the Second Amendment, Mr. CLYDE, for organizing this Special Order. I thank him for highlighting what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, the ATF's new pistol brace rule violates the separation of powers. Bureaucrats don't create laws; Congress does. This rule functions like a law that Congress never passed.

ATF—Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. In western Colorado, we call that a fun weekend, but D.C. bureaucrats have used this agency to infringe on the rights of the American people.

When you research how many pistol braces the ATF expects to be registered, the number varies. Some say 10 million, others say 20 million, and it may even be 40 million.

Why such disparity? Because the ATF doesn't know how many are out there because law-abiding Americans do not trust them enough to tell them.

In fact, there are probably going to be many more boating accidents this spring and summer than we have ever encountered in U.S. history from law-abiding gun owners.

We don't trust the ATF because of their overreaching actions, exactly like we are seeing with this rule.

There has been a lot of talk about defunding the ATF, even abolishing the agency altogether. I am still waiting to hear a good reason why the ATF should remain an agency at all. I have yet to hear one.

Instead of providing regulations that keep our communities safe, this agency has made our communities more dangerous by laundering weapons to the cartels. Operation Fast and Furious exposed the recklessness of the ATF, how little regard they have for the rule of law, and Americans have had a hard time viewing this agency and its rules as legitimate.

Think about it. The ATF had about 1,700 firearms that were being tracked. They had tracers on them. They were selling to known criminals during this Operation Fast and Furious. They lost 1,700 traced firearms, and now they expect to go after law-abiding American citizens for firearm accessories?

Are they really that competent to go after this many millions of Americans for a firearm accessory, a stabilizing brace, when they had 1,700 tracked firearms in the hands of known criminals that they just lost?

I think that alone proves the legitimacy of this agency, and I am very excited to bring them into an Oversight and Accountability Committee hearing so they can speak for themselves as to why they should remain an agency in our Federal Government and not have the appropriate features of their agency put under another, like the FBI, once we clean that out.

□ 1830

But other than that, the Second Amendment, it is absolute.

All the regulations the bureaucrats make, the laws that bureaucrats are trying to make, the unconstitutional laws that are passed by the Federal Government, the State legislatures, they make our country less safe. Gun-free zones are the most dangerous places in our country.

The Second Amendment is absolute, and it is here to stay.

A recent report states that Americans own 46 percent of the world's guns. I think we need to get our numbers up, boys and girls.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CLYDE for hosting this Special Order. I thank him for bringing us all together on this topic and, hopefully, we can shed some light to the American people and let them know that we are fighting against this agency and their abuse of separation of powers.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for her unwavering defense of the Second Amendment of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important issue because the unelected career bureaucrats are at it again. They are launching attacks on our constitutional rights, the constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners.

This seems to be the sole purpose of the agency lately, attacking the Second Amendment. Now they want to ban pistol braces.

Americans who don't know what a pistol brace is might have some obvious questions after hearing about this ban. What is a pistol brace? Obviously, it makes guns more deadly, right? It makes guns shoot faster. It makes them want to be used only by people who want to murder other people.

Why else would the ATF want to ban it?

But the Americans who actually use pistol braces know the reality: There is zero logical reason to ban pistol braces. It is a device used by a lot of disabled veterans, a lot of people I know, to provide more stability when shooting a gun.

Tens of millions of Americans own this brace, but they would immediately become felons when this goes into effect. That is not even practical from a law enforcement perspective.

Now, you could argue, actually, that the pistol brace makes the gun safer; it makes it less likely to shoot things they are not aiming at.

But no, the impulsive leaders at ATF have once again failed to apply simple logic and reason to their decision-making and, instead, chose to apply the mindset of the authoritarian, gun-grabbing bureaucrats we all know that they are.

Congress cannot sit idly by. I recently re-introduced a bipartisan piece of legislation that would create an appeals process for small business owners hurt by these haphazard rulings. Right now, the only recourse that exists is for these gun shop owners and manufacturers to sue the Federal Government in court.

Now, for the average American, that is not exactly doable. It takes time and a lot of money and a lot of resources.

My bill would put the ATF in line with every other Federal regulatory agency's appeal process and ensure Americans can petition their government for the redress of grievances and get decisions handed down in a timely manner.

These taxpayer-funded, anti-gun activists at the ATF cannot continue to trample on our Second Amendment rights without a response from Congress.

We must never cease fighting against these shameless power grabs, and Republican must use our House majority to protect law-abiding gun owners.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for those inspiring words.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my good friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for organizing this time on the floor. I think it is so important.

We are talking about the brace ruling from the ATF. A brace is a firearm accessory for disabled individuals. But I am sure Biden went to his Attorney General and to the ATF and said, you know what, I hate guns. How can I take millions of them off the street, without regard for if they are legally owned? And how can I do it without going to Congress because I really don't be want to do that.

Now, keep in mind, this is administrative law. Our Founders were against this type of thing because they knew that the laws shouldn't change with each administration.

When Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress and the White House, they didn't pass this legislation.

This ATF rule says that gun owners have 120 days of amnesty to register or destroy their firearm if it has this firearm accessory. If you don't obey, you become a felon.

What this administrative rule does not do is it does not make people safer. This ruling turns millions of law-abiding gun owners into criminals. Tens of millions of pistol braces have been sold in the United States, with the permission of the ATF, the written permission of the ATF.

They are telling you to take this off, or transfer it, or register it like a machine gun, basically, the same paperwork.

If you want to turn it into a short-barreled rifle, guess what? Twenty-six percent of Americans live in a State where the ATF has left them with no option. They will create an illegal gun in their State if they comply with the ATF ruling in order to keep their gun.

How much compliance do we think there is going to be?

Well, there was a bump stock rule similar to this. There are about half a million bump stocks estimated in circulation; 526 have been returned to the government. So they have made half a million felons is what they have done.

Now, Mr. CLYDE has several bills to fix this. I can anticipate—or I believe Justice Scalia, if he were alive, I can tell you, I believe, based on a meeting that I had with him, which one he would prefer.

Several of us had breakfast with Scalia, and we said, oh, Obama is so bad, and we don't have the constitutional balance of government. Fix this for us, Supreme Court.

Scalia said, this is not my job to referee fights between you and the executive branch. By the way, you are the most powerful, powerful branch. You are Article I, and you can't—you have all the tools you need to stop what he is doing.

One of my colleagues said, well, impeachment is so hard. Scalia said, I am not talking about impeachment. You are funding everything you complain about.

So I believe that his favorite method here, and it is certainly my favorite method, would have been to defund this activity.

The ruling is unconstitutional. The Second Amendment is clear. Shall not be infringed means shall not be infringed.

I urge all Americans to call their Representatives and support ANDREW CLYDE's bill.

Mr. CLYDE. I thank my good friend from Kentucky because he is absolutely right. We have the power of the purse.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my good friend.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and for his efforts in leading this fight.

Let's get something straight. I am a proud Texan, and let me tell you, Texans are not happy when the government comes after their Second Amendment right.

My District 14, on the Gulf Coast of Texas, has more concealed handgun licensees than any other congressional district in Texas, and I have to assume in the country, for that matter.

The Second Amendment is extremely clear: ''The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.'' What is so hard to understand about that?

But, let's face it, folks. The far left's dangerous attack on the United States Constitution continues unabated, with yet another example right here with the ATF's unconstitutional pistol brace rule, which bans millions of firearms with stabilizing braces.

The ATF ruling could turn as many as 40 million Americans into felons, and those 40 million Americans are sick and tired of faceless bureaucrats trying to destroy the Second Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said, where the people fear the government, there is tyranny. Where the government fears the people, there is liberty.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, fear the government that fears your guns.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas for those great words. He is absolutely correct. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), my good friend.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding.

The ATF's new rule criminalizing pistol braces is a brazen and unlawful attempt to usurp congressional authority. This pistol brace rule will fail for the same reason the bump stock rule failed: The ATF does not have the authority to create Federal law. Nobody voted for the ATF, though I know a lot of people who would vote against them if they could.

This new rule will ban pistol braces on certain firearms, forcing users to jump through numerous hoops to comply with this new decree or risk becoming a felon.

Disabled veterans and others have used these braces for years to help them fire pistols, and the ATF has unilaterally decided that this is no longer acceptable. Now, otherwise law-abiding Americans will either have to destroy their newly illegal firearms, or figure out how to comply with an arbitrary and confusing regulatory scheme outlined in the National Firearms Act.

The ATF cannot be trusted to protect our rights to keep and bear arms. There is no timeline in which the ATF, under any administration, would become an ally. It needs to go. We need to abolish the ATF before they abolish our Second Amendment rights.

Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms should be the name of a chain of convenience stores in Florida, not a Federal agency.

I urge every red-blooded American and every conservative in this Congress to stand with Representative CLYDE on his legislation, and to stand with me and cosponsor my bill, the Abolish the ATF Act of 2023. Let's get rid of this unlawful agency once and for all, and let this Special Order be considered a shot across the bow.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for that is, indeed, a great statement: A shot across the bow; a great example of what the United States Navy would do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), my good friend.

Mr. BURCHETT. I thank Mr. CLYDE and the Speaker for your service to our great country.

I don't have any notes for this, but I do want to say the ATF, to me, is the swamp.

Now, here we have a group of unelected bureaucrats, dadgummit, that have taken upon themselves to interpret a law.

It always reminds me, when I was in Nashville one time. I was sitting at the Crown Plaza across the street from the Capitol with one of my dear friends who just passed away; his name was Tom Hensley. He was called the Golden Goose. He was the liquor lobbyist. I never voted for his bills, but he always liked me.

He told me one time, a guy came up and threatened him that worked for our Governor and threatened him; and he sat there, and he chomped on his cigar; and he walked away and he said—BURCHETT, he said, you know what? He said, in a few more years he will be gone and the old goose will still be sitting here. That is exactly, exactly the mentality of the swamp.

It is not like on an episode of The Simpsons where they are all—six people are sitting around at a table in the old cartoon, and they are deciding what is going on. It is a bunch of unelected, arrogant bureaucrats who think they know what is best for this country.

Dadgummit, the ATF has overstepped their bounds once again. Law-abiding Americans, law-abiding citizens, law-abiding Tennesseans should not be deemed criminal because of some bureaucratic whim.

I appreciate the gentleman, thank him for his service to our country, thank him for this bill. I look forward to voting with him on this bill and being a sponsor.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) for hosting this Special Order on an important topic.

My speech is well beyond the time I am allotted, so I am just going to dispense with the notes, really, and talk about how absolutely insane, ridiculous, and unconstitutional this new rule is.

Not only has it been completely blown out of proportion what the brace is, a brace that was originally designed for disabled veterans, increases stability, and since 2015, had been ruled as an accessory by the ATF which, under their own regulations, under their own guidance, they said that they didn't have jurisdiction over accessories.

So I thought that was very interesting that now we have an unelected swamp creature, a bureaucrat who thinks that they can now make felons—law-abiding citizens, felons by now instituting this 120-day rule.

A lot of people have talked about this, but few have talked about the

economic impact this will have. Based on the NICS data that we have, this is going to be a $1.9 billion hit to the firearms industry; $1.9 billion to law-abiding citizens.

Believe me, this rule has nothing to do with gun safety. This has nothing to do with making communities safer. This is just a backroom attempt, a backdoor attempt to get at the firearm industry. That is all this is and nothing more.

□ 1845

This is why, Mr. Speaker, we have to pass the SHORT Act. This is why we have to pass the REINS Act, because the REINS Act would prohibit any regulation that has a $100 million or more impact to an industry to come back to Congress for an up or down vote.

You can fire your Congress-critter, but you cannot fire these unelected bureaucrats. We need to pass the REINS Act. We need to absolutely stop this regulation in its tracks. It is time to, once and for all, let those swamp creatures know that the Second Amendment shall not be infringed.

Mr. Speaker, thank you to the gentleman from Georgia and my friend, Mr. CLYDE, for hosting this special order on such an important topic. Most of you have likely heard about the new rule from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, that targets stabilizing braces for pistols. The rule wrongly reclassifies these braces as "short rifles," which are heavily regulated under that National Firearms Act. The final rule, published yesterday, January 31st started a 120-day clock for law-abiding gunowners to destroy, forfeit, or register their braces with the ATF. Otherwise, the new regulation will consider any unregistered stabilizing pistol brace as a short-barreled rifle and will subject the owner to penalties of up to 10 years of imprisonment, up to a $10,000 fine, or both.

This is insane and it's an infringement on Americans' Second Amendment rights through bureaucratic rulemaking.

For those who aren't familiar with stabilizing braces, these devices were originally designed with disabled veterans in mind and have been on the market for over a decade. Until last year, the ATF repeatedly stated that stabilizing braces did not convert the handguns into short-barreled rifles. In fact, they claimed going back to 2015 that braces were an accessory and therefore not subject to jurisdiction of the ATF. But Now, bureaucrats at the ATF are changing course. By changing this definition, the ATF is effectively making criminals out of millions of law-abiding Americans when they do not register by a certain date. The ATF is reversing over a decade of agency guidance and rulings on which the firearm industry and law-abiding gun owners have relied for years. The ATF estimates around three million stabilizing braces have been sold, however, a report from the Congressional Research Service puts that number much higher—between 10 million and 40 million.

If you look at just the cost—the cost of this new regulation—a rule put in place by unelected bureaucrats, this one rule will cost the firearm industry and gun owners a whopping $1.9 billion! This number was calculated by using data in NICS and industry data on the average cost of pistol braced firearms. Make no mistake. This new rule is not about gun safety. This is not about gun violence. This is a back door attempt to take down the firearm industry and make millions of law abiding citizens—felons. We must stop this unconstitutional overreach by the ATF and we will.

The Second Amendment is straightforward—the right to bears arms shall not be infringed. We cannot allow the federal government to make it harder—or impossible—for small business owners, homeowners, and law-abiding citizens to defend themselves. That is why we must pass the Joint Resolution of Disapproval for this rule, which prevents it from going into effect and prohibits the ATF from implementing a similar rule in the future. In addition, we must pass the SHORT Act, which would remove the unconstitutional taxation, registration, and regulation in the National Firearms Act of Short Barreled Rifles, Short Barreled Shotguns, and those classified as Any Other Weapons.

Finally, this is just another in a very long line of examples of why we must pass the REINS Act. The REINS Act would prohibit these swamp creatures—the unelected bureaucratic class from legislating from the agency rather than through Congress. The bill is simple. Any major rule or regulation would be required to come back to Congress for an up or down vote. Why? Because you can fire Your Congress-critter. But the big, government establishment has made it virtually impossible to fire these bureaucrats. Once passed, this rule would have never been allowed to go into effect. It's time to pass the Reins act. Time to pass the short act and protect our constitutional rights.

I am proud to join Representative CLYDE in introducing these bills, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the issue here tonight.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great colleague from the State of Florida for those encouraging remarks. I thank all of my colleagues who participated here in this Special Order tonight. It is incredibly important that we show Americans that we are united and unwavering in protecting and preserving our Second Amendment freedoms.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today after 3 p.m. on account of a family religious obligation that required his presence in the district.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Mr. JEFFRIES) for today after noon on account of official business related to the necessity of being unavoidably away in Memphis, Tennessee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–303. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Special Financial Assistance by PBGC-Withdrawal Liability Condition Exception (RIN: 1212-AB53) received January 30, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC–304. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Dishwashers [EERE-2016-BT-TP-0012] (RIN: 1904-AD96) received January 27, 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–305. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institutes of Health Loan Repayment Programs [Docket Number: NIH-2020-0001] (RIN: 0925-AA68) received January 25, 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–306. A letter from the Director, RPMS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Radiological Health Regulations; Amendments to Records and Reports for Radiation Emitting Electronic Products; Amendments to Performance Standards for Diagnostic X-ray, Laser, and Ultrasonic Products [Docket No.: FDA-2018-N-3303] (RIN: 0910-AH65) received January 25, 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–307. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Calcium Carbonate; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2017-C-6238] received January 27, 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–308. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Second 10-Year Maintenance Plan for the Indian Wells Valley PM10 Planning Area; California [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0549; FRL-8856-02-R9] received January 4, 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–309. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (21-1.5e); Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0588; FRL-8582-03-OCSPP] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received January 24, 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–310. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval;

Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky Area to Attainment of the 2015 Ozone Standard; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0949; FRL-9532-03-R5] received January 24, 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–311. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rimsulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0447; FRL-10478-01-OCSPP] received January 24, 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–312. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Malic Acid; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0305; FRL-10494-01-OCSPP] received January 24, 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–313. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Internal Network Security Monitoring for High and Medium Impact Bulk Electric System Cyber Systems [Docket No.: RM22-3-000; Order No.: 887] 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–314. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Procedures for Responding to Petitions for Rulemaking received January 4, 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–315. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's enforcement policy statement — Policy Statement on Enforcement Related to Gig Work received January 4, 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–316. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: DOD-2016-OS-0045] (RIN: 0790-AL58) received January 24, 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–317. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's policy statement — Statement of the Commission on Use of Prior Approval Provisions in Merger Orders received January 4, 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–318. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Initial Guidance Regarding the Application of the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax under Sections 55, 56A, and 59 of the Internal Revenue Code [Notice 2023-7] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–319. A letter from the Branch Chief, Legal Processing Division, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Prevailing Wage and Apprenticeship Initial Guidance Under Section 45(b)(6)(B)(ii) and Other Substantially Similar Provisions [Notice 2022-61] received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–320. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Treatment of Special Enforcement Matters [TD 9969] (RIN: 1545-BP01) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–321. A letter from the Branch Chief, Legal Processing Division, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Information Reporting of Health Insurance Coverage and Other Issues Under Sections 5000A, 6055, and 6056 [TD 9970] (RIN: 1545-BQ11) received January 24, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–322. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — TCJA Section 174 Changes in Method of Accounting (Rev. Proc. 2023-8) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–323. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Changes in accounting period and in methods of accounting (Rev. Proc. 2023-11) received January 24, 2023, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–324. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting the Office's Annual Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar Year 2022 for Employing Offices of the House of Representatives, the Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar Year 2022 for Employing Offices of the Senate, and the Report on Awards and Settlements for Calendar year 2022 for Employing Offices other than Employing Offices of the House of Representatives or the Senate, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1381(1)(1)(A); Public Law 104-1, title III, 301(1)(1)(A) (as added by Public Law 115-397, title II, 201(a)(1)(B)); (132 Stat. 5315); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

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. RESCHENTHALER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 8. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House (Rept. 118–2). 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 Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LIEU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act to expand employees eligible for leave and employers subject to leave requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the use of certain taxes and revenues; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself and Mrs. TORRES of California):

H.R. 696. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Eastvale, California; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 697. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to clarify that disparate impacts on certain populations constitute a sufficient basis for rights of action under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VASQUEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 698. A bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to authorize a study to review specific outcomes of entrepreneurial skills development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 700. A bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 701. A bill to restrict the appointment of certain military personnel to diversity, equity, and inclusion positions; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 702. A bill to protect consumers from price-gouging of residential rental and sale prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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 Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BROWN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. IVEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs that include the history of peoples of African descent in the settling and founding of America, the economic and political environments that led to the development, institutionalization, and abolition of slavery and its impact on all Americans, the exploration and expansion of America, impact on and contributions to the development and enhancement of American life, United States history, literature, the economy, politics, body of laws, and culture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 704. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BOST (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MACE, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SELF, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. CARL, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 705. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWN (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 706. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to allow households with children with chronic medical conditions to deduct allowable medical expenses incurred by such household member that exceeds $35 per month; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 707. A bill to require a study of the barriers to conservation practice adoption on leased agricultural land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 708. A bill to require the Natural Resources Conservation Service to review the national conservation practice standards, taking into consideration climate benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARSON (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MRVAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 709. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Muhammad Ali, in recognition of his contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 710. A bill to establish a national commission on fiscal responsibility and reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 711. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the short-term limited duration insurance exemption with respect to individual health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ROY, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 712. A bill to reimburse the States for border security expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 713. A bill to provide enhanced capabilities to combat transnational criminal cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ (for herself, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 714. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to extend the feral swine eradication and control pilot program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASE, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. TRONE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. NICKEL, Ms. ROSS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILD, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CHU, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. IVEY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. BROWN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. BALINT, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CROW, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 715. A bill to require a background check for every firearm sale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROSS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CROW, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LIEU, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 716. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Accountability, and 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. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 717. A bill to prohibit the removal from the United States of certain veterans, to expedite their naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 718. A bill to amend the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to include certain services in the definition of critical services for purposes of repair, restoration, and replacement of damaged facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 719. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act to prohibit neutrality agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 720. A bill to repeal the wage rate requirements commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 722. A bill to decrease dependency on People's Republic of China manufacturing and decrease migration due to lost regional economic opportunities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require States to include a photograph on electronic benefit cards issued to provide supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 724. A bill to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 725. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants to certain border communities for the purpose of reimbursing such communities for expenses related to security measures along the United States land border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN (for herself, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. MACE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 726. A bill to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to implement fertility controls to manage populations of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and to encourage training opportunities for military veterans to assist in range management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON, Mr.

COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. BUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. IVEY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. STEVENS, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 727. A bill to establish a National Council on African American History and Culture within the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 728. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program on short-term fellowship programs for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 729. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Emancipation Memorial from Lincoln Park in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 730. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 731. A bill to prohibit certain noncompete agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. POCAN (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. PORTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 732. A bill to rename the program under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CASTEN):

H.R. 733. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve mental health care for veterans through the establishment of a minimum requirement for the number of Vet Centers per State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. CARL):

H.R. 734. A bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of such Act in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 735. A bill to increase the benefits guaranteed in connection with certain pension plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WALBERG:

H.R. 736. A bill to require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 737. A bill to establish the Ralph David Abernathy, Sr. National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all direct and indirect subsidies that benefit the production or export of sugar by all major sugar-producing and -consuming countries should be eliminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RESCHENTHALER:

H. Res. 84. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BERA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H. Res. 85. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations Security Council should immediately impose an arms embargo against the military of Burma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BERA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H. Res. 86. A resolution condemning the Burmese military for perpetrating gross violations of human rights as part of its brutal campaign to suppress the democratic aspirations of the people of Burma, two years after the coup d'etat on February 1, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and 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. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 87. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. MANNING, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. NICKEL, and Ms. ROSS):

H. Res. 88. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in during Black History Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CLOUD, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. OGLES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CLYDE, Ms. MACE, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FALLON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, and Mr. HERN):

H. Res. 89. A resolution impeaching Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FALLON, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. SELF, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H. Res. 90. A resolution demanding that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H. Res. 91. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 1, 2023, as

''George Washington Carver Day''; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 738. A bill for the relief of Mykhaylo Gnatyuk and Melnik Gnatyuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 739. A bill for the relief of Tetyana Zvarychuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 740. A bill for the relief of Igor Klyuchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Family and Medical Leave

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment X to the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Aviation.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this Legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation would establish a single, unique ZIP code for Eastvale California

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this bill is:

Civil Rights

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Legislation to prohibit the sale, transfer, manufacture, and importation of semiautomatic weapons.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

a tax relief measure.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

The single subject of this legislation is:

Restricts the appointment of certain military personel to diversity, equity, and inclusion positions.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Education

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states ''[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense 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:

Second Amendment related due process rights for VA beneficiares with fiducaries.

By Ms. BROWN:

H.R. 706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To improve child nutrition.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

agricultural conservation

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Agricultural conservation

By Mr. CARSON:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This Muhammad Ali Congressional Gold Medal act will award Muhammad Ali with the Congressional Gold Medal

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 , Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishing a National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform charged with producing recommendations, subject to expedited legislative procedures, to stabilize the nation's fiscal outlook.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides Congress with the authority to ''provide for the common Defense and general Welfare'' of Americans.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Eliminate Junk Plans

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

The single subject of this legislation is:

To reimburse states for funds spent carrying out federal responsibilities.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide federal government with enhanced tools to go after transnational criminal cartels that illegally smuggle drugs and people into the United States.

By Ms. DE LA CRUZ:

H.R. 714.

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:

Feral swine

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Background Checks

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Artcle 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

-The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States;

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amendment to the definition of critical services eligible for specified recovery funding.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Allowing employers to contract with employees and labor unions as they see fit.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Repealing the Davis-Bacon law requiring the federal government to pay the ''prevailing wage.''

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Providing whistleblower protections for union workers.

By Mr. GREEN of Tennessee:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To nearshore manufacturing in the Western Hemisphere to reduce dependency on the People's Republic of China and to decrease illegal immigration.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Welfare

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

By Mr. JACKSON of Texas:

H.R. 725.

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:

Border Security

By Mrs. McCLAIN:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to implement fertility controls to manage populations of wild free-roaming horses and burros.

By Mr. MFUME:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Humanities

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, Congress has the power to ''provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United State.''

The single subject of this legislation is:

The ''Veterans Fellowship Act'' directs the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans Employment and Training to carry out a pilot program to allow states to use grants or contracts to carry out a short-term fellowship program for veterans. The pilot program would allow veterans to participate as fellows with an employer for a maximum of 20 weeks, receive a monthly stipend, and have the opportunity for long-term employment.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

to require the Secretary of the Interior to remove the Emancipation Memorial in Lincoln Park in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Law enforcement and crime prevention.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Economy

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Medicare

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 16 of section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation will is intended to bring additional mental health care for veterans through expanding access to Vet Center readjustment counseling locations.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Expanding protections for women in sports under Title IX.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To increase the benefits guaranteed in connection with certain pension plans

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 736.

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:

To require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishing an unit of the National Park System to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations through legislation.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration: Private Bill

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. PELTOLA, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 140: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 163: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 171: Mr. FINSTAD.

H.R. 208: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 234: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.

H.R. 239: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 253: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 263: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 294: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BROWN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 344: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 353: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 354: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 396: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 406: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 421: Mr. HUNT.
H.R. 432: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 451: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EDWARDS, and Ms. HAGEMAN.
H.R. 475: Mr. ALLRED, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 488: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 494: Mr. STEUBE and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 508: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.R. 525: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 562: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 563: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 566: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 603: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 613: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 644: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
H.R. 645: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 648: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 659: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 660: Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CASAR.
H.R. 670: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 676: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 683: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.J. Res. 7: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. STRONG, Mr. CISCOMANI, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.J. Res. 18: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. DELUZIO.
H. Res. 33: Ms. SHERRILL.
H. Res. 39: Mr. BABIN, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H. Res. 72: Mrs. KIM of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 29: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023 No. 21

Senate

The Senate met at 10:01 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who has guided our lives and is the author and finisher of our faith, teach us to live for Your glory. Keep us from becoming intoxicated by the desire for success and protect us from the fear of failure that paralyzes noble striving. Lord, lead us through the valley of pride and across the gorges of pretension to the richness of Your transforming spirit of love. Today, guide the Members of our Nation's legislative branch with Your wisdom. Show them solutions to the problems that beset our land and empower them with the compassion that seeks first to honor You. We pray in Your righteous 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, February 1, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK 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 MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, there is a little housekeeping, and then I will give my remarks.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 184

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for a second time.

The senior assistant 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. SCHUMER. In order to place the bill on the calendar, under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, House Republicans are struggling—struggling—to grasp a harsh reality about being in the majority. There is no good substitute for having a plan. You can't solve the Nation's biggest problems without a plan—a plan we can debate in Congress and which the American people can judge for themselves. This is especially true—especially true—when it comes to the debt ceiling.

Later this afternoon, President Biden will meet with Speaker MCCARTHY for their first one-on-one meeting of the year, and everyone is asking the same question of Speaker MCCARTHY: What is your plan? Where is your plan, Republicans? Where is your plan, Speaker MCCARTHY?

For days, Speaker MCCARTHY has heralded this sit-down as some kind of major win in his debt ceiling talks, but Speaker MCCARTHY is forgetting something obvious to everyone else: If you don't have a plan, you can't seriously pretend you are having any real negotiation.

Let me say that again because it is so crystal clear.

Speaker MCCARTHY, if you don't have a plan, you can't seriously pretend you are having any real negotiation.

Speaker MCCARTHY showing up at the White House without a plan is like sitting down at the table without cards in your hand.

And look, we know why the Speaker has struggled and is unable to produce a plan or why he is delaying it or avoiding it. He doesn't have the votes for one, in all likelihood. Some Senate Republicans want Social Security and Medicare cuts. Others want to cut the healthcare that Americans depend on

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

through Medicaid. And at least one Republican said on raising the debt ceiling: I am a ''no'' no matter what.

