



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2023

No. 87

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 23, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CARLOS A. GIMENEZ 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.

HONORING NOAH SHAHNAVAZ AND SEARA BURTON DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two fallen Hoosier police officers who were killed in the line of duty while serving our community last year.

Noah Shahnavaaz of Elwood and Seara Burton of Richmond were honored for National Police Week this year, and their names were added to the National

Law Enforcement Officers Memorial right here in Washington, D.C.

Noah was a 5-year Army veteran and had been with the police department for 11 months. Seara was a 4-year member of the Wayne County Police Department and was the first female canine officer in the department's history.

We will never forget Noah and Seara's service and sacrifice to our Indiana community and our entire Nation.

May our brave fallen police officers rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING MS. MUNJULURI

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Munjuluri, a junior at Columbus North High School, on winning the State of Indiana Poetry Out Loud Competition and then going on to become the 2023 Poetry Out Loud National Champion.

She has truly made Indiana's Sixth District proud, and she has a bright future ahead.

I congratulate Ms. Munjuluri, and I wish her the best of luck in all her future professional and personal endeavors.

HONORING OFFICER DUSTIN MOODY

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I would like to honor Officer Dustin Moody on the House floor.

Officer Moody was seriously injured in the line of duty, paralyzing him from the waist down just last year.

Before his injury, he had been serving in law enforcement for 10 years and had been with the Trafalgar Police Department since December 2020.

Throughout his career as a police officer, Officer Moody was dedicated to protecting our communities in Johnson County, Indiana.

God bless Officer Moody, and I thank all our brave Hoosier police officers for their service.

RECOGNIZING THE 317 RYDERS MOTORCYCLE CLUB

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 317 Ryders Motorcycle

Club, which is a group of motorcyclists in Shelby County, Indiana, for the philanthropic work that they do.

Since they were founded in 2002, the 317 Ryders Motorcycle Club's mission has been to provide fun motorcycle rides for its members while at the same time giving back to the Hoosier community.

I thank the 317 Ryders Motorcycle Club for all the funding and volunteering work that they do for Indiana's Sixth District, and I look forward to seeing what more the 317 group does.

ENERGY CONCERNS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise concerns with the EPA's newest attempt to create the Clean Power Plan 2.0.

By setting unattainable emission targets and relying on untested technologies, this rule will raise utility bills and threaten the reliability of our electric grid. Once again, EPA is driving out affordable baseload power plants to fulfill their rush to their green agenda.

We are already seeing a reliability crisis play out across the country, and EPA is doubling down on their attempts to regulate fossil fuels out of existence.

It is past time for this administration to face reality and put our Nation on a sustainable path forward to keep the lights on.

GREEN AGENDA WILL RAISE COSTS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness of the direction of this administration's American energy strategy.

Just last week, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation again raised alarms about potential blackouts this summer.

The administration is making a bad situation worse by continuing to roll out unattainable and unworkable emission standards. At the same time, agencies are forcing electrification of everything from cars to stoves.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2505

Mr. Speaker, this rush to a green agenda will raise the costs to turn the lights on, cook your meals, or heat your homes. Hoosiers and all Americans will be the ones to foot the bill for an incoherent energy strategy.

TAKE ACTION ON GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind Members of this Chamber what happened just 2 weeks ago in Allen, Texas.

Eight people were senselessly murdered by an extremist armed with an assault rifle—a 3-year-old boy and his mom and dad, who left behind a 6-year-old orphan who survived the mass shooting.

Two young sisters, one in the fourth grade and the other in the second grade, who were described as rays of sunshine, and three young adults each had their entire life ahead of them. All of them were simply minding their own business at the outlets on a Saturday, not knowing it would be their last day.

The news cycle may have changed—something many in this Chamber were waiting for—but each of these victims leaves behind loved ones who are still mourning an unimaginable loss.

Each of these victims, like every victim of a mass shooting before them, deserved better. They deserved real action that could have prevented a person deemed unfit to serve in the United States Army from accessing an assault weapon that he used to kill them.

They deserve better than their Member of Congress going on national television that same day and saying that thoughts and prayers are enough to stop gun violence and that if you disagree, then you don't believe in an Almighty God.

They certainly deserve better than platitudes from a Governor more concerned about his grade on the NRA scorecard than the number of victims of mass shootings in his State.

Mr. Speaker, I stood here at this podium 3 weeks ago after three 9-year-old children and two teachers were murdered in their classrooms in Nashville. I pleaded with the Republican majority to bring legislation to the floor to prevent another mass shooting.

I listed bills we could have considered: the assault weapons ban to get weapons of war, the gun of choice for mass shooters, off our streets; the Bipartisan Background Checks Act to make sure guns aren't falling into the hands of individuals who shouldn't have them; and the Enhanced Background Checks Act to ensure that a full background check is actually completed before the firearm sale is processed.

Yet, here we are, 17 days since Allen, Texas, 57 days since The Covenant School, and 1 day before the first anniversary of the massacre in Uvalde, and

what are we being forced to vote on this week? A piece of legislation that will make it harder to stop air pollution. Are they serious? This is a colossal disconnect.

There is a witness from a shooting just 2 weeks ago who talked about how he went to help a little girl whom he thought was hiding, and when he went to check on her, she didn't have a face after being shot with an AR-15-style assault weapon.

We can't even get a vote on whether these guns should be available. It is no wonder people think Congress is out of touch.

The United States is the only developed nation in the world where this kind of thing keeps happening again and again. We are the only country where mass shootings are so common that we have PSAs so people know what to do and where my girls' school day is interrupted on a regular basis to practice an active shooter drill.

It is shameful, infuriating, and embarrassing. This Chamber should be embarrassed that another mass shooting has disappeared from the news without a shred of action.

FARM BILL IMPACT NO. 20: NBAF RIBBON CUTTING

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deliver the 20th installment of my farm bill impact series and celebrate this week's ribbon cutting at USDA's National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas, in the heart of my district.

It has been 8 years since the facility's groundbreaking in 2015, and now this state-of-the-art, 700,000-square-foot research center is a national asset that will help protect animal agriculture against the threat and potential impact of serious animal diseases.

NBAF will be home to the only maximum biocontainment space in the country where USDA will conduct comprehensive research, develop animal vaccines and antivirals, and explore enhanced diagnostic and training capabilities. This facility isn't just about animal health. It is about public health, as well.

NBAF will replace the 60-year-old Plum Island Animal Disease Center in New York, create 400 new jobs for Kansans, generate more than \$100 million in total economic benefit for our State, and make Kansas the home of internationally recognized animal disease experts.

By bringing healthy animals into the facility, world-renowned research will happen here. I am proud to have this facility in my district and right down the street from K-State's College of Veterinary Medicine and the Biosecurity Research Institute, creating a scientific hub that will lead the world in agriculture research and health.

Last month, I chaired my first hearing of the House Agriculture Sub-

committee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry on animal health with USDA Under Secretary Moffitt. Animal health is at the forefront of livestock producers' minds, and so it is at the forefront of my mind on their behalf.

This year's farm bill is an opportunity to lead in the areas of innovation and research. We must get animal health right for our food security, economic security, and national security.

The 2018 farm bill contained special authorization for biosecurity planning and response, which helped make NBAF possible. NBAF is a concrete example of the impact that we can have when we reauthorize the farm bill in careful and creative ways.

Last year, I hosted House Agriculture Committee Chairman G.T. THOMPSON on an ag tour of Kansas, where I was proud to show him NBAF. Last month, I hosted House Agriculture Committee staff and congressional staff from agriculture districts around the country for a tour of NBAF. The technology, scale, and international significance of the facility are truly second to none.

Once fully operational, NBAF won't just support and protect agriculture. It will protect our country and the world.

I will be back on the floor soon to deliver another installment of my farm bill impact series and highlight more programs and titles within the farm bill that I believe Congress must understand and support to ensure that agriculture thrives right here in America.

OPPOSING A NATIONAL ABORTION HOTLINE

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to use my voice in defense of the voiceless.

Abortion has desensitized our Nation and resulted in the deaths of nearly 64 million unborn American citizens, which is basically the entire population of the Midwest.

Last year, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, rectifying a wrong that has plagued our country for decades. While that is a huge triumph for the right to life, there is still a lot of work to be done.

Last month, the Biden administration announced that it plans to use \$1.5 billion of taxpayer money to establish a national abortion hotline to counsel individuals on how to obtain an abortion and certain other family planning services.

According to the administration, the project will operate as a supplement to the existing Title X Family Planning services grant. The grant information states that one of the hotline's purposes will be to offer information, counseling, and referral for pregnancy termination.

The Public Health Services Act of 1970 established Title X funds to help low-income and uninsured women access healthcare and family planning services. From the beginning, Title X funds were never intended to support abortion services, and the underlying statute explicitly prohibits it.

In October 2021, however, the Biden administration finalized a rule that

violated the spirit of this law by actively supporting abortion. It provided Title X funding to clinics that perform elective abortions by requiring grantees to make abortion referrals.

This new abortion hotline goes one step further.

Taxpayer dollars should never go toward funding abortions, but President Biden and his administration are continually attempting to use Title X funds to promote abortion services.

This week, I am leading a letter to President Biden to push back on this gross violation of the law, and I will be doing everything within my power to prevent this hotline from going live, including a piece of legislation that I plan to introduce soon.

I firmly believe that life begins at conception, and I will fight to protect the lives of all Americans, born and unborn. I will also continue to protect pregnancy resource centers and pro-life organizations from domestic terrorism.

As a proud father and member of the Values Action Team, I will strongly oppose any legislation that would endanger the lives of the unborn, and I will support legislation that protects the rights of the defenseless.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING AANHPI HERITAGE MONTH AND SMALL BUSINESS MONTH

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

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of two celebrations that are incredibly important to my community: Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month and Small Business Month.

As the Representative of one of the largest and fastest-growing AANHPI communities in the country, I am beyond proud of the contributions our small business owners have made to our thriving southern Nevada economy, which include folks like: Alex Zen who curates Chinatown's Zen D'core, a boutique jewelry shop offering minimalist decor and jewelry; Amy Zhang Warthan, owner of No. 1 Boba Tea, which has proudly served the Las Vegas community since 1998; and leaders like Ken Cheng, manager of Chinatown Mall.

They have all worked tirelessly to create thriving commercial centers for our small businesses.

All of this amazing development would not be possible without the support of groups like the Nevada AAPI Chamber of Commerce, the Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce, the Las Vegas India Chamber of Commerce, the Philippine Chamber of Commerce, the Vietnamese American Chamber of Commerce, the Korean American Chamber of Commerce, the Sri Lanka America Association of Las Vegas, and so many more. They all work day in and day out to serve our AANHPI businesses across the Silver State.

From Chinatown to the Las Vegas strip and across the valley, southern Nevada draws its strength in our diversity, and the AANHPI Nevadans are key to that success.

Thank you to all of the AANHPI Nevadans who put the American Dream on full display by pursuing their passions and growing our small business economy.

FENTANYL IS A NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

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

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the HALT Fentanyl Act. The flow of fentanyl across our unsecure borders is not only a public health crisis but a national security crisis, as well.

With as much as 90 percent of illicit fentanyl coming from China, the Chinese Communist Party has a hand in the poisoning of American citizens.

