CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY PROJECT ADVANCE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, Syracuse University made a commitment to high school students to help prepare them for college. It also made a commitment to educators to help them continue to grow in their profession, and it made a commitment to the education community as a whole to continue important research.

The Syracuse University Project Advance is an enhanced concurrent enrollment project that is serving over 200 other partner schools. It has helped more than 750 educators become Syracuse University adjuncts.

We celebrate 50 years of the Syracuse University Project Advance program today. As a supporter of choice in education, I applaud SU for their continued efforts locally to provide programs that give students access to the tools necessary for their careers and prepare them for college.

The Syracuse University Project Advance increases dialogue between a major local university and our local high schools. It offers innovative courses, and it allows students the option to stay local and be prepared for the next chapters in their lives right in their hometowns.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF MILES ISBELL

(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, today, I honor the memory of Miles Isbell. Today would have been Miles' 12th birthday.

At the age of 9, Miles was diagnosed with brain cancer. While undergoing treatment, he refused to stop living his life to the fullest extent possible. He stayed active in school while undergoing treatment. He became a real-life trouper and outspoken candidate for cancer research while, in one night, raising $3 million for a brain cancer research facility.

Last September, the players on the San Francisco Giants baseball team wore pediatric cancer bracelets in Miles' honor. They brought him to several games, and he was able to meet several of the team's star players.

Miles had a tenacity that few of us could match. Despite the difficulty of his diagnosis and treatments, he never once uttered the word ''cancer.'' Indeed, this hat says: ''Smiles for Miles.''

Sadly, he passed away on October 21, 2022. The mark he left behind is indelible. He touched many lives. He showed everyone around him what courage and strength in the face of darkness looks like. May we honor his memory and remember his bravery.

Miles is now resting peacefully in the arms of the Lord. We in northern California mourn his passing. He will be missed every day. I can think of no better person to honor on this floor.

THE SUCCESS OF HOUSE REPUBLICANS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was grateful to join Speaker KEVIN MCCARTHY and other Republican colleagues in addressing the media to mark the first 100 days of the House majority and to present success with the Commitment to America. This includes a strong economy, a nation that is safe, a future built on freedom, and an accountable government.

Highlights so far include defunding Joe Biden's army of 87,000 IRS agents, eliminating the military vaccine mandate, establishing the bipartisan committee to strengthen America against the Chinese Communist Party, protecting America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve, passing the Parents Bill of Rights Act, and also passing the Lower Energy Costs Act.

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.

America supports the people of Russia oppressed by war criminal Putin, as we see by the persecution of Vladimir Kara-Murza, who, as has been exposed by today's Washington Post, is fighting for a free Russia. We shall remember Vladimir Kara-Murza.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 734, PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS ACT OF 2023, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 42, DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE COMPREHENSIVE POLICING AND JUSTICE REFORM AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 298

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 734) 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-3. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit (if otherwise in order).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNN of Florida). The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 298 provides for consideration of two measures, H.R. 734 and H.J. Res. 42.

The rule provides for H.R. 734, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, to be considered under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 42, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability or their designees.

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

The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act would reaffirm the principle of fairness in opportunity within Title IX by specifying that sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say something I never thought I would have to say on the House floor, in Congress, or anywhere for that matter, but here it is: women and men are different. That is not meant to be controversial, meanspirited, outlandish, or anything other than the factual statement that it is.

Perhaps I can be more specific, Mr. Speaker. Women and men are physically different. Women and men have different physical characteristics, and that is okay. That is why Title IX exists: to ensure that despite these differences, women and men have the same opportunities.

Saying women and men are different does not lack empathy for people who struggle with their identity. However, because some people struggle with their identity should not and does not change facts.

Speaking of the facts, I would be remiss if I did not include some for the House to consider, specifically in the context of athletics, one study coming from the Duke University School of Law's Center for Sports Law and Policy. They note the various differences between male and female athletes leads to a 10 to 12 percent performance gap between the sexes in athletic competition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD the results of this study.

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

There was no objection.

COMPARING ATHLETIC PERFORMANCES: THE BEST ELITE WOMEN TO BOYS AND MEN

(Doriane Lambelet Coleman and Wickliffe Shreve)

If you know sport, you know this beyond a reasonable doubt: there is an average 10–12 percent performance gap between elite males and elite females. The gap is smaller between elite females and non-elite males, but it's still insurmountable and that's ultimately what matters. Translating these statistics into real world results, we see, for example, that:

Just in the single year 2017, Olympic, World, and U.S. Champion Tori Bowie's 100 meters lifetime best of 10.78 was beaten 15,000 times by men and boys. (Yes, that's the right number of zeros.)

The same is true of Olympic, World, and U.S. Champion Allyson Felix's 400 meters lifetime best of 49.26. Just in the single year 2017, men and boys around the world outperformed her more than 15,000 times.

This differential isn't the result of boys and men having a male identity, more resources, better training, or superior discipline. It's because they have an androgenized body.

The results make clear that sex determines win share. Female athletes—here defined as athletes with ovaries instead of testes and testosterone (T) levels capable of being produced by the female, non-androgenized body—are not competitive for the win against males—here defined as athletes with testes and T levels in the male range. The lowest end of the male range is three times higher than the highest end of the female range. Consistent with females' far lower T levels, the female range is also very narrow, while the male range is broad.

These biological differences explain the male and female secondary sex characteristics which develop during puberty and have lifelong effects, including those most important for success in sport: categorically different strength, speed, and endurance. There is no other physical, cultural, or socioeconomic trait as important as testes for sports purposes.

The number of men and boys beating the world's best women in the 100 and 400 meters is far from the exception. It's the rule. To demonstrate this, we compared the top women's results to the boys' and men's results across multiple standard track and field events, just for the single year 2017. Our data are drawn from the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) website which provides complete, worldwide results for individuals and events, including on an annual and an all-time basis.

We have limited the analysis to those events where a direct performance comparison could be made. For instance, we included the 100 meters because both males and females compete over exactly the same distance; but we excluded the shot put because males and females use a differently weighted shot.

As surprising as those numbers may be to many people, the comparison is staggering when we count the number of times males outperformed the best female's result in each event in 2017.

Not only did hundreds and thousands of males outperform the best results of the elite females, they did so thousands and tens of thousands of times. (Yes, again, that's the right number of zeros.)

QUESTIONS ABOUT SEX IN SPORT AND SPORTS POLICIES

These data and comparisons explain why competitive sport has traditionally separated biological males (people with male bodies) from biological females (people with female bodies), and also why legal measures like Title IX in the United States require institutions to set aside and protect separate and equal funding, facilities, and opportunities for women and girls.