Speaker MCCARTHY knows that it is next to impossible to pass a plan through his own House—that he can't do that. So Speaker MCCARTHY may claim he wants to negotiate, but that is, ultimately, empty talk if the hard right has the power to reject whatever the Speaker proposes. It is a toxic dynamic that, sadly, isn't going away any time soon.

When President Trump was in office, I sat down with him to talk about the importance of raising the debt ceiling, and we didn't engage in threats or brinksmanship or hostage-taking. Instead, we Democrats presented a plan and moved forward from there. It was not easy. It took a lot of preparation and tough decision making, but, each time, we got the job done.

So one more time, House Republicans, show us your plan. You have an obligation to be transparent with the American people. If you don't have the votes to pass a plan, let's just get the debt ceiling done. If the plan involves drastic cuts to millions of Americans, then Republicans have an obligation to show the American people what those cuts are because Americans could be faced with the very painful, painful results of those proposed cuts.

Republicans owe it—owe it—to the American people. Speaker MCCARTHY owes it to the American people to stop dodging, to put pen to paper, and to explain clearly how Congress is going to ensure the United States does not default for the first time in history. We Democrats have a plan: Raise the debt ceiling without brinksmanship or hostage-taking, as it has been done before. Speaker MCCARTHY doesn't have a plan, so he is not really negotiating, and the clock is ticking.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the ERA, which is a different and extremely important matter, I want to praise and echo the words of my colleagues yesterday who reintroduced a resolution to affirm the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

The resolution is simple. It removes the arbitrary deadline for ERA ratification that was placed by Congress in the 1970s and recognizes the amendment as a valid part of the Constitution. There is no good reason why a constitutional amendment needs a deadline, especially not an amendment that affirms gender equality.

The Equal Rights Amendment has never been as necessary and urgent as it is today. The Supreme Court's repeal of Roe v. Wade reminded all of us that, even today—in 2023, the 21st century—women don't have the same fundamental rights as men. So this resolution is a terrific and necessary idea.

The ERA has been ratified by three-quarters of the States but not in the requisite time, and that is what this proposal would fix. It is very popular in the minds of the American people, and I strongly support the resolution. I want my daughters and granddaughter to live in a country where they never have to worry about being discriminated against simply because of their gender. Sadly, today, that is not the case. The ERA would fix that.

So I want to thank Senators CARDIN and DURBIN, Representatives PRESSLEY, DEAN, and BUSH, and everyone who is championing this important resolution.

ELECTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on election undermining by the Republican National Committee, one of the biggest lessons of last November was that, for all of the attempts by MAGA Republicans to undermine our elections, the roots of our democracy remain strong and run deep.

For 2 years, we heard the same thing over and over again from the MAGA brigade: that the 2020 elections were stolen, that President Biden was illegitimate, and that we couldn't trust that our votes were properly counted.

Well, Americans simply didn't buy it. They saw that the elections were fair. Some have said these were the fairest elections we have ever had. Yet, in every virtual race last fall, MAGA candidates who campaigned explicitly on denying the results of the 2020 election and overturning it were rejected by the voters. It was a good result for the country, for our democracy. Frankly, it was a necessary wake-up call for the GOP, telling them: Get rid of the Big Lie once and for all. The American people aren't buying it. Maybe a small band of extreme rightwingers is—MAGA people—but not everybody else.

It was so disturbing to read in the Washington Post that the RNC is not abandoning the conspiracy of the Big Lie so much as it is doubling down. According to reports, they are working on creating a ''permanent infrastructure in every state to ramp up 'election integrity' activities'' as a way to cater to that portion of their base that still believes in wacky election fraud conspiracies.

As a sign of how unserious this report is, the RNC also makes unfounded claims of a ''continuing onslaught of Democrat election manipulation.'' I would call it ridiculous—it is ridiculous—but it is a troubling attempt to undermine our democracy. When people don't believe the elections are on the level, that is the beginning of the end of this grand experiment in democracy that has lasted for centuries. Fortunately, the American people are rejecting it, but the Republicans that lead the MAGA wing are keeping at it.

I will make this easy for the folks over at the RNC: Undermining our elections is a losing strategy. It is a loser politically. It didn't work last year, and it is not going to work next year. For the sake of our country and the sake of the GOP, the RNC and the MAGA wing of the Republican Party need to break the election fraud echo chamber that has paralyzed their party and has, frankly, caused them to lose election after election.

GATEWAY PROJECT

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, yesterday, Mr. President, was a very special day for the people of New York. After a lot of hard work, we finally welcomed President Biden to celebrate progress on Gateway, the most important infrastructure project in America.

Anyone who knows me knows Gateway has been one of my greatest passions for more than a decade. Call it a labor of love—and it is—because I love New York. Without our tunnels, the region's economy would come to a screeching halt, and not just New York's, not just New Jersey's but the whole Northeast and eventually the whole country's.

So after many false starts and a lot of opposition, Gateway is finally full speed ahead, thanks to both the bipartisan infrastructure law and the great help and enthusiasm from President Biden.

We had a good time yesterday—the President, I, and the other Senators—because we knew we were getting something so important done. And that is why we are here. The implementation of the bills we passed last year is really vital to this country and to keeping our prosperity going and increasing.

There were a lot of smiles at yesterday's celebration. Many of us waited for years for this moment, and after a lot of persistence, we can finally say Gateway is going to be built.

Gateway is just one of the major infrastructure initiatives supported by the bipartisan infrastructure law. Just like the CHIPS and Science Act and the Inflation Reduction Act, it is beginning to pay real dividends in the form of new jobs, new investments, and prosperity. We are going to see much more of it this year and the years to come.

That is precisely what Democrats promised to do, and that is what we are delivering on.

I thank the President for helping us and celebrating with us yesterday in New York.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today, the Speaker of the House and the President will begin bipartisan discussions about the future and trajectory of our government's borrowing and spending.

It is right, appropriate, and entirely normal that our need to raise the debt limit would be paired with negotiations regarding Democrats' runaway printing and spending.

The American people changed control of the House because the voters wanted to constrain Democrats' runaway, reckless, party-line spending. The voters of this country looked at the trillions of dollars of party-line spending, the runaway inflation, and the mountain of debt, and last November they hit the brakes.

We just experienced 2 years when Washington Democrats got to set policy without negotiating, and the American people put an end to it.

Some Democrats are trying to rewrite history and pretend that Republican demands for negotiations are unusual, but that, of course, is just false.

Back in 2017, the Senate Democratic leader said the debt ceiling gave Democrats ''leverage'' in broader talks. As the New York Times explained back in 2017, then-Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leader ''began formulating a plan to apply pressure, jettisoning the idea of backing a straightforward or 'clean' debt limit measure . . . as a way to gain muscle in coming negotiations.'' That was the Pelosi-Schumer playbook for the debt limit: Demand negotiations.

Here is how the Democratic leader put it himself at the time. He said the debt ceiling ''gives another ample opportunity for bipartisanship, not for one party jamming its choices down the throats of the other.''

So I trust Democrats will be consistent with their past positions and the White House will waste no time beginning the customary bipartisan negotiations with the new Republican majority over in the House. The President of the United States does not get to walk away from the table.

The same President who happily signed off on trillions of dollars of needless party-line spending needs to begin good-faith negotiations on spending reform with Speaker MCCARTHY and do it today.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on a related matter, there are lots of egregious ways that President Biden has wasted taxpayer money trying to buy up his low approval ratings, but the Democrats' proposal for student loan socialism is really one of the worst.

It is like the Democrats paid scientists in a lab to invent the most unfair government handout that could possibly, possibly exist. Democrats want to take the graduate school loans of doctors and lawyers and white-collar professionals making six figures and put their debt on the shoulders of Americans who didn't take out loans at all.

To the middle-class families who saved, sacrificed, and skipped vacations to pay for more of their kids' college, the Democrats want to turn you into suckers.

To the plumbers, firefighters, checkout clerks, and auto mechanics who made career choices to avoid taking on debt, the Democrats think dentists and the lawyers deserve extra handouts at your expense.

To the patriots who volunteered to serve our Nation in uniform as part of a plan to attend college debt-free, the Democrats want to change the rules behind your back.

President Biden and his party wake up every day looking for ways to transfer money and power away from the working class toward elites. But even for today's Democratic Party, this one is especially galling.

This is ''reverse Robin Hood'' policy: Democrats stealing from the working class to reward people who are comparatively better off. It just isn't fair on a personal level. It is also staggeringly reckless fiscal policy.

Remember, this whole undertaking was first set up as a short-term emergency measure at the very start of COVID—those earliest weeks when the entire economy seemed to be in a free fall. That was almost 3 years ago.

Shortly afterward, thanks to the bipartisan CARES Act that came out of the Republican-led Senate, the economy rebounded. Household savings actually went up. Many white-collar professionals spent months, if not years, working remotely from the comfort of their living rooms. Any legitimate reason for pausing loan payments evaporated just a few months after it began, but the Democrats have kept it going, year after year. Now they want to magically wave away people's debts altogether. Needless to say, this would be enormously expensive for the country.

If you add up the cost of three things: the nearly 3-year-long ''pause'' thus far, the mass jubilee the Biden administration is trying to defend in court, and the Democrats' proposal to turn the income-driven payment program into permanent socialism, the total cost of these three measures is projected to hit $1 trillion—$1 trillion.

This estimate is from our colleague Senator CASSIDY, who is shining a bright spotlight on these terrible policies as the incoming ranking member of the HELP Committee.

On top of all the reckless inflationary spending the Democrats have pushed through, they want to redistribute up to another trillion dollars away from working-class Americans toward college-educated people who already earn higher salaries on average.

The Democrats want to squeeze even more money out of cashiers, welders, first responders, janitors, and cosmetologists and send it to a group of people who already outearn those people on an average basis—more reckless spending, more debt inflation, and no fairness for American families.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, finally, today marks a solemn anniversary for the people of Burma and for all of us around the world who spent years—literally years—rooting for them to make progress toward greater freedom and democracy. Two years ago, their hopes of a stable democracy were wrenched away by a brutal military coup.

To date, this takeover by the Tatmadaw, which is their army, has displaced 1.2 million people, including many thousands who have been forced to flee the country altogether.

Inside Burma, more than 16,000 people have been taken as political prisoners. At one point, the military was detaining American journalist Danny Fenster and Nathan Maung; the Australian economist, Sean Turnell; dozens of innocent children; and, of course, my friend Aung San Suu Kyi, whose latest conviction and a sham trial leaves her facing the possibility of life in prison.

Expert observers count the coup's death toll at 19,000. That includes people this illegitimate government simply executed outright, like the activists Ko Jimmy and Phyo Zeya Thaw.

Now the leaders of the Tatmadaw coup are laying out plans in broad daylight to stamp out Burma's pro-democracy movement once and for all. The military is shedding any last ounce of legitimacy it pretended to have and is now conducting airstrikes against innocent civilians.

The junta's new regulations for this year's election are designed to make viable opposition virtually impossible. No wonder the illegitimate Tatmadaw rulers rolled out the red carpet for Putin's Foreign Minister to visit Burma. Thugs recognize other thugs.

On the second anniversary of the coup, with a potentially devastating sham election on the horizon, it is absolutely vital that the United States continue our assistance to the National Unity Government and other key groups working inside Burma to protect the innocent and advance the cause of democracy and increase cross-border humanitarian aid. By our example, America should rally our partners to raise the international stakes for the Tatmadaw's continued brutality.

In December, the National Defense Authorization Act instructed the Biden administration to take several more concrete steps to bulk up American support for the people of Burma. It made sanctions on senior junta officials mandatory. It required more targeted and precisely timed sanctions against state-owned enterprises like MOGE, M-O-G-E. Finally, the NDAA also notably authorized funding for programs to strengthen federalism in and among ethnic states in Burma and for technical support and nonlethal assistance to Burma's ethnic armed organizations and People's Defence Forces to strengthen communication, command and control, and coordination of

international relief and other operations between and among those entities.

So, Mr. President, the people of Burma are fighting for the sort of future that citizens of democracies like ours enjoy: the right to self-determination. I am proud to stand behind them in this effort.

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.

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 204 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Louisiana.

EDUCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Louisiana, like all of our States, is working as hard as we can to improve K–12, elementary and secondary education. We used to have the best system of elementary and secondary education in the world. We still have the best system of higher education in the world, bar none. Kids from all over our planet want to come to America to go to college.

I know our universities have problems. We have to do a better job, in my judgment, with encouraging our universities to allow the free exchange of ideas, the dialectic through which we get the truth. I will save that topic for another day.

Our problem in America is elementary and secondary education. It is frustrating. We made some improvements, but not nearly enough. It is frustrating. Americans can do extraordinary things. Americans can unravel the human genome. Americans can take a diseased human heart and replace it with a new one and make the thing beat. Americans can send a person to the Moon and bring that person back safely. But we can't seem to teach all of our kids how to read and write and do basic math when we have 18 years to do it. I know the Presiding Officer knows what I am talking about because you, in a prior lifetime, have been in the trenches. Yes, we made progress, but it is so, so frustrating sometimes.

We have made progress. I know in Colorado, in part under your leadership—in large part under your leadership—Colorado has made strides. We made strides in Louisiana. We started—we have made efforts to improve for many, many years, but we started in earnest under a Governor in Louisiana called Governor Buddy Roemer, back in the late eighties, early nineties. I am not saying other Governors before and after Buddy didn't contribute mightily, but Buddy made education a major goal of his administration. And we have made progress, but it is fits and it is starts.

Here is our problem today. Some years ago, we started grading our schools. We graded our schools in Louisiana, our elementary and secondary school for two reasons. First, because we want education quality and, No. 2, transparency. We want parents to know where their child is going to school. We grade our schools A, B, C, D, E, F, and it is tough because everybody wants to be the best, but that which is measured gets done.

Today, we still grade our schools and we should continue to grade our schools. But here is the problem: Forty-one percent of our elementary and middle schools get As and Bs. I think that is probably pretty accurate. We are going to get that number up, those letter grades up, but about 41 percent of our elementary and middle schools grade ''A'' or ''B.'' Seventy percent of our high schools grade ''A'' or ''B.'' Something is not mentioned here. I wish I could say that 70 percent of our high schools were ''A'' or ''B'' schools, but we all know in Louisiana that they are not. If you look at our college entry scores, if you look at our ACT scores, if you look at other objective assessments, they are not in line with 70 percent of our high schools being ''A'' schools or ''B'' schools, while only 40 percent of our elementary and middle schools are. And that is just a fact. I hope there will come a time in my lifetime when I come here and say we have 90 percent or all of our schools are ''A'' or ''B'' schools, but I can't do that today. I wish I could, but I can't.

We need to look reality in the eye and accept it—not like we do in Washington, look reality in the eye and deny it. In Louisiana, we believe in looking reality in the eye and accept it. I know it is hard.

Right now, our teachers and our principals and our superintendents and our legislatures and people of Louisiana who care about education are trying to reform the system and come up with a new methodology, an objective methodology that properly grades our high schools; and it is hard. I know. I get it.

Here is the undercurrent. A lot of our teachers and our principals and our school board members are concerned that if the grades go down to reflect reality, they are going to get blamed. They are going to get blamed, and I get it. And it is wrong to blame them.

I will just mention our teachers. You know, for a kid to learn, somebody has to make him do his homework. Teachers can't do that. For a kid to learn, someone has to make that child go to bed at night and get a full night's sleep. For a kid to learn, someone has to feed that kid breakfast in the morning. For a kid to learn, someone at home has to enforce and reinforce to that child that he or she has to mind his teachers. It is called ''parents.''

In Louisiana, as in other States and as throughout the world, unfortunately, we have some parents who don't seem to care. I don't know what to do about that. I don't know why it is, but we do. And we can't expect teachers and superintendents and school board members to take the place of parents, but too often, they are blamed for all of the problems when, really, it starts with the parents. And the fact of the matter is, if a parent—if a parent doesn't love his kid—I can't imagine that, but it happens—if a parent doesn't love his kid, the kid is not going to stop loving his parent; the kid is going to stop loving himself. So I get it. We can't hold our teachers and our superintendents and our school board members responsible for fixing the impossible. We just have to figure out a way to work around it.

It is not just money. The Federal Government, State government, local government last year spent somewhere in the range of $760 billion—three-quarters of a trillion dollars—on elementary and secondary education. In Louisiana, we spent about $12,000 per year, per child. That is a lot of money in my State, given the standard in cost of living. By way of comparison, Florida spends about $10,000. It is not just money. I read a statistic one time—it is several years old. I don't know if it is accurate today or not. But I read several years ago that we spend twice as much—we, in America—spend about twice as much on elementary and secondary education as Slovakia does, yet we rank about the same. I don't know if it is still accurate, but it was then. It is not just money. It is also will. It is commitment.

I want to emphasize one more time that we need to come up with a new system that doesn't just blame the teachers and the superintendents and the school board members. I don't blame them for not wanting to be the scapegoats. About—I don't know—it was 2002, 2003, I was State treasurer. One day, I was listening in on a legislative hearing, listening to all these experts testify about how we fix these schools. There was not a teacher among them. I remember thinking, you know, I wonder how many of these folks really know what public schools are like today. So I went back to my office, and I made a phone call to these Baton Rouge Parish School systems where our State capital is located, and I said: What does it take to be a substitute teacher? They said, man, we need substitutes. All you have to do is have a college degree and go to a short orientation. We need substitutes so bad, we will take politicians. I said: Sign me up.

Every year since then, I try to do it three times a year. Sometimes I try to do it more. I have done it less this year. I will make it up this spring. I have been a volunteer substitute teacher. Every time, I insisted I really want

to be the substitute. I don't want somebody there with me. I don't want to just go and talk about how a bill becomes law. I want to be a substitute. If you do it—I encourage everybody to do it—you start about, I don't know, depending on the school, quarter to 7 and go to 2:45, maybe 3, 3:30. You have lunchroom duty or bus duty.

Let me tell you something. You are worn out. The first time I did it—I will never do this again. They gave me 11th grade chemistry. After about 2 hours—nobody told me this, I realized, man, you have got to go to the bathroom before you start class.

The next time I taught, I remember I brought a thermos of coffee because you get so tired. But my point is, after starting—I think then, we started at 8 and I went to 2:45. My plan was to go home after substitute teaching this chemistry class—my plan was to go to my office at the State Capitol there and work. I went home. I was dead-dog, down-to-the-marrow tired. It is hard being a teacher. It is hard. We have done a better job in Louisiana, with our teachers' cooperation, finding out which of our teachers can teach and paying them. And we also worked hard to find out which of our teachers can't teach and either teach them how or find a new line of work. I am not going to stand here and blame the teachers.

But I return to where I began. Seventy percent of our schools are not ''A'' and ''B'' schools. I wish they were. Some day they will be, but they are not. All I am asking today to my people back home who are listening, to the people in Louisiana who care about education—and most of them do—to our teachers, to our principals, to our superintendents, to our school board members, to our board of elementary and secondary members, to our legislators: Let's work together. Let's look reality in the eye and accept it. Let's understand that we need a new methodology to try to grade our schools. Let's look reality in the eye and accept the fact that our parents deserve to know the quality of school that their kids are attending, and let's come up with a new system that is accurate but that is fair to everybody. Let's stop blaming people and regretting yesterday and start creating tomorrow.

Because in my State—and I bet it is true in the Presiding Officer's State—the future of my State is education. It is not the price of oil, it is not the unemployment rate, it is not who the Senators are. It is education.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CRYPTOCURRENCY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before he leaves, let me commend my colleague from Louisiana. His role as a substitute teacher is one I greatly admire.

I thank you for sharing that with us today. I am sure it gives you great insight into education—greater than some—and I am going to accept your challenge and try to find a way to be a substitute teacher myself along the way, if they will have me. But thank you for that statement.

It has been almost 100 years since the Great Depression. It was a terrible time in American history. Businesses failed right and left. Families lost all of their savings. There were runs on banks, businesses failing. It was a horrible moment.

Luckily for us, the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt appeared in 1933, when he was sworn in as President of the United States, and we made some significant basic changes. One of them we still benefit from today: Federal deposit insurance.

If you go to a recognized legal bank in America, a regulated bank, under our Federal guidelines, there is an insurance policy that says that even if this bank goes bust, we are going to be there to protect much of your savings, maybe all of them, depending on how much you have invested in that bank.

We were tested during the savings and loan crisis a few decades ago, and we kept our promise. We paid people back when the savings institutions they were invested in failed.

But there are areas where you can invest your own personal savings where there is no insurance policy. You are on your own. The stock market is one of them.

By and large, when you buy stock, if you don't make money on it, that is your personal loss. But even when it comes to the stock market, the companies that are in that stock market doing business in America are largely subject to regulation. So we know, at least, that the books they are presenting have to be legal and be accurate in their disclosures. It is just the basics of government regulation.

However, there are some areas where you can bet your money or invest your money where there is no protection and no regulation. I want to speak to one of those areas at this moment. This area has been called the ''new money,'' ''digital cash,'' and some have called it ''the way of the future.'' I have another name for it: reckless, predatory, foolish, and dangerous. I am referring, of course, to cryptocurrency, the latest scam to rip off millions of hard-working Americans to the tune of billions of dollars.

In under a decade, this industry has skyrocketed in popularity, raked in big bucks for its leading speculators, before exploding into dust for all the world to see.

Let me tell you about crypto's terrible, horrible, no-good, very bad year—2022. Let's start with the most popular cryptocurrency, Bitcoin. In 2022, the currency cratered, losing more than 60 percent of its value in 1 year.

To put it in perspective, if you bought one Bitcoin at the start of 2022 and held on to it today, you would be down $25,000. Think of all the Americans who could have held on to that cash for family needs or to cover a downpayment on their first home. Their money is gone. There is no insurance. It is just an investment that disappeared.

They are not alone. The disaster began last May with a financial meltdown known as ''crypto winter.'' If you are one of the millions of consumers—millions—who were convinced by those well-respected financial advisers—Matt Damon, Larry David, and LeBron James—to buy into crypto, you don't need me to tell you what happened next.

In a matter of months, more than $2 trillion vanished from this industry. One crypto firm after another folded. Even a so-called ''stablecoin,'' which claims to offer great stability, went bust.

Then, in the fall, came the mighty collapse of the exchange FTX. Its founder, Sam Bankman-Fried, spent years cultivating the reputation of a selfless wunderkind and entrepreneur. He claimed crypto and the FTX platform would democratize finance, that he was giving a leg up to the little guy, finally, and sticking it to the barons of traditional finance.

It was all a lie. While Sam Bankman-Fried was burning millions of dollars branding himself as some noble disruptor, the reality is he was stealing his own users' money to fund his own risky bets.

Here is the worst part. For Americans who were scammed into investing in FTX, there is little hope of retrieving any of their money.

Earlier this week, Annie Lowrey wrote a piece in The Atlantic, sharing the story of one FTX user whose money was stolen. His name was Greg Sanders. Greg has actually been a crypto investor for quite a while, a pretty vigilant investor too. He even protected his assets with a technique he calls ''cold storage.''

So Greg knew about the risk with trading crypto. He knew those assets were loosely regulated, if regulated at all, and he knew about the volatility of the market. But Greg never expected that the company he trusted to safeguard his money would end up stealing it. He lost nearly $10,000 when FTX collapsed, and, like millions of others, he hasn't gotten any money back.

Here is what he said about his experience: ''FTX was legitimized in the public eye . . . I saw the Tom Brady commercials,'' Greg said. ''I saw the Major League Baseball umpires'' with FTX's name on their uniforms. ''Its name was on the Miami Heat arena. There was so much legitimatization from the public, and it lent credence to the idea that this was a safe place,'' to put your money.

Thankfully, Greg says he will be OK. He has a good-paying job and enough money saved to pay his bills.

But stop for a second and think about Americans who are not that lucky.

More than half of our Nation's families cannot afford a $1,000 emergency, and those same families, who struggle to make ends meet, have been targeted by the crypto ad campaigns Greg mentioned.

In fact, leaders of the crypto industry have explicitly marketed their products to unbanked and underbanked Americans, those who do not have access to traditional financial services.

Now, this is a problem that disproportionately affects Black and Brown Americans, who have historically been outside the financial system. So along comes crypto and its leading fabulists, like Sam Bankman-Fried. These grifters cloak themselves in the language of inclusion and accessibility, promising that crypto is open to everybody and operates ''without discrimination.''

Well, in a way, they are right. When the crypto industry melted down, everybody got hurt, especially all of the Black and Brown Americans, who were more likely than White Americans to invest in crypto. It seems the cynical ad campaigns worked.

So as a new year begins, where do we stand with crypto? The industry is hoping the dust will settle, that things will quiet down. Maybe it will even blow over, and everybody will forget the damage of 2022.

Guess again. Our Federal regulators are coming to life, and they are bringing down the hammer on crypto.

I want to commend Securities and Exchange Commission Chair Gary Gensler. He is doing his part to protect the integrity of our capital markets and to hold bad actors accountable. In the past month alone, the SEC has filed charges against two major crypto companies for burning their investors.

And there are other cops on the beat too. On Friday, the Federal Reserve rejected an application from a crypto company called Custodia for a deposit account at the central bank and denied its request to become a member of the Federal Reserve System. In denying the application, the Federal Board wrote that Custodia ''proposed to engage in novel and untested crypto activities . . . on open, public and/or decentralized networks.''

As we have learned, that would be a recipe for disaster. So I am glad both the Fed and the SEC, among others, are working to insulate our broader financial system and protect investors from the instability of crypto.

But, now, it is time for wiser minds in finance to come to their senses, and it starts with Fidelity. To think the crypto industry has entranced one of the largest 401(k) providers in the world is shocking. Yet that is exactly what happened.

This past summer, Fidelity announced it would allow retirement plan sponsors to offer plan participants exposure to Bitcoin.

Remember, Bitcoin alone lost more than 60 percent of its value last year. Now imagine if your 401(k) lived or died by the value of Bitcoin. That is unacceptable for 40 million Americans who invest with Fidelity, and I am one of them. Many of them are relying on those investments to retire in dignity.

So that is why last year I sent a letter, along with Senators WARREN and SMITH, to Fidelity CEO Abigail Johnson. We respectfully asked her to reconsider this ill-advised decision on crypto.

We received a response in which Fidelity said: ''respectfully disagree[d] with the assertion that bitcoin cannot meet the higher standards applicable to retirement accounts.''

So after the collapse of FTX, I thought: Let's send another letter to Fidelity and see if they have a change of heart.

We figured that at least diversifying from crypto would be a no-brainer at that point. Apparently not, because we still haven't received a response.

Hard-working Americans who entrust Fidelity with their retirement savings expect more. They deserve better than Ponzi schemes and endless volatility. The financial future and stability of millions of their customers—and many others—is on the line. It is time to do the right thing and be honest about cryptocurrency. There should be more transparency, accountability, and enough regulation so that we know they are telling the truth.

And let me close with one point. I was at a hearing with the Agriculture Committee where we were discussing the issue from a different perspective, whether Bitcoin and similar objects were commodities, subject to regulation by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, an Agency I know well from the financial industry in Chicago.

I left that hearing after some critical remarks about cryptocurrency, and a reporter stopped me in the hall, and she said to me: How much money have you received in political contributions from FTX?

I said: None.

She said: You are wrong. Look again.

I looked. It was over $7,000—money that I did not solicit but banked not knowing what was behind that money. We have given that money to charity, as you might expect.

But they have more friends in high places than they have really good arguments for their product.

I think that we have got to be thoughtful and mindful as politicians that this industry has a lot of money riding on this bet, and we have got to be careful that we don't become so beholden to them that we lose our clear-eyed look at an entity that has hurt so many people already and is likely to do more in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 21, submitted earlier today; that at 3:30 p.m., the Senate vote on adoption of the resolution; that if the resolution is agreed to, the preamble be considered and agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 21) supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2023, and ending on February 1, 2023, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

(The remarks of Mr. MURPHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 220 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. MURPHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

POLICE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today, the family of Tyre Nichols will celebrate the life of a 29-year-old man who was brutally killed by police earlier this month. In the wake of this tragedy, we have heard the predictable renewed calls for police reform legislation here in Congress, something that we attempted not that long ago.

In the summer of 2020, Senators from both parties introduced police reform bills after other high-profile tragedies like the George Floyd murder. Senator TIM SCOTT, on our side—the Senator from South Carolina—led those efforts. I was proud to work with him in crafting something called the JUSTICE Act, which would reform, retrain, and restore trust in America's police officers, something that I believe is very important. This package of bills included a number of initiatives to improve accountability and transparency and deliver real change to our communities across the country.