Our communities are becoming all too familiar with the danger that this toxic substance poses. Fentanyl poisoning is now the number one cause of death among adults between 18 and 49, resulting in the deaths of tens of thousands of Americans.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor the HALT Fentanyl Act, which will permanently reschedule fentanyl and ensure the Federal Government recognizes this substance for the deadly threat it is.

It will give our law enforcement the tools they need to combat this danger, and it will empower researchers to better understand the full scope of the drug's impact on Americans' health.

We owe a solution to the families who have lost a loved one to fentanyl. This bill is that solution, and I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on the HALT Fentanyl Act.

RECOGNIZING DR. CLAYTON CHAU

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Dr. Clayton Chau to the people of Orange County and to congratulate him on his dedicated service to our community.

When I chaired the Orange County Board of Supervisors, I was pleased to work with Dr. Chau in his capacity as the director of the Orange County Health Care Agency.

During the pandemic, he stepped up to serve as the county's health officer. Together, we worked to keep Orange County citizens safe and informed during a time of unprecedented anxiety.

Dr. Chau understood the importance of protecting the vulnerable while also preserving livelihoods, supporting workers and businesses, and maintaining an evenhanded approach.

Thanks to his work, we ensured a successful pandemic response in Orange County. Dr. Chau has so much to be proud of.

On behalf of Orange County, I thank him for his service and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

LEADING IN RENEWABLE ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud how the Inflation Reduction Act is delivering for our country and California's 37th Congressional District.

I am proud of the work that California has already done to be a leader in renewable energy. With key investments from the Inflation Reduction Act, our country can benefit from a clean energy market that puts our workers first and brings the United States into the 21st century.

The passage of the Inflation Reduction Act has already created \$242 billion in new investments with \$5.45 billion announced in my State alone for clean energy and manufacturing projects.

It has already created 142,000 new jobs across 41 States: red, blue, and purple. The IRA is projected to create 9 million new, good-paying jobs for Americans over the next decade, but that is not all it will do.

It will help us achieve our climate goals, boost clean technology manufacturing, make EVs more accessible and affordable, ensure families breathe clean air and drink clean water, and make gains toward environmental justice for historically forgotten communities.

What does this look like for my community?

It is funding for air quality monitoring grants in historically disadvantaged communities, clean schoolbuses for our children, and low-emission public transportation in Los Angeles.

After years of insufficient Federal action to address our climate crisis, Democrats came together to enact this historic law, and we cannot go back.

Unfortunately, Republicans prefer to help their corporate polluter friends roll back environmental safeguards and are currently working to use our economy as a bargaining chip to erase major clean energy provisions in the IRA through debt limit discussions.

If the Speaker and his ultra-MAGA colleagues got their way, they would inflict dire consequences on our efforts to stop the worst of climate change from happening.

They would end renewable energy credits for wind and solar, limit rooftop solar growth in homes and businesses, stop the expansion of electric vehicle sales and EV charging stations, repeal funding for low-income communities that was intended to address pollution, and repeal the Methane Emissions Reduction Program.

These are investments in clean energy that have largely benefited Republican districts, even though they won't admit it, and Republican actions today will take away the wealth and economic opportunity from everyday American households.

This law is our strongest chance to create a safer, healthier Nation for our

children and families and regain credibility with allies around the world.

We cannot allow Republicans to take us back to a time where fossil fuels and toxic policy decisions hold hostage our health and economy. Congress must pass a clean debt limit increase now.

RECOGNIZING MAY AS NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as National Foster Care Month. Nearly 500,000 children fall under the care of our foster system.

As overseers of their welfare, Congress has a sacred duty to support these children and those who work tirelessly on their behalf to ensure that they have safe and loving homes.

Our child welfare system is in desperate need of reform. We must have supportive policies that fairly compensate social workers and invest in the needs of our children.

Supporting the growth and development of a child and giving them safe shelter are incredibly important tasks that have fallen by the wayside.

Foster youth are feeling the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, alongside the disparities they face in education, healthcare, and employment.

This is why I joined my colleagues in the Caucus on Foster Youth to introduce a resolution to recognize the month of May as National Foster Care Month.

I will continue to raise awareness around our foster care system and the work of selfless social workers and advocates.

If we want to talk about adoption and providing for our children, we must take a real and lasting look at the problems we are facing and come together to work on solutions.

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to provide a report to the United States House of Representatives that Americans support impeachment.

Last week, I introduced Articles of Impeachment against five people who have abused the power of their positions and provided corruption and disservice to the American people.

I introduced Articles of Impeachment against U.S. Attorney Matthew Graves at the Department of Justice. Matthew Graves refuses to prosecute 67 percent of the crimes in Washington, D.C., and abuses his office in a political pursuit of people who he deems political enemies while persecuting people for January 6, people who just walked through the Capitol.

Matthew Graves must be impeached. He should prosecute criminals in Washington, D.C., that commit all kinds of crimes every single day, not care about the one day when people have already been arrested and are rotting in jail.

Last week, I introduced Articles of Impeachment against FBI Director Christopher Wray. By turning the FBI into Joe Biden and Merrick Garland's personal police force, Chris Wray has made himself a lackey of the regime.

Under Wray's watch, the FBI has intimidated, harassed, and entrapped American citizens that have been deemed enemies of the Biden regime. The FBI even raided Mar-a-Lago on August 8 of 2022 in an unconstitutional raid of a former President's home.

FBI whistleblower Garret O'Boyle told congressional investigators the FBI created a terrorist threat tag following the Dobbs Supreme Court decision in 2022.

O'Boyle confirmed that the purpose of the tag was to target pro-life individuals, and now Wray has weaponized the FBI against his own agents.

These brave FBI whistleblowers have been stripped of their salaries and their security clearances simply for coming forward and bravely telling the truth. FBI Director Christopher Wray must be impeached.

I introduced Articles of Impeachment against Attorney General Merrick Garland. Since Merrick Garland took over as Attorney General in March of 2021, he has completely weaponized the Department of Justice.

The politicization of the Department of Justice has resulted in the persecution of the left's political enemies and a real two-tiered justice system in America.

Garland has used the FBI as a personal police force for his boss, Joe Biden. The Department of Justice's persecution of Joe Biden's primary political adversary, Donald J. Trump, is antidemocratic.

Raiding the former President's home for legally declassified documents is a transparent violation of justice.

Persecuting a declared candidate for President of the United States is nothing short of election interference.

Not only that, from investigating parents who protest their local school boards to going after pro-life activists and Catholics, Merrick Garland must be impeached.

What I will tell the House of Representatives today is a Rasmussen poll was released just last week indicating that 53 percent of voters in America—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—support the impeachment of Joe Biden for high crimes and misdemeanors.

I introduced Articles of Impeachment on Joe Biden last week because of the national security crisis at our border.

I also introduced Articles of Impeachment against Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas for failing to do his duty to secure America's border, but he is only doing the bidding of his boss, Joe Biden.

At 5 p.m. yesterday, I simply released a survey on my social media asking: Do you support impeachment?

Mr. Speaker, 8,600 people responded, and that was just from 5 p.m. last night.

Mr. Speaker, 77 percent said, yes, they support impeachment. Only 23 percent opposed. If anyone reads the comments on my Twitter account, you know for sure it is not just Republicans that follow me.

Joe Biden has deliberately compromised our national security by refusing to enforce immigration laws and secure our border.

He has allowed nearly 6 million illegals from over 170 countries to invade our country. He has caused an approximate 1,700 percent increase in border encounters in just one sector of our northern border.

Under his reign, there have been approximately 1.4 million known got-aways who have evaded U.S. authorities.

He has allowed fentanyl, the number one killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45, to overwhelmingly flood into our country and kill over 300 Americans every single day.

Joe Biden should be impeached.

In my district alone, we have had an increase of 350 percent of fentanyl murders.

Joe Biden must be impeached.

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

□ 1030

REMEMBERING JUDY GILBERT-GOULD

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to recognize the remarkable life of Judy Gilbert-Gould.

Judy Gilbert-Gould, a lifelong resident of Miami, passed away on April 21, 2023, at the age of 88. She was the daughter of the late Stanley C. and Martha M. Myers and sister to the late Kenneth M. Myers.

As a young woman, Judy became involved in the National Council of Jewish Women, eventually serving as president of the Miami chapter. In recognition of her service, Judy was awarded NCJW's highest honor, the Hannah G. Solomon Award, for her commitment to the advancement of human welfare.

Judy later served in several other important professional and leadership capacities.

Working under then-Dade County State's attorney Janet Reno, Judy was the director of victim-witness services in the State's Attorney's Office to help prepare rape victims to testify in court.

Later on, Judy's professional career concentrated on working for the Jewish people. In 1983, Judy joined the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, where she served for many years as director of the Jewish Community Relations Council, the JCRC.

As the JCRC's executive director, Judy adroitly mobilized and engaged Miami's Jewish community on many levels. She led our citizen activists in building relationships with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, was pivotal in the pro-Israel movement here at home, and successfully advocated for the national agenda supported by the Jewish Council for Public Affairs.

On a personal note, we worked closely together to address a multitude of issues facing our community, from the scourge of anti-Semitism to ensuring we maintain our strong U.S.-Israel relationship.

Shortly after I was first elected to Congress, under Judy's leadership role at the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, she approached me with the idea to sponsor legislation that would create a month during which we honor the contributions American Jews have made to the fabric of our Nation.

I introduced a resolution, and since 2006 our Nation has celebrated Jewish American Heritage Month each May to educate Americans about the contributions Jewish Americans have made and continue to make to our country, helping to reduce hate, anti-Semitism, and bigotry.

Judy's commitment to Miami's Jewish community and the State of Israel was exemplary, and I will miss her guidance and wisdom.

My heart is with her family in mourning the loss of this kind, generous, and compassionate soul. We were forever privileged to have shared this time with Judy. May her memory be for a blessing.

FARM BILL LISTENING TOUR ACROSS NEW YORK

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently traveled across New York's beautiful and sprawling 24th District as part of my official 2023 farm bill listening tour. Our district is among the largest agricultural and dairy districts in the northeast and the largest apple growing district outside of Washington State.

I hosted several open-door roundtables in every part of the district to hear directly from farmers and producers about their concerns for our region's agricultural community. Ahead of our consideration of the farm bill later this year, feedback from farmers and producers is vitally important.

The farm bill reauthorization is always critical for communities like mine, but this year it is more important than ever. Our farmers are struggling, and they need advocates in Congress who will stand with them. In New York this is especially true, as a raft of new State laws and regulations from Albany are imposing unprecedented and costly burdens on rural communities.

Our farmers are counting on Congress to get this year's farm bill done and get it done right.

First of all, based on what I gleaned from my listening sessions, the following requests have been voiced:

Do not make any cuts to the farm bill programs that are pivotal to the vitality of the northeast agricultural community;

Next, reform the national crop insurance program to cover a wider range of items and better fit the needs of specialty crop farmers, including maple syrup, which is unique to the Northeast;

Support funding for the specialty crop block grant program as well as research and monitoring of invasive species that we have been experiencing in New York; and

Raise the 5-million-pound dairy margin tier 1 limit to reflect the consolidation that has occurred in the industry.