Still, society is being pushed in this period to reconsider both importance of separate sport compared to other values, and the way the girls' and women's category is protected. As a result, the conversation includes four general categories of policy options:

1. Keeping girls' and/or women's sport only for females.

2. Keeping the two categories but allowing males to compete in girls' and women's events (a) where they identify as girls and women, and/or (b) because they want the opportunity for some other reason, e.g., they are swimmers and their high school has a girls' but not a boys' swim team.

3. Keeping the two categories but allowing males to compete in girls' and women's events only if they identify as such and they transition their testosterone levels to within the female—ovarian—range.

4. Erasing the categories—no divisions by ''male'' and ''female'' however these are defined—and featuring only ''open'' sports and events where everyone competes together, or else in sports and events based on different classifications like height or weight.

Our goal in developing and presenting the data and comparisons is to provide some of the facts necessary to evaluate these options and to help answer the overarching question: what would happen if we stopped classifying athletes on the basis of sex or else allowed exceptions to that rule? More specifically, we hope that the data and comparisons are useful as people think about the following questions:

How important is sport, its particular events, and goals?

Should societies and sports governing authorities continue to be committed to equal sports events and opportunities for boys and girls, men and women?

Are there good reasons to ensure that biological females (people with female bodies) are included and visible in competitive sport, and if so, does it matter how they are visible? For example, is it enough that they are given an opportunity to participate at some point in development sport, or is it important that they are competitive for the win so that we see them in championships and on the podium?

In general, the goals of the identity movement are to ensure that people who are trans and intersex are fully and equally included in society's important institutions on the basis of their identity, not their (reproductive) biology. In cases of conflict between the goals of the identity movement and sports' traditional goals for girls' and women's sport, what should our priority be: equal opportunity in sport for girls and women or the ability of each individual to participate in sports on their own terms?

Should our priorities depend on the sporting context, for example, is or should the priority be different in elementary school, junior high school, high school, college, and professional sport?

If we want to have it all—to respect everyone's gender identity and still to support girls' and women's sport by making a place for athletes with female bodies in competition—what's the best way forward? What's the best compromise position? Ultimately, this is the most important question for sports policymakers in this period.

A. Is it acceptable to include everyone but still to classify on the basis of sex, like we do already on the basis of weight in wrestling and boxing? For example, could the Olympic

Committee have required Bruce Jenner—before he became Caitlyn and transitioned physically—to compete as a man in the men's decathlon?

B. Would it have been more or less acceptable to have required Jenner to compete in the men's decathlon, but not to prescribe how she expresses her identity as a woman?

C. If Jenner before her physical transition had wanted to compete in the women's heptathlon, would it have been acceptable for the Olympic Committee to have required her first to transition physically, at least her testosterone levels, so that—although she would still be competing with a lot of developed male traits useful for athletics—all competitors would compete on equal footing in terms of steroid levels?

D. If none of these options strikes the right balance between the two important competing interests, is there another option that does?

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, now we will hear that this bill is a distraction or that it does nothing to address school safety issues, but I couldn't disagree more.

We have seen women, strong women, women like Riley Gaines, speak to the real harm female athletes experience from the issues we are discussing today. For those who don't know, Riley is a former college competitive swimmer—just like my own girls at home who are swimmers.

I had the chance to speak with Riley just last week. She shared stories on how this problem has been branded on the left as taking away inclusiveness, when in reality it is taking away opportunities from our female athletes. Women are becoming collateral damage.

Riley told me stories about her competitor, a biological male, sharing locker rooms and showers with teammates. She told me how a year later one teammate who was quiet at the time wrote letters to her about how the experience still traumatizes her.

Riley also shared a story of how when that same biological male competitor won, she was asked to step away from the medal podium photo. The sport she loved had been reduced to a photo op. That is not progress. It is quite the opposite.

Riley reminded me that her story is not unique. In fact, I have a list provided by Concerned Women for America where they documented over 100 instances of women needing the type of protection that H.R. 734 would provide.

So what do we know after all of this debate?

We know that women and girls like Riley have to face legitimate safety and privacy concerns associated with sharing locker rooms with competitors of the opposite sex. Women and girls have to face physical safety concerns.

For example, there is a story of a biological male in North Carolina participating in women's volleyball. This biological male spiked the ball so forcefully into the face of a female competitor that he seriously injured the young girl and caused lasting damage to her.

There is the story of Tamikka Brents, an MMA fighter, who had her skull fractured and a concussion within 2 minutes of fighting a transitioned fighter, Fallon Fox.

Women and girls have to face the lack of a level playing field and stolen opportunities that come with it. As Riley speaks so eloquently about, the fact is that these biological men steal championships and associated opportunities from women. She would know.

Prior to transitioning, Lia Thomas, her competitor, was ranking in the mid-500s in the men's competition. After transitioning and competing against biological women, Lia Thomas finished first.

If this does not illustrate the unfairness of allowing biological males to compete in women's sports, I don't know what will.

These women are Olympians and college all-Americans.

We also have to face the fact that biological men competing in sports meant for women and girls has the effect of discouraging them. These sports that are meant for women and girls and having to compete against men, is discouraging.

Now they must face the inherent unfairness of competing against biological men.

We know that sports participation has incredibly positive benefits for participants, both from a physical and also from a mental health perspective.

Since this phenomenon of biological men participating in women's sports is relatively new, it is a problem that will only continue to get worse if we don't act to stand up on their behalf.

Speaking of problems that will get worse if we don't act, I want to turn now to H.J. Res. 42. This resolution would disapprove of the District of Columbia Council's Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2022.

Plain and simple, H.J. Res. 42 is about backing the blue.

In January of this year, the D.C. Council passed the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Amendment Reform Act, effectively making the job of our police officers even harder. Mayor Bowser declined to sign or veto it, which allowed it to continue in the process ultimately reaching here, the Congress, for disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the record four letters of support for H.J. Res. 42 disapproving of the D.C. Council's decision.

One letter is from the National Fraternal Order of Police. One letter is from the National Association of Police Organizations. One letter is from the United States Capitol Police Labor Committee. Finally, one letter is from the Commonwealth of Virginia's attorney general.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
Washington, DC, 28 March 2023.

Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVEN J. SCALISE,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KATHERINE M. CLARK,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVES JEFFRIES, SCALISE, AND CLARK: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for H.J. Res. 42, a resolution disapproving the adoption of the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act (CPJRAA) by the Washington, D.C. City Council. On January 19, 2023, the D.C. Council enacted the CPJRAA without the signature of Mayor Muriel E. Bowser.

The Fraternal Order of Police is the union that represents the men and women of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). These officers have made it clear to us and to the residents of the city that the CPJRAA would negatively impact the department's officers and the safety of the public in the District of Columbia. The D.C. Council seeks to strip MPD officers of their right to bargain collectively with the city over disciplinary procedures—a right which all other public employees have. The legislative action also repeals the requirement that the MPD commence discipline against their officers within 90 business days, which will result in abusively long disciplinary investigations that violate the Constitutional rights of these officers. The PCJRRA also provides for the disclosure of disciplinary records which will include personally identifiable information—placing these officers in jeopardy.

Irresponsible legislative actions like this contribute to the recruitment and retention crisis in the District and around the nation. In the last three years, the MPD has lost 1,191 officers—nearly one-third of the department. Of these, 40 percent were resignations—men and women who just walked away from their law enforcement careers in the District of Columbia. We believe that this type of attrition is directly attributable to the appalling way these officers have been treated by the City Council.

We urge the House to adopt H.J. Res 42 and disapprove of the PCJRAA.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we strongly urge all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to support and pass H.J. Res. 42 to protect the safety of the public in Washington, D.C. and the rights of the officers that keep the District safe. If I can provide any additional information in support of this resolution, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, March 30, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER MCCARTHY AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the National

Association of Police Organizations (NAPO) and the over 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers we represent across the country, I am writing to advise you of our concerns with the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act (CPJRAA) that was enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on January 19, 2023, and our subsequent support for H.J. Res. 42.

The CPJRAA will negatively impact the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) and the City it serves. The underlying message of this act is that law enforcement officers cannot be trusted. It strips the men and women of the MPD of their right to bargain over accountability or disciplinary issues. This creates substandard collective bargaining rights for the officers, setting them apart from their fellow public servants in the District, who are allowed to bargain over disciplinary issues.

Further, the CPJRAA undermines officers' Constitutional rights, including the right to due process, a right we give to all citizens. This is incredibly concerning. Without guidelines and procedures to protect officers' due process, officers are too often subjected to the whim of their departments or local politics during internal investigations and administrative hearings. The CPJRAA also violates officers' right to privacy by disclosing officer disciplinary records, without regard to personal identifiable information, which risks putting officers and their families in harm's way.

NAPO is concerned the CPJRAA will exacerbate the current hiring and retention crisis the MPD is facing. With the City Council not respecting or trusting the officers who serve and protect their citizens, it will hinder recruitment and impact officer morale. Therefore, we support H.J. Res. 42, disapproving of the CPJRAA. If we can provide any assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, ESQ.,
Executive Director.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE
LABOR COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the United States Capitol Police Labor Committee, I am writing you urgently asking your support for the new House Resolution, set to disapprove the Comprehensive Policing Amendment Act of 2022, with special attention to Subsection P.

The officers and members of the Capitol Police Labor Committee and the DC Police Union both fully support removing any form of physical neck restraints and the expansion of the mandatory training with rules to prevent the hiring of previously fired bad cops.

But we must ask you to intervene and send this bad bill back to the DC City Council, as the whole of the bill is untenable and dangerous. Subtitle P is especially concerning for Capitol Police in the wake of the January 6th insurrection. While certainly drafted by the DC Council with good intentions, Subtitle P would have likely forced much of our backup and support to arrive to the scene of the insurrection without riot gear or appropriate less-lethal options for their safety, or ours. The language of the act is too wide, unclear, and dangerous to our ability to protect peace in the District and at the United States Capitol.

Additionally, as the President of a labor organization and a believer in the rights of collective bargaining, I must ask you as an ally of labor to look closely at Subtitle L. Subtitle L in the act would strip certain rights of collectively bargain away from one class of employee within the District, denying them rights that make up the foundation of the labor movement. Fair and transparent investigations, discipline, and appeal are necessary and just matters of collective bargaining. They're mandatory sectors of public section employee relations and clear rights of collective bargaining. This threat to collective bargaining is a dangerous pandora's box and I must ask for your help.

The Comprehensive Policing and Justice Act of 2022 must be sent back to the D. C. City Council so these issues can be reviewed, negotiated, and resolved. Congress has the right and responsibility to take action here to prevent these dangerous subtitles from becoming law, threatening our safety and stripping away the rights of labor.

GREGG PEMBERTON,
Chairman, DC Police Union.
GUS PAPATHANASIOU,
Chairman, FOP-USCP Union.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Richmond, VA, April 6, 2023.

Hon. MURIEL BOWSER,
Washington, DC.
Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Hon. KENYAN R. MCDUFFIE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAYOR BOWSER AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS: It has become painfully apparent that Washington, D.C., can protect neither its residents nor the thousands of Virginians who commute daily to the city for work or entertainment. As the chief law enforcement officer for the Commonwealth of Virginia, I feel responsible for the safety of all 8.642 million Virginians.

Unfortunately, due to the proximity of our communities, D.C.'s crime problem has become Virginia's crime problem.

I refuse to stand by quietly as you continue to deny, reject, and refuse to address your very prevalent crime spike that is impacting D.C. residents and its visitors and commuters. Your unwillingness to enforce your laws and hold violent offenders responsible puts your residents and mine at risk.

Over the weekend, Christy Bautista, an innocent young woman from Virginia, was murdered in the supposed safety of her hotel room less than an hour after checking in to attend a concert in your city. A Capitol Hill staffer was brutally attacked in broad daylight. Over the summer, a young Arlington woman was harassed on the metro, and countless Virginians have been murdered in D.C. over the last three years, including Aaron Bourne, Kenithy Manns, Christian Gabriel Monje, and Ahmad Clark.

Yet, D.C. Council Chairman Mendelson recently denied that D.C. had a crime crisis. According to the Metropolitan Police Department, D.C. has seen two consecutive years of over 200 homicides—a distinction the city hasn't reached in nearly two decades. In addition, carjackings have been steadily rising for the last five years. Homicides in Washington, D.C., have increased by 31 percent since this time last year, sexual assault increased by 84 percent, and motor vehicle theft has increased by 107 percent. In general, crime in 2023 has risen by 23 percent.