I remember, after the George Floyd murder, I asked my friends, the mayor of Houston and the mayor of Dallas, if they would assemble a group of community leaders so that I could better understand what the relationship was, particularly between communities of

color and the police in those cities. It was pretty eye-opening. While many young people and many not so young people are raised to believe that the police are their friends and people you could depend on and call if you are in trouble, in some communities, there is a lack of trust and confidence in the police because of a very different experience that they have had in those communities.

I believe there still is a broad bipartisan appetite for these types of reforms that were included in the JUSTICE Act. I was optimistic that we could, at the time, pass a police reform bill that was desperately needed, but when Leader MCCONNELL tried to bring that bill to the floor, our Democratic colleagues blocked it. That is right. They blocked it. They refused to allow the Senate to even debate or consider this legislation.

Strangely enough, this package included a bill by Senator BOOKER and then-Senator KAMALA HARRIS to make lynching a Federal crime, but they voted to block the consideration of the bill that included their bill to make lynching a Federal crime. It just didn't make any sense to me then, and it doesn't make any sense to me now.

This would have strengthened the use and accountability for body cameras—I am talking about the bigger bill now, of course—improved access to deescalation training and duty-to-intervene training, and established two commissions to give us a better understanding and recommendations on the challenges that needed to be addressed in the long run. But, as I said, our colleagues across the aisle blocked it. This important point is worth remembering now as our Democratic colleagues renew their call for police reform.

Now, in light of the filibuster of the JUSTICE Act, I introduced a standalone bill that included deescalation provisions from Senator SCOTT's legislation, and I worked with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE on a bipartisan bill that was signed into law last December. So at least that piece of the JUSTICE Act did become law. It was signed into law by President Biden.

Deescalation training is very important. That doesn't mean that rogue police officers will always follow their training. Indeed, these officers, if they were trained to deescalate these conflicts, certainly did not follow their training, and they will be held accountable, as they should be, by the prosecutors who will bring charges against them. But it bears repeating that Republicans tried to bring a police reform bill to the floor 2½ years ago, and our Democratic colleagues stood in the way.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another matter, today, President Biden and Speaker MCCARTHY will sit down to discuss options to avoid a debt crisis and rein in government spending.

The one thing that President Biden and Speaker MCCARTHY agree on is that we cannot breach the debt ceiling. I guess that is at least a start. From there, there doesn't seem to be a lot of common ground, not yet anyway. With a potential default on the horizon, this topic has gotten a lot of attention, but as we all know, America's debt crisis didn't appear overnight. It has been building for decades.

As I have said before and will say again, Republicans and Democrats have not exactly covered themselves with glory when it comes to deficit spending and increasing the debt. Washington has spent and spent with no meaningful steps to balance the budget. We are writing checks—spending money—that we know people of my generation will never have to pay back but that younger generations certainly will. That strikes me as profoundly immoral. The national debt has skyrocketed from $3.2 trillion in 1980—$3.2 trillion in 1980—to $9.7 trillion in 2000 to $31.5 trillion today.

I think it was Everett Dirksen who said, years ago, ''A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you're talking about real money.'' Nobody ever thought to use the T-word until recently.

During COVID–19, we worked together to avert a public health crisis and an economic catastrophe during the pandemic, and we did that on a bipartisan basis, but in the last 2 years, our Democratic colleagues have spent another $2.5 trillion-plus in purely partisan spending bills: the so-called American Recovery Act and the Inflation Reduction Act.

There has been more than $2.5 trillion in partisan spending, and the President takes the position that he won't even negotiate on the debt ceiling, when he is the one person whose signature is required to sign something into law. And by his signature, he has raised the debt more than $2.5 trillion in partisan spending in the last 2 years, and he won't even negotiate? It strikes me as unsustainable and certainly irresponsible.

The President was happy to take a tour across America to brag about these costly bills, but when we hit the debt limit, he is nowhere to be seen. He is pointing the finger of blame at the Republican House of Representatives and at the Speaker and suggesting that, well, if you want to cut spending, tell us where you would cut.

Let's look at spending that the President and Democrats were solely responsible for. If we could cut back $2½ trillion of spending, that would do a lot to address the current level of debt. But the President's position is, it is not my responsibility. I don't really care. And he wants to try to lay all of this at the feet of Speaker MCCARTHY. It is wildly inappropriate and irresponsible.

In short, President Biden has made clear that he expects Congress to raise the debt limit with no conditions attached, but that also means to let this runaway spending and accumulating debt continue. That is the part he doesn't say but is implicit in his position.

Republicans have made clear that his position is untenable. For one, it is a matter of financial prudence. Congress can't raise the debt ceiling just to keep spending like there is no tomorrow. We need to get government spending in check, and the best way to do that is on a bipartisan basis. But there is also a matter of practicality.

Republicans now control the House, meaning that the only viable path to success means compromise. We have a divided government—that is what the midterm elections gave us. Some of my colleagues like to say that divided government is the best time to do hard things. I think that is true, but if it doesn't change behavior, those hard things never get addressed.

President Biden can roll out as many ultimatums as he wants, but the reality is his party no longer controls all the levers of government like it has during the last 2 years. And in order to avoid a debt crisis, which he said is nonnegotiable, he is going to have to work with Republicans.

Today's meeting with Speaker MCCARTHY is a start, but at minimum, I hope the President will walk back his statement about not negotiating and understand that he has no choice but to work with Republicans, just like Speaker MCCARTHY has no choice but to work with President Biden. That is the nature of a divided government that the voters gave us with the midterm elections, and we need to get serious about workable solutions.

Secretary Yellen has said she thinks that the government will not default before June, which means we have approximately 4 months to work this out. I hope today's meeting between the President and the Speaker marks the beginning of bipartisan negotiations, and I am eager to learn more about their discussion.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SPACE SHUTTLE ''COLUMBIA'' ACCIDENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on a final matter, today marks a solemn anniversary for our country. Twenty years ago today, the Space Shuttle *Columbia* was making its return to Earth on the heels of a mission dubbed STS–107.

After 16 days in orbit, the shuttle was bound for Kennedy Space Center in Florida, where members of the astronauts' families and countless spectators gathered to watch its landing, which is always an exciting and inspiring sight.

The shuttle was traveling across the southern part of the United States, and as it crossed Texas on a beautiful Saturday morning, something terrible happened. Folks along the flight path stood in their yards, excited to watch a glimpse of *Columbia* returning from its 28th mission. They watched the orbiter streak across the sky at some 12,000

miles an hour, when, suddenly, they heard a loud noise and saw the shuttle begin to come apart.

We soon realized that the worst had happened: The shuttle broke into several pieces as it reentered Earth's atmosphere, and all seven astronauts aboard lost their lives.

The crew of *Columbia* included two Texans: Rick Husband and Willie McCool, along with Michael Anderson, Kalpana Chawla, David Brown, Laurel Clark, and Ilan Ramon. They were scheduled to land at Kennedy Space Center just 15 minutes after passing over Texas.

The disaster left a field of wreckage that stretched from Fort Worth, across East Texas, and into Louisiana. Texas is a big place, but that means virtually the whole breadth of our State was covered with wreckage.

The government, of course, immediately launched a massive search to recover pieces of the space shuttle in order to determine what went wrong. NASA officials, National Guard troops, and law enforcement at all levels began scouring the landscape to recover pieces of the shuttle. Divers from the Environmental Protection Agency led efforts to recover pieces that fell into the Toledo Bend Reservoir near Hemphill.

Some 25,000 volunteers from Texas and Louisiana helped search an area that covered 2.3 million acres. They ranged from college students at nearby Stephen F. Austin to teams of ham radio operators who helped law enforcement with communications. As Texans and Americans do, people from all walks of life came together at a time of tragedy and rallied behind a unified effort to help bring answers to a nation in mourning.

This tragedy happened just a couple of months into my first Senate term, and I witnessed this massive response effort in action.

In the aftermath, I visited an area in Nacogdoches, which is over in East Texas, where tents were set up by search teams. It was remarkable to see the dedication of men and women firsthand engaged in this effort.

Search crews battled the rain and cold temperatures as they combed through pine forests and underbrush searching for wreckage. Recovery teams and volunteers found everything from a 600-pound piece of a main engine to the sole of a spacesuit boot. These discoveries, of course, were crucial to the investigation, which helped NASA understand what went wrong and how we could prevent similar accidents from occurring in the future.

In the months and years since, the Agency underwent an extensive transformation of its culture and operations to improve the safety of future missions. Jon Clark, a former NASA flight surgeon, whose wife Laurel was killed on *Columbia* said:

> Their sacrifice has evolved into a safer space program.

Those changes are no consolation for the families who lost loved ones 20 years ago today, but I hope they can find some comfort in the knowledge that these American heroes made a lasting impact on America's space program.

I appreciate the Texans who came together in the wake of this tragedy to preserve pieces of *Columbia* and provide NASA and these families with answers that they so earnestly sought. Their efforts, then and now, have helped make the Nation's space program safer and more successful.

As we mark the 20th anniversary of the loss of *Columbia*, I am proud to cosponsor a Senate resolution to commemorate the loss of *Columbia* and honor its crew. I appreciate the bipartisan support of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have joined in this effort, and I hope the resolution will pass unanimously today.

Today, we pay tribute to seven courageous individuals who lost their lives aboard the Space Shuttle *Columbia*. We remember, we honor, and we celebrate their commitment to research, exploration, and the pursuit of the extraordinary. We honor their legacy by continuing to push the boundaries of scientific discovery and human space.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

INFLATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I rise today to discuss yet another of the consequences of President Biden's policies, and that is that prices are going up, the price hikes.

Families in West Virginia and across our Nation are struggling because the policies and priorities of these past 2 years have made essential items and goods seemingly unattainable. Whether it is gas, goods or services, energy prices, utility costs, small business expenses, owning a home, or simply affording to put food on the table, American families are squeezed at every turn.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, prices have risen 13.7 percent since President Biden took office. A recent report from the Heritage Foundation found that because of that staggering rise, the average American family has $7,400 less in their pocket at the end of the year.

This is a timely topic today because the Federal Reserve has just announced the eighth consecutive interest rate hike they have had to deploy in order to curb this administration's 2-year spending spree which is fueling our high-inflation economy. But an interest rate hike—once reserved as a measure that sends a direct signal to policymakers—is just another Wednesday in this President's America.

Chairman Powell warned last August that the continued interest rate increases and inflationary pressures would bring ''pain to households and businesses.'' And, boy, does that ring true today. Meanwhile, President Biden continues to laud small inflation changes and slowed economic growth, but he refuses to recognize his administration's role in the record-high prices that the American middle class is continuing to have to face or the further economic fallout Americans are likely to face—projected by many economists—later this year from interest rate hikes in the past year.

So let's just dive into this a little bit. Whether it is a conversation with Senate colleagues, waiting in line at a store, or a constituent calling my office, the cost of food remains a central topic of concern all across this Nation. According to the most recent reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of groceries went up 11.8 percent from the year prior. You hear about it with meat, eggs, bread, and butter—all the essentials. To add to this, the cost of restaurant purchases is up 8.4 percent. In fact, the price of every food category has continued to grow at a faster rate than its historical average.

A recent PBS analysis also points out that America's rural population is experiencing their cost of living going up faster and lingering longer than those in urban areas, and that is a factor that disproportionately impacts people in my State of West Virginia. In the words of one West Virginian who wrote in to my office, ''How are we supposed to keep our houses warm and food on the table?''

Speaking of housing, it remains unaffordable. Because of President Biden's price hikes, fixed mortgage rates rose from 3.4 percent in January of 2022 to over double, 7.12 percent, in a matter of months. The National Association of Realtors' Housing Affordability Index dipped below 100, signifying that average American families do not have enough money to qualify for a mortgage on a median-priced home. In other words, new families and hard-working individuals who made smart financial decisions with the hope of purchasing a home can no longer pursue that dream because it is out of reach; it is unaffordable.

Moving to energy—something that is absolutely central to the proud history and tradition of our State, my State—despite the recent downturn in energy prices, it can't be forgotten that Americans are still paying 30 percent more for energy, and at its peak in June of 2022, it was 70 percent more. With costs

like this becoming more mainstream—actually, gas is going up just recently—American families are having to choose again between keeping their lights on, filling their car with gas, or buying groceries.

This is not only unfair, but it is avoidable. It is avoidable for folks living in a country with as many resources as we have right here in the United States. It also shows the direct impact on our families when leaders turn their backs on American energy.

Additionally, the U.S. manufacturing industry has not been exempt from the economic woes created by this administration. The Institute for Supply Management's manufacturing Purchasing Managers Index—that is a big clump of words there—fell into contraction category in November and December of 2022. Meanwhile, despite this, President Biden has been touting a historic manufacturing boom that doesn't really exist. The reality is, U.S. manufacturers may be on their way to a recession, and the downturn will likely deepen as purchasing power decreases and interest rates continue to rise, as they did today. This further demonstrates how out of touch the administration is from the devastating reality that American businesses are grappling with.

So if you don't believe me—I hope you do, but if you don't believe me, take it from my constituents. Back home, they write frequently to express the middle-class squeeze they are feeling. Erwin from Mercer County in Southern West Virginia said that the current economic condition has created a choice for him between driving to work and feeding his family.

Paige from Buckhannon said something similar. She said:

> I have full time jobs and two children. I'm tearful because I sit here [wondering and] looking at upcoming bills and I'm having to . . . pay a bill or buy groceries.

Ronald from Cabell County, over in the Huntington area:

> How do you propose that I continue to be able to live with increasing food prices—gasoline prices—and the ever-increasing utility costs?

Jeremy in Raleigh County told me:

> My electric bill at my residence is double the cost of my mortgage every month. This is not sustainable. I will go bankrupt just trying to keep the lights on.

But this isn't just impacting Jeremy because Jeremy is a great family man and a great friend, and he is trying to help his friends, neighbors, and family pay their electric bills as well.

So I am continuously inspired by this kindness that I see and the generosity of West Virginians toward one another, but it shouldn't have to come to this.

So my question to President Biden this week is, When is enough enough? Even in areas where we have prices that are decreasing in recent months, President Biden is trying to take credit when, in actuality, prices are still much, much higher than when he took office.

Now more than ever, American families need leadership, not misleading messages and attempts to take credit when it is not deserved. American families are asking for a path out from the hole created by the price hikes my colleagues and I will continue to highlight on the Senate floor today.

With that, I see Senator HYDE-SMITH from the great State of Mississippi here to talk about, I am sure, similar issues. She has been a champion of affordability and the middle-class worker to try to help meet these very challenges that I outlined. So I welcome her.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, in less than a week, President Biden will deliver his State of the Union Address to the Nation. In the buildup to that speech, we are already seeing the President and his administration spinning a tale about just how wonderful things are in this country, particularly after they took power and racked up more than $3 trillion more in spending. Unfortunately, those tall tales do not reflect the reality for the people in my home State of Mississippi or across the Nation.

In the 2 years since President Biden took office, we have seen his administration fail the American people time and time again. Inflation was 1.4 percent in January of 2021, but the policies the President has forced on this Nation since then have made daily living unaffordable for families. Today, a strong majority of Americans—more than 70 percent—believe that the country is on the wrong track, and it is easy to understand why. Too many workers and families now live paycheck to paycheck, trying to keep the lights on, put food on the table, get gas in their cars, and stock up on everyday essentials that they have to have.

President Biden's inflationary runaway spending is a root cause of the skyrocketed prices we are paying for all goods and services. Not a single industry is spared the cost of this inflation. Since Joe Biden took office, higher prices have cost families an additional $10,000, and there seems to be no end in sight. Prices have gone up across the board to 13.5 percent, and grocery costs have jumped 18.6 percent. Just look at the price of essential staples: Chicken breast prices have gone up by 33 percent, and ground beef, whole milk, and bread have gone up by 21 percent.

Unlike President Biden, I actually have to take a trip to the grocery store to feed my family. I do all of my own shopping, and I see firsthand how these price increases affect the people of Mississippi. In the checkout line, I have watched a mother forced to put something back on the shelf after realizing that she can't afford everything in her cart. I have seen a retired husband grabbing only the barest necessities for the week. Up and down the aisle, as I push my buggy, the conversation is constant on ''Can you believe how much the price of groceries has increased and how expensive it is?''

It breaks my heart to see the individuals in my community and the Nation struggling to get by. It shouldn't be this way, but in Joe Biden's America, you are forced to weigh priorities on buying groceries, prescription medicine, or putting gas in your car.

When it comes to energy prices, the hardship continues for many Americans. This pain is 100 percent self-inflicted by the Biden administration's stubborn refusal to maximize American energy production. According to census data, about 22 percent of American households could not pay their energy bill last year. When families were actually able to pay, they had to sacrifice other necessities, such as groceries, their medicine, or their gasoline.

This winter isn't bringing any relief either. Compared to last winter, the average household will spend upwards of 28 percent more to heat their home with natural gas, according to the Energy Information Administration. Electricity rates are also expected to continue to rise due to lower domestic supply of liquefied natural gas as well as labor shortages and the cost of materials. But this should come as no surprise since the attack on American energy began on day one of the Biden Presidency. In fact, this administration's regulatory overreach also contributes to rising costs across our economy.

Despite record-high prices, Joe Biden wants to further regulate the agriculture industry. The Food Safety and Inspection Service, for instance, is studying line speeds of poultry plants with the ultimate goal of just slowing them down, which will affect costs and supplies in the grocery stores. In addition, the EPA recently unveiled its new waters of the United States rule, which will further hamper the ability of farmers to grow food because the Federal Government will have the ability to regulate ditches and low spots on private land.

It is a basic fact that it is expensive to comply with overly burdensome regulations. The Biden administration's desire to overregulate everything makes it seem as if the President wants Americans to struggle to afford food.

Madam President, the American people are smart, and they understand when things aren't going well.

The rosy stories the White House will barrage us with before the State of the Union Address won't change the fact that the American dream seems further from attainable for hard-working families because we just cannot afford Joe Biden.

My colleagues and I want to get our economy back on track to relieve the financial stress that families are experiencing. We must stop the irresponsible government spending, unleash

American energy production, cut regulations, and embrace pro-growth commonsense policies. The American people deserve that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am pleased to rise today and join my colleagues from West Virginia and Mississippi, and I join them to, once again, call attention to the disastrous effects of President Biden's price hikes and his policies.

Americans are facing soaring inflation that has not been seen in generations. Price increases families are seeing at the grocery store, at the pump, in monthly electric bills, and for basic housing needs have far outpaced wage gains and left Americans struggling to make ends meet.

The numbers speak for themselves. In 2022, annual average inflation reached 8 percent, the highest level in 40 years. Rather than working to solve the problem, the Biden administration seems set on making it worse. You don't need to look any further than your kitchen to find the latest example.

In 2022, the food-at-home price index, which measures grocery prices, rose 18.6 percent—18.6 percent—reaching heights not seen since the Carter administration. This rise in food prices is directly related to increases in the cost of production faced by our hard-working farmers and ranchers.

These increases are driven by the Biden administration's continued regulatory overreach, failure to empower our domestic energy producers, and failed economic policies. Our producers are facing increased prices for diesel fuel, fertilizer, and for crop protection products, and more. New regulations from this administration threaten to drive up the cost of production even further.

The recently published ''Waters of the United States,'' or WOTUS, is a prime example of regulations that will stifle our agriculture and energy industries and make inflation worse. Instead of this disastrous rule—this WOTUS rule—we should take a States-first approach to protect our land and water that respects private property rights. This comes on top of the administration's misguided approach to domestic energy production, which has caused us to increase our reliance on foreign energy suppliers, which has increased the price of the gallon of gasoline by more than $1 since the administration took office—more than $1 a gallon.

We should be empowering our domestic energy producers, including those in my State of North Dakota, to restore our energy independence, reduce our reliance on foreign oil imports, create more jobs here at home, and help reduce prices for consumers. We need to unleash America's vast energy reserves. That is the right solution to lower prices and help provide hard-working families and businesses relief from the record inflation that has been caused by the policies of the Biden administration.

The Biden administration needs to stop doubling down on failed economic policies. The administration needs to get government out of the way and focus on the fundamentals. That includes increased domestic energy production, securing our border, and taking meaningful action to reduce inflation.

I yield the floor.

S. RES. 21

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the resolution designating January as ''National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month.''

I am proud to introduce this resolution every year to raise awareness about the ongoing atrocities of human trafficking. We must continue to support the ongoing partnerships between governments, nonprofits, service providers, and survivors, who are all working to end human trafficking.

The human trafficking industry generates an estimated $150 billion in illegal profits a year. And human trafficking impacts 50 million victims around the world. Many of the victims of human trafficking are often difficult to identify and are subjected to manipulation, force, fraud, and abuse. We cannot turn a blind eye to ongoing exploitation and forced labor in our country and throughout the world. We have a responsibility to raise awareness of these horrendous acts, ensure victims understand that they are not alone, and provide legislative solutions to support and protect survivors.

Last Congress, I was able to work with my Senate colleagues to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. By designating January as ''National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month,'' we will shine a light on the issue and continue the bipartisan charge to end trafficking and exploitation.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON S. RES. 21

The question is on adoption of S. Res. 21.

Ms. SMITH. Can we have the yeas and nays, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hagerty	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Romney
Booker	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Braun	Hirono	Sanders
Britt	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Coons	Luján	Tester
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Markey	Tuberville
Cramer	Marshall	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Mullin	Welch
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fetterman	Ossoff	Young
Fischer	Padilla	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Murkowski	Rubio	Wyden

The resolution (S. Res. 21) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Under the previous order, the preamble is agreed to and the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to celebrate the success of the Affordable Care Act. We just completed the open enrollment period for 2023. Over 16 million Americans signed up for health coverage under the Affordable Care Act. That is about a 100-percent increase from the first year's enrollment in 2014. In less than 10 years, we have doubled the number of enrollees under the Affordable Care Act.

It has contributed to a substantial reduction in the number of uninsured, which, in and of itself, is an important goal in healthcare. Uninsured individuals have less ability to access quality

care in this country. That is something we all need to be concerned about and do our best to make sure everyone has access to healthcare.

But they also contribute to what is known as cost-shifting, and it causes a dislocation of healthcare facilities in the proper locations in our community. It also makes our healthcare system less efficient. If an individual does not have coverage for preventive healthcare and diseases are discovered later, it makes it more expensive and less likely a successful result.

We all can celebrate the numbers but recognize we also are taking a big bite out of the uninsured medical population in this country. My numbers in Maryland are very impressive: 180,000 Marylanders enrolled in our State insurance exchange under the Affordable Care Act. That is, by the way, for minorities, a 9-percent increase in the Hispanic population and a 3-percent increase in the Black population. We are committed to eliminating health disparities in America.

There are many provisions in the Affordable Care Act. I want to mention one I am particularly proud of because I had something to do with its creation, and that is elevating the National Institutes of Health with the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities. We made it a full Institute under NIH. We set up an office for minority health within the Health and Human Services Agencies. We did this so there would be a focus on dealing with the systemic challenges we have to medical care in this country. And the research that is being done by the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities is cutting edge on reasons why we have disparities in this country, and it is leading to corrective action being taken.

I will just give you one example: NIH UNITE Program, which deals with incentives to create a more diversified workforce in healthcare, which is critically important to access, as well as to make sure that clinical trials include all of our population so that the results are meaningful for all communities in America.

The results that we have been able to move forward in bridging the disparities for access to healthcare in America, all this has been done under the Affordable Care Act.

But we didn't stop there. We recognized we had to improve the Affordable Care Act. I am very proud of the leadership of President Biden and the Democrats in our initiatives under the American Rescue Plan and the Inflation Reduction Act. We enhance the subsidies to make it affordable for all Americans to be able to purchase their insurance through the health exchanges. We made that a commitment so every American could have access to affordable, quality healthcare.

We need to make those enhancements permanent so we still have work to do. I want to thank our colleague Senator SHAHEEN for her leadership in legislation, which I strongly support, that would make the enhancements in the subsidies under the Affordable Care Act permanent so that we can keep having these impressive numbers of Americans enrolling in health insurance.

Americans are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act, not just in having comprehensive, affordable insurance coverage but also the quality of that coverage. No longer do they have to worry about exclusions for preexisting conditions. It wasn't too long ago that just about everyone in this country was concerned as to whether their insurance coverage would cover their entire healthcare needs because they had a prior episode sometime in their life. Women were concerned whether childbirth was a preexisting condition. Well, we eliminated that fear with the Affordable Care Act in that insurance companies cannot exclude coverage or limit coverage based upon preexisting conditions.

And as you recall, the leading cause of bankruptcy in America was unpaid medical bills. But under the Affordable Care Act, we eliminated lifetime and yearly caps on the coverage that you have—again, helping American families deal with their healthcare needs.

There is still more to be done. I want to acknowledge that. We need to do some things.

I want to say, first, that I was pleased that under the Inflation Reduction Act, we were able to reduce the cost of prescription drugs. Insulin, starting last month—January—was limited to $35 a month. That was a game changer for millions of Americans to know they have an affordable supply of insulin to deal with their needs. That has already taken effect. And included in the Inflation Reduction Act will be a cap on Part D out-of-pocket expenses of no more than $2,000 a year. So we are also capping today the unlimited exposures seniors had on prescription medicines.

I must tell you, we passed legislation—as I think everybody here is aware of—under the Inflation Reduction Act, to start, by 2026, doing something that most Americans would be shocked that we are not doing today: negotiate prices with the pharmaceutical industry, using our market share to bring down the cost of medicines so American consumers are not gouged compared to the international marketplace. Starting in 2026, we will have negotiated the price, starting with the 10 most expensive drugs in this country.

I want to mention an area where I think we need to do more. I have been very much engaged in oral healthcare. Most people know that when I came to the Senate in 2006, a year later, Deamonte Driver, a youngster in Prince George's County, lost his life because he couldn't get access to oral healthcare. I made that a crusade with my former colleague, the late Elijah Cummings, in trying to do something about that. I am pleased that both the Affordable Care Act and the Children's Health Insurance Program require coverage for pediatric dental care. That is a step in the right direction, but we haven't completed the needs that are out there.

If you neglect your oral healthcare, you are likely to be neglecting your general healthcare. It is an area where we can prevent a lot of illness and problems. Most dental problems are preventable if you have access to dental care.

I have introduced legislation that would remove any annual or lifetime limit on oral healthcare under the Children's Health Insurance Program, the CHIP program. I want to thank Senator STABENOW for joining me in this effort. To me, this is something that is very consistent with the Affordable Care Act, and I hope that we will be able to get that passed.

But we also have to expand coverage. Medicaid coverage for dental care is primarily determined by the States, and many States limit coverage to emergency dental care, which means people, many families, can't afford their normal checkups for the adults who are in the family. We must do better as a nation. We need to expand Medicaid to cover oral healthcare. And for the 37 million seniors who are on Medicare, many cannot afford their dental annual visits. We need to expand Medicare to cover dental care as well. I want to thank my friend Senator SANDERS for his leadership, also, on that particular issue. The bottom line: Let us all work together so that we can achieve the goal of the Affordable Care Act. We have achieved a great deal to date by the passage of that bill, but we still need to do more to make sure healthcare is a right and not a privilege and that every American has access to affordable, quality care. Working together, we can achieve that goal.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, let me begin with a simple statement which I hope every Senator in this body agrees with: that the United States of America pays its bills on time.

We have since our Nation was founded. We never default on our debts. We always pay what we owe. We honor our financial obligations to all Americans and all those who invest in the American economy. And because we pay our bills on time, the United States has earned a reputation as a reliable, credible, and trustworthy partner around

the world, and that helps every single American and our entire economy.

Now, as everybody in this Chamber knows, in order to maintain the full faith and credit of the United States, we have to raise the debt ceiling. And this is not about new spending. This is about paying the bills that are already due and already owing under the laws that we have already passed in this country and that have already been signed by Presidents of both parties.

When Donald Trump was President of the United States, Republicans voted with Democrats to raise the debt limit three times, and the U.S. Congress has raised the debt limit a total of 78 times since 1960, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents.

If the Government of the United States had failed to raise the debt ceiling in the past, we would have faced an economic catastrophe. Think about it this way: You wouldn't just wake up one day and decide not to make your mortgage payment or not to make your car payment. You pay what you owe. It is as simple as that.