On a personal note, I plead and I beg of the farm bill appropriators and drafters, please don't ban chocolate milk in schools. It was a lifeline for me and my family. Even the one and only Elon Musk has recognized the value in chocolate milk.

Mr. Speaker, these were the requests that were echoed by farmers across the 24th District, and they are the priorities I am fighting for in Congress. I thank Chairman G.T. THOMPSON for his continued leadership as chair of the House Agriculture Committee and look forward to working with him in advancing these priorities.

I will continue to advocate for solutions that support our agricultural producers in New York and across the country. Members of this body must realize, without productive farmers, we have no food and we will not achieve prosperity. We must put aside partisan politics and come together to make this year's farm bill a path to growth in all of our agricultural economies.

REMEMBERING LIVES LOST IN CHARLOTTE FIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JACKSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week there was an enormous fire in Charlotte. An apartment building that was under construction caught fire. Within an hour, it became a five-alarm fire.

Ninety firefighters from the Charlotte Fire Department responded. They were able to heroically rescue 15 construction workers, including one from on top of a crane. Tragically, two construction workers were not able to be rescued, and they died: Reuben Holmes and Demonte Sherrill.

Reuben was loved by his family. He was set to have lunch with his sister on Saturday, and they just can't believe what happened.

Demonte was a father of four. Obviously, this is a tragedy that will re-

shape their families' lives but also a big part of our community.

We honor the first responders who sprang into action and did everything they possibly could under extraordinary circumstances, a fire that burned at a temperature of 2,000 degrees.

We call upon the members of our broader Charlotte community to do everything that they can for these families that have suffered truly unimaginable loss.

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 37 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:

May the peace of God, which transcends all our understanding guard our hearts and minds this day. For if You, O Lord, guard our thoughts, how can we think of anything but of that which is derived from Your truth? So may our hearts also reflect Your integrity.

If You guard our thoughts, almighty God, how can we think of doing anything except that which is noble and right and pure? So also may our hearts reveal Your nobleness, Your righteousness, and Your perfection.

If You, O Lord, guard our hearts, how can we avoid living lives that show forth Your merciful love? So may we direct our minds to live in light of Your compassion and kindness.

If You, holy God, guard our hearts, how can we resist living lives that are worthy of Your admiration and Your praise? So may we lead our minds to discover Your more excellent way.

We may not understand how or even why You are calling us to participate in the peace You desire for this world, for this Nation, or for this place. But may we dedicate our hearts and our minds to Your keeping, that Your love, kindness, and truth would, in Your mercy, be revealed through us.

We pray in the name of the one who has shown us what is good, acceptable, and perfect.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio 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.

COMMEMORATING MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to commemorate Mental Health Awareness Month, I recognize an organization in Guam, which started in October of 2021 and has continued to advocate for mental health and suicide prevention.

TU;MA is a woman-owned small business, and I am honored to recognize the founder, Mrs. Jesrae Moylan, who is here with us today in the Halls of Congress.

It was founded through the challenges faced when Jesrae's younger brother, Ray, took his life in 2017. TU;MA was a nickname provided to Ray by Jesrae's son, Apollo.

A name which had no meaning then has a significant presence today with the island community. TU;MA focuses on shifting the stigma surrounding mental health and normalizing such conversations through the sharing of stories and connections assisting in the healing process.

On behalf of a thankful Nation and island, I commend Mrs. Jesrae Moylan and team TU;MA for their selfless efforts in helping others and reminding them to always choose themselves.

NATIONAL PRESERVATION MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, May marks National Preservation Month. This year's theme is "People Saving Places."

This Congress can do that by supporting the Historic Tax Credit Growth and Opportunity Act. This bipartisan bill, which I introduced with Congressmen LAHOOD and BLUMENAUER, builds on the success and lasting benefits of the Federal historic tax program.

Over the last two decades, my western New York community has seen

over \$1.2 billion of investments in more than 250 rehab projects made possible thanks to historic tax credits.

Across the Nation, historic tax credits have driven \$122 billion in private investment and supported millions of jobs.

By restoring and expanding the historic tax credit program through the Historic Tax Credit Growth and Opportunity Act, we give the country an opportunity to rebuild stronger and communities the tools to invest in the revitalization of their neighborhoods.

RECOGNIZING MARISA VICERE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Centre County's own Marisa Vicere who was named the Youth Mental Health First Aid Instructor of the Year, an award that she received for her efforts to support mental health and well-being in her home State of Pennsylvania.

Each May, we observe Mental Health Awareness Month to acknowledge the mental health challenges faced by millions of Americans.

For Marisa, every day is committed to mental health awareness and support. In 2012, Marisa founded the Jana Marie Foundation and has "devoted its energy to opening minds and saving lives through educational programming and community mobilization to empower young people in the Centre County region."

Marisa started the foundation after her sister, Jana Marie Vicere, tragically lost her life in a battle against depression at the young age of 30.

Marisa honors her memory by continuing her sister's commitment to helping others and through creative expression in the arts.

In addition to her national award, she will soon be inducted as one of this year's outstanding State College alumni.

I commend Marisa Vicere for winning the 2023 Youth Mental Health First Aid Instructor of the Year and for her selfless service to the Centre County community through the Jana Marie Foundation.

ACCESS TO REPRODUCTIVE CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, our Supreme Court is a symbol of corrupt and cruel judicial politics.

Clarence Thomas is the poster child for the Supreme Court, the only Federal court with no ethical standards at all, let alone, enforce them.

They empower extremists who would deny vital lifesaving care in their zeal to enforce their vision on the limits of women's health.

It is not just about their opposition to abortion. They are forcing women to be pregnant, regardless of the consequences to real people.

The harms are not theoretical as illustrated in today's Washington Post editorial. Real women and their families suffer serious injury being denied care they need.

I am proud I come from one of the few States that has no limitations on families' access to reproductive healthcare, the most personal of decisions.

Change is coming, make no mistake, as more and more recognize the impact of this cruel interference in the most personal of decisions.

Despite hopelessly gerrymandered State legislatures, the people ultimately will win.

CELEBRATING THE 110TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORT WORTH ROTARY CLUB

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Rotary Club of Fort Worth, Texas, on their 110th anniversary.

Since their first meeting in June of 1913, the Rotary Club has supported the community in many ways and has enriched the lives of people in the Fort Worth area.

Rotary was founded as a service club for community members from diverse backgrounds to come together to make positive changes in their communities.

Whether it is scholarships to local schools, supporting nonprofits, or providing education and water to impoverished countries around the world, the Rotary Club of Fort Worth has always put service above self.

As a long-time Rotarian and member of this club in Fort Worth, as my father was—Jack Williams—I am proud to congratulate the Rotary Club of Fort Worth for their significant milestone.

I am confident they will continue their exceptional service to the community for the next hundred years. If the Four-Way Test was observed more today, the world would be a better place.

In God We Trust.

WORK REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I keep hearing from my Republican friends about work requirements, work requirements, work requirements.

Speaker MCCARTHY said—get this—people are getting paid to sit at home on the couch. Okay. Let's talk about work requirements.

I have good news for my GOP friends. In 1996, you all demanded the work requirements that are still in place today.

Now, maybe if Speaker McCARTHY weren't so busy auctioning off his used Chapstick for \$100,000, he would know working families in this country are struggling and need help.

Maybe if he weren't so busy giving speeches to Wall Street bankers, he would know most people on food assistance are children, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Maybe if he spoke to an able-bodied adult on food assistance, he would know they aren't sitting on the couch. They are out working. They just make so little, they qualify for a measly \$6-a-day benefit they use to buy food.

Republicans are going after food assistance so they can give another tax break to billionaires. It is a disgrace. It is a shame.

Speaker McCARTHY should try living on SNAP for a week before screwing over poor people.

STRASBURG WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Strasburg High School wrestling team for their Class 2 State championship victory, the Rams' second State title in a row.

The four individual State champions who led this victory include junior Heath Burks with 126 points and his third State title, senior Ethan Asher with 138 points and his third State title, junior David Burks with 150 points and his second State title, and senior Chuck Fake with 215 points and his second State title.

Additional top Strasburg Rams performers were Conner Miller placing sixth, Jadon Shanholtz placing third, Donovan Burks placing sixth, Braden Stern placing fifth, and Hutson Conrad placing third.

This was a remarkable performance by the whole team, and I wish the best of luck to the seniors on the team in their future endeavors.

Congratulations again to all these talented athletes, parents, coaches, and staff on this well-deserved victory.

HONORING THE FAMILIES OF UVALDE, TEXAS

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the families of Uvalde, Texas. One year ago this week, 21 souls walked through the doors of their classrooms for the very last time.

They were teachers, artists, athletes, aspiring police officers, and honor roll students. Hours later, they were dead, gunned down by a teenage shooter with weapons designed for the battlefield.

At the morgue, their bodies were so ravaged they had to be identified through DNA testing.

I have three children: 9, 7, and 1. When I drop my older children at school, I think of the families in Uvalde who never had a chance to say goodbye to theirs.

Over the last year, those same families have held back tears in our committee rooms as they begged Congress to end America's gun violence epidemic.

We know how to stop school shootings. We know that assault weapons bans, universal background checks, and a higher age for gun purchases will save American lives.

The teachers and children who died cannot change the law, but we can honor their memories by having the courage to act.

FAILED TAX AND SPENDING 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. Madam Speaker, failed tax and spending policies by Biden and liberal Democrats hurt families.

Since Biden took office, the 10-year spending levels have increased by \$10 trillion. Sadly, this includes the \$2 trillion American Rescue Plan, which ignited the highest inflation in 40 years, destroying jobs.

I was grateful to join House Republicans in passing the Limit, Save, Grow Act, which will limit government spending, reduce Federal regulations, and promote pro-growth energy policies.

House Republicans are the only ones who have passed legislation that responsibly addresses the debt ceiling by limiting irresponsible spending, saving taxpayer dollars, and creating jobs.

Democrats own this debt crisis, and they own default if they do not come to the table with a serious proposal.

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.

South Carolina appreciates Senator TIM SCOTT and Ambassador Nikki Haley.

□ 1215

EDUCATION IS NOT ABOUT CENSORSHIP

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern and outrage that extreme Republicans are moving to cut education through McCARTHY's default on America act at the same time that extreme Republicans are banning books in our libraries and classrooms across our country.

Sadly, last semester alone, there were 1,477 instances of book banning. Sadly, these efforts chill speech. They are part of a national education scare, a campaign to foment anxiety and anger with the goal of suppressing free expression in public education.

America is not Communist China or authoritarian Russia that ban books or Nazi Germany that burns books. Indeed, Anne Frank's "The Diary of a Young Girl" is now a banned book.

Over 70 percent of Americans oppose book bans. Americans know education is about learning. It is not about censorship.

A country that does not know its history is bound to repeat it.

DEMOCRATS RESPONSIBLE FOR DEBT CEILING CRISIS

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

Mrs. BICE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of passing pragmatic legislation to address the debt ceiling.

During this 1-minute speech, the national debt will increase by \$1.5 million or roughly \$25,000 per second. Over the last 12 years, the U.S. Government has more than doubled our national debt, reaching \$31 trillion.