Washington, D.C., is dealing with a crime explosion. Actions speak louder than words—and the only actionable items taken by Washington D.C. leadership have been ways to lessen criminal penalties, further fostering an environment for criminal activity. There is no deterrent for illegal behavior in Washington, D.C., as these repeat offenders know they will either not be charged or let back on the streets in no time.

That's why we lost Christy Bautista. D.C.'s lenient policies and perspectives are responsible for her murderer's release when he should have been in custody. An innocent woman lost her life to someone who should have been in jail.

Her murder is a tragedy that should have never happened.

To keep our communities safe—Washington D.C. and Northern Virginia—we need to work together to address the issue of rising crime. But that means acknowledging it is a problem and committing to finding a solution rather than sweeping it under the rug.

Our nation's Capital should be a beacon of hope and freedom for the entire world, not known as a place where attending a concert can end one's life. I urge the city's leadership to address the scourge of violent crime that is growing more intolerable by the day.

Sincerely,

JASON S. MIYARES.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it is this last letter from Virginia's attorney general that makes an important point. I am quoting directly from the letter, ''Unfortunately, due to the proximity of our communities, D.C.'s crime problem has become Virginia's crime problem.''

What happens in the Nation's Capital certainly has consequences for our neighboring communities, but I would also argue that it has consequences across the country. The decisions made here often affect decisions around the country and in other major cities.

Therefore, we must think carefully when we review legislation that would allow outside groups to target individual officers and make it more difficult for those officers to do their jobs. We certainly don't want that to catch on.

D.C., as of this month compared to last year, has had total crime rise 23 percent, seen homicides increase by 31 percent, and sexual abuse crimes rise a staggering 84 percent.

Why we would be trying to implement measures alienating law enforcement officers is beyond me. We should be doing everything we can to show law enforcement officers that we stand with them, especially in areas where crime is on the rise and out of control. We should make it easier, not harder, for them to do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, our female athletes, and police officers here in the Nation's Capital and around the Nation.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider a rule for two bills that do not address the most pressing issues in our country. Over the last 2 weeks in New Mexico, I spent my time in my beautiful, large district in classrooms, meeting with healthcare providers, learning from Tribal leaders, and talking to students and their parents.

They shared their worries about poor access to healthcare, about affordable housing, their worries about whether we were going to target Social Security and Medicare in this House.

They talked to me about the epidemic of gun violence. Let's talk about that epidemic. There have been at least 145 mass shootings so far this year. More kids die from gun violence than from any other cause. Americans want Congress to pass meaningful gun safety laws so our kids can be safe and cared for in our schools.

What are we getting out of the Education and the Workforce Committee?

We are getting book banning and now sports banning. You know what? Books and sports don't kill kids, guns do.

I have behind me here just some of the names of the many children who have died in their classrooms and in their schools.

Parents are scared. Students are terrified of being killed at school, a place where they should be safe and ready to learn. Kids should be able to go to a 16th birthday party and come home again.

But the bills this rule makes in order won't fix the scourge of gun violence in this country. While kids are dying from gun violence, the answer from the House Republican majority is to bully trans girls with H.R. 734 and undermine D.C.'s local laws. That is not okay.

Today, I stand in strong solidarity with some of the most vulnerable students in our schools, trans girls. Trans kids deserve to be understood. They deserve to be loved. They deserve an opportunity to play on a team and make friends.

Today, the Republican majority has brought up yet another bill that is meant to divide us and to get people angry and upset over things that are not key to whether they can have what they want their kids to accomplish in school.

H.R. 5, which the Republican majority passed in March, was about banning books. H.R. 734, which we are debating this week, is about bullying kids.

The problem is this: When you bully these kids it can lead to their death. I am worried that this bill will lead to rising suicide rates among the most vulnerable kids in our schools.

Studies have proven that when we welcome trans kids with compassion and kindness they are less likely to attempt suicide.

Studies have shown that the problem isn't whether a kid is trans or not, it is are they accepted? At a time when trans kids face alarming rates of behavioral and mental health issues and 53 percent of trans kids have considered suicide, my colleagues have chosen to use fear to score political points.

Mr. Speaker, 1 in 25 American kindergartners won't live to adulthood. Imagine that. Imagine going into a kindergarten class, like I did several times in my district, looking out at that class and thinking, which one of those precious children will not make it to adulthood?

That is the issue we should be addressing, both gun violence and addressing behavioral and mental health, and providing the resources that they need.

You know what? The rate of children not making it is twice as much for Hispanics and over three times as much for Black students.

Do we go after that in this bill?

No, we don't.

Sports and books are what H.R. 734 goes after, not guns and violence.

There is already a mechanism in place to address the fairness in playing sports that has been raised on the other side of the aisle. There is already a way of addressing those distinctions in playing sports. The NCAA and Olympics put these in place decades ago.

The Olympics already has a manual for what you should do, and it was done in 2003.

Here in the United States we already have something done by the NCAA. The NCAA adopted a student athlete participation policy that will cover the concerns that some people may have.

Women in sports, I will tell you—they say they are doing this for women.

Guess what? Women in sports who compete, they don't want this bill. They understand it is not about sports but about making people angry.

We have the statements of women's rights and gender justice organizations in support of full and equal access to participation in athletics for transgender people, and it is signed by numerous women's sports organizations. One after another they have lined up to say, no, this bill is bad for women in sports.

You know what? I want to make sure here in Congress that we lead with compassion. We are all human. We all have within our families, within our communities, people who are lesbian, who are gay, who are trans, who are many, many different aspects of who they are, who they actually are and authentically are.

Why are you willing to sacrifice those beautiful kids of ours? Why? I just don't understand it.

You know what? Trans kids deserve to live.

The rule also makes in order H.J. Res. 42, which disapproves of the District of Columbia's Comprehensive Police and Justice Reform Amendment Act. The D.C. Council, elected by D.C. residents, passed this bill through democratic process.

D.C., just like those in Kentucky and other local jurisdictions—it is the local jurisdictions which should have the right to enact laws through their democratic process without congressional interference.

We should not be having congressional interference into local matters, like protecting our citizens and like having a police force that is responsible to those citizens.

□ 1245

Just because Congress can intervene in D.C. affairs, doesn't mean that it should.

The D.C. reform bill includes many of the reforms that both Republican and Democratic States and localities have passed, things like banning choke holds, things like using body cameras. That is available in red districts, in red States, in red cities, and in blue cities. In New Mexico we have those things.