And you know that, if you were to wake up one morning and say that you are not paying your mortgage or you are not paying your car payment, you will face consequences. If you don't pay your mortgage, you could have your home foreclosed on. If you don't pay your car payments, your car can be repossessed.

The same logic applies to the U.S. Government, but the consequences are not confined to just one individual or one homeowner or one car owner. If the United States fails to pay its bills on time, every American—everyone inside this room and everyone outside this room—will suffer the consequences. We are not talking about risking foreclosure on one house or losing one car. We are talking about the economy of our country grinding to a halt. If the United States stops paying our bills, our economy takes a nose dive. It is as simple as that.

When I talk to my colleagues here on the Senate floor, both Republicans and Democrats, they agree that it is a no-brainer. You pay what you owe. You raise the debt ceiling. You don't default. It is common sense.

In fact, I was listening just the other day to Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL, who said:

> America must never default on its debt.

He said that a few days ago. I agree.

But across and on the other side of the Capitol, in the House of Representatives, Speaker MCCARTHY and the new majority, composed of some very rightwing and extreme Members, are taking their orders from former President Donald Trump, the same Donald Trump who as President signed three debt limit increases into law. Now he wants Republicans to use the debt limit as a club against President Biden.

House Republicans are stalling our efforts right now to pay our bills on time, even though they know—just as Senator MCCONNELL knows, just as every Senator here knows—that failing to do so would result in chaos and calamity for the country. It is a threat designed to force the rest of the U.S. Congress into enacting an extreme rightwing agenda.

So let's be very clear. Here is what House Republicans are saying. They are saying: You do what we want or else we will tank the American economy.

I think anybody hearing that proposition would recognize it for what it is—a form of economic terrorism. But MAGA Republicans are holding the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to impose their agenda on the American people. They have decided to politicize what should be a nonpartisan issue because Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate have voted for programs to require us to raise the debt ceiling in the past.

In fact, I think it would be important to know that we would not be here at this time, on the Senate floor, having hit the debt ceiling and trying to work to make sure we avoid actually going over the cliff—we would not be here—if it was not for the tax cuts that were passed during the Trump administration. We would not be here at this particular moment. And, in fact, 25 percent of the total national debt was accumulated during the Trump administration—25 percent of the total debt of the United States, during the Trump administration.

Now, I want to be clear, I am not saying this is all Republican debt, but it certainly is not all Democratic debt. This is the debt of the country. This is the debt owed by Uncle Sam.

And what does the Constitution of the United States tell us about how we treat America's debt?

Well, here is the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution right here, and what it says is this:

> The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for the payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.

The Fourteenth Amendment passed shortly after the Civil War, and it is crystal clear that the obligation to pay America's debts is not a Democratic obligation; it is not a Republican obligation. It is an American obligation, and beyond being the right thing to do, it is in the Constitution of the United States. It is a national duty and a constitutional duty.

So, as I listen to Speaker MCCARTHY and his Republican House colleagues, they want us to ignore the Fourteenth Amendment. They want to impose their reckless policies on the rest of us under threat of our doing what they want us to do. So I do want to be clear about what the consequences of this would be.

I talked in general terms about economic catastrophe. Here is what it would mean. It would mean seniors going without Social Security benefits. It can mean troops going for weeks or even months without pay—the men and women in uniform who are out there protecting our country. Medicare may not be able to cover the costs of a doctor's visit. Those are just some of the governmental functions that could come to a grinding halt if we don't pay our debts on time, and we don't know the full extent of what would happen because, as I said, we have never been there before. This is uncharted territory.

Economists estimate a very dire toll: 3 million jobs lost; $130,000 added to the cost of your average 30-year mortgage. I want everyone to hear that. The mortgage costs for homeowners would go up. And, of course, as the mortgage costs for homeowners go up, the value of everyone who has already got a House also goes down. Retirement accounts in free fall, skyrocketing borrowing costs on car loans, and we would be hit by this catastrophe just as we are recovering from the economic hit we took during the pandemic. And it would trigger an increase in costs just as we are beginning to turn the corner on inflation.

So why would anyone do this? Why would someone threaten to do this?

I have been listening very carefully to Speaker MCCARTHY and Republicans in the House, and they say that they want to reduce the deficit and the national debt. That is what they say, but this is one of those situations where you always say: Watch what they do, not what they say.

The reality is that Republicans, through their actions and their records, don't care about the deficit and the debt. That is not their priority because, if they really cared about the deficit and the debt, they would not have passed the 2017 Trump tax cuts without a plan to pay for them—a tax cut, by the way, which disproportionately benefited the very, very rich and big multinational corporations—because that tax cut, that giveaway to the very wealthy and big corporations, it increased the deficit by $2 trillion over 10 years, added to our national debt.

As I said, we wouldn't even be here today, at this point in time, but for the fact that Republicans increased the deficit by $2 trillion. By the way, that is not my estimate, that $2 trillion. That is from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

And if Republicans really cared about reducing the deficit and debt, they could have joined us, just last year, when we closed a number of loopholes for big corporations, a measure that reduces the deficit by $238 billion over the next 10 years. That is something Democrats did. We didn't have a single Republican vote here in the Senate or in the House for that.

And if Republicans really cared about reducing the deficit and debt, the Republican-controlled House of Representatives would not, as one of their very first measures, have passed a law

to slash the funding that the IRS desperately needs to enforce the law against wealthy tax cheats.

Let me say that again. They cut the moneys that the IRS needs to enforce current tax law against very wealthy Americans and big corporations that are not paying what they owe today. They are getting away with cheating on their taxes, and Republicans cut the money that the IRS needs to go after them. And this is very explicitly, as the Secretary of Treasury said, talking about Americans who earn more than $400,000 every year, including lots of multimillionaires and billionaires in the country.

So when you say the IRS can no longer have the funds to go after wealthy tax cheats, what happens? You collect less revenue from very wealthy people. And what happens when you collect less revenue from very wealthy people? You increase the deficit. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that the action the House already took would increase the deficit by over $114 billion. This is from the Republicans in the House who are now threatening the United States not pay its bills, claiming that they care about the deficit and debt, when one of the very first actions that they took was to increase it. So that is just not the case. Their actions indicate that they don't care about the deficit.

What is it really about? So what Republicans are really after is attacking critical investments that support the American people and that help strengthen our country. As one Republican strategist, Grover Norquist, once said, it is about shrinking the government down to the size where you can ''drown it in the bathtub.''

This House Republican majority is desperate to cut and decimate programs that Americans need and that our future requires. So, for example, they want to cut some of the new initiatives we undertook to supercharge American innovation. We passed legislation, the CHIPS and Science Act, designed to maintain our technological edge over China and others. They want to cut it. They want to roll back investments that we made that are already bringing more high-tech manufacturing jobs back to the United States. We want to ensure those manufacturing jobs. They want to continue to offshore those good jobs. They want to cut investments we are making in clean energy that will help us fight the climate crisis, strengthen the American workforce, and, yes, also help us better compete around the globe, where China has a huge headstart when it comes to things like electric batteries. They want to cut Pell grants, which help millions of Americans pursue a college degree. They want to cut investments we are finally making to modernize our national infrastructure—something that was very bipartisan here in the U.S. Senate. That is important for our roads, our bridges, our transit systems, our ports, our airports. They want to cut it. Some are talking about cutting Medicare and Social Security.

That is just a partial list of what the House Republicans are threatening to do, and they are saying that if we don't all agree to that, they are not going to allow the United States to pay its bills on time.

The bottom line here is, when you look at the Republican playbook, it is cutting investments that are important to the American people and important to the success of our country while pushing for more tax cuts for the superwealthy. This is not a new movie; this is a rerun; this is trickle-down economics. It is the same old playbook, and here they go again.

But here is the thing: We have been here before. Some of us were here when this threat was last made. I vividly remember the year 2011. It was another moment when the Republicans were fresh—fresh—after winning a majority in the House of Representatives. I was in the House at the time. Then, as now, the Republicans said they really cared about the deficit and the debt. Then, as now, they threatened that they wouldn't pay the bills on time. They wouldn't vote to pay the country's bills on time.

I remember back then that we sat down with them in good faith. President Obama tapped Vice President Biden to lead the budget negotiations, and a small bipartisan and bicameral group of us was selected to try to hammer out a plan. I was part of those discussions. They took place just off the floor here, down the hall, less than 15 yards away. We worked week after week after week, and we negotiated to try to hammer out an agreement.

But here is what became very clear: The Republican objective then, as now, was not to reduce the deficit and the debt. The Republican objective was simply to cut investments in important areas. They didn't want to raise one penny—not one dime—to reduce the deficit or debt by closing tax breaks for very wealthy people. That was then. This is the same story today.

If you look at the list of things they did back then—no cutting tax breaks for the wealthy, cutting important programs, including Medicare, were very much part of their agenda—we got very close to tripping over the final cliff of the debt ceiling. Like today, we had already hit the debt ceiling, and the Treasury Department was taking extraordinary measures to prevent us from actually defaulting on our debts. In fact, we got so close to actually not paying our bills on time that the S&P downgraded America's credit for the first time in our history. They said: You are getting very close to the place where creditors of the United States aren't going to anymore support the United States. They are not going to buy U.S. bonds. In fact, interest rates began to creep up just because of that when we got so close to the cliff. We came very close to going over that waterfall and crashing the economy.

So many of us learned a valuable lesson that day. I learned it, and I know that then-Vice President, now-President Biden learned it, and that is that you don't negotiate over whether or not the United States pays its bills on time, because all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, have an obligation and a responsibility to do that.

We also learned something I want to be equally clear about. We are not against negotiating about the budget. We are happy to sit down anytime with Republican colleagues and the Speaker of the House to negotiate all aspects of the budget. We can talk about spending levels, and we can talk about revenue levels. In fact, we have a budget process here. If Speaker MCCARTHY and his colleagues want to do this under the regular process and do it in a bipartisan way, they have to pass a budget resolution. They outline where they want to make cuts. I don't expect them to outline any proposed increases in revenue, but that is the place they would do that. Then we will have a debate. I serve on the Senate Budget Committee. I would look forward to that. I do look forward to that. I serve on the Appropriations Committee where we decide on expenditures. That is the forum for negotiation.

The Democrats are for negotiating on the budget. We welcome that. Then the American people would see exactly what everyone's budget priorities are. They would see that the Republicans want to protect tax breaks for the very wealthy while they want to cut investments that are very important to middle America. They would see all of that during the budget process, but they want to short circuit that process. They, instead, want to say that they are not going to vote to pay our bills on time unless we all agree to their radical agenda. We are saying we are happy to negotiate—let's have a budget negotiation—but the negotiation isn't that you get everything you want in exchange for the Democrats' joining you to vote to pay our bills on time.

We didn't do that when President Trump was in office. As I said, we voted three times to raise the debt limit. We didn't say: You have got to accept all of our proposed efforts to get rid of tax breaks for the very wealthy. Yet what they are saying is that we have got to accept their approach to deep cuts to important investments in order for them to do what all of us have an obligation under the Constitution to do, which is to pay our bills on time.

So I hope all of us will do the simple thing—mandated in the Constitution—as Americans, not as Democrats or Republicans. As Americans, let's pay our bills on time, and let's not crash our economy. Yes, as part of the normal budget process, let's have a conversation about spending and about revenue, but don't do it while, at the same time, you are saying you are not going to let the United States pay our bills on time.

As I said in my opening remarks, we have always paid our bills on time. If you don't do it, really bad things happen to all Americans. So let's get that done, and then let's have our conversation about budget priorities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Texas.

CHINA

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a gross miscarriage of justice—the imprisonment of Mark Swidan by the Government of China and the Chinese Communist Party.

Mark is from Luling, a small city in my home State of Texas. His mother, Ms. Katherine Swidan, still lives in Luling, while Mark eventually became a resident of Houston, my hometown. For over 10 years, Katherine has been waging a desperate battle to see her son again.

In 2012, Mark traveled to China on a business trip, which turned into a nightmare. On November 13, 2012, Mark was abducted by China's Public Security Bureau while he was taking his family back home. A witness to the abduction has said that Mark was detained because Chinese officials wanted to view the contents of his cell phone.

Mark was accused of being a part of a criminal conspiracy with 11 other individuals to manufacture and traffic drugs—charges that Mark has denied and which have been debunked over and over again.

Chinese authorities tried to coerce Mark into confessing. He refused, and he pleaded not guilty in a trial that occurred in November 2013. During the trial, the prosecution didn't produce any forensic evidence to back up their allegations, and no drugs were found on Mark or in his hotel room. Records in Mark's passport showed that he wasn't even in China during the time of the alleged offenses, and the 11 other individuals indicted in relation to this alleged drug conspiracy couldn't identify Mark. Nevertheless, outrageously, in 2019, a Chinese court sentenced Mark to death.

Mark remains unjustly detained today. He is suffering in a Chinese prison right now, as we speak. In prison, Mark has been kept in deplorable, abusive conditions. His jailers seek to break his will and break his faith. They have confiscated his Bible and his rosary. Mark's cell exposes him to extreme heat and extreme cold. He is deprived of sleep and subjected to physical abuse. He is in danger of high blood pressure, skin infections, and asthma. He has lost more than 100 pounds. His health is dire. Throughout all of this, Mark has been denied access to his family and access to American diplomats.

Mark has communicated with his mother, and his mother has told me and told the world that the Chinese communist government has failed to break Mark's faith, which remains strong.

I spoke with Mark's mother earlier this week. This is a mom whose heart is breaking. This is a mom who wants to see her son again. This is a mom who wants to hold and hug and care for the son she loves.

The treatment of Mark has been atrocious, so much so that even the United Nations has called on China to release him. The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention—a U.N. group of human rights experts who investigate cases of arbitrary detention around the world—found that Mark is being held in violation of customary international law and international norms, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The world can see that the Chinese Communist Party is trying to use hostages and hostage taking as a tool of statecraft. The Chinese Communist Party says they want to be taken seriously as a great power and a great nation, and they say they want to be respected on the global stage. But their treatment of Mark is not how great nations and great powers behave; their treatment of Mark is how third-world despots act.

I have drafted and this week introduced a resolution calling on the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communist Party to immediately release Mark. I am joined by my colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, and by Representative CLOUD from Texas in the House, who has introduced the same resolution in the House of Representatives. This resolution not only calls for Mark's immediate release, it also condemns China for withholding from Mark access to his family and to proper medical care.

Furthermore, it calls on the Biden administration to prioritize efforts to secure Mark's release, both in their conversations with Chinese diplomats and in international forums. In a few days, Secretary of State Blinken will be in Beijing, and he will have an opportunity to finish the final chapter of this tragedy. I am calling on the Biden administration to use all of the tools at our disposal to secure Mark's release, and I am calling on the Government of China to finally release Mark.

This ordeal has to end. It has to end for Mark. It has to end for his mother. It has to end for his family. We must and will do more so that Mark can come home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDING THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT TO FIX A TECHNICAL ERROR IN THE DEFINITIONS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 223, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 223) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to fix a technical error in the definitions.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 223) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.

Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (58) as paragraph (59);

(2) by redesignating the second paragraph designated as paragraph (57) (relating to the definition of ''serious drug felony'') as paragraph (58); and

(3) by moving paragraphs (57), (58) (as so redesignated), and (59) (as so redesignated) 2 ems to the left.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 11) designating the week of January 22 through January 28, 2023, as ''National School Choice Week''.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 11) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 23, 2023, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CONGRATULATING THE SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY JACKRABBITS ON WINNING THE 2023 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 22, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 22) congratulating the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits on winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 22) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 214 AND S. 219

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 214) to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

A bill (S. 219) to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

MORNING BUSINESS

RECOGNIZING THE ARKANSAS MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. COMMISSION

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and congratulate the Arkansas Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission's 30th anniversary.

For three decades, the Arkansas Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission has worked to promote and preserve the life and legacy of Dr. King in The Natural State and advocate the principles of nonviolence and equality among all citizens.

Dr. King devoted his life to pursuing equality and fighting injustice. His leadership of the civil rights movement ushered in a turning point in our country's history. His vision and influence will forever be part of America's identity.

Arkansas's MLK Jr. Commission works year-round teaching about the life of Dr. King and encouraging us all to take action to improve the lives of others. Through programs devoted to empowering individuals and communities, it has made a positive difference and inspired the next generation of leaders.

The commission organizes a number of community outreach projects that help further education, foster appreciation of history, and encourage youth to engage in positive leadership development right in their own neighborhoods and beyond. Notably, it hosts one of the largest national celebrations and day of service events in recognition of Dr. King.

It has been praised by Dr. Bernice King, daughter of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as one of the most active commissions in the country. In 2017, the group hosted what was coined a MegaKing Fest that emphasized a theme of ''Passing the Torch'' of the civil rights icon's legacy to future generations.

I am pleased to congratulate the Arkansas Martin Luther King, Jr. Commission on this milestone of 30 years of service to our State. Dr. King's legacy and mission live on through its efforts and we are proud of what it represents and the impact is continues to make.

TRIBUTE TO LON PRIBBLE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize the dedication of an exemplary civil servant, Mr. Lon Pribble, on the occasion of his upcoming retirement. Lon Pribble began his service to the Nation as a cadet in the U.S. Military Academy in 1979, serving as a military officer until his first retirement at the rank of lieutenant colonel in 2005. However, as a dedicated, energetic individual, he could not stay away from Army service for long. He soon began supporting the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, also known as ERDC, as a contractor analyst. In 2010, Lon became the director of government and legislative affairs for ERDC as a civil servant. My staff and I have had the pleasure of working with him ever since. In his role, Mr. Pribble has communicated the Army's emerging research priorities as well as how my constituents at ERDC help meet the needs of American warfighters. His deep knowledge of key legislative issues and advice to Army leaders and Members of Congress alike positively impacted the Army's interests with Congress. He has kept us informed about facility improvements, changes in the workforce, and partnerships that ERDC is developing throughout Mississippi and the rest of the Nation.

Part of the legacy Lon Pribble leaves at ERDC is an enhanced capability to meet critical Army research needs. He did this through his work supporting facility upgrades, such as construction of the Fragmentation Research Laboratory, the Target Preparation Facility, and the Supercomputing Research Center. Through these efforts and many others, the four ERDC laboratories in Vicksburg have become world-class facilities, and I am proud to represent them. While I am particularly grateful for his work in Mississippi, I know that he similarly supported improvements to the Army's research and development capabilities in other locations across the Nation. These efforts include a new annex housing researchers who study military beach operations in the Outer Banks of North Carolina, and an expansion of the Permafrost Research Tunnel near Fairbanks, AK, which is improving our understanding of the Arctic terrain. During his tenure at ERDC, Lon Pribble's experience in facilities led him to become a resource to the broader defense research enterprise by chairing a government panel charged with assessing defense laboratory infrastructure issues.

Lon Pribble is an outgoing personality and was instrumental in making connections for industry and academic partners across the State and the Nation to help carry out ERDC's mission. I have appreciated his efforts to ensure that partnerships between ERDC and Mississippi universities continue to grow, advance the science and technology to meet Army needs, and develop a diverse student talent pool experienced in Army priorities.

For these efforts, Lon Pribble has received numerous civilian recognitions in addition to his former military awards, including twice receiving the Commander's Award for Civilian Service in 2016 and in 2020. These honors recognize that Lon Pribble has embodied the Army's ideal of selfless service as both a military officer and a civilian. I join my constituents in thanking Lon Pribble for his commitment to our State and the Nation and wish him a happy retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN HEUPEL

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the honor of recognizing Justin Heupel of Flathead County for his dedication to his students and passion for advancing agriculture education in Montana.

Originally from Culbertson, MT, Mr. Heupel first joined FFA as a student in 1988. His passion for farming and ag took him to Montana State University where he received a degree in agricultural education—''Go Cats!'' He has served Montana as an educator for 27 years and has spent the last 19 years teaching at the H.E. Robinson Agricultural Education Center in Kalispell, where he also serves as a faculty adviser for FFA.

Mr. Heupel has been instrumental in improving and expanding ag education

in our great State. He served as president of the Montana Association of Agricultural Educators and advocated for the Advancing Agricultural Education in Montana program that helped create over 25 new agriculture education programs in Montana schools and provided funding to improve the quality of existing programs. Recently, Mr. Heupel received the National FFA Organization's highest degree recognizing him for his exceptional service to agricultural education.

Teachers serve an important role as they shape the minds of young Montanans and help prepare them for future careers. Montana has a rich legacy of agriculture, as it is the primary driver of our economy. There is no doubt that Mr. Heupel's passion for teaching about agriculture helped encourage young Montanans to pursue careers in this important field. In fact, nine of his former students have gone on to become agricultural education teachers themselves.

Passionate educators like Mr. Heupel help make Montana a better place and give students the tools they need to be successful. It is my honor to recognize Mr. Heupel for his devotion to shaping the next generation of Montana ag leaders and keeping Montana's rich legacy of agriculture alive. Keep up the great work; you make Montana proud.●

REMEMBERING QUINCY RAMON NELSON-SWEATT

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of Quincy Ramon Nelson-Sweatt of Rineyville, KY, who passed away Friday, September 2, 2022, at his home, surrounded by his closest family and covered in love.

Quincy was born 9 years ago today, on February 1, 2014, to Timothy Sweatt and Natalie Nelson in Elizabethtown, KY. He was a student at Rineyville Elementary School, where he was in the third grade. He chose to be extraordinarily positive in the midst of the most challenging time, bravely facing diffuse midline glioma, a terminal cancer of the brain and spinal cord.

He never lost his sweet smile that could put anyone at ease—or the way his copper-brown eyes could light up the whole room. He always took such pride in his appearance. From his haircuts and sun-kissed curls to his outfits, he always loved to look his best. Quincy was truly beautiful both inside and out.

Before the date of diagnosis, November 11, 2021, he was a perfectly healthy, active, fun-loving little boy. Within 10 months, he underwent emergency surgery to try to remove the tumor, which was unsuccessful and left him a quadriplegic; he also had 55 rounds of radiation to his brain and spinal cord, along with trying multiple chemotherapy drugs.

He endured the toughest days with grace and positivity that was unmatched. He exhibited such joy, which was undeniably shared with anyone in his presence. Whether he was singing and dancing to his favorite songs or snuggling with his mama or his cats, Sprinkles and Peaches, he knew how to savor the time he had.

His love for life is indescribable. His list of loves was long and as big as his heart. He loved cars, trampoline jumping, singing to his jams, dancing, playing with his cousins that were like siblings, farming, running outside, and time with his family and friends. His favorite hobbies were singing and listening to music, baseball, go-cart riding, swimming, and playing outside. He was passionate about it all.

Quincy was an empathetic and intuitive old soul that made everyone around him feel special and loved. If you ever need inspiration, meditate for just a minute on his life and the love he shared and choose to live with love.

Quincy was preceded in death by his paternal grandmother Gwendolyn Sweatt. Quincy is survived by his parents, Timothy Sweatt and Natalie Nelson; paternal grandparent, Timothy Buckler; maternal grandparents, Byron and Mary Nelson; aunt and uncles on his father's side, Frederick Sweatt, Freda Sweatt, and Stephen Buckler; on his mother's side aunt and uncles Erin Riffle (Jason) and Clint Nelson; his cousins on his mother's side Ava, Caleb, Hudson, and Charlotte Riffle; and his cousins on his father's side Dallas, Rashaud, and Nia Sweatt.

Quincy will live in the hearts of his family and will be missed more than words could ever describe. Happy Birthday, Quincy.●

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST JUDGES

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, since 2010 I have sponsored a State of the Union essay contest for Vermont high school students. This contest gives students in my State the opportunity to articulate what issues they would prioritize if they were President of the United States.

This is the contest's 13th year, and I would like to congratulate the seven volunteer judges who helped choose the contest winners and finalists. The contest relies on its committed team of judges. The judges take time to review each essay and evaluate the diversity in writing that engages students and will benefit them for years to come. The judges' willingness to participate in this project reflects their dedication to both the students and our state, and for that, I graciously thank them.

The judges include:

Andrew Chobanian of Oxbow High School—participant for one year

Lauren Conti of Stowe High School—participant for one year

Jason Gorczyk of Milton High School—participant for ten years

Krista Huling of South Burlington High School—participant for ten years

Mary Schell of White River Valley School—participant for one year

Sarah Soule of Middlebury Union High School—participant for five years

Terri Vest of Twinfield Union School & Vermont Virtual Learning Collaborative—participant for thirteen years

I am very proud to enter the State of the Union Essay Contest judges into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to recognize their contributions.●

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY WINNERS

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, since 2010, I have sponsored a State of the Union essay contest for Vermont high school students. This contest gives students in my State the opportunity to articulate what issues they would prioritize if they were President of the United States.

This is the contest's 13th year, and I would like to congratulate the 382 students who participated. It is truly heartening to see so many young people engaged in finding solutions for the problems that face our country. To my mind, this is what democracy is all about.

A volunteer panel of Vermont educators reviewed the essays and chose August Howe as this year's winner. August, a junior at Twinfield Union School, wrote about the impact of misinformation on our society and our democracy. J Lahue, a freshman at Burr and Burton Academy, was the second place winner. J wrote about how to address political polarization. Keenan Wallace, a junior at Twinfield Union School, was the third place winner, with an essay on unions and labor rights.

I am very proud to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the essays submitted by August, J and Keenan:

WINNER, AUGUST HOWE, TWINFIELD UNION SCHOOL, JUNIOR

This past Sunday, January 8th, 2023, rioters stormed official capitol buildings in Brazil. The incident parallels in many ways the January 6th attack on the U.S. capitol, the two-year anniversary of which had passed just two days prior to the Brazil riot. Both events were caused, in part, by misinformation campaigns waged primarily on social media platforms. Both instances are extreme examples of what can happen when misinformation forces people into action against problems that don't exist. Both instances are proof as to why the rise of misinformation and fake news on social media is one of the major problems facing our country.

The past 25 years have seen the rise of the internet and subsequent social media platforms. Starting out as a place to connect with people on a personal level, these platforms have grown to dominate the online landscape and now serve as many people's primary source of information. They have strayed from their original purpose, developing into money generating machines that rely on user's constant engagement. Tapping into people's psychology is the main way social media platforms and those on it obtain such participation, and unfortunately, negative and emotionally-manipulating content is what gains the most attraction. As a result, social media platforms breed negativity, division, and ultimately, distorted opinions that turn into mis- and disinformation and fake news on just about every subject out there.

The solution to such a problem is complicated and far from perfect, but there are still a few options. Social media platforms are essentially news sources at this point, yet they are not held to the same legal standards. News sources are liable for the content they release, social media platforms, however, are exempt from such liability by Section 230, a law passed by the U.S. Congress that protects all providers and users of interactive computer services from liability for the content on these platforms, regardless of whether it is true or false. Originally created to protect internet user's speech, Section 230 now enables people to exercise their freedom of speech and introduce mis- and disinformation into the media stream without consequence. By repealing Section 230 and holding social media companies responsible for the content on their platforms, we will hold them to the same standards as established news outlets, and force them to do more to stop the spread of misinformation on their platforms.

Equally as important as holding companies accountable is encouraging the education of the general public on media literacy and critical thinking skills to identify misinformation and fake news. An educated population is essential to a well-governed population, and that education must now include media literacy. Programs should be implemented in schools, starting as young as elementary students, to teach how to identify fake news and be media literate.

Regulating social media platform like standard news outlets, and educating the general population are the best ways we can defend our country's democracy from the threat of misinformation in social media.

SECOND PLACE, J LAHUE, BURR AND BURTON ACADEMY, FRESHMAN

Political polarization, or the divergence of political beliefs away from the center towards ideological extremes, is a prominent problem and a threat to democracy. Americans continue to create more divides between people who have opposing views, and the result, an astounding lack of empathy plagues our country. The 2019 government shutdown and the violent January 6th insurrection were both major consequences that stemmed from political polarization. This rise of extreme ideologies can be attributed to various factors, such as media partisanship, hostility between political opponents, and economic inequality. These factors then lead to congressional gridlock, lack of trust, an increase in violence, and, most importantly, a lessened sense of community. But, there are steps that, if taken, could stop polarization at its roots.

To solve political polarization, I propose a new bill, titled The Unity Act, to address the underlying problems. This bill would create forums to unify people and cultivate common ground by promoting dialogue and understanding and addressing economic inequality. While political polarization is a scary threat to democracy and the Nation we live in, we can bridge the divides with the following measures.