It is clear to everyone that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

This is why we passed the Limit, Save, Grow Act. The legislation is a responsible approach which would raise the debt ceiling while saving taxpayers \$4.8 trillion over 10 years.

I am astounded that President Biden and the Senate Democrats are willing to hold our economy hostage. The facts don't lie. House Republicans have done our job, and Speaker McCARTHY has negotiated in good faith. Meanwhile, for over 100 days, this administration and Senate Democrats have done nothing.

Let me be clear, if we default, it is because of their inaction. It is past time for President Biden and Senator SCHUMER to do their jobs.

CONGRATULATING IAM TONGI ON WINNING "AMERICAN IDOL"

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Iam Tongi, a proud son of Kahuku, on winning season 21 of "American Idol." A fellow child of the Windward side, a "keiki," "child" of Ko'olauloa, Iam is the first Hawaii-born and Pacific Islander contestant to ever win "American Idol."

Throughout his "American Idol" journey, Iam captured the hearts of viewers across the country with his incredible voice and soulful tributes to his late father, Rodney.

While on the show, Iam not only showcased Hawaii's local music and

sound, but also the challenges with getting priced out of paradise. Like many "kama aina," "residents," I am and his family were forced to move to the Mainland because of Hawaii's high cost of living.

I have shared this with many of my colleagues here: Our children like I am have become our greatest exports. That is not "pono"; that is not "right." We must make Hawaii more affordable so that families like I am's don't have to leave their home.

I am's music, his story, and his spirit have inspired millions of Americans across this country. Hawaii is so proud of him. Wherever he goes, I hope he knows Hawaii will always be his home and his "ohana" "family."

HAPPY BIRTHDAY AND FAREWELL TO SAM WEST

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, today I wish one of the members of my team, Sam West, a very happy birthday but also farewell.

Sam is originally from Indianapolis. He went to school at Indiana University and Purdue University, so he is both a Hoosier and a Boilermaker. He worked as an auto technician before coming to work here in Congress.

In healthcare there are a million acronyms. I don't know of any other place in the world than D.C. that uses more acronyms, and nobody seems to know what they stand for.

It is because of Sam's time working on automobiles that allowed us to see eye-to-eye on so many things. I spent my entire career in the private sector as an auto dealer, and Sam has always been able to translate a lot of Pennsylvania's healthcare priorities into terms that I have been using my whole life, and it just clicked. We really worked well together.

He is moving over to the Senate to be a health policy adviser for Senator BILL CASSIDY. I know he is going to do a great job.

Sam, I tell people all the time, it is not so much the Member that matters, it is the staff. Here is Sam with a couple of his cheerleader friends, Indianapolis Colts cheerleaders. Wherever he goes, he will always be a part of our team, and he is always going to have great fans.

JOE BURDICK PROMOTES PATRIOTISM

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a hero of Ohio's Seventh District, Navy veteran Joe Burdick. Joe promotes patriotism by hand-carving wooden American flags.

Like Americans themselves, each of Joe's flags is unique. They are imper-

fectly perfect, complete with knots, dings, and rings, yet each is beautiful in its own way.

From the strength and sacrifice of Old Glory red to the pure innocence of the white, the flag represents sacrifice, independence, and hope. Joe captures these qualities in his art.

The flag is an integral symbol of our Nation, and Joe and I agree that desecrating the American flag is not a legitimate act of protest. Doing so tramples on the service and sacrifice of millions who have defended and still defend the values it stands for.

I thank Joe for using his talent for patriotism. I urge all Americans to follow his example by always treating our flag with the solemn reverence it deserves.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 467, HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 11, PRO- VIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRON- MENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS"; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 45, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDU- CATION RELATING TO "WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS OF FED- ERAL STUDENT LOANS"

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 429 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 429

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. 467) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as

amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans". All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, last night the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 429, providing for consideration of three measures: H.J. Res. 45, H.R. 467, and S.J. Res. 11.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 467 under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Energy and Commerce Committee or their designees and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 45 and S.J. Res. 11 under closed rules, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction or to their designees.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to commit for S.J. Res. 11 and one motion to recommit for H.J. Res. 45.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. Included within the measure is H.R. 467, the HALT Fentanyl Act. It is important to say that the HALT Fentanyl Act makes great strides in addressing the growing fentanyl crisis in our country. By making permanent the scheduling of fentanyl-related analogs in the schedule I category, in addition to giving researchers the ability to conduct studies on these substances, we can begin to repair the damage that this drug has inflicted on our communities and our Nation.

I spent almost three decades practicing as a physician. I have witnessed and heard so many devastating stories of the consequences of this crisis which we now face. We face it in north Texas; we face it across the country.

Between September and March, nearly a dozen teens spread across three schools in Carrollton, Texas, were injured because of fentanyl poisoning. In fact, three of those poisonings were fatal. One death is too many, and we must equip our communities to address this issue from the source.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce has a long history of producing bipartisan policies to actually address the opioid crisis in this country. The SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act, known as the SUPPORT Act of 2018, was a product of our committee, and it made reforms to the way we administer programs to control and respond to and better treat individuals who have a problem with opioids.

However, the landscape has drastically changed. It is now a different disease than what it was in 2018, so we have gone from diversion of prescription opioids to the manufacture and importation of illicit fentanyl, products that are created in the People's Republic of China in their base form,

exported to Mexico, imported by cartels, and poisoning our children.

We need to better understand the effects of fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances to better treat patients suffering from exposure. The HALT Fentanyl Act will improve regulations to encourage research so we can better understand the impacts of fentanyl on human health.

Our recent bipartisan mental health package passed in the Energy and Commerce Committee worked on several provisions that would relax regulations to expand access to evidence-based treatment programs and ease restrictions on treatment options for substance use care.

Finally, the HALT Fentanyl Act will ensure that law enforcement officers have the tools to prosecute cases relating to fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances. Due to the crisis at our southern border, illicit fentanyl remains an imminent threat throughout the country. At a time when people are dying at alarming rates from fentanyl poisoning, this legislation is an absolute necessity to counteract this crisis and save our young American lives.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, also included in this package is a provision that would repeal a continuation of President Biden's war on affordable energy and consumer choice.

S.J. Res 11 would be instrumental in protecting American families who would suffer from additional costs passed along to them and ensure that they, the American public, are able to select vehicles that best fit their needs rather than functionaries in the administration in a far-removed Washington, D.C.

If not for our Republican majority, Madam Speaker, President Biden could continue to act unilaterally to enact his radical Green New Deal agenda. Thankfully, the American public saw fit to entrust Republicans with the majority in the people's House to prevent President Biden and Democrats from acting upon their worst impulses.

Once again, Democrats have seen fit to attack a vital component of our Nation's economy. Why Democrats would want to make more difficult the lives of those who deliver our food and our goods to our grocery stores and our homes, and the fuel to our gas stations, I do not know.

Madam Speaker, what I do know is that every American owes these hard-working men and women a tremendous debt of gratitude that we will not soon be able to repay.

Madam Speaker, in 2021, trucks moved close to 11 billion tons of freight across America. That is over 70 percent of the cargo shipped in the continental United States.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, some were sitting in the comfort of their homes while dozens of Amazon packages were dropped at their doorsteps. That was only because of these long-

haul drivers who traverse our Nation daily, ensuring our communities are supplied with goods that allow Americans to enjoy a high standard of living and literally preventing American families from starving during the pandemic.

So it is bewildering, Madam Speaker, that Democrats have decided to reward the courage and perseverance of long-haul truckers with onerous and expensive new regulations that will have a devastating effect upon their livelihoods.

Madam Speaker, implementing these new regulations and standards will burden truck drivers with as much as \$8,000 per driver in new costs when it comes time to retire their current vehicles.

Democrats pride themselves on being advocates of the little guy, the downtrodden, but I would ask you, Madam Speaker, how is forcing Americans already suffering from the sky-high inflation brought to us by the Biden administration, saddling them with an additional \$8,000 from their hard-earned dollars, how is that lightening their burden? Madam Speaker, simply, it does not.

Once again, President Biden and members of the Democratic Party are so single-minded in their pursuit of this Green New Deal agenda that they are blind to the obvious collateral damage that their policies are inflicting. Thankfully, our Republican majority will be able to deliver tangible relief by repealing this counterproductive and misguided executive action.

Madam Speaker, today, we are also considering H.J. Res. 45 to formally disapprove of the authority the administration claims it has to unilaterally forgive student loans.

In August 2022, the Biden administration announced a plan to cancel student debt up to \$20,000 for Pell grant recipients and up to \$10,000 for non-Pell grant recipients for those making under \$125,000 a year.

Madam Speaker, on May 11, 2023, 2 weeks ago, a glorious day, the public health emergency came to an end. Americans are back to work. They are back to school. They are returning to normal life.

The Biden administration is attempting to claim authority for this \$315 billion student loan forgiveness through the COVID-19 national emergency status and the Higher Education Relief Opportunities for Students Act, the so-called HEROES Act of 2003. This 2003 law provided temporary relief to military members during their deployment following 9/11. This is a twisted interpretation of a bill that compensated our Nation's servicemen and -women for their heroic efforts after the Nation was attacked on 9/11.

The bottom line is this is quite likely unconstitutional. It is an overreach of executive authority and would not make student debt disappear. It would instead unfairly shift the burden of

student loans to the 87 percent of Americans who did not take out such loans.

Madam Speaker, this is an important rule to consider these important bills.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BURGESS for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today while we stand here debating this rule, the Republicans' default on America's plan is holding Americans hostage.

Across my district and this country, Americans are wondering what will happen to their food security. How about their Medicare? What about veterans' healthcare? Republicans are holding us hostage so they can protect the tax cuts that they gave to the wealthiest corporations and millionaires.

We need to remember that the debt we are looking at today was incurred by Republicans during the Trump administration, \$7 trillion of that.

Do you know what? If they crash the economy, it is not the millionaires who would be hurt. It is working families.

The Republican default on America would impact the very bills we will be talking about today. It would cut funding to fight the fentanyl crisis, treat addiction, reduce pollution, and help Americans pay their bills when a pandemic hits.

The rule we are considering today will make in order three bills.

The first bill is H.R. 467, the HALT Fentanyl Act. We all agree that there is a scourge of fentanyl in our communities, and we all agree it needs to be stopped. There is no district in our country, no family, and no community that hasn't seen and experienced the horrors of fentanyl.

The problem is that this bill isn't going to do what needs to be done to address the fentanyl crisis. To fight the fentanyl crisis, we need more law enforcement funding, and we need to treat addiction.

Right now, as noted, fentanyl-related substances are listed on schedule I. That listing goes to the end of 2024. The main thrust of this bill is to make that listing permanent, but our communities are pleading with us to do more than the status quo.

For decades, we tried to incarcerate our way out of addiction, but addiction is a disease, not a crime.

Madam Speaker, I am speaking from the heart. I know most of my colleagues on this floor have heard that I lost two brothers to addiction, two beautiful souls that were taken from this world far too soon. It was partially because there was no treatment available.

This country has failed to treat addiction as the health crisis that it is, so I know personally the pain that fentanyl brings to our families and our communities because I felt that pain when my brothers passed away.