So let's stop interfering in D.C.'s affairs. Let's put forward legislation in contrast that addresses the needs of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have had ample opportunities to work with Republicans during the 117th Congress on bills that protect students in schools, including H.R. 7966, the STOP II Act, sponsored by Representative RICHARD HUDSON of North Carolina, that would have increased funding for school resource officers and mental health guidance counselors and would have provided Federal grants for better securing our schools; and H.R. 7942, the Securing Our Students Act, sponsored by Representative BURGESS Owens of Utah, that would have allowed school district to use unspent COVID–19 emergency relief funds to improve school buildings and strengthen security.

Unfortunately, the Democrat then-majority blocked these bills from coming to the House floor.

In addition, the House recently passed H.R. 5 which includes provisions ensuring the rights of parents to be informed about violent incidents in school and ensuring that school boards cannot censor the voices of parents who are expressing concerns about any such violent incidents.

This is not about bullying kids. It is about fairness. It is about standing up for biological women and girls when no one on the left seems to care about that.

Our colleagues across the aisle have even said it is okay for biological males to share locker rooms and showers with biological females even if they don't consent.

If supposed groups that support women oppose this bill, then they don't support women. We aren't saying that they can't participate in sports with children or biological males that might have a different identity. We are not saying they can't participate in sports. We are saying they must compete according to their biological sex.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY).

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which provides consideration of legislation to protect women and girls in athletics, and the resolution to curb the reckless anti-cop, pro-crime policies being carried out by the D.C. Government.

I would be remiss to not point out the irony that my colleagues across the aisle have twisted themselves into a knot trying to malign a bill that seeks to protect a fair playing field for

women and girls, a historically marginalized group, but it is telling about how far out of the mainstream some of these policies have become.

Ensuring that biological female athletes can compete fairly and honestly with other biological female athletes is the epitome of common sense. For the self-described party of science to ignore the biological realities between men and women is convenient and willful ignorance.

What kind of message do we want to send to our young female athletes who work hard putting in the time, sweat, and tears into their sport only to find out that they lose a competition because the deck has been knowingly and purposefully stacked against them?

It is just plain wrong.

Achieving notoriety and fairness in female sports has come a long way over the last several decades in this country, but there is still a very long way to go. This bill would take us a half century backwards.

Everyone should have a right to compete in sports, but it can't come at a cost of trampling on the rights of women and girls to compete fairly.

I am proud to support this legislation that protects the original intent of Title IX: to prevent discrimination on the basis of sex.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that respects the realities of natural biology and protects fair opportunities for women and girls to compete and to win.

Additionally, I would like to share my support for H.J. Res. 42. As a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, I was present to question the leadership of the D.C. Council about the latest efforts to vilify and defund the police.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. It was shameful to see how the leadership of our Nation's Capital shrugged their shoulders at the alarming spikes in violent crime sweeping across the district. D.C. residents are fed up. Visitors to our Nation's Capital are fed up.

Americans deserve to be safe, not subjected to repeat offenders shooting up the Metro stop while they commute to work, as happened earlier this year. Our police officers and first responders deserve to be supported, not vilified. Where Congress can, under current law, it should act to preserve law and order and prevent these reckless actions from taking effect.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would not protect kids. We must remember that this legislation could require female student athletes to be subjected to invasive genital examinations or forced to disclose their menstruation data.

What parent would want their child to go through that?

This is a grotesque violation of privacy and the complete opposite of protecting our children.

If Republicans really want to protect our girls, they should focus on real issues. The sexual abuse of female athletes and students goes unreported too often. The U.S. Center for SafeSport found that 93 percent of athletes experienced sexual harassment or unwanted contact and they were too afraid to report it. We must address the real issues that our children face.

With regards to the D.C. bill, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule. I will have more to say tomorrow about the police accountability and transparency legislation enacted by the District of Columbia's local legislature, but I want to take this time to discuss democratic principles.

It is true that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on our local D.C. matters, but it is false that Congress has a constitutional duty, obligation, or responsibility to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice.

I remind my Republican colleagues, who claim to revere the Founders, what James Madison said in Federalist 43 about the residents of the Federal District: ''A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them.''

The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate ''full legislative power'' on local D.C. matters.

D.C. disapproval resolutions are profoundly undemocratic and paternalistic legislation.

D.C.'s local legislature, the D.C. Council, has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the members vote, they can vote them down. This is called democracy.

Congress has 535 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of the States. None are elected by or accountable to D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote—even on legislation that applies only to D.C.—they cannot vote them out of office.

The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and to end taxation without representation. Yet nearly 700,000 D.C. residents cannot consent to any action taken by Congress, whether on national or local D.C. matters, while paying full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and more total Federal taxes than 23 States.

If the House cared about democratic principles or D.C. residents, it would be voting on my statehood bill, the Washington, D.C., Admission Act, instead. Congress has the constitutional authority to admit the State of Washington, D.C. The House is choosing not to. It is a choice.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying to all Members of the House: Keep your hands off of D.C.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard our Democratic colleagues across the aisle talk about Republicans not caring about sexual abuse of female athletes and it is going underreported. But not a single Democrat voted for H.R. 5 which has language in it in the Parents Bill of Rights to inform parents of violent activity going on at school.

This provision was put in, in part, because of circumstances that happened in Loudoun County, Virginia, which kept a sexual assault by a trans student of a young female under wraps, including even transferring that student to another school where that student committed an additional sexual assault. Not a single Democrat voted for H.R. 5.

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

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for the rules package of H.R. 734, the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act.

Here we are again, Mr. Speaker. This side of the aisle is advocating for sanity and humanity while that side of the aisle raises their hands saying: What are we doing here?

Just like in our debate where we had to denounce socialism on this floor, and just like our debate where we had to defend the lives of abortion survivors, we are here to protect America. We are here for the sanity and humanity of America.

Women's sports are meant for biological women and biological women alone. Let's follow the science. For generations, female athletes such as Lisa Leslie, Serena Williams, Katie Ledecky, Mia Hamm, and, most recently, Riley Gaines—who sat in this very gallery during our State of the Union Address and most recently was violently assaulted by a radical mob of activists—have fought tirelessly to tear down societal barriers in sports.

This movement, Mr. Speaker, is making a mockery—a mockery—of their brave dedication and overall progress for women in general.

Now my colleagues across the aisle want to insult the hours of blood, sweat, and tears that these women have invested into their sports and their careers. We are not going to stand for it. Enough is enough. The emperor has no clothes.

Some 50 years ago, Congress passed Title IX to give women the opportunity to compete at levels never seen before. Women broke barriers, and now this radical movement wants to break their spirit.