The first way the bill would eliminate polarization is by targeting economic inequality. By increasing the minimum wage to just 10 dollars and 10 cents, around four million people would be taken out of poverty. Similarly, investing in education, especially Pre-K, would improve economic mobility. Furthermore, The Unity Act would expand the Earned Income Tax Credit to bring children above the poverty line. These reforms would solve economic inequality, a major cause of extreme ideologies because inequality leads to social divisions.

With the investment in education, the bill would also encourage middle schools to teach media literacy and how to differentiate between fake and factual information. Teaching this important skill at a young age would lessen the negative effects of misinformation. The bill would also recommend schools teach tough topics to create more dialogue and thus reduce the risk of extreme partisan views.

While these reforms would address the underlying problems, the major initiative would target polarization through Citizen Assemblies. Citizen Assemblies would be held in the counties of each State monthly. They would bring people together to speak about divisive issues that need to be addressed. Assemblies would select participants in the same way as jury duty so they could engage in political deliberation with their ideas directed towards the State and National Government. These assemblies would effectively establish common ground to reduce extreme partisan views.

In conclusion, political polarization is an increasing problem that undermines democracy through issues like lack of trust and a lost sense of unity. By correcting economic inequalities, bettering the education system, and introducing Citizen Assemblies, polarization can be slowly eliminated. If passed, The Unity Act would create a bridge to improve the welfare of American citizens by cultivating common ground. Especially as newer and more partisan issues emerge, it is imperative that we strive towards a more cohesive Nation by addressing political polarization.

THIRD PLACE, KEENAN WALLACE, TWINFIELD UNION SCHOOL, JUNIOR

One of the most pressing issues facing our society today is the issue of labor rights. Recently there has been a slew of confrontations between workers and corporations, from Starbucks and Amazon to the threatened rail strikes earlier this year, 2022 has been tumultuous. The way that each of these confrontations were negotiated either within the corporation or, in the case of the rail strikes, by the United States Government sends an important message, our workers' rights are not the priority.

In November of this year Starbucks employees organized a walkout at more than 100 Starbucks locations in protest of Starbucks repeated refusal to negotiate contracts with labor unions. Many workers cited being underpaid, understaffed and overworked. But Starbucks has been adamant in their anti-union stance, giving pay increases selectively to locations that had not voted to unionize, firing union organizers, refusing to negotiate contracts with union representatives, and taking steps to prohibit union elections at its stores. Unfortunately, this union busting attitude is not exclusive to Starbucks. At Amazon, one of the world's largest corporations, the same issues repeat themselves. Low pay, oppressive and, at times unsafe working conditions, as well as aggressive anti-union policies are also apparent there.

Earlier this year the 12 largest rail unions threatened to strike in protest of low pay and a lack of paid sick leave. Because of the massive economic impact, a strike like this would have the US government stepped in. In November President Biden brokered a deal between the major rail unions and the rail corporations. This deal promises a 24 percent wage increase over the next five years, but it critically lacks any guaranteed paid sick days. This lack of sick days led four of the 12 major unions to reject the deal. Despite this Biden stepped in and asked Congress to impose the deal onto the Unions, disregarding their decision. This sets a precedent for corporations like Starbucks and Amazon to disregard labor unions.

The framework for the solution is already in place. The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is an agency that was created to enforce the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). This agency is responsible for helping organize unions and they step in when corporations violate the NLRA. Unfortunately, the NLRB is tremendously underfunded and since 2014 it has received no budget increases, resulting in an effective budget cut of more than 20 percent due to inflation. Additionally, under the Trump administration the agency's leadership was gutted, further challenging the fight for unionization. Under Biden the NLRB's performance has increased, but it is not enough. By increasing the NLRB's funding, its ability to organize unions, achieve justice for wronged workers and keep corporations in check would increase dramatically.

Increasing funding for the NLRB is a simple, low cost solution to a problem that has plagued the American working class for decades. A stronger NLRB would not only be a boon for workers, but also a valuable tool for the government to check the ever-increasing power that corporations hold over our democracy.●

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST FINALISTS

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalists' essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the 13th Annual State of the Union Essay contest conducted by my office.

The material follows:

FINALISTS

JACOB ANTONOVICH, BELLOWS FREE ACADEMY FAIRFAX, SENIOR

My grandfather, Robert Antonovich, got drafted into the Korean War where he served in the Army. At the present moment he lays dying, at home, and without much dignity. My grandfather is in dire need of hospice as he goes through his last stages of life but at 88, he is unable to afford privatized healthcare and my grandma (aged 90) is of little help. Fortunately, as a result of my grandfather's service he is entitled to receive benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). What upsets me is that where a privatized hospice service could be there in 24 hours, after almost two weeks, the VA is still unable to get anyone there to help my grandfather walk through his last life with the dignity he deserves.

Beyond my grandfather, millions of Americans who put their lives on the line to serve this country are stuck without much dignity. According to the National Coalition for the Homeless; between 130,000 and 200,000 veterans are homeless on any given night which represents between one fourth and one fifth of all homeless people. After putting their lives on the line, why are so many veterans being dumped on the streets in such poor conditions? Many of these problems could be fixed by providing proper funding and ensuring that the security of veteran relief organizations is a top priority. For instance, of the $300 Billion budget for the VA only about one percent was spent on homeless care programs. The VA's budget is even less for community care, which covers hospice services. Based on the 2023 Budget submission for the VA, less than .0004 percent of the budget was allocated to community care. To make matters worse, hospice care is only a portion of that already small percentage leaving very little money to help those in need.

The poor treatment of veterans is a major problem in this Nation. To fix this, I suggest

that more money be allocated to these specific areas of the VA as to ensure that no veterans are left homeless, and that all who served have a chance to live the remainder of their lives in dignity rather than the abject squalor that many are forced to live in today. I am still hoping that the VA will be able to get hospice care to my grandfather before it's too late, but with how a large portion of veterans in this Nation are currently being treated, I'm not so sure. I hope that through the hard work of our Nation's legislators, no veterans will ever be left behind like the thousands of veterans who are homeless today or my grandfather who is yet to receive the care he needs at a price he can afford.

ANDREW BARRETT, OXBOW HIGH SCHOOL, SOPHOMORE

Mental Health America (MHA) unveiled in 2019–2020, that ''20.78 percent of adults in America were experiencing a mental illness.'' Mental health awareness is a minuscule topic compared to most political conversations, but it cannot be disregarded. Millions of American citizens face mental illness; most go without treatment due to the expense and shortage of mental health professionals. Mental health is prominent in society, and its awareness needs improvement. What is the solution? Increased funding for mental health care, and early schooling on mental health is crucial for advancement.

Lately, due primarily to the pandemic, there has been a spike in mental illness. Mental illnesses like depression can disrupt people's capacity to function, whether at school, work, home, or social life. As of 2020, 12.1 million adult Americans experienced profound thoughts of suicide. Additionally, MHA states, ''half (54.7 percent) of adults with a mental illness do not receive treatment,'' and ''59.8 percent of youth with major depression do not receive any mental health treatment.'' Mental illness can lead to substance use disorder, proving hazardous to those suffering from mental illness and potentially to others around them. Society needs to be a safe place where individuals are comfortable and capable of seeking support.

The leading solution to the mental health crisis is better funding for mental health care. Funding would come from America's military spending. According to World Population Review, America has the highest military budget and is greater than the following ten countries combined. There is a shortage of mental health specialists, and seeking aid is unaffordable for most. A large portion of adults (42 percent) with a mental illness ''reported they were unable to receive necessary care because they could not afford it,'' according to MHA. Therapy and care are too expensive for most people, proving problematic in overcoming mental illness. Therapy presents a sense of hope. Dr. Lloyd Sederer, a psychiatrist, states, ''When there is hope, there is reason to participate in treatment, to learn to manage the disease, and to reach for life when faced with setbacks.'' Altogether, funding for treatments and mental health care would help reduce the mental health emergency in America.

Along with funding for mental health care, social standards need to change. There cannot be a stigma around mental illness. People should feel comfortable and aware of mental illness. Education on the matter is critical to accomplish this because mental illness is real. If taught the subject at a young age, people are provided awareness, and they will feel comfortable seeking help and helping others.

Mental health is an immensely influential element of every person's life.

ALEXANDER CALIFANO, CRAFTSBURY ACADEMY, JUNIOR

In recent months, the Supreme Court has been at the center of American political debate as it prepares to rule on a number of crucial cases. Among these is Students for Fair Admission vs. Harvard in which the Court will decide the future of affirmative action.

In 1964, the Civil Rights Act was signed into law by Lyndon Johnson, legalizing affirmative action in the United States with the goal of preventing discrimination in hiring practices. This protection was later extended into the realm of college admissions. The ability of universities to use affirmative action as a tool to level the playing field for historically disadvantaged groups is now in jeopardy. Those who oppose affirmative action argue that by favoring historically disadvantaged groups, universities discriminate against other groups. That is simply untrue. The goal of these practices is to promote student diversity, which benefits all of us by expanding our intellectual horizons and inviting us to view the world from new perspectives. The diversity that affirmative action policies foster is responsible for spreading knowledge of and empathy for people from all walks of life and all races and cultures. If the Supreme Court outlaws affirmative action, it won't just be historically disadvantaged groups that will be hurt. We would all suffer by losing an invaluable part of the educational system.

To prevent the Supreme Court from restricting the range of educational opportunities available to racial groups already struggling to make their way in this country, Congress should make good on its endless promises to help Americans by taking concrete action. This year, the Respect for Marriage Act codified the right of individuals to enter into interracial and same-sex marriages, protecting them from the caprices of the Supreme Court. Congress should similarly codify affirmative action policies. Such codification would ensure that affirmative action can fulfill its intended purpose of advancing historically disadvantaged groups while, at the same time, giving America's future leaders a chance to interact regularly with students who represent the diversity of knowledge, beliefs, opinions, and ethnicities that make American universities the best in the world and which have made this country strong. Furthermore, by allowing policies that help historically disadvantaged groups succeed, we will be living up to this Nation's founding ideal—the notion that all men are created equal. We can help make that dream a reality by reversing the effects of race-based prejudice, discrimination, and violence.

If the Supreme Court decides to end affirmative action, Congress must move to protect the rights of educational institutions to craft admissions policies that would ensure that applicants aren't punished for their race, ethnicity or lack of resources and that future generations of students aren't deprived of the diversity of thoughts, opinions, and ancestries that have made America such a powerful force for good.

LEAH KUHNERT, WOODSTOCK UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

Climate change is perhaps the most unavoidable issue facing our world today, yet is often pushed off by lawmakers worldwide in favor of other issues. Although fixing climate change is a complex task, addressing environmental impacts by sector is an important step towards taking much-needed action before the effects of climate change are irreversible. According to the EPA, agriculture accounted for 11 percent of US greenhouse gas emissions in 2020. This is why, as a country, we must take action to decrease industrial agriculture and turn towards regenerative farming techniques.

Governmental subsidies are what currently drives the dysfunctional system of industrial agriculture. The Agriculture Act of 2018 section 1202 outlines the crops eligible for governmental subsidies, which include ''. . . wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, upland cotton, long grain rice, medium grain rice, soybeans, designated oilseeds . . .'' etc. These subsidies have effectively supported the growth of specialized farms that mass produce only one of these crops. The problem with this is that over-tilling and a lack of crop diversity in these industrial farms destroy the health of the soil. This renders ineffective the natural process of carbon sequestration that relies on healthy soil, contributing considerably to climate change.

An essential step that can be taken is to re-evaluate how subsidies are used and how they impact the environment. These subsidies have created a system that primarily benefits commercial agribusinesses in the long run. Meanwhile, it disadvantages small farmers who raise a diverse range of crops and livestock. When prices for industrially produced foods are driven down by subsidies, small farmers are forced to lower their prices in response, causing losses in revenue. It isn't necessary to get rid of agricultural subsidies altogether, but it's critical to change how they're used. Instead of offering permanent funds to artificially prop up monoculture, subsidies should be used as a specific and short-term tool to support farmers in switching to more regenerative and diverse crop production.

A study by the University of Vermont found that regenerative farming methods, such as rotational grazing, crop rotation, and cover cropping result in the sequestration of atmospheric carbon, unlike specialized farming methods. Regenerative farming techniques contribute to a more sustainable agricultural system while also helping mitigate the effects of climate change.

Switching to regenerative farming practices also makes economic sense. By growing a more diverse selection of crops, farmers are less vulnerable to revenue loss in cases of a failing crop. Additionally, regenerative methods allow farmers to do more with less land, which means spending less money on farmland. Effective land use increases the health of the soil and extends the lifetime of the farmland, and the rotation of crops and livestock ensures a more sustainably symbiotic system. Regenerative agriculture will contribute to the stability of farmers in America, while also reforming the food economy. Most importantly, this change will help to mitigate the imminent destructive effects of climate change that we're facing now more prevalently than ever. It's time to end our subsidy system that rewards irresponsible and unsustainable farming.

ELLA MATTEI, NORTHFIELD MIDDLE & HIGH SCHOOL, FRESHMAN

It is a basic human right to have access to healthy, affordable food to create the best future possible for future generations. Food accessibility is getting worse and worse each year, even in a farming State such as Vermont; food is getting more expensive to transport creating a higher price. This inevitably causes problems for people with a low income to have access to healthy food. Food deserts are an increasing problem in poor neighborhoods and towns, and they don't have enough money to fix them. Food deserts are generally associated with low-population areas, abandoned or vacated homes, high unemployment- rated areas, or less-educated people.

Food deserts are more common in Black neighborhoods according to a 2014 study from Johns Hopkins University. They found that black and urban areas have a severe lack of supermarkets while white areas had the most and mixed-race areas were a mixed bag.

The idea of people not getting their basic needs met because of a characteristic of them such as their skin color is mind-blowing. America claims to be a great country but won't feed people because of the color of their skin. More than 39 million people in America suffer from hunger each year and about 9 million of them are children. In America, we are supposed to protect our citizens and the fragile minds of our youth. Instead, there are children starving and we have not made much progress to solve this nationwide problem. Here in Vermont, 1 out of 4 people know somebody facing food insecurity, and 2 out of 5 Vermonters are facing food insecurity personally.

To fix food insecurity, we must invest our Nation's resources to support healthy food access to all populations. 60 years after LBJ's War on Poverty, it is embarrassing that the richest Nation on Earth, which feeds other countries, could possibly have people starving. If the government were serious, it must invest in local community-based solutions. Urban farms in places like Detroit should be a model for the rest of our country's food deserts. Creating food-sharing programs, and making more Federal food assistance programs should also be a priority for this new Congress. They should also create more food pantries where people can donate food.

Many people would argue that it would be too expensive to fix this national crisis because it would cost around $37 billion a year until 2030, but America is the wealthiest country in the world and if we can afford to have the most nuclear weapons when each weapon costs $8.4 million, we are capable of feeding our citizens. Everybody deserves a chance at being fed.

LEILA MCMILLIAN, SOUTH BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, FRESHMAN

Equality, respect, and understanding are things that everyone deserves even, if not especially, those who are psychologically or physically different. People with disabilities or neurodivergence are often ridiculed or avoided because they process and navigate the world around us differently. It is my opinion that if other people actually understood more about what it is like to be different than a ''normal person'', then they might sympathize more and bullying or other mistreatments might become less of a problem.

According to an NPR article; ''A new study suggests that nearly a third of children and adolescents with disabilities has experienced violence—defined as physical, emotional or sexual abuse as well as neglect. It's everything from being struck or verbally attacked by a family member to cyberbullying. And they're reportedly twice as likely to experience violence as young people without disabilities.'' Because of the greater likelihood of being bullied for being different, people might be less inclined to say anything if they need help for fear of being ridiculed. A person might hide their actions or needs to fit in with ''normal'' people, but if they really need help and are too afraid to ask for it, then serious problems like fights or school shootouts could break out more often.

People with neurodivergence or disabilities are often seen as abnormal and people make such a big deal out of their differences that it pretty well separates them from the rest of society. According to NPR; ''A tremendous number of kids are affected. An estimated 291 million children and adolescents—slightly more than 1 in 10—have disabilities such as hearing or vision loss, epilepsy or intellectual disabilities.'' Our kids should not have to be the subject of other's disgraceful humor, or be the butt of their jokes. They should be able to grow up in a world that accepts people for who they are, not what they are or what other people think they are. They should have equal chances to work in good jobs as any other person, because they are people too and should be treated as such. Some people might not see the problem as it is though, people all over the world have been accused of witchcraft because of their differences, or have been called cursed. ''It is not an easy issue.'' Says Fran Kritz, a health policy reporter based in Washington, D.C. ''We're talking about something that has multiple causes and can't be treated with a vaccine or intervention. We have to create new social norms and educational, social service, health and other systems that prevent and respond effectively to violence against children with disabilities. We need to ensure that systems are sufficiently supported financially and that personnel have ongoing training.'' We are people too and we all deserve equality and respect as anyone does.

ALAINA ROGERS, BELLOWS FREE ACADEMY FAIRFAX, JUNIOR

The gun violence epidemic is an extremely serious issue facing America today, and it continues to get worse. According to the CDC and Pew Research Center, 45,222 people lost their lives to gun violence in 2020, which is the most recent year for which complete data can be found. As I have grown up, I have seen the number of gun violence stories hitting the news increase year after year. I have watched my school crack down on safety and lockdown procedures. I have been repeatedly made aware of the threats local schools have had to deal with in recent years, and I have seen the strain that gun violence has put on our country while nothing is done about it. Gun violence has been a prominent issue in America for many years, and it is only getting worse. It is time for us to take action.

There are steps our Federal Government can take to prevent gun violence. Common sense gun laws that limit access to these deadly weapons are crucial to ending this crisis. Universal background checks must be strengthened, and the loopholes that allow private sales, transfers of guns from one person to another, and sales of firearms at large gun shows to bypass background checks must be closed. According to FBI records, more than 300,000 illegal firearm sales were blocked by background checks in 2020. Background checks are effective when they are conducted and have earned bipartisan support from the vast majority of Americans. Eighty-eight percent of Americans support universal background checks. However, these background checks can only truly protect us if they are required at the Federal level for all firearm purchases and transfers.

In addition to strengthening universal background checks, assault rifles and high-capacity magazines must be banned at the Federal level. These weapons are designed with the purpose of killing other human beings and have no place in American society. Assault rifles and high-capacity magazines have the capacity to kill many people quickly, making them highly dangerous. There was a Federal ban on the sale and import of assault weapons from 1994 to 2004, and studies show that mass shooting fatalities were 70 percent less likely during that time. A ban like this must be reinstated and the prospect has received bipartisan support.

Gun violence is a very complex issue. Many things need to happen to truly ensure domestic tranquility. However, the first and most crucial step is to enact common sense gun laws, and we must take action quickly. 2022 was a challenging year for both our country and the State of Vermont in terms of gun violence, with both the Buffalo and Uvalde mass shootings and skyrocketing crime rates in the Burlington area. As we wait to solve this problem, tens of thousands of people lose their lives every year. It is imperative that we take action, to protect our current generation and ensure that future generations grow up feeling safe and secure in their communities and their country.

HANNAH SMILEY, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL, SOPHOMORE

365 days. 648 mass shootings. 44,208 people dead due to gun violence this year alone. No family has been left untouched by the immense harm caused by gun violence. Everywhere we go, we live in constant fear of being attacked or losing someone we love. It has changed the way we as Americans live our lives. This isn't the so-called ''American dream'' so many speak of. In fact, gun violence has stripped the most important part of our Constitution from us; our right to live.

Our country has become, dare I say, accustomed, to gun violence. Some may even call it our ''new normal''. We're almost numb to the constant news of shootings all over the country. It seems as though we can't escape it, now more than ever. Pew Research Center states that since 2010, the number of total gun violence deaths has increased by 43 percent. These deaths include suicide, mass shootings, and homicide. When looking at these statistics, we often fail to realize that these ''statistics'' are actually real people. Real families. Real lives.

In order to see the full picture of gun violence, it's important to hear stories from survivors themselves. In a 2021 interview, Ashley, a Sandy Hook shooting survivor who was only seven at the time of the widely known school shooting, claims to have PTSD from this event. She said, ''It was just a whole lot of anxiety that I had never felt as a 7-year-old. I had hardly even felt sadness . . . It kind of made us realize that the world's not all sunshine and rainbows, I guess.'' Ashley's story is heartbreakingly terrifying, yet it's not unique. Her story sounds like countless others who've described similar feelings of anxiety and trauma. Survivors feel as though they can't escape the terrors. How can we, as human beings, continue to let innocent people lose their lives to gun violence?

There are several solutions to the issue of gun violence in the US, the main one being stricter gun laws. For example, Japan, a country with one of the lowest gun violence rates in the world, has issued strict gun control laws. The process of purchasing a gun in Japan is both time-consuming and expensive. Those interested in purchasing a gun must undergo a multi-step process consisting of a gun safety class, recurring written exams, mental and physical health checks, an extensive background check, and gun storage inspections. According to The New York Times, in 2020, around 192,000 licensed firearms were purchased in Japan, which is fewer than the number of registered guns in Alabama. For context, Japan's population is roughly 20 times Alabama's population. America's obsession with guns has triggered an epidemic of hate and violence.

We must act on the issue of gun violence by issuing and enforcing stronger gun control laws to make our country a safer place for everyone. This solution is vital to American life as we know it.

JOSHUA STEARNS, HANOVER HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

The most basic tenet of our democracy is that politicians are chosen by the people. First observed in 1812, gerrymandering has allowed politicians to define their districts to choose their voters, overriding the will of the people. Districts are as old as our Nation and play an instrumental role in who victors

up and down the ballot, thereby defining our communities. With the Nation more polarized than ever, gerrymandering has become increasingly ambitious in the past decade.

In the Constitution, the framers stipulated that ''the Number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty Thousand,'' but today the average congressional district has 747,184 constituents. The Permanent Apportionment Act of 1929 capped the number of representatives at 435. Since then, the population of our country has nearly tripled, causing an explosion in the number of Americans per congressional district. Beginning in 1967 with the Uniform Congressional District Act, every State was mandated to conduct elections for the House of Representatives using single-member-districts (SMDs). This requirement normalized gerrymandering as politicians throughout the country manipulated boundaries to select their voters and maximize their chances of victory in subsequent elections.

SMDs empower politicians of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, to gerrymander. Gerrymandering can be clearly observed after the 2020 redistricting in Democratic-controlled States like Illinois and Republican-controlled States like Wisconsin. Gerrymandering directly influences many of the important issues we face today, from abortion to gun control to climate change. While both parties gerrymander, it has tended to skew elections towards Republicans nationally, particularly because district manipulation in Southern States results in the disenfranchisement of people of color, one of Democrats' most important voting blocs. In Georgia, where Senator Raphael Warnock won a majority of the vote in 2022, Democrats won only 35 percent of the State's U.S. House seats. In contrast to SMDs, multi-member-districts (MMDs) combined with proportional representation award each party a certain number of seats based on the percentage of the votes garnered. Using MMDs, Georgia Democrats would have been awarded about half of the U.S. House seats. Such is the case in many States. This representation discrepancy caused by gerrymandering could have wildly changed the outcome of the 2022 elections.

This method by which we select those who represent us in the peoples' house, intended by the founders to be representative, currently is undemocratic. Just because gerrymandering has been part of our political fabric for centuries does not mean that it should endure. Should we not choose to further democratize our Nation?

Solving this systemic issue will not be easy—most institutionalized processes are difficult to reverse. But it is possible. To do so, we must begin with repealing these two Congressional Acts which have undermined our democracy, and we must transition to proportionally representative MMDs. To fully realize the possibility that is our democracy, we must also increase the number of representatives of the peoples' house, to ensure the fair, equal, and meaningful representation of every citizen of this great country. Because every American deserves equal representation.

LYLA TRIGAUX, BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, FRESHMAN

Despite living in Vermont, one of the most progressive states when it comes to LGBTQ rights, I still see discrimination in my day to day life. In my neighborhood alone, there are hateful stickers plastered all over signs, claiming someone ''can't be born in the wrong body.'' As a freshman in high school, I fear for my transgender classmates who are targeted by these stickers, and I also fear for those who have to experience discrimination like this in school, as well. School is supposed to be a foundation for building a healthy and happy life, but for the nearly two million youth in America who identify as LGBTQ, school too often becomes the opposite. Congress must pass bills like the Safe Schools Improvement Act to make our school system and our country a more inclusive place.

Bullying at school can not only prevent youth from learning, but it can also pose a threat to their wellbeing. LGBTQ youth are at an increased risk of being bullied. According to the 2019 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 32 percent of lesbian, gay or bisexual students said they have been bullied on school property, compared to 17.1 percent of straight students. This negative environment can lead to serious outcomes for these students, from failing to graduate to taking their own lives. According to the Trevor Project, the suicide rate of LGBTQ youth is more than four times higher than the suicide rate of straight, cisgendered youth, and feeling unsafe at school is a contributing cause. With lives on the line, we must take steps to make our schools safer for everyone.

The Safe Schools Improvement Act was a bill introduced to the House in 2021 aimed at stopping bullying and harassment in schools. The bill requires schools to enact policies to not only prohibit, but also prevent bullying and harassment based on protected categories like gender identity and sexual orientation. Preventing these incidents from happening in the first place is what makes this bill a good solution. While supporting LGBTQ youth after bullying or harassment has already occurred is important, it's not enough. Schools being able to stop it from happening in the first place is what can save someone from trauma. Making this bill a law may also be a quicker process than writing a whole new one. According to the Trevor Project, of the LGBTQ youth that seriously consider suicide each year, at least one attempts it every 45 seconds. The faster we pass this bill the more lives it may be able to save.

All students deserve equal access to education and the chance to learn without the distraction of threat to their safety and mental wellbeing. For too long, LGBTQ youth have had to endure a hostile school environment. Supporting the Safe Schools Improvement Act is an important step towards ending bullying, protecting students' rights, and saving lives.

SAMANTHA URBINA, BELLOWS FREE ACADEMY—FAIRFAX, JUNIOR

As of the 2020 census almost 19 percent of the United States population are Latino or Hispanic. Latinos are the second largest ethnic group, the largest minority group and our history is being glossed over in our high school education, being forgotten in a country founded by immigrants. Correcting this injustice starts in the classroom. For example, there is not any mention of our contributions during the world wars. I know there was though, my great uncle, a Mexican-American, was part of the 101st Airborne division during World War II. From what I can remember of all the history that I have learned from elementary school to now, there has been little to no mention of the colonization of Latin and Central Americans or any Latino history or contributions to the United States. The Chicano movement was active during the 1960s and Hispanic-Americans were also fighting for equality during this time, but almost all of the attention in class and textbooks was focused on Civil Rights for Black Americans, Women, and Native Americans. Talking to my friends from other high schools such as Essex, Champlain Valley Union, Colchester and Burlington said they had little to no education on Latino history. Either it was barely mentioned in a world history class, only talked about cultures in Spanish class or a short unit about North American Indigenous peoples.

The lack of education is part of the reason for the stereotypes and misinformation about Latinos and who we are. Latino history in America is American history and it should be added to the curriculum, and the excuse that areas that don't have a large population of Latinos-like Vermont-don't need to learn that part of history is wrong and demeaning. It causes us to feel invisible in our own home and school. Learning and being educated is connected to how everyone thinks as an adult. The lack of Latino history taught can lead to prejudice and biases against this group of people. Drowning out those loud voices that talk with hatred gets us one step closer to complete equality and equity between everyone, it won't be perfect but the hope is that it will be better.

Progress starts here. Celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month is not enough, we can do better than that. School Boards should change the curriculum to include everyone's history, even if there aren't students that are Latino, by not teaching inclusive history it is like we don't exist. In a world history class; tell the story of the colonization of Latin and Central American countries. In American History; let the students know that Latinos had a part in our wars, in the Civil Rights movement, that our voices were loud enough to be heard. Change starts with a clear view of United States education standards shifting to be as inclusive as they claim, changing for all the Latino kids who feel invisible to be proud of who they are and where they come from.

GRETCHEN WERTLIEB, SOUTH BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, FRESHMAN

When you think of global warming, you probably think of factories, vehicles, and anything else that emits gas, or, more scientifically, greenhouse gasses. But there is one huge factor that not many people think of. Something we contribute to every day. Food waste.

Feeding America is the largest food rescue organization in the country. They send all that food to people in need of meals or food banks. According to Feeding America, about 108 billion pounds of food is wasted every year. That's equivalent to 130 billion meals that could go to people in need. All in all, around 40 percent of all food is wasted in the US, which comes out to about $408 billion a year.