Treatment for addiction can save precious lives, but we lack the capacity to provide those services. Instead, the default on America plan that their crisis is creating would cut funding for mental health and addiction treatment services.

H.R. 467 would also expand mandatory minimums, which takes away discretion from judges to look at each case on its own, which disproportionately harms Black and Brown communities more than others.

Last night in the Rules Committee, Republicans rejected 37 Democratic amendments that would have added more law enforcement funding to interdict fentanyl at border crossings. They would have provided more evidence-based approaches to fentanyl use. They would have made sure that we had the tools we needed to treat addiction.

Instead of creating and finding solutions, Republicans are creating more problems. The Republicans' default on America act will cut funding for Customs and Border Protection, potentially leading to an increase in the amount of fentanyl hitting our streets.

Is this their way of addressing the fentanyl crisis?

We need to do better. We need to make sure we give real solutions to these very serious problems.

Madam Speaker, I am tired of hearing that Democrats are to blame for the fentanyl crisis. We all recognize the need to do more.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the last 2 years, the Biden administration has seized record amounts of illicit fentanyl at the border.

DHS has seized more than 35,000 pounds of fentanyl in fiscal year 2022.

The Department of Justice disrupted or dismantled 130 fentanyl networks.

The administration is expanding access to treatments for those suffering from addictions.

Democrats in Congress filed a funding bill last year that beefed up resources for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, the National Guard counter-drug program, and the Drug Communities Program.

Contrast that with the Trump administration. A GAO report blasted the previous administration for failing to come up with a coherent national opioid strategy, and the crisis spiked. In the first 2 years of the Trump administration, we saw significant spikes in the fentanyl crisis, and more people died.

According to the CDC, the annual number of overdose deaths from synthetic opioids increased by 192 percent between 2016 and 2020.

In contrast, since day one of this administration, President Biden has provided solutions to the overdose crisis.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the December 2019 GAO report: "The Office of National Drug Control Policy Should Develop Key Planning Elements to Meet Statutory Requirements."

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

There was no objection.

[From the United States Government Accountability Office, Dec. 2019]

THE OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY SHOULD DEVELOP KEY PLANNING ELEMENTS TO MEET STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

WHY GAO DID THIS STUDY

Almost 70,000 people died from drug overdoses in 2018, according to the latest Centers for Disease Control and Prevention data. The 2018 SUPPORT Act reauthorized ONDCP and imposed new requirements. GAO noted in its March 2019 High Risk report that the federal effort to prevent drug misuse is an emerging issue requiring close attention.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. §1708a(b), GAO has periodically assessed ONDCP's programs and operations. This report assesses the extent to which ONDCP (1) met selected statutory requirements related to the National Drug Control Strategy in 2017, 2018, and 2019, and (2) has planned or implemented actions to meet selected new requirements in the SUPPORT Act. GAO assessed the 2019 Strategy and companion documents against four key statutory requirements that were consistent with or similar to ONDCP's ongoing responsibilities under the SUPPORT Act. GAO also assessed ONDCP's progress in addressing seven new SUPPORT Act requirements, and interviewed ONDCP officials.

WHAT GAO RECOMMENDS

GAO is making 4 recommendations to ONDCP to develop, document, and implement key planning elements to meet certain requirements in the SUPPORT Act. ONDCP agreed to implement 2 recommendations related to the Strategy, but disagreed with 2 related to the Drug Control Data Dashboard, noting that recent updates satisfy the law. GAO maintains that they do not fully do so, and that implementing key planning elements would help address the law, as discussed in the report.

WHAT GAO FOUND

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) is responsible for overseeing and coordinating the development and implementation of U.S. drug control policy across the federal government. However, ONDCP did not issue a National Drug Control Strategy for either 2017 or 2018, as required by statute. ONDCP was also required to assess and certify federal agencies' drug control budgets to determine if they were adequate to meet Strategy goals and objectives. Without a Strategy in 2017 and 2018, ONDCP could not complete this process according to statutory requirements. ONDCP issued a 2019 Strategy and companion documents that addressed some but not all of the selected statutory requirements GAO reviewed. For example, the Strategy and companion documents did not include the required 5-year projection for budget priorities.

The October 2018 Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act (SUPPORT Act) retained some requirements and introduced new ones for ONDCP. ONDCP met some SUPPORT Act requirements GAO reviewed. For example, ONDCP filled all five coordinator positions described in the SUPPORT Act. However, its approach to meeting other requirements does not incorporate key planning elements. For example, the SUPPORT Act requires that future iterations of the Strategy include a description of how each goal will be achieved, performance evaluation plans, and a plan for expanding treatment of substance use disorders. ONDCP could not provide in

writing or otherwise describe its planned steps, interim milestones, resource investments, or overall timeframes—all key planning elements—that would provide assurance it can meet these requirements by the deadline for the next Strategy—February 2020. The SUPPORT Act also required ONDCP to publish an online searchable Data Dashboard of drug control data, with information including quantities of drugs and frequency of their use. While ONDCP published (and later updated) a public version of this resource on its website, as of December 2019, it was not complete (e.g., lacked required data on the unmet need for substance use disorder treatment). Further, ONDCP officials had no information on next steps for fully meeting the requirements. Developing, documenting, and implementing key planning elements to meet these requirements—including resource investments, time frames, and any processes, policies, roles, and responsibilities—would be consistent with key principles for achieving an entity's objective and standards for project management. Importantly, doing so would help ONDCP structure its planning efforts and comply with the law.

DECEMBER 18, 2019.

Congressional Addressees:

The scale and impact of illicit drug use and prescription drug misuse has profoundly affected individuals, their families, and the communities in which they live, and continues to represent a significant threat to public health. Almost 70,000 people died from drug overdoses in 2018, a 27 percent increase in deaths since 2015, according to the latest, preliminary data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Since 2011, these deaths have also outnumbered injury deaths by firearms, motor vehicle crashes, suicide, and homicide, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration. Opioids—particularly highly potent synthetic opioids like fentanyl that are manufactured to mimic naturally occurring opioids such as morphine—are currently the main driver of these deaths. Primarily due to increasing rates of opioid-related deaths and opioid use disorder, the then-acting secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) declared the opioid crisis a public health emergency on October 26, 2017. Overdose deaths due to other potentially dangerous drugs—including cocaine and methamphetamines—have also increased in recent years.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), within the Executive Office of the President, is responsible for coordinating and overseeing the implementation of national drug control policy, including the National Drug Control Strategy, across the federal government. ONDCP is also responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of national drug control policy efforts by developing and applying specific goals and performance measurements and monitoring certain agencies' program-level spending. According to the President's fiscal year 2020 budget, federal drug control funding for fiscal year 2018 was \$33 billion. Federal drug control efforts span a range of activities across multiple agencies—known as National Drug Control Program agencies—including efforts to prevent illicit drug use and prescription drug misuse, treat drug use disorders, enforce drug laws, and stop the importation of illicit drugs into the United States. As part of overseeing and coordinating these efforts, the Director of ONDCP is required to promulgate a National Drug Control Strategy and assess and certify the adequacy of the annual drug control budgets submitted by National Drug Control Program agencies.

ONDCP was established by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, and, until 2018, was most

recently reauthorized by the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006). The ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 reauthorized ONDCP through September 30, 2010. After that date, ONDCP continued to operate under the provisions of the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 pursuant to continued funding in annual appropriations acts. In October 2018, the Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment for Patients and Communities Act (SUPPORT Act), among other things, reauthorized ONDCP and amended its authorities. In particular, the SUPPORT Act continues to require the ONDCP Director to promulgate the National Drug Control Strategy, and also includes a number of detailed new requirements for its content and development. For example, the Strategy is required to include a performance evaluation plan for each long-range goal in the Strategy for each National Drug Control Program agency. Furthermore, the SUPPORT Act includes other new requirements, such as the creation of a publicly accessible Drug Control Data Dashboard that captures an array of drug related data.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 1708a(b), we have periodically assessed ONDCP's programs and operations. This report assesses the extent to which (1) ONDCP met selected statutory requirements related to the National Drug Control Strategy for 2017, 2018, and 2019, and (2) ONDCP has planned or implemented actions to meet selected new requirements of the SUPPORT Act. In March and May 2019, we provided testimony on our preliminary findings regarding the extent to which ONDCP's 2019 National Drug Control Strategy met selected statutory requirements.

To assess the extent to which ONDCP met selected statutory requirements related to the Strategy for 2017, 2018, and 2019, we reviewed the current National Drug Control Strategy and three associated companion documents that ONDCP stated are intended to fulfill their statutory requirements, and assessed these documents against selected provisions of the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006. ONDCP officials told us that they began preparing the current National Drug Control Strategy, which they issued on January 31, 2019, in early 2018—prior to the enactment of the SUPPORT Act in October 2018. Officials stated that they intended for the 2019 National Drug Control Strategy to respond to the requirements of the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 because this was the applicable law at the time that they began drafting the Strategy. In light of ONDCP's stated approach, we based our analysis of the 2019 Strategy and companion documents on requirements in the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006, focusing on the same four provisions we discussed in our March and May 2019 testimonies. These four requirements were that the National Drug Control Strategy must contain (1) annual and quantifiable objectives and targets, (2) a 5-year projection for program and budget priorities, (3) specific drug trend assessments, and (4) a description of a performance measurement system. We selected these four provisions from the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 because we determined them to be related to aspects of ONDCP's role in (a) setting a strategic direction to oversee and coordinate national drug control policy and (b) ensuring a framework for measuring results. We also selected these provisions because they were consistent with or similar to ONDCP's ongoing responsibilities under the SUPPORT Act, which is the governing statute for future iterations of the National Drug Control Strategy. In addition to our analysis of the 2019 Strategy, we interviewed ONDCP officials about their activities and

responsibilities in overseeing and coordinating national drug control policy.

To assess the extent to which ONDCP has planned or implemented actions to meet selected new requirements in the SUPPORT Act, we reviewed the SUPPORT Act and the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 to identify requirements from the SUPPORT Act that were relevant to ONDCP and excluded, for example, requirements for other federal agencies. Due to the large number of requirements in the SUPPORT Act, we focused on those that were new and notably different from the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006. Based on this review, we selected seven requirements to examine. Specifically, we selected two requirements to designate officials to fill new coordinator positions—the performance budget coordinator and the emerging and continuing threats coordinator; four requirements for new elements to be included in the National Drug Control Strategy, such as a performance evaluation plan for each long-range goal in the Strategy; and one requirement to establish and maintain a drug control data dashboard. We then assessed relevant documents and information gathered during interviews with ONDCP officials about any efforts they had taken to address selected requirements and compared these against the relevant statute and Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government related to defining and establishing an entity's objectives.

To provide additional context for both of our objectives, we also interviewed officials from three National Drug Control Program agencies—HHS, the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)—about their views on and contributions to ONDCP's development and implementation of the 2019 National Drug Control Strategy. We also interviewed these officials about their agencies' and components' engagement with ONDCP during the 2017, 2018, and 2019 budget certification process. We selected these agencies because they received the largest share of 2018 drug control funding. For each agency, we interviewed headquarters officials who had responsibilities related to drug control policy and annual drug control budget submissions. We also selected and interviewed officials from one component from each agency—the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration from HHS, the Drug Enforcement Administration from DOJ, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection from DHS. We chose these components because of their drug control program responsibilities and their share of the 2018 drug control funding. The information collected from these interviews is not generalizable to all National Drug Control Program agencies but provides perspective on their experiences.