It is an insult to that legislation and to the progress society has made. It is

an insult—yes—that we are even here today having to debate this very issue. Women deserve protections and a fair playing field and a fair swimming pool.

Is that too much to ask for, Mr. Speaker?

This legislation will give them just that. H.R. 734 states that sex in the athletic context must be recognized based only on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth. It also clarifies that a recipient of Title IX funding is violating the prohibition against sex discrimination if a school allows a person whose sex is male to participate in a women's athletic activity.

Simply put, we cannot ignore the biological differences between a male and a female. To do so would be ignorant and a disservice to the sporting world.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about hate. This is about love. This is about love for our country, love for the advancement that women have made, and love for sanity.

Let's give women the protection that they deserve and the protection that they have earned.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all opposition to this bill is not radical. Indeed, the Republican Governor of Utah also opposed a similar bill, and in his veto message he talked about the fact that even though he might not understand what it means to be trans, even though he doesn't understand the science which might be conflicting, he said: I choose to err on the side of kindness and compassion.

He wanted to make sure that the children live, the few children in his State who play sports, the few trans children in his State who play sports, he said: Why are we heaping so much hatred on those children?

I want them to live.

The reason why that concern is so profound is because of the fact that transgender kids have an extremely high risk of suicidal behavior. In 2021, suicide was the second leading cause of death for kids ages 10–14 and 20–34. Nearly one in five trans kids attempted suicide that year. I want our trans kids to live.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, our Rules Committee meeting last night was an embarrassment.

Republicans went on and on about locker rooms, the same creepy stereotypes they leaned on when they tried to stop gay marriage.

They went on and on about fairness, but no mention of the unfairness girls' sports teams face when it comes to unequal resources, unequal pay, and unequal treatment.

They went on and on about safety, but no mention of the number one reason America's schools are unsafe: gun violence. Our kids are being slaughtered, for God's sake. Does anybody on the other side even care?

Republicans claimed trans people don't even exist, which makes me wonder why they wasted all our time on their creepy obsession with controlling the lives of people they think aren't even real.

Republicans now believe Congress—Congress—should be empowered to pick and choose which kids should be allowed to play on the soccer team.

You can't make this stuff up.

What is next? A bill about who can play together at recess?

Republican hypocrisy is breathtaking. Republicans want to ban trans kids from sports, but they won't ban child marriage in States like West Virginia and Tennessee.

The same party systematically taking away women's reproductive rights across the country, the same party that won't lift a finger as our kids are massacred in our schools, that takes NRA blood money instead of addressing an actual problem like gun violence, now wants to use protecting girls as their sick excuse for targeting trans kids.

Enough is enough. Stop the fearmongering.

The truth is that this bill would mean more trans kids, already vulnerable as it is, would be bullied, beaten, and killed. It would deprive trans kids of the opportunity to learn about teamwork, discipline, and sportsmanship.

Finally, let me just say that the trans community deserves so much better than this. I hope they know that they have allies in Congress and across the country who care about them and who will fight for them. It shouldn't be a radical idea to respect people for who they are, and it shouldn't be a radical idea to love people for who they are.

I urge my Republican colleagues to stop the lies, stop the bigotry, stop the hate. Leave kids alone. I urge a ''no'' vote on this awful, rotten rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I flatly reject any talk of fearmongering on behalf of Republicans on this side of the aisle.

Talk about fearmongering, we have just heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that, according to this bill, female student athletes will be subject to violative exams. Nothing in this bill talks about them being subject to exams, physical or otherwise, only that they compete in the sports according to their biological sex at birth.

Nothing in this bill prevents or says that transgender children cannot participate in sports. We are only saying that, out of fairness and safety for women and girls, students participate in sports according to their biological sex. We are not preventing anyone from participating in sports.

Mr. Speaker, again, I reiterate, the public safety legislation that Republicans proposed in the 117th Congress that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle opposed—bills that would increase funding for school resource officers and mental health counselors, Federal grants to secure schools, Securing Our Students Act, allowing districts to claw back unspent COVID–19 funds to improve school buildings and strengthen security—those bills were flatly rejected from the Democrat-held majority at the time. Those bills would have done exactly what they suggest that they want to do now. Maybe if we bring those bills back, we will get their support.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we can actually point to two accomplishments that we did on this House floor when Democrats were in charge. The Democratic leadership in Congress helped us lead to pass the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. It was bipartisan, but we had very few Republicans. That would have provided the kind of resources we need in our schools to help our children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SORENSEN).

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Speaker, every day I hear from parents who worry about their children's safety in school, from bullying to gun violence. Yet, instead of addressing the issues that are relevant today, we are debating a bill that takes away certain kids' ability to learn, like how to be a part of a team, how to build friendships, how to set goals, and how to work with one another. Every child in America should learn this.

It is hard to be a kid today. It is hard to go to school. It is hard to make friends. It is hard to fit in. We need to give kids the opportunity to be healthy and happy and to have joy.

This isn't about protecting sports. This is about every child setting their own goals, being a part of their team and overcoming challenges, and being, finally, proud of who they are and what they can achieve.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SORENSEN. Mr. Speaker, stop the nonsense. Let's get back to work and solve the real problems, which is what the people back home sent us here to do.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Vermont (Ms. BALINT).

Ms. BALINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and to speak clearly and directly on H.R. 734, which Republicans are ironically calling the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This bill is undeniably an attack on our kids and does nothing of substance to protect girls.

Bills like this are aimed at taking away rights from LGBTQ Americans, specifically our kids. Kids and their families are being targeted and harassed for political gain. I ask, is this really the Nation that we want to live in?

Sports bans for kids are cruel and unnecessary. These bills are clearly, at their core, un-American. They are about restricting rights. They are about barring kids—kids, kids—from full participation in sports.

The U.S. House of Representatives must not participate in this obvious fear-based hate and discrimination of trans youth. We risk lives when we don't stand up clearly and loudly against discrimination of all kinds.

This bill would have us believe that we should be afraid of trans youth. Nothing could be further from the truth.

When I talk to these kids and their families, when I listen deeply to these kids and their families, what they say is: I just want to live my life. I just want to have friends. I want to be myself. I don't want to go to school and be picked on.

They need our support. They do not need us demonizing them and fearmongering and bullying.

Today, Republicans blocked our amendments, which would have actually supported our girls in schools. My amendment would have strengthened protections against harassment in schools based on sex, race, color, national origin, disability, and age. It would have restored protections against harassment and ensured equal opportunities for all students. It would have also required schools to take additional steps to protect students that have experienced sex-based harassment.