Even if you can get fresh food easily from your local grocery store, your family farm, or somewhere else, food waste impacts you more than you think. Food waste sitting in landfills produces tons of methane, a greenhouse gas even more dangerous than carbon dioxide (CO_2). ''In the United States, food waste is responsible for more than twice as many greenhouse gasses than commercial aviation, leading some experts to believe that reducing food waste is one of our best shots at combating climate change'' (New York Times). Greenhouse gasses trap heat in by drifting up into the air and mixing with other gas molecules. In an article from MIT through the Climate Portal, Jesse Kroll, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Chemical Engineering, is quoted as saying ''Greenhouse gas molecules will absorb light . . . This traps the energy, which would otherwise go back into space, so it has the effect of heating up the atmosphere''. This, combined with so many other factors of global warming, is enough to heat our planet to the point of destruction.

Although it's a big problem, food waste still has some people skeptical about solutions. Some people don't have a place to

compost food, or don't know what to do with it. It's also hard to know what to do with the already giant piles of food in landfills. One thing we can do to decrease food waste is talk to people about it. Getting your neighborhood or town involved with simple practices like composting or a community garden can make a difference. You can also be more mindful when buying produce at the store. The majority of foods in landfills are foods that don't look as pretty as what you would see in a store. Just because that tomato is misshapen or the lettuce has a brown spot doesn't mean they aren't edible.

Another good way to decrease food waste is donating to organizations that rescue food, like Feeding America. You can also donate directly to your local food bank, which provides meals for families in need. This is a great option, because food waste also contributes to food insecurity. Whatever you may choose to do, we can all be more mindful when thinking about our food consumption and the consequences.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:49 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, 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. 382. An act to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19.

H.R. 497. An act to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 382. An act to terminate the public health emergency declared with respect to COVID–19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 497. An act to eliminate the COVID–19 vaccine mandate on health care providers furnishing items and services under certain Federal health care programs; to the Committee on Finance.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

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.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 214. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 219. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

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–242. A communication from the Senior Attorney for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Editorial Corrections and Clarifications'' (RIN2137–AF56) 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–243. A communication from the Chair, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–244. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; 2019–2021 Spiny Dogfish Specifications'' (RIN0648–XG800) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–245. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA774) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–246. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Mid-Atlantic Blueline Tilefish Fishery; Final 2022 and 2023 and Projected 2024 Specifications'' (RIN0648–XC411) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–247. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Affairs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Adjustments to 2019 Northern Albacore Tuna Quota, 2019 North and South Atlantic Swordfish Quotas, and 2019 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Reserve Category Quota'' (RIN0648–XT006) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–248. A communication from the Secretary of the Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tanker Security Program'' (RIN2133–AB95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 2, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–249. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Certification Standards for Commercial Balloon Operations'' ((RIN2120–AL51) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–250. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Increase the Duration of Aircraft Registration'' ((RIN2120–AL45) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1514)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–251. 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. 4031'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31454)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–252. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Yaw Maneuver Conditions - Rudder Reversals'' ((RIN2120–AK89) (FAA–2018–0653)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–253. 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. 4033'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31456)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–254. 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. 4034'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31457)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–255. 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. 4032'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31455)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–256. 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 to VOR Federal Airway V–426 and Jet Route J–125, and Establishment of United States Area Navigation Route T–399 in the Vicinity of Clear, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0245)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–257. 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 United States Area Navigation (RNAV) T–Route T–378; Fort Yukon, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0232)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–258. 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 VOR Federal Airways V–26, and V–63; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–464; and Revocation of the Wausau, WI, Low Altitude Reporting Point; in the Vicinity of Wausau, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0243)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–259. 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 R–2206 and Establishment of Restricted Areas R–2206B, R–2206C, R–2206D , R–2206E, R–2206F, and R–2206G; Clear, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0755)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–260. 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 Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–269; Yakutat, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1152)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–261. 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 United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–380; Emmonak, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0245)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–262. 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; Eagle Lake, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0924)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–263. 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; Multiple Indiana Towns'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0871)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–264. 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 Class E Airspace; Startford, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0970)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–265. 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; Bloomfield, IA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0773)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–266. 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; Duluth, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0904)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–267. 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; Evansville, IN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1209)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–268. 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; Colorado Plains Regional Airport, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0711)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–269. 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; Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport, MT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0764)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–270. 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; Liberal, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–271. 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; Independence and Pittsburg, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–272. 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; Menominee, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–273. 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; Hoffman GmbH and Co. KG Propellers; Amendment 39–22212'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0980)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–274. 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; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc. and de Havilland) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22235'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1490)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–275. 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 39–22199'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–276. 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 39–22218'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1307)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–277. 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 Inc., Erickson 214 Holdings, LLC, Leonardo S.p.a., and Various Restricted Category Helicopters; Amendment 39–22227'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1402)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–278. 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 39–22228'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No.

FAA–2022–0672)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–279. 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 39–22197'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0817)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–280. 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 39–22186'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1164)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–281. 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 39–22200'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1247)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–282. 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 39–22201'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0986)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–283. 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; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes; Amendment 39–22214'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1070)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–284. 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 39–22202'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0982)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–285. 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; Deutsche Aircraft GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by 328 Support Services GmbH; Avcraft Aerospace GmbH; Fairchild Dornier GmbH; Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22206'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0688)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–286. 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; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc. and de Havilland) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22240'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1420)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–287. 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 39–22217'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0988)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–288. 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 39–22216'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1052)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–289. 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 39–22213'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0673)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–290. 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; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22211'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1299)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–291. 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; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22215'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0887)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–292. 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 39–22222'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0682)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–293. 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. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22207'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0984)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–294. 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 39–22188'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0807)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–295. 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 (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited) Helicopters; Amendment 39–22223'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0286)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–296. 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; Piaggio Aviation S.p.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22222'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0599)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–297. 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 39–22231'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1065)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–298. 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 39–22248'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1481)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–299. 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 Inc., Helicopters and Various Restricted Category Helicopters; Amendment 39–22198'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0460)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–300. 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 39–22225'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1066)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–301. 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 39–22224'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1064)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–302. 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 39–22226'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1060)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–303. 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 (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited) Helicopters; Amendment 39–22229'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0992)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–304. 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 39–22219'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0503)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–305. 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 39–22239'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1059)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–306. 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 39–22232'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–307. 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 39–22237'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–308. 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 39–22238'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0103)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–309. 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 39–22234'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1053)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–310. 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; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22209'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0885)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–311. 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; Butte, Montana'' (MB Docket No. 22–115) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–312. 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; Great Falls, Montana'' (MB Docket No. 22–117) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–313. 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; Helena, Montana'' (MB Docket No. 22–118) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–314. A communication from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Empowering Broadband Consumers Through Transparency, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' ((FCC 22–86) (CG Docket No. 22–2)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–315. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishing the Digital Opportunity Data Collection, Modernizing the FCC form 477 Data Program'' (WC Docket Nos. 19–195 and 11–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–316. 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; Missoula, Montana'' (MB Docket No. 22–116) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–317. A communication from the Honors Attorney, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''3.45 GHz Clearinghouse Selection Committee Order'' (WT Docket No. 19–348) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–318. A communication from the Acting Chief of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protecting Against National Security Threats to the Communications Supply Chain through the Equipment Authorization Program; Protecting Against National Security Threats to the Communications Supply Chain through the Competitive Bidding Program'' ((FCC 22–84) (ET Docket No. 21–232) (EA Docket No. 21–233)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–319. A communication from the Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Wireline Competition Bureau released a Fourth Report and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking entitled Affordable Connectivity Program'' ((RIN3060–AL16) (FCC 22–87) (WC Docket No. 21–450)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–320. A communication from the Division Chief for Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Incorporation by Reference; North American Standard Out-of-Service Criteria; Hazardous Materials Safety Permits'' (RIN2126–AC48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–321. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation'' (RIN0605–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–322. A communication from the Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules, Seventh Report and Order and Ninth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' ((FCC 23–3) (WP Docket No. 07–100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–323. A communication from the Chief of Revenue and Receivables, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of the FY 2023 Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1102 Through 1.1109 of the Commission's Rules'' ((FCC 22–94) (MD Docket No. 20–270)) 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–324. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Submission of Rules Under the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act'' 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–325. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Labeling Rule'' 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–326. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Policy Statement of the Federal Trade Commission on Education Technology and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act'' 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–327. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Statement of the Commission on Use of Prior Approval Provisions in Merger Orders'' 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–328. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Policy Statement on Enforcement Related to Gig Work'' 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–329. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Responding to Petitions for Rulemaking'' 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–330. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Offer Rate Review'' ((RIN2140–AB46) (Docket No. EP 755) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–331. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Safety Provisions for Lithium Batteries Transported by Aircraft (FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018)'' (RIN2137–AF20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–332. A communication from the Chair, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Annual Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN3147–AA24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 26, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–333. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–789, ''Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–334. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to D.C. Act 24–789, ''Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 198. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize provisions relating to rural health clinics under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 199. 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 Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 200. A bill to require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form or allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 201. A bill to require agencies submit zero-based budgets; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 202. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to reauthorize the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 203. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 204. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 205. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 206. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 207. A bill to modify the procedures for designating foreign states under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and granting temporary protected status to nationals of such foreign states; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KELLY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 208. A bill to establish a procedure for terminating a determination by Surgeon General to suspend certain entries and imports from designated places; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 209. 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 Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 210. A bill to expand employees eligible for leave and employers subject to leave requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 211. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish an enhanced use lease pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 212. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 213. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue obligations to make Medicare and Social Security payments, despite the debt limit being reached; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 214. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms; read the first time.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 215. A bill to establish a National Council on African American History and Culture within the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 216. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the family caregiver program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to include services related to mental health and neurological disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 217. 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 Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KING, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. COTTON, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. LEE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 218. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from sending petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 219. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills; read the first time.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 220. A bill to prohibit certain noncompete agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 221. A bill to restrict the appointment of certain military personnel to diversity, equity, and inclusion positions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 222. A bill to require the designation of certain airports as ports of entry; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 223. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to fix a technical error in the definitions; considered and passed.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 224. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to associates of the International Criminal Court engaged in investigations of personnel of the United States and its allies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VANCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BUDD):

S.J. Res. 6. 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 Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. Res. 21. A resolution supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2023, and ending on February 1, 2023, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. Res. 22. A resolution congratulating the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits on winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 23. A resolution demanding that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 24. A resolution supporting the observation of ''National Girls & Women in Sports Day'' on February 1, 2023, to raise awareness of and celebrate the achievements of girls and women in sports; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RISCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. LEE):

S. Con. Res. 3. A concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and protected for all people of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, and recognizing the 237th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 9

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 9, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from sending petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to China, and for other purposes.

S. 40

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 40, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 68

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 68, a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to prevent harm and disruption to the United States agriculture industry by protecting against foreign influence over agriculture production and supply chains, and for other purposes.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 137

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 137, a bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his contributions to civil rights, his loyalty and patriotism to the United States, and his dedication to justice and equality.

S. 142

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 142, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 148

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to enable to Federal Trade Commission to deter filing of sham citizen petitions to cover an attempt to interfere with approval of a competing generic drug or biosimilar, to foster competition, and facilitate the efficient review of petitions filed in good

faith to raise legitimate public health concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 173, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 203. A bill to amend section 923 of title 18, United States Code, to require an electronic, searchable database of the importation, production, shipment, receipt, sale, or other disposition of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today I rise to introduce the Crime Gun Tracing Modernization Act.

This bill would bring ATF into the 21st century by allowing the Agency to electronically search for the records of guns used in crimes across the country. It is hard to believe that ATF still must store paper records and search them by hand in order to identify the guns used for criminal activity. These archaic rules prevent the people responsible for enforcing our laws from doing their jobs effectively.

The National Tracing Center at ATF is responsible for quickly placing crime gun ownership information into the hands of law enforcement officials so they can solve crimes and save lives. In 2021, National Tracing Center receive over 540,000 trace requests.

Unfortunately, the timely completion of these trace requests has been made nearly impossible because ATF cannot search these records electronically.

To make matters worse, these millions of records are stored in thousands of boxes that are overflowing the hallways of the National Tracing Center in Martinsburg, WV. The records that agents must search through are so massive, ATF has been told that if it places more boxes inside the facility, the floor may collapse.

Every moment after a crime is committed matters dearly to our law enforcement agencies. Prohibiting the efficient search of these records puts our communities at risk.

I thank my former colleague Senator Leahy for championing this bill last Congress. I am committed to continuing the fight for this important fix.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 204. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, later today, I will introduce the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, along with my colleague Senator LANKFORD. It is a simple bill. It simply states that a baby born alive after an attempted abortion is entitled to the same protection and medical care that any other newborn baby is entitled to. And you would think that it would be a simple ''yes'' vote from every Member of this body, but unfortunately, that is not where we are.

Four years ago and then three years ago, the U.S. Senate took up this bill, and almost every single Democrat in this body voted against it. Just 3 weeks ago, the House of Representatives took up this bill, and almost every single Democrat over there voted against it. Apparently banning infanticide is now controversial because—let's be clear—that is what we are talking about here.

Some Democrats have tried to cloak their opposition to this bill in meaningless phrases about a private decision between a woman and her doctor, but what is the decision we are talking about? We are talking about whether or not a living baby, born after an attempted abortion, should be provided with medical care or be left to die or, I suppose, be killed outright by the abortionist. That is what we are talking about. That is the ''decision'' Democrats are referring to. And that is apparently the decision they think should be left up to patients and their doctors—whether or not to let a living, breathing baby die.

The Senate voted on a previous version of this bill introduced by my former colleague Senator Sasse 4 years ago when the Democratic Governor of Virginia came right out and said you could keep a newly born baby comfortable while you decided what to do with it—in other words, while you decided whether to let the child die or, I guess, kill it or whether to let it live. That chilling statement made it abundantly clear that we needed to state explicitly that any baby, wherever he or she is born, including in an abortion clinic, is entitled to medical care. It is staggering that we have gotten to the point where we need to debate this in Congress, staggering that this wouldn't be an automatic ''yes'' vote from every Member of this body, but that is where we are.

If anyone thinks that abortion isn't a slippery slope, that we can somehow devalue unborn babies' lives while maintaining respect for everyone else's, then I am here to tell them differently because the Democratic Party has gotten to the point where its members not only oppose legislation to protect unborn babies; they oppose legislation to protect born ones as well. In Democrats' world, there are now apparently two classes of born babies: the wanted ones born alive in delivery rooms and the unwanted ones born alive in abortion clinics. Apparently, only one of those classes of babies is entitled to the equal protection of the laws.

Democrats talk a lot about abortion when they are talking about this bill, but this bill, of course, would do absolutely nothing to restrict abortion. It is not a bill protecting unborn babies; it is a bill protecting born babies.

I do understand why Democrats are so worked up, though, because while this bill may not do anything to restrict abortion, there is always the chance that drawing attention to the humanity and dignity of the child who has just been born will draw attention to the humanity and dignity of the child who is about to be born—the child Democrats are determined our laws should not protect. And Democrats are apparently so determined to preserve the so-called right to kill unborn babies that they are fully comfortable opposing a law that would protect born—born—babies.

These are hard things to talk about, but they have to be said because that is the reality of where we are right now.

Roughly 50 percent of the U.S. Congress opposes giving the equal protection of the law to born human beings if they happen to be born alive following an attempted abortion.

Now, I think we are at a real inflection point as to where we want to be as a nation. Do we want to be a country where the circumstances of your birth determine whether or not your right to life is protected? Do we want to be a country that endorses leaving living, breathing babies to die, that discards born babies because they are, for a moment at their birth, unwanted? I don't know. I think we are better than that. We have to be better than that.

If we truly want to be a nation that protects human rights, that stands for justice, that defends the vulnerable, then we cannot be a nation that says it is acceptable to leave living, breathing, born human beings to die in abortion clinics, that says there are two classes of newborn babies and that only one of them deserves to be protected. Every human being deserves to be protected, no matter the circumstances of his or her birth.

I want to thank Senator LANKFORD for his leadership on this issue. We will be working together to advance this legislation, and I pray that sooner rather than later, we will get to the day when this bill will be an automatic ''yes'' vote from every Member of this body.

Madam 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. 204

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

''§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive:

''(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

''(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

''(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

''(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

''(b) PENALTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

''(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted for a violation of this section, an attempt to violate this section, a conspiracy to violate this section, or an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

''(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

''(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

''(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

''(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

''(C) punitive damages.

''(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

''(4) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

''(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

''(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

''(i) after viability, to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

''(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

''(2) ATTEMPT.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.

''(3) BORN ALIVE.—The term 'born alive' has the meaning given that term in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Born-Alive Infants Protection Act').''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors.''.

(2) The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''**PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS**'' and inserting ''**ABORTIONS**''.

(3) The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 74 and inserting the following:

''74. Abortion ..... 1531''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect one day after the date of enactment.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 205. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam 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. 205

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 ''Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. MINIMUM STATE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each State that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and does not meet the requirements described in this section, as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall, not later than the last day of the fifth full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act (referred to in this Act as the ''compliance deadline''), enact legislation or issue regulations establishing the following minimum requirements:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY CONCUSSION SAFETY AND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Each local educational agency in the State, in consultation with members of the community in which such agency is located, shall develop and implement a standard plan for concussion safety and management that—

(A) educates students, parents, and school personnel about concussions, through activities such as—

(i) training school personnel, including coaches, teachers, athletic trainers, related services personnel, and school nurses, on concussion safety and management, including training on the prevention, recognition, and academic consequences of concussions and response to concussions; and

(ii) using, maintaining, and disseminating to students and parents—

(I) release forms and other appropriate forms for reporting and record keeping;

(II) treatment plans; and

(III) prevention and post-injury observation and monitoring fact sheets about concussion;

(B) encourages supports, where feasible, for a student recovering from a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities,

during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), such as—

(i) guiding the student in resuming participation in athletic activity and academic activities with the help of a multi-disciplinary concussion management team, which may include—

(I) a health care professional, the parents of such student, a school nurse, relevant related services personnel, and other relevant school personnel; and

(II) an individual who is assigned by a public school to oversee and manage the recovery of such student; and

(ii) providing appropriate academic accommodations aimed at progressively reintroducing cognitive demands on the student; and

(C) encourages the use of best practices designed to ensure, with respect to concussions, the uniformity of safety standards, treatment, and management, such as—

(i) disseminating information on concussion safety and management to the public; and

(ii) applying uniform best practice standards for concussion safety and management to all students enrolled in public schools.

(2) POSTING OF INFORMATION ON CONCUSSIONS.—Each public elementary school and each public secondary school shall post on school grounds, in a manner that is visible to students and school personnel, and make publicly available on the school website, information on concussions that—

(A) is based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence (such as information made available by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention);

(B) shall include information on—

(i) the risks posed by sustaining a concussion;

(ii) the actions a student should take in response to sustaining a concussion, including the notification of school personnel; and

(iii) the signs and symptoms of a concussion; and

(C) may include information on—

(i) the definition of a concussion;

(ii) the means available to the student to reduce the incidence or recurrence of a concussion; and

(iii) the effects of a concussion on academic learning and performance.

(3) RESPONSE TO CONCUSSION.—If an individual designated from among school personnel for purposes of this Act, one of whom must be in attendance at every school-sponsored activity, suspects that a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity)—

(A) the student shall be—

(i) immediately removed from participation in a school-sponsored athletic activity; and

(ii) prohibited from returning to participate in a school-sponsored athletic activity on the day that student is removed from such participation; and

(B) the designated individual shall report to the parent or guardian of such student—

(i) any information that the designated school employee is aware of regarding the date, time, and type of the injury suffered by such student (regardless of where, when, or how a concussion may have occurred); and

(ii) any actions taken to treat such student.

(4) RETURN TO ATHLETICS.—If a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), before such student resumes participation in school-sponsored athletic activities, the school shall receive a written release from a health care professional, that—

(A) states that the student is capable of resuming participation in such activities; and

(B) may require the student to follow a plan designed to aid the student in recovering and resuming participation in such activities in a manner that—

(i) is coordinated, as appropriate, with periods of cognitive and physical rest while symptoms of a concussion persist; and

(ii) reintroduces cognitive and physical demands on such student on a progressive basis only as such increases in exertion do not cause the reemergence or worsening of symptoms of a concussion.

(b) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) FIRST YEAR.—If a State described in subsection (a) fails to comply with subsection (a) by the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 5 percent the amount of funds the State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) for the first fiscal year following the compliance deadline.

(2) SUCCEEDING YEARS.—If the State fails to so comply by the last day of any fiscal year following the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 10 percent the amount of funds the State receives under that Act for the following fiscal year.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—Prior to reducing any funds that a State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary of Education shall provide a written notification of the intended reduction of funds to the State and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect civil or criminal liability under Federal or State law.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONCUSSION.—The term ''concussion'' means a type of mild traumatic brain injury that—

(A) is caused by a blow, jolt, or motion to the head or body that causes the brain to move rapidly in the skull;

(B) disrupts normal brain functioning and alters the mental state of the individual, causing the individual to experience—

(i) any period of observed or self-reported—

(I) transient confusion, disorientation, or impaired consciousness;

(II) dysfunction of memory around the time of injury; or

(III) loss of consciousness lasting less than 30 minutes; or

(ii) any 1 of 4 types of symptoms, including—

(I) physical symptoms, such as headache, fatigue, or dizziness;

(II) cognitive symptoms, such as memory disturbance or slowed thinking;

(III) emotional symptoms, such as irritability or sadness; or

(IV) difficulty sleeping; and

(C) can occur—

(i) with or without the loss of consciousness; and

(ii) during participation in any organized sport or recreational activity.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term ''health care professional''—

(A) means an individual who has been trained in diagnosis and management of concussion in a pediatric population; and

(B) is registered, licensed, certified, or otherwise statutorily recognized by the State to provide such diagnosis and management.

(3) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; STATE.—The terms ''local educational agency'' and ''State'' have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) RELATED SERVICES PERSONNEL.—The term ''related services personnel'' means individuals who provide related services, as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401).

(5) SCHOOL-SPONSORED ATHLETIC ACTIVITY.—The term ''school-sponsored athletic activity'' means—

(A) any physical education class or program of a school;

(B) any athletic activity authorized during the school day on school grounds that is not an instructional activity;

(C) any extra-curricular sports team, club, or league organized by a school on or off school grounds; and

(D) any recess activity.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 220. A bill to prohibit certain noncompete agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, if you were working for the sandwich shop Jimmy John's—I don't know if the Presiding Officer has ever had a Jimmy John's sandwich. It is a pretty good sandwich. If you were working for Jimmy John's sandwich shop in the middle of the last decade, around 2014, 2015, 2016, you might have been required to sign a contract with Jimmy John's to make sandwiches. Buried in that contract, as a fast food worker at Jimmy John's in 2014, 2015, 2016, was something called a noncompete clause.

A lot of Americans have heard of noncompete clauses. They think of them as applying to executives, individuals who make a lot of money, who possess really intricate, detailed information about a product. But Jimmy John's made everybody who came to work in many of their sandwich shops sign a noncompete agreement. The noncompete agreement for Jimmy John's sandwich makers said that if you ever left Jimmy John's, you would not be able to work at any business within 2 to 3 miles of any Jimmy John's for any company that made over 10 percent of its revenue from selling ''submarine, hero-type, deli-style, pita, and/or wrapped or rolled sandwiches'' for 2 years. Low-income, minimum-wage workers at Jimmy John's, if they tried to leave that job, were prohibited from going to work for Subway or going to work for D'Angelo's or maybe even, according to this definition, McDonald's or Burger King.

Of course, that sounds patently ridiculous. Why would you need to protect the intellectual secrets of sandwich making at Jimmy John's by applying noncompete agreements for these low-income workers? But this wasn't and isn't an anomaly. In fact, one out of six hospitality restaurant workers, by some studies, has a noncompete agreement. Today, noncompete agreements apply to one in five American workers. That is 30 million workers.

Amazon warehouse workers were required for a long time to sign noncompete agreements. I read a story the other day of a company called Camp Bow Wow that pays people to pet-sit. They required their pet sitters to sign noncompete agreements.

The reason that noncompete agreements are being used at industrial-level scale today is not to protect the trade secrets of sandwich making or pet sitting; it is to keep wages down. It is to prevent low-income workers from being able to go out and get a better job and thus pressure their existing employer to increase wages. This practice has become pervasive throughout our economy, and it is just a fundamental restraint on free trade.

Now, many of these noncompete agreements end up being nonenforceable. A lot of State laws don't allow you to have a noncompete agreement for a low-wage worker. But in practice, it doesn't really matter because when that individual tries to leave and they get told they can't because of a noncompete agreement, they don't know that it is nonenforceable in State law or if they do know, they don't have the resources to contest the cause in a court of law. So what do they do? They just end up staying.

The FTC filed a complaint in January of this year against two Michigan-based companies that required their security guards to sign noncompete agreements prohibiting them from working for a competing business within a 100-mile radius. Despite the fact that these security guards were making very low wages, the company's noncompete included a restriction that required the employee to pay a $100,000 penalty for any alleged violation of the clause. The intention here is simply to bind the employee to the company, to give them no ability to bargain for a higher wage because they might be able to get a better wage somewhere else. There is no proprietary information that those security guards possess.

What is equally interesting is that there is increasingly great data to show that there is actually no reason to have noncompete agreements even for higher income workers. The imposition of noncompete agreements on low-wage workers is primarily about just trying to restrain wages, but the imposition of noncompete agreements on higher income workers is about impeding innovation. It is about a company that doesn't want competitors, so they bind their executives to noncompete agreements such that their executives can't go work for a competing company or can't go out and start a company that may compete.

What is so maddening is that there are plenty of protections in our existing law that protect companies from intellectual property theft or patent theft. If what you worry about is your trade secrets being appropriated by a competitor, well, the law already protects you from that. You don't have to deny your employees or your executives the ability to go work for another company.

California rightly has the reputation as probably the world's center of innovation, right? More startups, more world-changing companies have come out of California than any other State and probably than any other part of the world. California was the first or one of the first in this country to ban noncompete agreements. California decided it didn't need noncompete agreements to protect intellectual property in a State that probably has a greater interest in protecting intellectual property than any other State. In fact, California's economic engine is dependent on their prohibition of noncompete agreements because by prohibiting noncompete agreements, California has a culture in which startups are encouraged, in which executives can leave one company and start another.

Eric Yuan was an executive at Cisco Webex. If he wasn't working in California, he might have had a noncompete agreement applied to him, but he didn't, and so he could leave and start a company that was arguably competing with Cisco Webex—a company called Zoom.

To many economists on the right and the left, this is becoming a no-brainer. Noncompete agreements are bad for wage growth. Noncompete agreements are bad for innovation. Noncompete agreements are bad for low-income workers. Noncompete agreements are bad for high-income workers.

So today I am on the floor to talk about what the data tells us about noncompete agreements as a means to encourage my colleagues to take a look at a piece of legislation that we are introducing today, the Workforce Mobility Act, a pretty simple piece of legislation that would ban the use of noncompete agreements for both high-income and low-income workers.

It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. Senator TODD YOUNG, Senator KEVIN CRAMER, Senator TIM KAINE, and I are introducing this bill today. I don't know that there is another policy that the four of us can find common ground on, but we find common ground on this issue because maybe if you are a progressive, you come to this issue through the rights of workers and boosting their wages. If you are a conservative, you come to this issue through the restraint on free trade that exists through the perpetuation of noncompete agreements. But all across America, this is a pretty bipartisan issue, and here in the Senate, it is bipartisan as well.

I am glad that the FTC, just a week or so ago, announced that they were going to undertake a rule to ban noncompete agreements. I congratulate the Biden administration and the FTC for taking a leadership role. It may be that that rule, once it is adopted and in place, will do the work of this legislation, but we know that rules are only as good as the commitment of one particular administration.

So my hope and my recommendation is that no matter what the FTC does when it comes to restrictions on noncompete agreements, that we pass the Workforce Mobility Act so that we provide a guarantee in the law that noncompete agreements are not going to stand in the way of wages rising or small businesses starting.

There is a lot of public support out there as 92 percent of voters think that it is way too hard today to start or grow a new business and as 80 percent of voters—again, across party lines—support policies that allow people who want to start a new business more freedom by reducing the restrictions that come when you try to venture out on your own. Increasingly, one of the primary restrictions that exists for people who want to start a new business, who want to become entrepreneurs, are these noncompete agreements.