We conducted this performance audit from September 2018 to December 2019 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

BACKGROUND—ONDCP'S RESPONSIBILITIES

ONDCP was established by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 as a component of the Executive Office of the President, and its Director is to assist the President in the establishment of policies, goals, objectives, and priorities for the National Drug Control Program. ONDCP is responsible for (1) leading the national drug control effort, (2) coordinating and overseeing the implementation of national drug control policy, (3) assessing

and certifying the adequacy of National Drug Control Programs and the budget for those programs, and (4) evaluating the effectiveness of national drug control policy efforts. About a dozen National Drug Control Program agencies, as identified by ONDCP, have responsibilities for drug prevention, treatment, and law enforcement activities.

DEVELOPING THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

Among other responsibilities, the Director of ONDCP is required to develop and promulgate the National Drug Control Strategy. The National Drug Control Drug Control Strategy is to set forth a comprehensive plan to reduce illicit drug use and the consequences of such illicit drug use in the United States by limiting the availability of and reducing the demand for illegal drugs. Many of the SUPPORT Act's requirements for the National Drug Control Strategy are the same as, or similar to, those that applied under the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006. For example, both laws require the National Drug Control Strategy to include a 5-year projection for the National Drug Control Program and budget priorities. However, there are certain differences, and the SUPPORT Act includes a wide range of detailed new requirements that were not included under the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006. One of these is that the National Drug Control Strategy include a description of how each comprehensive, research-based, long-range quantifiable goal established in the Strategy for reducing illicit drug use and the consequences of illicit drug use in the United States will be achieved. Other examples of new requirements include creating plans to increase data collection and expand treatment of substance use disorders. The SUPPORT Act also requires the Director to release a statement of drug control policy priorities in the calendar year of a presidential inauguration (but not later than April 1). The President is then required to submit to Congress a National Drug Control Strategy not later than the first Monday on February following the year in which the term of the President commences, and every two years thereafter.

CERTIFYING AGENCY DRUG CONTROL BUDGETS

The Director of ONDCP is also responsible for developing a consolidated National Drug Control Program budget proposal for each fiscal year, which is designed to implement the National Drug Control Strategy and inform Congress and the public about total federal spending on drug control activities. As part of this effort, the Director of ONDCP is required to assess and certify National Drug Control Program agencies' drug control budgets on an annual basis to determine if they are adequate to meet the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy.

ONDCP DID NOT FULLY ADDRESS SELECTED STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO THE NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY IN 2017, 2018, OR 2019

FOR 2017 AND 2018, ONDCP DID NOT ISSUE A NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

ONDCP did not issue a National Drug Control Strategy for 2017 or 2018. Pursuant to the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006, the Director of ONDCP was required to promulgate the National Drug Control Strategy annually and the President was to submit the National Drug Control Strategy to Congress by February 1 of each year. According to ONDCP officials, ONDCP did not issue a National Drug Control Strategy for these years because (1) ONDCP did not have a Senate-confirmed Director during those years; and (2) 2017 was the administration's inaugural year, and previous administrations also did

not issue a Strategy during their first years. By statute, in the absence of a Director, the Deputy Director of ONDCP is to perform the functions and duties of the Director temporarily in an acting capacity. ONDCP had officials serving as Acting Director beginning in January 2017. The current Director of ONDCP was appointed Deputy Director beginning in February 2018 and served as Acting Director from February 2018 until April 2018. As of April 2018, the current Director continued in his role as Deputy Director until he was confirmed by the Senate as Director of ONDCP in January 2019. The previous administration also did not issue a National Drug Control Strategy in its inaugural year—2009—but it did issue a National Drug Control Strategy in its second year. On January 31, 2019, ONDCP issued its National Drug Control Strategy for 2019, which we discuss in more detail later in the report.

WITHOUT A NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY, ONDCP COULD NOT COMPLETE THE DRUG CONTROL BUDGET CERTIFICATION PROCESS IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS IN 2017 AND 2018

The ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006 required the Director of ONDCP to issue drug control funding guidance to the heads of departments and agencies with responsibilities under the National Drug Control Program by July 1 of each year. ONDCP is to issue funding guidance for agency budget proposals for the fiscal year two years in the future. For example, ONDCP was to issue funding guidance to agencies in 2017 for development of the 2019 budget, and issue funding guidance in 2018 for development of the 2020 budget. Such funding guidance was required to address funding priorities developed in the National Drug Control Strategy. National Drug Control Program agencies are to submit their budget requests to ONDCP in the summer of each year (before submission to the Office of Management and Budget) and in the fall of each year (at the same time as submission to the Office of Management and Budget). The Director of ONDCP then determines whether National Drug Control Program agencies' summer budget requests are adequate to meet the goals of the National Drug Control Strategy and certifies whether fall budget submissions include the funding levels and initiatives identified during the summer budget review.

Since ONDCP did not issue a Strategy in 2017 or 2018, ONDCP could not develop and issue funding guidance, nor could it review and certify budget requests and submissions of National Drug Control Program agencies, in accordance with the statutory requirement. ONDCP officials stated that—in lieu of a Strategy—they used other sources to formulate the administration's priorities, which served as the basis for drug control funding guidance in 2017 and 2018. For example, for the development of the fiscal year 2019 drug control budget in calendar year 2017, ONDCP officials stated that they relied upon the following sources for drug policy guidance:

- Initial development of the President's Initiative to Stop Opioid Abuse and Reduce Drug Supply and Demand;

- Draft recommendations from the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis;

- policy statements made by the President as a candidate; and

- policy priorities identified in the fiscal year 2018 President's Budget.

Additionally, for the development of the fiscal year 2020 funding guidance in calendar year 2018, ONDCP officials stated that they relied upon the following sources for drug policy priorities:

- the interim and final Report of the President's Commission on Combating Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis;

- the President's Initiative to Stop Opioid Abuse and Reduce Drug Supply and Demand; the draft National Security Council Strategic Framework; and

- a draft 2018 National Drug Control Strategy that ONDCP officials told us they drafted but did not issue.

These sources may have provided ONDCP officials with some information about policy priorities and actions. However, ONDCP officials stated they did not consider these documents to be the National Drug Control Strategy, and none of the sources fulfill the statutory requirements under the ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 2006, which require funding guidance to address priorities from the National Drug Control Strategy. ONDCP officials told us that they provided drug control funding guidance to the heads of departments and agencies with responsibilities under the National Drug Control Program in 2017 and 2018. As described by ONDCP officials, drug control funding guidance identifies key program goals and the programs and activities that require agency funding to achieve the objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy.

ONDCP has since issued the 2019 National Drug Control Strategy which states that it establishes the administration's drug control priorities. The Strategy also states that the priorities provide federal drug control departments and agencies strategic guidance for developing their own drug control plans and strategies, and that the Strategy is intended to ensure federal drug control budget dollars are allocated in a manner consistent with the administration's priorities. ONDCP officials told us that the agency intends to issue the next National Drug Control Strategy in February 2020 in accordance with the SUPPORT Act.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, this GAO report highlights the failures of the last administration in addressing this crisis we are talking about today.

The rule also makes in order two Congressional Review Act disapproval resolutions.

H.J. Res. 45 would roll back the student loan payment pause to last October. It would create chaos and instability for millions who are living check to check.

Let's remember why student loans were paused in the first place. Let's remember how dark and horrible it was when the pandemic first hit.

Remember how scary it was when COVID-19 started and the economy was in free fall? People lost their jobs. They were struggling to pay rent. We didn't know what the future held.

A pause to student loan payments was the right response to a public health emergency that was also a financial emergency. The payment pause was a lifeline for 37 million borrowers and their families, giving them much-needed breathing room to pay their bills, to pay their rent without worrying about sabotaging their credit.

H.J. Res. 45 could send surprise bills for interest to tens of millions of Americans. This could lead to unprecedented delinquencies and defaults for the most vulnerable borrowers.

The third bill, S.J. Res. 11, would reverse an EPA rule that reduces air pollution from the trucking industry.

Many parts of America were once cloaked in air pollution that would sit

at street level, sting your eyes, fill your lungs. Choking air, they called it.

In response, we enacted the Clean Air Act and tasked the EPA with cleaning up our air.

Still, one in three Americans live in counties with unhealthy air pollution. Heavy-duty vehicles make up about 6 percent of vehicles on the road but generate 59 percent of these dangerous pollutants that we are talking about. This contributes to respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, and even death.

The Clean Air Act gives the EPA both the authority and obligation to protect Americans from air pollution that could endanger public health or welfare. That is exactly what EPA's heavy-duty engine and vehicle rule would do.

Republicans want to block the EPA rule from going into effect. Even worse, if this passes, Republicans would block EPA from regulating this pollution in the future.

Why would we want to keep this agency from doing its job of keeping us healthy?

□ 1245

So instead of putting polluters first, Republicans should be spending this week paying America's bills. It is the patriotic thing to do. Clearly, that is not their priority. Remember, a default hurts working-class Americans. It hurts seniors on Medicare, food assistance recipients, and teachers' and students' access to care. If you are still waiting for your tax refund, it might not come.

Democrats have signed a petition to bring to the floor for a vote a bill that would raise the debt ceiling without any harmful cuts to the programs Americans rely on. All we need is five moderate Republicans to join the petition and the default crisis would be over.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), a valuable member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas that I am proud to serve with on the House Committee on Rules for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule which provides for consideration of the HALT Fentanyl Act, an important first step in fighting back against a drug that is killing thousands of Americans.

The HALT Fentanyl Act is an extension of the work that this majority is doing to support our law enforcement officers and first responders. These men and women in blue, who are maligned, villainized, and defunded in cities and States across the country, need our support today to continue to fight back against the trafficking of these lethal drugs.

Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers all agree that without

this important scheduling in place, the surge of fentanyl into this country will break new records and more lives and communities will be ruined in the wake.

In just a 10-day span earlier this year, State troopers in my district reported over 20 deaths from fentanyl overdoses. In just a 10-day span, 20 victims of the flood of this deadly substance into our country were killed, their families and their communities torn apart in the process.

In recent years, the drug-related death rate in Erie County in western New York has risen by 256 percent. As is the case in so many communities, fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances are responsible for more and more of these deaths.

It is hard to believe it can get any worse, but sadly, it could. If we allow the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances to expire, we will strip law enforcement of the authority they need to seize these extremely lethal drugs.

They are the ones who are pursuing the traffickers and getting them off the streets. They are also the ones who, too often, arrive on the scene to try to save the life of someone who has tragically succumbed to an overdose.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this legislation that will help ensure law enforcement has the tools they need to protect our communities and save lives.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I agree that we need to address the fentanyl crisis, but what we are saying is we need to do more. The bill we are looking at today does not increase any funding for law enforcement. It does not address the need that we have to increase our funding to assist law enforcement in interdicting this horrible drug.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, it reminds me of Texas—in fact, it reminds me of someone with whom I served in the Texas Legislature. He was asked what he did there, and he said: "Oh, I am not here to do anything, I am just here in case somebody else decides to do something."