We cannot keep putting our children in harm's way with this hateful rhetoric that is coming directly from inside the Halls of Congress. Instead, let's do our job and take real steps to actually protect our children.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that they say is demonizing: ''H.R. 734, 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.''

''Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit a recipient from permitting males to train or practice with an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls so long as no female is deprived of a roster spot on a team or sport, opportunity to participate in a practice or competition, scholarship, admission to an educational institution, or any other benefit that accompanies participating in the athletic program or activity.''

It makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have read this bill, given their vehement opposition to it.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Republicans are attacking one of the most marginalized, most discriminated groups in our country—trans Americans—just to score cheap political points. Yes, cheap political points because this is something from the top down, from the head of the Republican Party here in Congress to each of the States that have introduced anti-trans legislation.

It is especially sick when you look at the statistics. Over 50 percent of trans youth considered suicide just last year. Let that sink in: 50 percent—not a fraction, 50 percent.

Yet, rather than address pressing issues like gun violence, the leading cause of death for our children, Republicans are attacking trans and other LGBTQ kids. It shows exactly who they are—bigots and bullies. I said that once and I will say it again: bigots and bullies.

This isn't their first attack on the trans community, as I mentioned. At the start of this Congress, my Republican colleagues threatened to revoke funding for an organization in my district that helps trans Americans find jobs and mental health resources. Oh, big conspiracy, trying to help people with mental health issues and help them find jobs.

If they think their attacks will stop me from supporting the trans community, they are simply wrong.

Transgender, nonbinary, and intersex youth want to participate in team sports for the same reason as their cisgender peers: to be part of a team, learn sportsmanship, and challenge themselves.

As the brother of an LGBTQ American, I find their attacks offensive. I will vote ''no'' on this piece of legislation.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, which I hope we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House's unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE).

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues and I are here to defend Social Security and Medicare and to support our Nation's seniors.

My district has the lowest median household income in Oregon. We have over 160,000 seniors who rely on Social Security for their retirement.

My colleagues across the aisle are approaching Social Security as if it is an unearned handout. That is beyond offensive. That is not what it is meant to do. That is not what it is meant to be.

People have paid into this system their whole lives. They should be able to get their contributions back, and that is the promise of our Social Security program.

Right now, we only tax income up to $160,000 a year to fund Social Security. Millionaires and billionaires who get their income from investments instead of earning their money by the hour, like most of my constituents and like most working Americans, aren't paying their fair share into Social Security at all.

We must change the system. By finally requiring the wealthiest Americans to pay into Social Security at the same rate as all the hardworking nurses and firefighters across this country, we can expand benefits, not cut them.

I am not in Congress to protect billionaires. I am here to make sure those who have paid into the system their whole lives and who have worked hard, including our fishermen, electricians, and schoolteachers, can retire with dignity and welcome a new generation to the workforce. It is our responsibility to make sure that Social Security can be successful in the future.

It is time for the House majority to stop playing games with people's lives with bills that don't do anything and support Social Security and Medicare.

□ 1315

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, across the country, State legislatures, including my home State of Texas, have advanced legislation seeking to ban transgender kids from participating in sports. Very sadly, this bill here today in Congress is seeking to do the same.

The so-called Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act up for consideration today is nothing more than another extreme MAGA Republican political stunt, taking away the focus from the real issues affecting American people.

It would stipulate that Title IX compliance ban gender and intersex girls and women from participating in sports.

Denying children access to a place where they can gain mental and physical benefits does not protect women in sports. It harms women in sports.

This bill sanctions discrimination against transgender students, which is mean-spirited and just plain bullying. This is not the role of Congress.

I have heard directly from trans and intersex constituents in my district. They are worried every day about what political stunt and what political attack will come next. No one should live in fear just for being who they are.

I strongly oppose the rule and strongly, strongly oppose final passage of this bill.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kindness, and I only have a minute to talk about kindness.

I vigorously oppose the underlying legislation dealing with our beautiful children. Mr. Speaker, that is what it is, and I join with the Utah Governor who indicates that this minute problem does not deserve a sledgehammer.

This bill deals with girls and women in sports, and the Olympics and the NCAA have spoken on transgender. I speak from the heart as a fellow human being. I speak from loving children as the chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus.

I cannot stand here and tolerate 53 percent of trans kids considering suicide last year. They want to belong. They want to have friends. They want to play sports.

If you are 5 years old, 12 years old, this Congress has no right in interfering with a beautiful community. It is, in fact, a blessing to have a world and a Nation that has people who are different.

I affirm their difference. I stand for their difference. I will fight for their difference because they should be loved like anyone else.

The rules and regulations are already in place. Why are we here doing that when guns are killing our children?

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I close with some powerful words from a Republican, a Republican Governor who vetoed a similar bill in his State.

He said, ''I must admit I am not an expert on transgenderism. I struggle to understand so much of it, and the science is conflicting. But when in doubt, I always try to err on the side of kindness, mercy, and compassion.''

''Here are the numbers that have most impacted my decision: 75,000, 4, 1, 86, and 56—75,000 high school kids participating in high school sports in Utah; four transgender kids playing high school sports in Utah; one transgender student playing girls' sports; 86 percent of trans youth reporting suicidality; 56 percent of trans youth having attempted suicide.

''Four kids, and only one of them playing girls' sports. That is what all of this is about. Four kids who aren't dominating or winning trophies or taking scholarships. Four kids who are just trying to find some friends and feel like they are part of something. Four kids trying to get through each day. Rarely has so much fear and anger been directed at so few. I don't understand what they are going through or why they feel the way they do, but I want them to live.''

I want our transgender children to live. I want them to have the ability to do what they need to do in school, which is to learn, to play, to compete, to learn about what it is like to be on a team.

I want them to live, which is why I oppose this rule, and I am asking all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Please err on the side of compassion, kindness. Let them live.

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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, they can say it all they want. It doesn't make it true. This bill demonizes no one. It doesn't prohibit anyone from participating in sports.

We have heard a lot about the trans community today and the high percentage of trans students who committed suicide last year.

I want to reiterate: Those that are truly concerned about the mental health status of trans students would have supported H.R. 7966, the STOP II Act in the 117th Congress to provide additional funding for mental health guidance counselors.

Again, I have read the text of the bill. There is nothing in it that prohibits trans students from participating in sports. We are simply saying that they must compete against their own biological sex.

Like I said at the beginning of my remarks, I never thought I would have to say certain things on the House floor.