So I am coming to the floor today to recommend this bipartisan piece of legislation to my colleagues, to point to the States that have already adopted these restrictions, and to show how not only does the sky not fall when you get rid of noncompete agreements but that startups flourish and that wages increase.

Finally, I come to recommend to my colleagues that, in an environment where it is going to be a little harder to find agreement between Republicans and Democrats, this is a place where we can find that common ground. In one piece of policy, we can stick up for low-income workers and the free market. This is something that we can do together to help raise wages and to help power our economy.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 21—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY PREVENTION MONTH DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON JANUARY 1, 2023, AND ENDING ON FEBRUARY 1, 2023, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF, AND OPPOSITION TO, HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND MODERN SLAVERY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PADILLA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 21

Whereas the United States abolished the transatlantic slave trade in 1808 and abolished chattel slavery and prohibited involuntary servitude in 1865;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking and modern slavery, which is commonly considered to mean—

(1) the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of an individual through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjecting that individual to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery; or

(2) the inducement of a commercial sex act by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the individual induced to perform that act is younger than 18 years of age;

Whereas forced labor and human trafficking generates revenues of approximately $150,000,000,000 annually worldwide, and there are an estimated 50,000,000 victims of human trafficking and modern slavery across the globe;

Whereas victims of human trafficking are difficult to identify and are subject to manipulation, force, fraud, coercion, and abuse;

Whereas children and youths experiencing homelessness are vulnerable and susceptible to manipulation, making them a prime target for the lucrative criminal industry of human trafficking;

Whereas the Department of Justice has reported that human trafficking and modern slavery has been reported and investigated in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Department of State has reported that the top 3 countries of origin of federally identified human trafficking victims in the United States in fiscal year 2021 were the United States, Mexico, and Honduras;

Whereas, to help businesses in the United States combat child labor and forced labor in global supply chains, the Department of Labor has identified 158 goods from 77 countries that are made by child labor and forced labor;

Whereas, since 2007, the National Human Trafficking Hotline has identified 82,301 cases of human trafficking involving 164,839 victims;

Whereas there are known risk factors that contribute to youths running away, including domestic violence, child sexual abuse, and neglect, and runaway youths who experience homelessness are potential targets for human trafficking;

Whereas, of the more than 26,500 endangered runaways reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in 2020, 1 in 6 were likely child sex trafficking victims;

Whereas youth experiencing homelessness experience high rates of human trafficking and 1 in 5 homeless youths is a victim of sex trafficking, labor trafficking, or both;

Whereas 22 percent of youths who experience homelessness were approached for paid sex on their first night of homelessness;

Whereas LGBTQ youths are disproportionally affected, accounting for 33.8 percent of sex trafficking victims;

Whereas youths facing homelessness have a lower probability of being trafficked if they have a supportive adult in their life;

Whereas the Administration for Native Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services reports that American Indian, Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander women and girls have a heightened risk for sex trafficking;

Whereas the Department of Justice found that studies on the topic of human trafficking of American Indians and Alaska Natives suggest there are—

(1) high rates of sexual exploitation of Native women and girls;

(2) gaps in data and research on trafficking of American Indian and Alaska Native victims; and

(3) barriers that prevent law enforcement agencies and victim service providers from identifying and responding appropriately to Native victims;

Whereas, according to the Government Accountability Office, from fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2016, there were only 14 Federal investigations and 2 Federal prosecutions of human trafficking offenses in Indian country;

Whereas, to combat human trafficking and modern slavery in the United States and globally, the people of the United States, the Federal Government, and State, Tribal, and local governments must be—

(1) aware of the realities of human trafficking and modern slavery; and

(2) dedicated to stopping the horrific enterprise of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas the United States should hold accountable all individuals, groups, organizations, governments, and countries that support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking and modern slavery;

Whereas, through education, the United States must also work to end human trafficking and modern slavery in all forms in the United States and around the world;

Whereas victims of human trafficking deserve a trauma-informed approach that integrates the pursuit of justice and provision of social services designed to help them escape, and recover from, the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma they endured;

Whereas combating human trafficking requires a whole-of-government effort that rests on a unified and coordinated response among Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies and that places equal value on the prevention of trafficking, the identification and stabilization of victims, and the investigation and prosecution of traffickers;

Whereas laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist and protect victims of human trafficking and modern slavery have been enacted in the United States, including—

(1) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(2) title XII of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 136);

(3) the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227);

(4) sections 910 and 914(e) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–125; 130 Stat. 239 and 274);

(5) section 1298 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (22 U.S.C. 7114);

(6) the Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–392; 132 Stat. 5250);

(7) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–393; 132 Stat. 5265);

(8) the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–425; 132 Stat. 5472);

(9) the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–427; 132 Stat. 5503);

(10) the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–103; 136 Stat. 840);

(11) the Abolish Trafficking Reauthorization Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–347; 136 Stat. 6199);

(12) the Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–348; 136 Stat. 6211); and

(13) the End Human Trafficking in Government Contracts Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–211; 136 Stat. 2248);

Whereas the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–22; 129 Stat. 227) established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to provide a formal platform for survivors of human trafficking to advise and make recommendations on Federal anti-trafficking policies to the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established by the President;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued a final rule (80 Fed. Reg. 4967) to implement Executive Order 13627, entitled ''Strengthening Protections Against Trafficking in Persons in Federal Contracts'', that clarifies the policy of the United States on combating trafficking in persons as outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation by strengthening the prohibition on contractors from charging employee recruitment fees;

Whereas, although such laws and regulations are currently in force, it is essential to increase public awareness, particularly among individuals who are most likely to come into contact with victims of human trafficking and modern slavery, regarding conditions and dynamics of human trafficking and modern slavery, precisely because traffickers use techniques that are designed to severely limit self-reporting and evade law enforcement;

Whereas January 1 is the anniversary of the effective date of the Emancipation Proclamation;

Whereas February 1 is—

(1) the anniversary of the date on which President Abraham Lincoln signed the joint resolution sending the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification to forever declare, ''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction''; and

(2) a date that has long been celebrated as National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code; and

Whereas, under the authority of Congress to enforce the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States ''by appropriate legislation'', Congress, through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), updated the post-Civil War involuntary servitude and slavery statutes and adopted an approach of victim protection, vigorous prosecution, and prevention of human trafficking, commonly known as the ''3P'' approach: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2023, and ending on February 1, 2023, to recognize the vital role that the people of the United States have in ending human trafficking and modern slavery;

(2) marking the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month with appropriate programs and activities, culminating in the observance on February 1, 2023, of National Freedom Day, as described in section 124 of title 36, United States Code;

(3) urging continued partnerships with Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies, as well as survivors of human trafficking, social service providers, and nonprofit organizations to address human trafficking with a collaborative, victim-centered approach; and

(4) all other efforts to prevent, eradicate, and raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery.

SENATE RESOLUTION 22—CONGRATULATING THE SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY JACKRABBITS ON WINNING THE 2023 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 22

Whereas, on January 8, 2023, the South Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as ''SDSU'') Jackrabbits defeated the North Dakota State University Bison by a score of 45 to 21 in the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I Football Championship Subdivision (referred to in this preamble as the ''FCS'') Championship game in Frisco, Texas;

Whereas this is the first national championship for the SDSU Jackrabbits football program and first team national championship in the NCAA Division I era for SDSU athletics;

Whereas the SDSU Jackrabbits finished the 2022-2023 season with an overall record of 14 wins and 1 loss, with 8 wins and 0 losses in the Missouri Valley Football Conference, including earning a number 1 seed in the FCS playoffs;

Whereas the SDSU Jackrabbits have qualified for the FCS playoffs the past 11 seasons;

Whereas the 2022-2023 SDSU Jackrabbits—

(1) averaged 34.2 points and 384.6 yards per game; and

(2) allowed only 15.8 points and 273.9 yards per game on average;

Whereas the SDSU head coach, John Stiegelmeier, was awarded the 2022 American Football Coaches Association National Coach of the Year Award for the FCS and the Stats Perform 2022 Eddie Robinson Coach of the Year Award;

Whereas Coach Stiegelmeier, a native of Selby, South Dakota, announced his retirement after 26 seasons as head coach of the SDSU Jackrabbits, finishing his head coaching career at SDSU, his alma mater, with a record of 199 wins and 112 losses; and

Whereas SDSU President Barry Dunn and Athletic Director Justin Sell have cultivated a standard of excellence within SDSU athletics and guided the athletic programs at SDSU to national prominence: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the South Dakota State University football team on a successful season and for winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2) recognizes the hard work, dedication, determination, and commitment of the South Dakota State University football players, coaches, and staff;

(3) commends the Head Coach of the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits football team, John Stiegelmeier, for his dedication and service to the South Dakota State University football program; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of South Dakota State University, Barry Dunn;

(B) the Athletic Director of South Dakota State University, Justin Sell; and

(C) the Head Coach of the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits football team, John Stiegelmeier.

SENATE RESOLUTION 23—DEMANDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IMMEDIATELY RELEASE MARK SWIDAN

Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 23

Whereas Mark Swidan is being unjustly and arbitrarily detained by the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China (CPC), according to the United States Government and the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) Working Group on Arbitrary Detention;

Whereas Mark Swidan is a United States citizen from Luling, Texas, and is a resident of Houston, Texas;

Whereas, on November 13, 2012, Mark Swidan was abducted by officers of the Public Security Bureau while on a business trip to the People's Republic of China, and on December 21, 2012, Swidan was formally arrested following an indictment issued by the Public Prosecutions Office of the People's Procuratorate of Jiangmen City alleging that Swidan was part of a criminal conspiracy with 11 other individuals to manufacture and traffic drugs;

Whereas, on April 30, 2019, a Chinese court sentenced Swidan to death, which he has appealed;

Whereas security officials in the People's Republic of China repeatedly attempted to coerce Swidan into signing a confession, but Swidan refused to sign a confession and pleaded not guilty;

Whereas, according to evidence evaluated by the UNHRC Working Group on Arbitrary Detention—

(1) no drugs were found on Swidan or in his hotel room;

(2) the prosecution did not produce any forensic evidence of the alleged offenses;

(3) records in Swidan's passport indicate he was not in the People's Republic of China during the time of the offenses; and

(4) the 11 other individuals indicted in relation to the alleged conspiracy could not identify Swidan;

Whereas officials of the People's Republic of China and the CPC have maliciously and systematically denied Swidan's mother Katherine Swidan, a resident of Texas, and other members of his family the ability to contact him;

Whereas officials of the People's Republic of China and the CPC have denied and continue to deny United States diplomats full consular access to Swidan, in violation of international norms;

Whereas Swidan's detention has been and continues to be inhumane, and includes exposure to extreme weather conditions, sleep deprivation, and physical and psychological abuse;

Whereas Swidan's health has precipitously deteriorated and security officials in People's Republic of China continue to deny independent or competent medical care and evaluation to Swidan;

Whereas humanitarian organizations of the United States, including the Dui Hua Foundation, which helped put this case before the Working Group, and the Global Liberty Alliance, which has asked the Sister Cities programs to sever relationships with Jiangmen until Swidan is released, have sought to highlight the injustice and conditions of Swidan's detention;

Whereas the UNHRC Working Group on Arbitrary Detention—

(1) found that Swidan is being held in violation of customary international law;

(2) emphasized the nonconformity by the People's Republic of China with international norms, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

(3) stressed that ''the appropriate remedy would be to release Mr. Swidan immediately and accord him an enforceable right to compensation and other reparations, in accordance with international law'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) demands that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan;

(2) condemns the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China for refusing to provide Swidan with—

(A) regular communication with his family;

(B) access to United States diplomats; and

(C) independent and competent medical care and evaluation; and

(3) calls on the United States Government to deepen and prioritize efforts to secure the release of Swidan, including by—

(A) urging Chinese counterparts at every level of engagement to release Swidan, and

(B) using the voice and vote of United States diplomats in international forums to highlight Swidan's case.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24—SUPPORTING THE OBSERVATION OF ''NATIONAL GIRLS & WOMEN IN SPORTS DAY'' ON FEBRUARY 1, 2023, TO RAISE AWARENESS OF AND CELEBRATE THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF GIRLS AND WOMEN IN SPORTS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 24

Whereas ''National Girls & Women in Sports Day'' began in 1987 as a day to recognize and acknowledge the success and progress of girls and women in sports;

Whereas athletic participation helps develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills, and opportunities for athletic participation should be available to all individuals;

Whereas, because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting equality, it is imperative to eliminate the existing disparities between male and female youth athletic programs;

Whereas the share of athletic participation opportunities of high school girls has increased more than sixfold since the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as ''title IX''), but high school girls still experience—

(1) a lower share of athletic participation opportunities than high school boys; and

(2) a lower level of athletic participation opportunities than high school boys enjoyed over 50 years ago;

Whereas 60 percent of high school girls participate in a sport;

Whereas female participation in college sports has nearly tripled since the enactment of title IX, but female college athletes

still comprise only 44 percent of the total collegiate athlete population, 30 percent of whom are white women and only 14 percent of whom are Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (referred to in this preamble as ''BIPOC'') women;

Whereas, in 1971, women coached 90 percent of collegiate women's teams, but as of 2023, women coach only 41 percent of all National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as ''NCAA'') women's teams and BIPOC women represent only 7 percent of head coaches;

Whereas there is a need to restore women to those positions to ensure fair representation and provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas, for too long, the many achievements of women in sports have not received fair recognition;

Whereas the long history of women in sports in the United States—

(1) features many contributions made by female athletes that have enriched the national life of the United States; and

(2) includes inspiring figures, such as Gertrude Ederle, Wilma Rudolph, Althea Gibson, Mildred Ella ''Babe'' Didrikson Zaharias, Mary Lou Retton, and Patty Berg, who overcame difficult obstacles in their own lives—

(A) to advance participation by women in sports; and

(B) to set positive examples for the generations of female athletes who continue to inspire people in the United States today;

Whereas the United States must do all it can to break down the barriers of discrimination, inequality, and injustice in sports;

Whereas girls and young women in minority communities are doubly disadvantaged because—

(1) schools in minority communities have fewer athletic opportunities than schools in predominately White communities; and

(2) the limited resources for athletic opportunities in minority communities exacerbates the existing gender inequity between girls and boys;

Whereas the United States Women's National Soccer Team has led the fight domestically and internationally for equal treatment and compensation for female athletes;

Whereas the 4-time World Cup champion United States Women's National Soccer Team will compete to win a historic third World Cup title in a row at the 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup;

Whereas, with the recent enactment of laws such as the Equal Pay for Team USA Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–340), Congress has taken steps—

(1) to ensure all athletes representing the United States in global competition receive equal pay and benefits regardless of gender; and

(2) to represent to the world, and especially young girls, that everyone deserves equal pay and benefits; and

Whereas, with increased participation by women and girls in sports, it is more important than ever to continue protecting title IX and upload the mandate of the law of equitable and fair treatment and more general principles of gender equity throughout the sport system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports—

(1) observing ''National Girls & Women in Sports Day'' on February 1, 2023, to recognize—

(A) all women athletes who represent schools, universities, and the United States in their athletic pursuits; and

(B) the vital role that the people of the United States have in empowering girls and women in sports;

(2) marking the observation of National Girls & Women in Sports Day with appropriate programs and activities, including legislative efforts—

(A) to build on the success of the Equal Pay for Team USA Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–340) and ensure equal pay for all female athletes; and

(B) to protect and uphold title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) so that future generations of athletes will not have to experience the inequitable and unfair treatment that many athletes have had to endure, and continue to endure, today; and

(3) all ongoing efforts—

(A) to promote gender equity in sports, including equal pay and equal access to athletic opportunities for girls and women; and

(B) to support the commitment of the United States to expanding athletic participation for all girls and future generations of women athletes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, today I rise to introduce a resolution recognizing February 1, 2023, as National Girls and Women in Sports Day.

Nearly 4 million girls and women across this country participate in high school and college athletics. Participation in sports has been shown to provide lifelong benefits to their physical and mental health. Athletic participation helps develop self-discipline, initiative, and confidence. When female athletes are supported on the field, they are empowered to become leaders off of it.

For far too long, the many achievements of women in sports have not received fair recognition. Female athletes, coaches, and trainers are consistently paid less than their male counterparts, subjected to subpar working conditions, and receive substantially less investment and promotional support for their athletic programs. This country must do all it can to break down the barriers of discrimination, inequality, and injustice in sports.

Today's resolution celebrates the tremendous accomplishments of female athletes across the United States, supports the growth of female sports, and encourages the next generation of athletes to follow their dreams.

I thank Senator CAPITO for leading this important bipartisan resolution with me, and for all of our supporters in the Senate.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT THAT IS ESSENTIAL TO A FREE SOCIETY AND PROTECTED FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, AND RECOGNIZING THE 237TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE VIRGINIA STATUTE FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RISCH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 3

Whereas the democracy of the United States is rooted in the fundamental truth that all people are created equal, endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

Whereas the freedom of conscience was highly valued by—

(1) individuals seeking religious freedom who settled in the colonies in the United States;

(2) the founders of the United States; and

(3) Thomas Jefferson, who wrote in a letter to the Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church at New London, Connecticut, dated February 4, 1809, that ''[n]o provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprizes of the civil authority'';

Whereas the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was—

(1) drafted by Thomas Jefferson, who considered the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom to be one of his greatest achievements;

(2) enacted on January 16, 1786; and

(3) the forerunner to the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas section 2(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(a)) states that—

(1) ''[t]he right to freedom of religion undergirds the very origin and existence of the United States''; and

(2) religious freedom was established by the founders of the United States ''in law, as a fundamental right and as a pillar of our Nation'';

Whereas the role of religion in society and public life in the United States has a long and robust tradition;

Whereas individuals who have studied the democracy of the United States from an international perspective, such as Alexis de Tocqueville, have noted that religion plays a central role in preserving the Government of the United States because religion provides the moral base required for democracy to succeed;

Whereas, in Town of Greece v. Galloway, 572 U.S. 565 (2014), the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that ''people of many faiths may be united in a community of tolerance and devotion'';

Whereas the principle of religious freedom ''has guided our Nation forward'', as expressed by the 44th President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2011, and freedom of religion ''is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe'', as expressed by that President of the United States on Religious Freedom Day in 2013;

Whereas ''[f]reedom of religion is a fundamental human right that must be upheld by every nation and guaranteed by every government'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1999;

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects—

(1) the right of individuals to freely express and act on the religious beliefs of those individuals; and

(2) individuals from coercion to profess or act on a religious belief to which those individuals do not adhere;

Whereas ''our laws and institutions should not impede or hinder but rather should protect and preserve fundamental religious liberties'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in remarks accompanying the signing of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.);

Whereas, for countless people of the United States, faith is an integral part of every aspect of daily life and is not limited to the homes, houses of worship, or doctrinal creeds of those individuals;

Whereas ''religious faith has inspired many of our fellow citizens to help build a better Nation'' in which ''people of faith continue to wage a determined campaign to meet needs and fight suffering'', as expressed by the 43rd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2003;

Whereas, ''[f]rom its birth to this day, the United States has prized this legacy of religious freedom and honored this heritage by standing for religious freedom and offering refuge to those suffering religious persecution'', as noted in section 2(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(a));

Whereas Thomas Jefferson wrote—

(1) in 1798 that each right encompassed in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is dependent on the other rights described in that Amendment, ''thereby guarding in the same sentence, and under the same words, the freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press: insomuch, that whatever violated either, throws down the sanctuary which covers the others''; and

(2) in 1822 that the constitutional freedom of religion is ''the most inalienable and sacred of all human rights'';

Whereas religious freedom ''has been integral to the preservation and development of the United States'', and ''the free exercise of religion goes hand in hand with the preservation of our other rights'', as expressed by the 41st President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1993; and

Whereas we ''continue to proclaim the fundamental right of all peoples to believe and worship according to their own conscience, to affirm their beliefs openly and freely, and to practice their faith without fear or intimidation'', as expressed by the 42nd President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 1998: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) on Religious Freedom Day on January 16, 2023, honors the 237th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; and

(2) affirms that—

(A) for individuals of any faith and individuals of no faith, religious freedom includes the right of an individual to live, work, associate, and worship in accordance with the beliefs of the individual;

(B) all people of the United States can be unified in supporting religious freedom, regardless of differing individual beliefs, because religious freedom is a fundamental human right; and

(C) ''the American people will remain forever unshackled in matters of faith'', as expressed by the 44th President of the United States in a Presidential proclamation on Religious Freedom Day in 2012.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I have three requests 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:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2023

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, February 2; 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 morning business be closed; further, that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Falk nomination and at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Falk nomination; finally, that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider with respect to the Falk and Zakheim nominations be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. 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 5:59 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 2, 2023, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FREEDOM FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act that would endanger health care workers, their families and their patients.

H.R. 497 would put more strain on our already fragile health care system by eliminating the COVID–19 vaccine mandate for health care providers.

As a Member of Congress, who represents a congressional district that has experienced the worst of the COVID–19 pandemic, I must oppose this bill.

The Biden administration plans to end the public health emergency in May, but we must remember that we are currently in a winter surge.

The current COVID positivity rate in Houston is 20 percent.

We are still in a pandemic, and we must do what we can to slow the spread so that less people are ending up in hospitals.

Before widespread availability and access to COVID vaccines, health care workers were 3 times more likely to get COVID than the rest of the public.

By keeping the vaccine mandates for health care workers, we can continue to slow the spread and keep health care workers and their families safe.

In a 2020 survey by MentalHealthAmerica, 76 percent of respondents were worried about bringing COVID home to their children, and half of respondents worried about bringing COVID home to their partners or an older family member.

In a survey of U.S. physicians, it was found that the portion of the day spent treating COVID–19 patients was associated with higher PTSD scores, depression and anxiety.

Additionally, many health care workers at the beginning of the pandemic saw coworkers get sick and die from COVID, and this contributed to their increased stress and anxiety.

According to the University of Chicago, it was found that an increase in staff vaccination rates resulted in fewer COVID–19 cases among the staff and the patients.

Additionally, the same study found that the more transmittable variants of COVID may require additional boosters for staff to help manage COVID–19 cases in nursing homes.

By taking away the vaccine mandate, we are making health care workers and their patients even more susceptible to the virus.

By taking away the vaccine mandate, we are neglecting vulnerable Americans who deserve their right to life and safety when getting health care.

It is important to remember, that vaccines are not new and that they are necessary to limiting viruses and keeping the country safe.

It is federal law that any health care settings that receive money for Medicare or Medicaid patients must ensure that their health care workers are vaccinated against COVID–19.

Even though the vaccine requirement caused many health care workers to leave, the health care work force is larger than it was prior to the pandemic.

As of December 2022, the health sector added 54,700 jobs over the previous month and the employment in healthcare was 1.2 percent higher than the peak in February 2020.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill to show our support for our health care workers.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FAIR COLA FOR SENIORS ACT OF 2023

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Fair COLA for Seniors Act of 2023, which would require using the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly (CPI–E) when calculating cost of living adjustments (COLAs) for federal retirement programs. The proposed index would adjust the benefits programs such as Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, civil service retirement, military retirement, veterans' pensions and compensations, and other retirement programs.

Current law uses the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI–W) which measures costs solely of working individuals—unlike most Social Security beneficiaries. Using CPI–W does not adequately consider the rising expenditures of retirement, such as housing and healthcare costs. This inadequate accounting amounts to an effective decrease in benefits for those who rely on these federal programs. The proposed change will lead to increased COLAs, ensuring that seniors are able to keep up with the rising costs of their real-world expenses.

I thank Representatives JIMMY PANETTA (CA–19), STEVE COHEN (TN–09), LUCY MCBATH (GA–07), SETH MOULTON (MA–06), BETTY MCCOLLUM (MN–04), LOIS FRANKEL (FL–22), RAÚL GRIJALVA (AZ–03), BRENDAN BOYLE (PA–02), MARY GAY SCANLON (PA–05), DINA TITUS (NV–01), CHELLIE PINGREE (ME–01), DEBORAH ROSS (NC–02), ILHAN OMAR (MN–05), JASON CROW (CO–06), JOYCE BEATTY (OH–03), ANDY KIM (NJ–03), GWEN MOORE (WI–04), TED LIEU (CA–36), and JAMAAL BOWMAN (NY–16) for their support as original cosponsors. I look forward to working with the Chairpersons of the Ways and Means, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Reform, and Armed Services Committees to ensure this critical piece of legislation becomes law.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROMOTING ACCESS TO DIABETIC SHOES ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Promoting Access to Diabetic Shoes Act.

With serious comorbidities and complications associated with it, diabetes has a significant impact on the health of our country. Diabetes is the leading cause of non-traumatic lower extremity amputation in the United States. Research shows that approximately 50 percent of people with diabetes will develop at least some degree of peripheral neuropathy and that 25 percent can expect to develop a foot ulcer at some point. As many as 24 percent of people who develop a foot ulcer will go on to have an amputation.

The good news is that preventive measures such as therapeutic or diabetic shoes can help avert the progression of neuropathy and the need for amputation. However, current Medicare statute does not allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to fulfill certification requirements as a patient's primary care providers. This means that patients who typically see these providers need to be referred to a physician for certification and continue to see them afterwards. Not only does it increase costs, this policy interrupts patient care and delays access to time-sensitive services.

My legislation would allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to fulfill these documentation requirements, which is within their scope of practice. Enacting this legislation would streamline this administrative process and allow Medicare patients to get the care they need in a timely fashion.

I urge my colleagues support this bipartisan legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE EMANCIPATION STATUE REMOVAL ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce the Emancipation Statue Removal Act, which would remove the Emancipation Statue from Lincoln Park, a federal park in the District of Columbia, and require the Secretary of the Interior to donate the statue to a museum or similar entity. This bill is part of a series of statue and memorial removal bills I am introducing during Black History Month.

The Emancipation Statue was dedicated on April 14, 1876, the 11th anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln's assassination. Although formerly enslaved Americans paid for this statue, it was designed and sculpted without their input, and it shows. The paternalistic

statue depicting a Black man on his knees in front of President Lincoln fails to recognize African Americans' agency in pressing for their own emancipation.

Understandably, recently liberated African Americans during the Reconstruction era were grateful for any recognition of their freedom in a country where they still experienced virtually total exclusion from American life. However, even at the time of its unveiling, prominent Black Americans expressed their displeasure with the statue's design, including Frederick Douglass. During his keynote address at the statue's unveiling, Douglass pointedly did not praise the statue. Rather, in a letter to the editor of the National Republican a few days after the unveiling, Douglass expressed his dismay at the statue: ''The negro here, though rising, is still on his knees and nude. What I want to see before I die is a monument representing the negro, not couchant on his knees like a four-footed animal, but erect on his feet like a man.''

In 2020, Boston removed its replica of the statue and plans to place it in a publicly accessible location where it can be better contextualized. It is time for Congress to place the original statue in a museum, too.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREG PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded for Roll Call No. 95, Roll Call No. 96, Roll Call No. 97, Roll Call No. 98, Roll Call No. 99, and Roll Call No. 100 on Tuesday, January 31, 2023. Since my first day in office, I have been squarely focused on what I was sent here to do: Represent Hoosiers of the 6th Congressional District of Indiana. Since the beginning of the COVID–19 pandemic, Congress and the State of Indiana have been laser focused on preventing the spread of COVID–19 and protecting the health of Hoosiers and all Americans. I am proud to have worked across the aisle to pass multiple bipartisan coronavirus relief bills that provided much needed assistance to Hoosiers and small businesses. Unfortunately, the Biden Administration has politicized the COVID–19 pandemic to implement their radical, leftist agenda through unilateral executive action.

I adamantly support H.R. 382, the Pandemic is over Act and H.R. 497, the Freedom for Health Care Workers Act. In September 2022, President Biden said the ''pandemic is over,'' but subsequently decided to extend the Public Health Emergency (PHE) several more times. President Biden has abused the PHE to implement student loan cancelation absent congressional authority, keep students from school, and force vaccine and mask mandates. Regrettably, President Biden compounded workforce shortages by requiring vaccine mandates for federal health care workers, disproportionately hurting rural and underserved communities.

Had I been present I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 95 (the Previous Questions), Yea on Roll Call No. 96 (Adoption of H. Res. 75), Nay on Roll Call No. 97 (Motion to Recommit), Yea on Roll Call No. 98 (Final Passage of H.R. 497), Nay on Roll Call No. 99 (Motion to Recommit), and Yea on Roll Call No. 100 (Final Passage of H.R. 382).