That is the approach of these extreme House Republicans. They have no plan to protect our families from pollution or protect our planet from the climate crisis. Following their seditious leader, Donald Trump, they are just here to say "no." For some reason, any time we have a success that is green, it just makes them see red.

Democrats are choosing to stand with families that are concerned about real health problems like bronchitis and childhood asthma and cardiovascular disease that is caused and accentuated by pollution.

We need some heavy-duty action here today to protect our lungs and the lungs of our planet. Yet, they object to even this modest heavy-duty truck rule—the first updating of this pollution standard in 20 years.

With their fossilized thinking and smoggy judgment, Republicans are permitting our planet to overheat, and with this rule rollback, they would ensure that we keep choking during the overheating.

As health-harming pollutants enter our air and bake, smog pollutes our cities and endangers the most vulnerable. To prevent announcements of yet another ozone action day, what we need is a little ozone action right here in the Capitol.

When this truck rule takes effect, each year we will see tens of thousands fewer cases of childhood asthma and fewer premature deaths. Yet, MAGA extremists are not content with merely polluting our minds, as they do across this country, they refuse to prevent smog and soot from polluting our lungs.

Yes, life is a highway, but it need not be overwhelmed with health-harming pollution. Adopting a cleaner standard for trucks protects all of us, but especially the most vulnerable, the young, the elderly, and those with respiratory ailments.

You may remember a great musical that proclaimed, "On a Clear Day You Can See Forever." Not so much now. Not so often across America, even in our smoggy national parks. Democrats and Republicans may not see eye-to-eye on much, but we should be able to be clear on smog, it shouldn't be a partisan issue.

Once upon a time, long, long ago, "conservation" was a conservative value. A "no" vote is a breath of fresh air—a vote to keep soot out of our lungs.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), another member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding. A lot of conservatives believe in conservation. For example, the Governor of Florida, Ron DeSantis, has expanded the Everglades more than any Governor in the history of the State because that is actual conservation—instead of the nonsense being spewed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

When they say, oh, we do something. Let's just be clear to the American people what doing something actually is. It is giving billions of dollars of subsidies to your fat cat corporate cronies, enriching them at the expense of hard-working American families. That is the truth.

Madam Speaker, 90 percent of subsidies are going to billion-dollar corporations and 80 percent of electronic vehicle subsidies are going to people making well over \$100,000. That is the actual truth of what is going on.

Here today we are talking about several bills. We are dealing with the fentanyl crisis, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to address by allowing our border to be wide open, exploited by cartels, driving

fentanyl into our communities on the back of the Chinese, making money doing so, and killing 72,000 Americans last year alone, including 5 children in Hays County where I live south of Austin. It is happening every single day.

My colleagues don't care about securing the border. They want to hide behind the fact that they say that fentanyl comes through ports of entry. What they don't acknowledge is that there is no patrolling of the border by Border Patrol because they are all processing human beings being smuggled here for profit by dangerous cartels.

This bill is designed to take a step forward. It takes an important step forward in ensuring that we are dealing with the fentanyl precursors and that we are doing what we need to do to recognize how deadly it is. The fact is, our colleagues don't want to actually secure the border, which is where fentanyl pours across every single day.

On student loans—need we go any further than looking at the quotes from Speaker PELOSI when she said: “People think that the President of the United States has the power for debt forgiveness. He does not. He can postpone. He can delay. But he does not have that power. That has to be an act of Congress.”

That was that grand MAGA extremist, NANCY PELOSI.

She also added: “Suppose . . . your child just decided they, at this time, [do] not want to go to college, but you're paying taxes to forgive somebody else's obligations.” She continued, “You may not be happy about that.”

Are American families supposed to be happy that they now must cover the cost of someone else's education? Again, that great MAGA extremist NANCY PELOSI.

The fact is, the American people understand that making other Americans, plumbers or people who paid off their loans, pay off other people's student loans is inherently un-American and inherently unfair.

One last message to my Republican colleagues, passing a CRA to die in the Senate and die at the President's desk is not enough. We should defund the student loan fiasco in the debt ceiling bill. Don't blink.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, while my colleague speaks loudly about stopping fentanyl at the border, I will remind him that this bill doesn't do anything about fentanyl at the border. Indeed, the Republicans in the Rules Committee last night rejected amendments which would have placed more money on law enforcement and on the ability to stop fentanyl at the border.

Madam Speaker, I remind them that the Cato report points out that fentanyl is brought in at our ports of entry more than 90 percent of the time.

Madam Speaker, I point out that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to pro-

vide for consideration of a resolution, which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST), who will discuss the need to reassure the American people.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, seniors in America deserve to retire with dignity. They have earned Social Security and Medicare benefits through a lifetime of work. The seniors of today without pensions or generational wealth depend upon their benefits. Yet, they are living in fear that Republicans in this body will take away their healthcare and their means to pay for housing or food.

The bills we are considering this week have nothing to do with combating those fears. What they actually do is harm the health and financial stability of Americans. They dirty our air, they worsen student debt, and they increase the prison population.

My Republican colleagues cannot be serious. These priorities and bad policies do nothing to meet the moment.

Madam Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to come to their senses, and I urge them to stop playing games with our economy. Instead, give the American people some certainty. Give our seniors some certainty. Assure our seniors that you will not cut Social Security and Medicare. It is one thing to say it on the news, and it is another thing to do it in this Chamber.

Before Medicare, nearly half of older Americans had no health insurance. Today, Medicare is often the only source of healthcare for nearly all seniors. More than 66 million people rely on Social Security to meet their basic needs in a country where most Americans, over 60 percent, can't afford an unexpected \$400 bill tomorrow; that is seniors, people with disabilities, children, and more than 8 million veterans.

Republican proposals to sunset Social Security and Medicare would cause panic and disruption for our seniors at a time when peace and security are critical and well-deserved.

Let's spend our time this week finally considering Democrats' legislation that guarantees seniors the retirement that they were promised and that strengthens our healthcare. Our elders give us so much: culture, wisdom, and tradition.

Madam Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues in this body to give

back to them and guarantee them what they have earned. Let's do even more. Let's expand Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing benefits.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FROST. Let's work together to get rid of surprise bills. Let's end unaffordable prescription drug prices.

Madam Speaker, I urge Republicans in this Chamber to abandon the bad bills that they are bringing to the floor and refocus on real solutions that working families and our seniors deserve.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), another member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, as I sit here and listen—I am on the Rules Committee—I hope all those listening in the balcony, what my Democrat friends are saying are just words. My strong belief is that this fentanyl bill, H.R. 467, is a step in the right direction.

The issue that is plaguing this country is the invasion of the border.

Where have we heard one word from my Democrat colleagues about stopping the invasion?

We are a Nation of borders. Every nation is sovereign or you cease to be a Nation. That is where our fentanyl is coming in and it shocks me to keep hearing you say it is coming in at designated points of entry. There are no designated points of entry. The whole border is open.

□ 1300

The lives that were lost due to the drug overdoses that killed 100,000 of our young people last year, why does that not resonate? I have no earthly idea why this administration is intent on keeping our borders open, and they know it.

You got a Vice President who is laughing at it. You got a President who hasn't even been there other than to go on one regulated visit to the border. It is insane, and the American people are tired of it.

In South Carolina, I went to a news conference with police officers. They seized enough fentanyl to wipe out the whole State of South Carolina. What do we hear from the other side? Crickets. We hear nothing, and it is a crying shame of what happens.

Mr. Speaker, I will end with this: A DEA agent who was talking about this problem—he had picture after picture of our young people—said, In the morgue, there are no drug treatment centers. In the morgue, there are no education systems. In the morgue, there are no things to coach people who are in a casket. It is a sad day for America, and hopefully this insanity will end at some point in time when a new administration takes over.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an October 2020 NPR article titled: "Opioid Crisis: Critics Say Trump Fumbled Response To Another Deadly Pandemic."

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

There was no objection.

[From NPR, Oct. 29, 2020]

OPIOID CRISIS: CRITICS SAY TRUMP FUMLED RESPONSE TO ANOTHER DEADLY EPIDEMIC

(By Brian Mann)

When then-presidential candidate Donald Trump spoke in Manchester, N.H., a week before the 2016 election, he said the opioid crisis was destroying lives and shattering families.

"We are going to stop the inflow of drugs into New Hampshire and into our country 100%," Trump promised.

It was a major campaign issue. Overdoses were surging in battleground states key to the election, like New Hampshire, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

In 2017—Trump's first year in office—more than 42,000 Americans died from overdoses linked to heroin, fentanyl and prescription opioids, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Before coronavirus hit, opioids were widely viewed as the nation's top public health crisis.

Trump declared a public health emergency in October 2017, noting that overdoses had joined gun violence and car crashes as a leading cause of death in America.

"No part of our society, not young or old, rich or poor, urban or rural has been spared this plague," he said.

Significant accomplishments followed. Trump signed legislation in 2018 that boosted federal funding for drug treatment. During trade talks with China last year, Trump pushed to slow that country's exports of fentanyl.

"The federal government has taken some important steps to increase access to evidence-based treatment for opioid use disorder," said Beau Kilmer, who heads the Rand Corporation's Drug Policy Research Center.

Kilmer also credits Trump for "pressuring China to better regulate some of its synthetic opioids."

A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY, BUT NO CLEAR LEADERSHIP

But while some progress was made, critics point to serious missteps behind the scenes that hampered federal efforts, including the decision to sideline and defund the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP).

An internal memo acquired by NPR in 2017 found the White House was contemplating a 94% cut in resources to the agency, tasked since 1988 with developing and coordinating the nation's drug addiction efforts.

That decision was later reversed but Trump handed leadership of the opioid response to a series of political appointees, including former New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie and White House adviser Kellyanne Conway.

"This made it difficult for people to understand, you know, who's leading and coordinating the effort on opioids," Kilmer said.

Still, there seemed to be some success, with opioid deaths dipping slightly in 2018. "This sign of progress is an example of what can happen when an administration prioritizes an issue," said ONDCP director Jim Carroll in a statement earlier this year.

But in 2019, the number of overdoses surged again to a new record with more than 50,000

opioid-related fatalities. The CDC's preliminary data shows another big increase in deaths during the first four months of 2020.

U.S. WENT TWO YEARS WITHOUT A NATIONAL STRATEGY

Researchers also say fentanyl has continued to spread fast, despite interdiction efforts, contributing to more overdose deaths in the western United States where the synthetic opioid had been scarce.

In December, the Government Accountability Office issued a report blasting the administration for failing to come up with a coherent national opioid strategy as required by law.

"ONDCP did not issue a national drug control strategy for either 2017 or 2018," the GAO concluded.

The ONDCP declined an interview request for this story, but a spokesman told NPR in an email that the agency has addressed the GAO's concerns and is once again functioning in full compliance.

"ONDCP has released several documents that together address all of the statutory requirements that GAO noted as missing," the spokesman said.

But in recent months, even some members of the Trump administration have begun voicing alarm.

"Basically everything is pointed in the wrong direction," said Adm. Brett Giroir, assistant secretary for health and an opioid policy expert at the Department of Health and Human Services.