I never thought we would have to consider bills protecting sports for women and girls or legislation to support law enforcement officers, but if we don't support them, who will?

For me, those two things come naturally, and I think—I hope, anyway, we are about to see robust support from both sides of the aisle on these commonsense issues.

But even as I speak these words, I am aware that the President of the United States has issued statements of administration policy on these two bills stating his opposition and intent to veto them should they reach his desk.

How sad we can't support all women and girls in athletics. How sad we have decided to support activists over frontline police officers who are contending with increases in crime across the board. But unfortunately, this is where we are.

We heard today about the Utah law being vetoed and that it was for students. In the State of Connecticut, it was one transgender student that took the State championship away in State track and field from a biological female.

Unfortunately, this is where we are. This is why these two bills are necessary. Despite the statement from the President, I believe we must act to advance these two important pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation it provides for.

The material previously referred to by Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 298 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 178) affirming the House of Representatives' commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare. 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 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 Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Burgess	Donalds
Alford	Burlison	Duarte
Allen	Calvert	Duncan
Amodei	Cammack	Dunn (FL)
Armstrong	Carey	Edwards
Arrington	Carl	Ellzey
Babin	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Bacon	Carter (TX)	Estes
Baird	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell
Balderson	Ciscomani	Fallon
Banks	Cline	Feenstra
Barr	Cloud	Ferguson
Bean (FL)	Clyde	Finstad
Bentz	Cole	Fischbach
Bergman	Collins	Fitzgerald
Bice	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Biggs	Crane	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Crawford	Flood
Bishop (NC)	Crenshaw	Foxx
Bost	Curtis	Franklin, C. Scott
Brecheen	D'Esposito	Fry
Buchanan	Davidson	Fulcher
Buck	De La Cruz	Gaetz
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Gallagher
Burchett	Diaz-Balart	

Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—203

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
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
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
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)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
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—13

Boebert
Bush
Cohen
Doggett
Evans
Kildee
Lee (CA)
Miller (OH)
Moore (UT)
Neal
Ross
Scott, David
Swalwell

□ 1357

Messrs. THOMPSON of California, TAKANO, CLYBURN, Ms. CROCKETT, Messrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi, MORELLE, and GRIJALVA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BURCHETT changed his 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 (Ms. TENNEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 202, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—217

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Santos
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—202

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Escobar
Eshoo
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
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)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto

Spanberger	Tlaib	Velázquez
Stansbury	Tokuda	Wasserman Schultz
Stanton	Tonko	Waters
Stevens	Torres (CA)	Watson Coleman
Strickland	Torres (NY)	Wexton
Sykes	Trahan	Wild
Takano	Trone	Williams (GA)
Thanedar	Underwood	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	
Thompson (MS)	Vasquez	
Titus	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—15

Boebert	Kildee	Neal
Bush	Lee (CA)	Ross
Doggett	Lynch	Scott, David
Espaillat	Miller (OH)	Swalwell
Evans	Moore (UT)	Walberg

□ 1406

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Deirdre Kelly, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–26)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRONG). Pursuant to the order of the House on April 10, 2023, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Revised Definition of 'Waters of the United States' ''.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of April 10, 2023, at page H1715.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the veto message on H.J. Res. 27.

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 am proud to once again rise in support of H.J. Res. 27, which I introduced to negate an ill-timed and ill-conceived rule coming out of the Biden administration.

I remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that since I last spoke on the floor of this Chamber in support of H.J. Res. 27, the resolution passed both the House and the Senate with bipartisan support.

While the Clean Water Act has greatly improved the health of our Nation's waters in the 50 years since it has become law, this administration's rule defining a ''water of the United States,'' or WOTUS, is just the latest in a string of examples of executive overreach beyond the intent of the Clean Water Act.

Decades of agency interpretations and misinterpretations of WOTUS have created a lot of uncertainty for rural communities, farmers, businesses, and industries that rely on clean water, and this rule does absolutely nothing to provide clarity.

In his message to the House regarding the veto of this legislation, the President claims that H.J. Res. 27 ''would leave Americans without a clear definition of 'waters of the United States.'''

□ 1415

This is simply untrue and disingenuous, especially considering it was his own administration that decided to get rid of the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule, which provided long-awaited clarity on the scope of WOTUS, in favor of this new overreaching and unclear definition.

This issue matters to everyday Americans all over the country, and I hear about it all the time.

I am disappointed to see the President favor radical environmental activists over America's families, small businesses, farmers, builders, and property owners.

That being said, I am hopeful that the Members of the House and Senate can come together to override this veto, terminating this ambiguous and burdensome rule in favor of greater economic prosperity for Americans nationwide.

Recently, two Federal courts halted enforcement of the administration's rule, granting relief to farmers, homebuilders, and landowners in 26 States.

Every Member today has the opportunity to vote to override the President's veto and ensure all 50 States are relieved of the burdens this rule has created.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 27, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, clean water is critical for the health and safety of our communities and our families. Our local businesses, farmers, and our economy depend on clean water for their success and their prosperity.

House Democrats have a proud and successful history of supporting clean water. House Democrats have championed investments in our Nation's water and wastewater infrastructure systems, ensuring that all communities can trust in the safety of the water they drink and the treatment of the wastewater they produce.

Last Congress, House Democrats provided historic, bipartisan investment in our Nation's infrastructure through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. Specifically for clean water, the BIL invests almost $13 billion in clean water infrastructure and is creating jobs in communities across the country.

The BIL showed what Congress can do when we focus on the needs of American families. Today, I would put to you that we are doing the opposite and putting polluters over people with this doomed veto override attempt.

In my own State of Washington, we are defined by clean water, including the health of the iconic Puget Sound and the hundreds of crystal clear lakes and thousands of miles of rivers and streams that run through our State.

My constituents know that rivers, streams, and wetlands are intrinsically connected. Pollution that starts in one body of water does not stay put.

House Democrats know we can protect clean water while providing certainty to businesses, farmers, and for everyone who depends upon clean water for their lives and livelihoods.

This is especially true for the 117 million Americans who depend on smaller streams as a source of drinking water at a time when many States continue to face historic droughts.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they want clean water rules that are simple, clear, and easy to follow. So do we. We agree on that.

The Biden administration's Clean Water Restoration Rule does just that, following the law and the science of protecting clean water while providing regulatory certainty and stability for everyone.

Unfortunately, this resolution will do the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the administration's call for vetoing H.J. Res. 27.

The argument is that they want bright lines in the regulation of clean water, yet the only proposal that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to support is the Navigable