REMEMBERING THE 1973 VASTER HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the 1973 Vaster High School Basketball Team. Vaster High School was in Moscow, Arkansas, in Jefferson County, and at the time, had a population of around 600 people. Although a small community and school, this team had tenacious grit in the State Overall Championship tournament.

Back in 1973, the State of Arkansas decided state champions through an overall state tournament instead of having a state champion by different classifications, as it does today. In a 3-day tournament, Class B Vaster beat Morrilton, a Class AA school on Thursday, then beat Conway, a Class AAA school on Friday, and on Saturday, Vaster faced the Class AAAA, defending state champion, Central High School from Little Rock. It was described as a David versus Goliath matchup going into the game, and everyone expected a blowout win for Central. In the end, Central won the game by only 1 point. Though a heartbreaking loss, Vaster had put itself on the map, had persevered, and exhibited pride in the school, the town, and in the Cinderella run with its first-year head coach and group of fantastic players.

There is an event today honoring the 50th Anniversary of Vasters runner-up bid, and while Vaster High School is no longer in existence, the memory of the School shall always be bright because of the 1973 team who fought Central High for the state title. I would like to finish with naming the members of the 1973 Vaster High School basketball team.

Herbert Pryor (Head Coach), Andrew Carr (Assistant Coach), Cleveland Allen, Erick Biley, Samuel Biley Jr., Reddic Barkins, Rodney Crawford, (Trainer), Jimmy Dade, Carl Evans, James Evans, Tommy Evans, Roy Franklin, Jimmy Gladney, Ronnie Grice (Manager), Homer Jackson, Melvin Jackson, Jacob Jones (Trainer), Charles Petty, Rodney Ryce, Thomas Tarty.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank those who have remembered and are celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the 1973 Vaster High School Basketball Team. These young men will forever be remembered in the history of Arkansas sports.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT SILVA FOSTER UPON RECEIVING THE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Master Sergeant Silva Foster of the 349th Air Mobility Wing upon receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross for his service, dedication, and sacrifice during Operation Allies Refuge. He exemplifies the best of America, and his tireless efforts guarantee the safety of all those who call America home.

Last year, the servicemembers of the 349th Air Mobility Wing met a challenge of colossal scale when they played a pivotal role in completing the drawdown of forces from Afghanistan. This command was critical in the largest noncombatant evacuation operation in known history, Operation Allies Refuge, ultimately saving over 124,000 lives. The 349th Air Mobility Wing directly supported the evacuation of nearly 13,000 Afghans while simultaneously managing the security and operations at Hamid Karzai International Airport. I have listened to countless stories from this group of brave men and women that exemplify the character, leadership, and bravery that is cultivated at Travis Air Force Base.

Service records only scratch the surface of the courageous actions performed by the 349th Air Mobility Wing. They put their hearts and lives on the line to save so many. These valiant servicemembers like Master Sergeant Silva Foster epitomize the values of courage and patriotism.

On behalf of a grateful country and all the constituents of California's Eighth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Master Sergeant Silva Foster of the 349th Air Mobility Wing for receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross and extend my sincere gratitude for his sacrifice and contributions to the defense of this great country.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MRS. BONNIE BELL McGOWAN

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Bonnie Bell McGowan. A beloved member of our community, Mrs. McGowan's life was marked by her love for golf and her unwavering commitment to helping others achieve success through the game.

Shortly before she was born, Mrs. McGowan's parents began managing and operating Pine Needles Lodge and Golf Club. With their home situated on Pine Needles' 18th hole, Mrs. McGowan was heavily exposed to golf in her youth and quickly developed a love for the game. She went on to play at Pinecrest High School, Rollins College, and the University of North Carolina. While travelling with her husband, Pat McGowan, on the PGA tour, she became the president of the PGA Tour Wives Association in the mid-1980s. She later returned home to Pine Needles where she helped carry on her parents' business and worked as a golf instructor. She established her own legacy by becoming the face of Pine Needles and was well known for her thorough and dedicated coaching. In 2016, she became an assistant coach for the Sandhills Community College women's golf team. As proof of her love for the game and true desire to help all succeed on the course, she did not accept pay for her efforts and instead volunteered her time coaching the college team for 6 years. Mrs. McGowan was

also active with the Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA). She led The O'Neal School's FCA chapter for 10 years and supported the FCA Golf Ministry's initiatives in the golf industry.

Sadly, Mrs. McGowan passed away on January 12, 2023, due to complications associated with pancreatic cancer. My thoughts and prayers are with her family and all who knew and loved her. Mrs. McGowan's love for golf and commitment to teaching, supporting, and helping others represents the very best of our community. She leaves behind a remarkable legacy, and I join our entire community in gratitude as we honor her extraordinary life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring the life and legacy of Mrs. Bonnie Bell McGowan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LARRY R. ROGERS, SR.

HON. JONATHAN L. JACKSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of attorney Larry R. Rogers, Sr. Chicago recently lost a powerhouse in the legal community, a dedicated leader in the civil rights fight, and a man who inspired me. America was a better place because Larry lived in it, and I am proud to recognize him in Congress.

As a native to the Roseland neighborhood in the south side of Chicago, Larry was raised by his mother who worked 2 jobs to support their family and pay for her children to attend Catholic school. Larry was inspired by her work ethic and commitment to a good education, which was evident in the path Larry pursued for himself.

After graduating college, Larry put his dreams on hold in order to provide for his own family. While working at 1 of his 3 jobs, Larry struck up a friendship with a customer at a gas station, which ultimately changed his life. Joe Power, a young attorney at the time, encouraged Larry to finish law school. Once he did, Joe recruited Larry to work at the law firm he was in at the time and the two eventually went on to found a personal law and medical malpractice firm, Power Rogers LLP.

Shortly after starting the law firm, it became evident that Larry was destined to be a lawyer. He secured multimillion-dollar verdicts and recoveries for his clients, including a record $27 million product liability verdict against an infant formula company, which in 1985 was the largest personal injury verdict in Illinois history, and a $55 million verdict for a brain-damaged woman, which is the largest medical malpractice verdict that went to judgment in Illinois history. In addition to this history-making victories in the courtroom, Larry also achieved historic victories for himself. He served as the first African American President of the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association, was the President of the Cook County Bar Association, and was awarded the John Paul Stevens Award, the Chicago Bar Association's highest and most prestigious award.

While these successes are worthy of mention, Larry's work was more than legal accomplishments. He was often a mentor to young lawyers by being a trailblazer when there weren't many African American lawyers reaching the same heights as Larry so often did. Throughout his entire life, Larry understood the importance of helping others and advocating to those who needed it most, and that included supporting the young people at the start of their careers. Larry often told those who were new to the legal profession, ''Work hard. Maintain your integrity and be willing to associate with others in your field. Get to meet them and learn from them whether the others are African Americans or whites or whatever their ethnic background may be.'' As I begin my service in Congress, and proudly represent the First District of Illinois, I will carry Larry's words with me and commit myself to helping those in need.

Larry's formidable legal career also had a profound impact on his son, Larry Rogers, Jr., who I am grateful to call a friend. I can see the generational impact of Larry Sr.'s work Larry Jr. carries the mantle of his father's success, along with several other family members who have become lawyers. And while Larry Sr. has left this world, his spirit will remain as we continue to see the work being done by all of those he mentored, including his own children. Larry was a man who walked the corridors of power and never forgot those who are far too commonly left behind, and his influence will continue to be seen for generations to come.

Larry reached the heights of corporate success while carrying the compassion of the community he came from. In addition to his remarkable career, Larry Sr. was a champion for civil rights and remained a man who kept his heart and commitment with the people who needed it most. I also speak on behalf of my father, Rev. Jesse Jackson, who is grateful for Larry, Sr.'s friendship and dedication to equality throughout their relationship. Larry and my father often worked together, including at Rainbow/PUSH, and I know that we are better because of Larry's focus on social justice, both professionally and personally. The passing of Larry Rogers marks a significant loss for civil rights and a fighter for our community. My family will carry Larry's wisdom with us as the fight continues.

Above it all, Larry is remembered as a wonderful father, grandfather, and friend to those he left behind, including life partner Pam, his children and stepchildren Larry Jr., Dom, Ann Marie, and Frederic, and many grandchildren, sisters, brother, nieces, and nephews. Larry made life better for all of us and we thank God for blessing us with his presence. I hope memories of him serve as a blessing and provide comfort to all he knew.

RECOGNIZING DUNCAN CAMPBELL AND THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRIENDS OF THE CHILDREN

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity today to celebrate the accomplishments of Duncan Campbell who, in addition to being a business entrepreneur and a philanthropist, I am grateful to call a friend. Duncan is a pioneer in changing the way we help America's children and young people who are facing the greatest challenges in life. Starting as a childcare worker for juvenile offenders and later working on the Governor's Children Agenda and serving as Chairman of the Multnomah County Juvenile Services Commission, Duncan has spent decades dedicated to the pursuit of improving the lives of children who are born into unfortunate circumstances. I especially want to highlight a program he created, Friends of the Children, which is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year.

Friends of the Children is a mentoring organization that enrolls children ages 4 to 6 who are facing the most extreme challenges, and provides them with salaried, professional mentors who meet with them every week through high school graduation. Each professional mentor, called a Friend, works with 8 to 10 children. Children spend 16 hours per month with their Friends, working to achieve a set of individualized goals that place them on a path to success.

The Friends model created by Duncan is now gaining national recognition as a solution to some of our greatest challenges, and I find it a privilege to advocate for it here in Congress. It can be used to prevent foster care placement and improve stability for children already in the system. Investing in paid, professional mentoring would reduce the burden on existing systems and increase the number of children receiving evidence-based services. The program has been carefully analyzed by a wide variety of experts. It works. It's extraordinarily successful, having grown into a national network of 30 cities.

Friends of the Children is a program unlike any other. It is the solution to breaking the cycle of poverty and trauma. With the intensity and duration to change life trajectories, it provides more equitable opportunities for youth experiencing trauma or living in extreme poverty. The Friends of the Children relationship-based service model addresses the needs of our country's most vulnerable youth, empowering them to move beyond their circumstances to become healthy, contributing citizens. I encourage my colleagues to partner with chapters that serve their constituents and hear more about how their communities benefit from this program.

I offer my congratulations to Duncan, on the work he's done these last 30 years and I look forward to working with him for years to come.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT KYLE ANDERSON UPON RECEIVING THE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend First Lieutenant Kyle Anderson of the 349th Air Mobility Wing upon receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross for his service, dedication, and sacrifice during Operation Allies Refuge. He exemplifies the best of America, and his tireless efforts guarantee the safety of all those who call America home.

Last year, the servicemembers of the 349th Air Mobility Wing met a challenge of colossal scale when they played a pivotal role in completing the drawdown of forces from Afghanistan. This command was critical in the largest

noncombatant evacuation operation in known history, Operation Allies Refuge, ultimately saving over 124,000 lives. The 349th Air Mobility Wing directly supported the evacuation of nearly 13,000 Afghans while simultaneously managing the security and operations at Hamid Karzai International Airport. I have listened to countless stories from this group of brave men and women that exemplify the character, leadership, and bravery that is cultivated at Travis Air Force Base.

Service records only scratch the surface of the courageous actions performed by the 349th Air Mobility Wing. They put their hearts and lives on the line to save so many. These valiant servicemembers like First Lieutenant Kyle Anderson epitomize the values of courage and patriotism.

On behalf of a grateful country and all the constituents of California's Eighth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate First Lieutenant Kyle Anderson of the 349th Air Mobility Wing for receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross and extend my sincere gratitude for his sacrifice and contributions to the defense of this great country.

HONORING THE THURSDAY LUNCHEON GROUP'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Thursday Luncheon Group, an organization established in 1973 with the goal of increasing African American participation in the formulation, articulation, and implementation of United States foreign policy.

Since joining Congress more than 20 years ago, and as the first African American to lead the House Foreign Affairs Committee, promoting diplomacy, democracy, development, and diversity in U.S. foreign policy has been one of my main priorities. I have seen firsthand the important benefits of the work of the Thursday Lunch Group to ensure that those making and implementing foreign policy are reflective of the diversity of the United States.

The Thursday Luncheon Group celebrates its 50th anniversary this year and as the U.S. Department of State's oldest Employee Affinity Group, the organization has served as a beacon of light by upholding and advocating for more diverse recruitment, retention and leadership at the State Department, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Two senior officers working at what was then known as the U.S. Information Agency: Mr. William B. Davis and Mr. Roburt Duman established The Thursday Lunch Group In 1973. Mr. Davis and Duman gathered friends and colleagues at the Department of State and USAID to explore possibilities for greater inclusion and promotion of African Americans in the international affairs. These two founders and those who organized around this important mission began to meet every first Thursday of every month to share professional development opportunities for Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel, while also created opportunities to interact with leaders in the foreign affairs community.

Half a century later, the Thursday Luncheon Group has over 600 members, including retired and current Department of State and USAID employees, and dedicated members from 5 other federal agencies. Their members have taken prominent roles in the development and execution of U.S. foreign policy, including Chiefs of Mission, Career Ambassadors, and Assistant Secretaries. TLG members monitor recruitment, assignments, employment practices, training, and other matters of vital interest to historically excluded groups at the State Department and USAID. The organization remains committed to mentoring entry-level and mid-level officers to prepare them to become the future leaders in international affairs. Moreover, TLG members are dedicated to giving back to their communities. The organization raises funds to support paid summer internships at the Department of State and established the Terence A. Todman Book scholarship (named after the first African American to be named Career Ambassador, the highest rank among the diplomatic corps) for students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. I applaud the Thursday Luncheon Group's efforts to promote excellence and inclusion in international affairs and congratulate the members of the Thursday Luncheon Group for 50 years of service in ensuring our country is represented with excellence around the world.

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO HUMANITARIAN AND SPORTING LEGEND MUHAMMAD ALI

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, as we kick off the start of Black History Month, I am proud to reintroduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Muhammad Ali in recognition of his contributions to our Nation. I believe it is long past time to recognize this American civil rights activist and sporting legend with Congress' highest honor. Sadly, we were unable to act swiftly enough to honor him prior to his passing at age 74 in 2016, so that is why I am asking my colleagues to join me now in honoring an American hero. Over the course of his illustrious career, Muhammad Ali produced some of our Nation's most lasting and impactful sports memories. From winning a Gold Medal at the 1960 Summer Olympics, to lighting the Olympic torch at the 1996 Summer Olympics, his influence as an athlete and a humanitarian spanned over 50 years.

Despite having been diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in the 1980s, Ali devoted his life to charitable endeavors. Ali, and his wife Lonnie were founding directors of the Muhammad Ali Parkinson Center and Movement Disorders Clinic in Phoenix, AZ and helped raise over $50 million for Parkinson's research. In addition to helping families cope with illness, Ali led efforts to provide meals for the hungry and helped countless organizations such as the Make-A-Wish-Foundation and the Special Olympics.

Muhammad Ali's humanitarian efforts went beyond his charitable activities in the United States. In 1990 Muhammad Ali travelled to the Middle East to seek the release of American and British hostages who were being held as human shields in the first Gulf War. After his intervention, 15 hostages were freed. Thanks to his devotion to diplomatic causes and racial harmony, Ali was the recipient of many accolades, including being chosen as a ''U.N. Messenger of Peace'' in 1998 and receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2005 from President Bush.

Through his unyielding dedication to his sport and to struggling populations around the world, Muhammad Ali still serves an example of service and self-sacrifice for generations of Americans. The Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting commemoration of his life and work, for which he is deservingly known as ''the Greatest.''

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing one of our Nation's most lasting and influential figures by signing on to this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF UPS AIRLINES

HON. MORGAN McGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize UPS and celebrate the 35th anniversary of UPS Airlines' first flight. From its founding as a small bike messenger operation, UPS has grown into one of the most recognized brands in the world, and it continues to be a shining example of good corporate citizenship.

Thirty-five years ago, UPS did what many, including the Federal Aviation Administration, said could not be done—it built an airline in less than a year. UPS Airlines remains the fastest built airline in FAA history, and 3 decades later, it is one of the world's largest, safest, and most on-time airlines, moving the equivalent of 6 percent of the U.S. economy and 2 percent of global economy in goods and services through its supply chain each day.

Louisville is the proud home of UPS Airlines' primary global hub, Worldport, a facility that processes more than 2 million packages every day, employs more than 20,000 hardworking Kentuckians, serves nearly 800 airports worldwide, and plays a critical role in the supply chain ecosystem year-round. Over decades of global supply chain changes, UPS Airlines has remained a constant, providing good-paying jobs for hardworking Louisville families and adapting to ensure reliability for both customers and consumers.

On this 35th anniversary, I'm honored to recognize the tireless work of UPS Airlines serving our communities and creating pathways to success for thousands of employees across the Nation.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DOMINIC CALDERON UPON RECEIVING THE DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2023

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Lieutenant Colonel Dominic Calderon of the 349th Air Mobility Wing upon receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross for his service, dedication, and sacrifice during Operation Allies Refuge. He exemplifies the best of America, and his tireless efforts guarantee the safety of all those who call America home.

Last year, the servicemembers of the 349th Air Mobility Wing met a challenge of colossal scale when they played a pivotal role in completing the drawdown of forces from Afghanistan. This command was critical in the largest noncombatant evacuation operation in known history, Operation Allies Refuge, ultimately saving over 124,000 lives. The 349th Air Mobility Wing directly supported the evacuation of nearly 13,000 Afghans while simultaneously managing the security and operations at Hamid Karzai International Airport. I have listened to countless stories from this group of brave men and women that exemplify the character, leadership, and bravery that is cultivated at Travis Air Force Base.

Service records only scratch the surface of the courageous actions performed by the 349th Air Mobility Wing. They put their hearts and lives on the line to save so many. These valiant servicemembers like Lieutenant Colonel Dominic Calderon epitomize the values of courage and patriotism.

On behalf of a grateful country and all the constituents of California's Eighth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Dominic Calderon of the 349th Air Mobility Wing for receiving the Distinguished Flying Cross and extend my sincere gratitude for his sacrifice and contributions to the defense of this great country.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 2023 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 7

Time to be announced

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee for the 118th Congress.

TBA

FEBRUARY 9

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Organizational business meeting to consider committee rules and an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee for the 118th Congress; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the state of the U.S. Territories.

SD–366

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine U.S.-China policy in the era of strategic competition.

SD–419

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S179–S212

Measures Introduced: Twenty-seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 198–224, S.J. Res. 6, S. Res. 21–24, and S. Con. Res. 3. **Pages S203–04**

Measures Passed:

National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month: By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. 4), Senate agreed to S. Res. 21, supporting the observation of National Trafficking and Modern Slavery Prevention Month during the period beginning on January 1, 2023, and ending on February 1, 2023, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, human trafficking and modern slavery. **Pages S184–88**

Controlled Substances Act: Senate passed S. 223, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to fix a technical error in the definitions. **Page S192**

National School Choice Week: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 11, designating the week of January 22 through January 28, 2023, as ''National School Choice Week'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S192**

Congratulating the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits: Senate agreed to S. Res. 22, congratulating the South Dakota State University Jackrabbits on winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title. **Pages S192–93**

Falk Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, February 2, 2023, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Joseph Lee Falk, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace, and vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m. **Page S212**

Messages from the House: **Page S199**

Measures Referred: **Page S199**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S199**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S193, S199**

Executive Communications: **Pages S199–S203**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S204–05**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S205–12**

Additional Statements: **Pages S193–99**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S212**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—4) **Page S188**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:01 a.m. and adjourned at 5:59 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 2, 2023. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S212.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

2023 FARM BILL

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the 2023 Farm Bill, focusing on trade and horticulture, after receiving testimony from Alexis Taylor, Under Secretary of Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs, and Jennifer Lester Moffitt, Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, both of the Department of Agriculture; and Sarah Charles, Assistant to the Administrator, Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution authorizing expenditures by the committee, and adopted its rules of procedure for the 118th Congress.

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: 44 public bills, H.R. 694–737; 3 private bills, H.R. 738–740; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 12; and H. Res. 84–91 were introduced. **Pages H625–29**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H630–31**

Reports Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 83, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House (H. Rept. 118–2). **Page H625**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Carey to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H581**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:53 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H587**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 84, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H590**

Order of Business—Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government: Agreed by unanimous consent that, notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 12 (as amended by section 1(c) of House Resolution 78), the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with not more than 19 other Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, of whom not more than 8 shall be appointed in consultation with the minority leader. **Page H590**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:24 p.m. and reconvened at 1:31 p.m. **Page H598**

Denouncing the horrors of socialism and Removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 83, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) denouncing the horrors of socialism, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 76) removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House, by a recorded vote of 218 ayes to 209 noes, Roll No. 102, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 101. **Pages H590–99**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:44 p.m. and reconvened at 4:31 p.m. **Page H611**

Stopping Home Office Work's Unproductive Problems Act of 2023: The House passed 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 221 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 103. **Pages H599–H607, H611–12**

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 yesterday, January 31st.

Relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020: The House passed H.J. Res. 7, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020, by yea-and-nay vote of 229 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 104. **Pages H607–11, H612–13**

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 yesterday, January 31st.

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 87, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H613**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, February 2nd. **Page H613**

Order of Business—Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government: Agreed by unanimous consent that, notwithstanding section 1(a)(2)(A) of House Resolution 12 (as amended by section 1 (c) of House Resolution 78), and the order of the House of today, the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government be composed of not more than 21 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. **Page H613**

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Representative Turner, Chair; Representatives Wenstrup, Stewart, Crawford, Stefanik, Kelly (MS), LaHood, Fitzpatrick, Gallagher, Austin Scott (GA), Hill, Crenshaw, Waltz, Robert Garcia (CA), Himes, Carson, Castro (TX), Krishnamoorthi, Crow, Bera, Plaskett, Gottheimer, Gomez, Houlahan, and Spanberger. **Pages H613–14**

Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party: Representative Gallagher, Chair; Representatives Wittman, Luetkemeyer, Barr, Newhouse, Moolenaar, LaHood, Dunn of (FL), Banks, Johnson (SD), Steel, Hinson, Gimenez, Krishnamoorthi, Castor (FL), Carson, Moulton, Khanna, Kim (NJ), Sherrill, Stevens, Auchincloss, Torres (NY), and Brown. **Page H614**

Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Pandemic: Representative Wenstrup, Chair; Representatives Malliotakis, Miller-Meeks, Lesko, Cloud, Joyce (PA), Greene (GA), Jackson (TX), McCormick, Ruiz, Dingell, Mfume, Ross and Robert Garcia (CA). **Page H614**

Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government: Representative Jordan, Chair; Representatives Issa, Massie, Stewart, Stefanik, Johnson (LA), Gaetz, Armstrong, Steube, Bishop (NC), Cammack, Hageman, Plaskett, Lynch, Sanchez, Wasserman Schultz, Connolly, Garamendi, Allred, Garcia (TX) and Goldman (NY). **Page H614**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H598–99, H611–12, and H612–13.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LIVES WORTH LIVING: ADDRESSING THE FENTANYL CRISIS, PROTECTING CRITICAL LIFELINES, AND COMBATTING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THOSE WITH DISABILITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Lives Worth Living: Addressing the Fentanyl Crisis, Protecting Critical Lifelines, and Combatting Discrimination Against Those with Disabilities''. Testimony was heard from Kemp Chester, Senior Advisor, International Relations and Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Neerja Gandotra, Chief Medical Officer, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Jon C. DeLena, Associate Administrator, Business Operations, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

ECONOMIC DANGER ZONE: HOW AMERICA COMPETES TO WIN THE FUTURE VERSUS CHINA

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce held a hearing entitled ''Economic Danger Zone: How America Competes to Win the Future Versus China''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES TO INVESTIGATING THE ORIGINS OF PANDEMICS AND OTHER BIOLOGICAL EVENTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Challenges and Opportunities to Investigating the Origins of Pandemics and Other Biological Events''. Testimony was heard from Karen L. Howard, Acting Chief Scientist, Director of Science and Technology Assessment Science, Technology Assessment, and Analytics, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted

its rules for the 118th Congress. Subcommittee names and the Committee Authorization and Oversight Plan were approved.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress. The subcommittee roster was approved.

THE BIDEN BORDER CRISIS: PART I

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Biden Border Crisis: Part I''. Testimony was heard from Mark Dannels, Sheriff, Cochise County, Arizona; Ricardo Samaniego, County Judge, El Paso County, Texas; and a public witness.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress, as amended. The Staff Resolution was agreed to.

FEDERAL PANDEMIC SPENDING: A PRESCRIPTION FOR WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE; BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Accountability: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Federal Pandemic Spending: A Prescription for Waste, Fraud and Abuse''; and a business meeting on a resolution naming subcommittee chairs and ranking members for the 118th Congress. Testimony was heard from David Smith, Assistant Director, Office of Investigations, U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security; Michael E. Horowitz, Chair, Pandemic Response Accountability Committee, Inspector General, Department of Justice; and Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office. Subcommittee chairs and ranking members were approved.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; THE STATE OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPLY CHAIN CHALLENGES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held an organizational meeting; and a hearing entitled ''The State of Transportation Infrastructure and Supply Chain Challenges''. The Committee adopted its rules for the 118th Congress. Subcommittee Chairs, ranking members, and subcommittee assignments were approved. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the Department of the Energy's implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 79, to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish an interagency task force between the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Food and Drug Administration for purposes of sharing information and providing technical assistance with respect to patents, S. 113, to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, an original bill entitled, ''Stop STALLING Act'', an original bill entitled ''Preserve Access to Affordable Generics and Biosimilars Act'', an original bill entitled, ''Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act'', and the nominations of Nancy G. Abudu, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, DeAndrea Gist Benjamin, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Rachel Bloomekatz, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Cindy K. Chung, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Bradley N. Garcia, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Anthony Devos Johnstone, of Montana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Maria Araujo Kahn, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Julie Rikelman, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Daniel J. Calabretta, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Tiffany M. Cartwright, Jamal N. Whitehead, and Kymberly Kathryn Evanson, each to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, Nusrat Jahan Choudhury, Natasha C. Merle, and Ramon Ernesto Reyes, Jr., each to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Jessica G. L. Clarke, Dale E. Ho, and Arun Subramanian, each to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Matthew L. Garcia, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico, Margaret R. Guzman, Myong J. Joun, and Julia E. Kobick, each to be a United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Lindsay C. Jenkins, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Kenly Kiya Kato, and Hernan D. Vera, both to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Araceli Martinez-Olguin, Rita F. Lin, and P. Casey Pitts, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Gina R. Mendez-Miro, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Adrienne C. Nelson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, Ana C. Reyes, and Todd E. Edelman, both to be a United States District Judge for the District

of Columbia, Jamar K. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, Robert Stewart Ballou, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, Gordon P. Gallagher, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Jonathan James Canada Grey, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Colleen R. Lawless, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Andrew G. Schopler, James Edward Simmons, Jr., both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, and Rosemarie Hidalgo, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Violence Against Women Office, Amy Lefkowitz Solomon, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Jill E. Steinberg, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Launching Into the State of the Satellite Marketplace'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, organizational meeting, 9:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through January 31, 2023

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	12	17	..
Time in session	36 hrs., 20′	78 hrs., 38′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	177	579	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	80	..
Public bills enacted into law	29	..	..
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	..	..	..
Measures passed, total	11	44	55
Senate bills	..	..	..
House bills	..	20	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	4	..
Simple resolutions	11	20	..
Measures reported, total	*0	1	1
Senate bills	..	..	..
House bills	..	..	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
Simple resolutions	..	1	..
Special reports	..	..	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	8	..	..
Measures introduced, total	219	792	1,011
Bills	192	674	..
Joint resolutions	5	25	..
Concurrent resolutions	2	11	..
Simple resolutions	20	82	..
Quorum calls	1	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	3	41	..
Recorded votes	..	58	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 0 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 1 report has been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through January 31, 2023

Civilian nominees, totaling 198, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2
Unconfirmed	196
Other Civilian nominees, totaling 230, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	230
Air Force nominees, totaling 61, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	61
Army nominees, totaling 241, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	235
Navy nominees, totaling 11, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	11
Marine Corps nominees, totaling 1,069, disposed of as follows:	
Unconfirmed	1,069

Summary

Total nominees carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominees received this Session	1,810
Total confirmed	2
Total unconfirmed	1,808
Total withdrawn	0
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, February 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Joseph Lee Falk, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace, and vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 2

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: H. Con. Res. 9—Denouncing the horrors of socialism. Consideration of H. Res. 76—Removing a certain Member from a certain standing committee of the House.

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.