During a panel discussion in late July, Giroir described recent increases in opioid overdoses as "a nightmare," adding that "all the progress that we made has been reversed and this is even before the pandemic."

TRUMP ATTACK ON AFFORDABLE CARE ACT THREATENS OPIOID RESPONSE

Drug policy experts say things could grow even worse in the months ahead if Trump is successful in dismantling the Affordable Care Act.

The program created during the Obama administration subsidizes state Medicaid programs that provide insurance coverage for roughly 40% of Americans receiving opioid addiction treatment.

"We've seen very large increases in the number of individuals going to treatment programs," said Brendan Saloner, a researcher at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.

If the Supreme Court strikes down the ACA, as Trump has urged, those gains in insurance coverage and care would likely be reversed.

"The situation is bleak and it could be a lot bleaker," Saloner said.

Meanwhile, Democrat Joe Biden has released a plan of his own promising to end the overdose crisis if he's elected. His number one policy idea? Preserve and expand the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Newsweek article titled: "Fentanyl Surge Started and Peaked Under Trump Despite GOP Blaming Biden."

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

There was no objection.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 11, 2022]

FENTANYL SURGE STARTED AND PEAKED UNDER TRUMP DESPITE GOP BLAMING BIDEN

(By Alex J. Rouhandeh)

A major jump in fentanyl seizures at the border between fiscal year 2020 and fiscal year 2021 has placed President Joe Biden at

the center of GOP criticism. However, the problem appeared to be mounting months before he took office.

The first time monthly fentanyl seizures saw a sizable spike over the last four years was in June of 2020 under former President Donald Trump when Customs and Border Protection (CBP) seized 713 pounds of the drug, an almost 200 percent increase from the month.

Only once before then, over fiscal years 2020 and 2019, did the pounds of fentanyl seized in a month crack 400 pounds. However, following the June 2020 seizure, the pounds of fentanyl taken by CBP has surpassed the 700-pound mark each month all but twice. The two greatest monthly seizures of 1,212 pounds and 1,193 pounds both took place in October and December of 2020, just before Trump's turnover to Biden.

Nonetheless, certain Republican politicians have looked to place sole blame for the issue on Biden.

"The Biden administration's weak stance on border security and drug enforcement has enabled drug traffickers to send enormous amounts of fentanyl into our country," Republican Congressman Madison Cawthorn of North Carolina said in a February 10 statement. "The carnage and destruction caused by these weak and incompetent policies must end now."

"This has everything to do with the open borders policies President Biden imposed on day one of his term that has allowed an unprecedented supply of this drug to enter the homeland and devastate families and communities," Republican Congressman Darrell Issa said in a February 8 statement.

So far, 117 Republicans joined together in signing a letter demanding the president take "immediate action" to address the crisis by supporting the classification of fentanyl as a schedule 1 drug (with accepted medical use) instead of a schedule 2 drug (substances with "high potential for abuse").

Although fentanyl is used to treat pain in cancer patients, according to Med Line, Republicans argue that the drug should be reclassified to ensure law enforcement "has the tools they need to combat this threat."

Funding for CBP drug enforcement activities through the National Drug Control Program has looked consistent over the past several years. Under Trump, almost \$3.8 billion went to CBP for drug enforcement in 2020, and over \$3.1 billion was allocated to the agency in 2019. Under Biden, over \$3.4 billion went to CBP through the Drug Program in 2021.

Following the Trump peaks in October and December of 2020, the fentanyl seized each month has generally hovered between 800 and 1,000 pounds. However, in December of 2021, CBP seized 549 pounds of fentanyl, the lowest amount seized since the June of 2020 uptick. The data for January and February of this year has not come out yet.

Newsweek contacted CBP for comment but did not receive a response in time for publication.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think that we need to bring back to focus what we are doing here. This bill does something that we have no objection to, which is to permanently classify fentanyl as schedule I.

What we keep hearing on the other side, though, is about what more needs to be done, but their bill doesn't do it. Democrats have bills that would indeed increase law enforcement, that would indeed increase treatment for addiction, that would indeed increase the ability for us to research into these drugs and determine if there are possibilities in this ground where we could

actually find antagonistic drugs that would help counter the overdose that happens from them, but this bill doesn't do that.

Now, when they get up there and they start talking about the open border, this is not what this bill is. This is not what this bill is. This bill simply, as was pointed out last night, sort of codifies the status quo.

Our communities want more. Democrats were willing to provide more. We have introduced bills that do more, but they were rejected by the Republicans.

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

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, should we do more? Of course, we should do more, but fentanyl is pouring into our country not only at our ports of entry, but across our borders. We did do more a week ago bolstering border security.

Fentanyl is taking too many American lives, and I rise today in support of the HALT Fentanyl Act. This bill will help to combat the spread of fentanyl-related substances by permanently listing it as a schedule I drug, recognizing its deadly effects, giving our communities yet one more tool in a growing and necessary toolbox.

The smallest amounts of these drugs can kill even just one person, and laced with other substances, they are taking countless lives. Accessibility and lethality of these drugs have fueled countless fatalities. Fentanyl poisoning is the number one cause of death among adults 18 to 49 years of age, more than cancer, more than heart disease, and more than car accidents.

In upstate New York, the opioid crisis is devastating our communities, and it is being fueled by fentanyl. This is the public health crisis of our lifetime. In my home State, my district in Sullivan County, New York, has the highest opioid death rate in the entire State. That is why we are also pushing for Sullivan County to be designated a Federal High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

The truth is, every community in America is a victim to the fentanyl crisis, every family is on the front line of this opioid crisis, and we must give law enforcement and communities every tool necessary. I am proud to support this bill. I am proud to support law enforcement and their efforts to intercede and give them the tools to keep fentanyl out of our communities and off our streets.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed, I agree that we need to make sure that we address fentanyl for every community whether it be New York or New Mexico, because the fentanyl crisis is a public health crisis, and families are losing loved ones every day.

Indeed, in New Mexico in 2020, the New Mexico Department of Health found that 65 percent of people with substance use disorders were not getting the treatment they needed. The same problem we find nationwide. Over 86 percent of people suffering from opioid abuse were not getting the treatment they needed in 2020.

Even once treatment began, people are at their most vulnerable when they suffer from a relapse. Their bodies cannot handle the sudden return of high levels of opioids, and the result is often fatal.

I do hope that we can continue to agree that we must address this and that we must provide an addition to this bill, the kind of funding that is needed and that is urgent to treat addiction.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I give the compliment back to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Mexico. We are alums, and we will leave that for all to find out from where, but I am very proud to stand with her and really to stand with all of those who believe that the scourge of fentanyl must end now.

Mr. Speaker, we should not have one more death. I don't think there is any disagreement on this floor that there shouldn't be any more deaths. I also believe that it is important to recognize that there are some things that we come together on. I have never heard a Democrat be against border security. I have never heard a Democrat be against fighting the scourge of fentanyl taking out children.

As I have said over and over again, as a senior member on Homeland Security and Judiciary, who has written comprehensive immigration bills to protect Americans and to secure our borders, at the same time as the ranking member and former chair of the Crime Subcommittee, I know what to do with fentanyl.

I have introduced H.R. 3570. We have to stop fentanyl now to be able to get at the core of our problem. There is no doubt fentanyl comes in mostly from legal points of entry by United States citizens and others.

It does have other entry points, but the core is to protect the lives of our children. Why couldn't we do our work where we are doing one bill and another bill? H.R. 3570 deals with synthetics. It deals with educational outreach.

Just last night, I was speaking to a young person who said, Can you get Naloxone to be, if you will, in nontraditional places, clubs? Certainly, it should be in schools. It might even need to be in places of civic mindedness because it is where young people go to save their lives. Then synthetics, fentanyl that is used medically, are being sold online in pills that are misrepresented to our young people, and they lose their life.

H.R. 3570 takes care of that, fights the scourge of online sales and fentanyl trafficking. There is a pathway of getting to where we want to be, but a schedule I where you are, in essence, doing mandatory minimums that are not stopping, if you will, this horrible traffic. We are indicating we can get to this with enhanced penalties for the actions of the perpetrator so that you don't by mistake get someone innocently doing research or otherwise dealing with this particular drug that we are talking about that can be deadly.

There are scientists, there are responsible medical professionals, and then there are the devastatingly drastic evil people who try to use this to kill our children. We cannot adhere to that.

H.R. 3570 looks at it comprehensively. Working with the Judiciary Committee, working with Energy and Commerce, and all our Members, it is important to put forward legislation that can embrace us all. I believe that we have the responsibility to do the right thing.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The underlying bill could stand some work from all of us, and I ask us to save our children. Let's save our children and stop this deadly drug from coming into the United States, and let's find a way to reach our children.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New Mexico has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 467 to make class-wide scheduling of fentanyl-related substances permanent.

This hits close to home for me. I represent the men and women of eastern Ohio, a region of the country that has been hit particularly hard by this deadly drug. If the current order is allowed to expire, law enforcement will lose their ability to seize some of these fentanyl-related drugs. They will effectively be street legal.

Here are two staggering truths: Fentanyl poisonings are now the number one cause of death in the country of adults between 18 and 49. Over three-quarters of teen overdose deaths in 2021 were caused by fentanyl. That is 75 percent. In many of these instances, those taking the fentanyl had no idea they were doing so. That is what makes this lethal and heavily addictive drug so dangerous.

Sadly, it is very clear that the Biden administration is not serious about

solving this epidemic. If they were, they wouldn't be allowing our southern border to be overrun by the cartels and their drug mules. Who is paying the price for these policies and lack of border enforcement? It is the families of those that have become addicted. It is those that have overdosed and died from fentanyl. We have even had law enforcement officials in eastern Ohio that have been exposed to fentanyl and almost died during the conduct of their work busting up drug rings.

We should not be relaxing the penalties for that. We should be stiffening the penalties for fentanyl. Just 19 grams of fentanyl, what would fill a saltshaker in a restaurant, could kill 10,000 people.

Here is the bottom line: This legislation is necessary to make the temporary class-wide scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances permanent. If this body doesn't act, we should all be ashamed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues Mr. LATTA and Mr. GRIFFITH for their leadership here, and I urge quick and overwhelming passage of this life-saving bill.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I think what we heard on the House floor today was agreement, agreement on the need to address the scourge of fentanyl and what it is doing to our communities. I think we heard individuals talk about the individual pain they feel, whether it be in Texas, in New York, in New Mexico.

I think we want to hold that sense of agreement on this topic together because we don't always agree on things, but I think in this instance, we agree that we need to put our families first. We need to put the people who unwittingly end up dying from fentanyl with no idea that they were even taking that drug, and we need to remember that pain and that fear that those families must have.

□ 1315

As we talk about this issue, we must also remember that we have to do more. Making sure that fentanyl is classified and is not available with the fentanyl substances is important. We don't disagree on that. The issue that we are raising is the need to do more, and especially given the moment we are living in today.

This week, we are days away from a potential default because Republicans have refused to raise the debt limit. We are in a crisis, and it is a crisis that the Republicans have manufactured. We need to remember what that crisis does. That crisis actually hinders our ability to do the work that is so urgent to combat fentanyl.

Fentanyl comes in through our ports of entry. The Cato Institute, which is not a liberal or progressive institute, notes that 90 percent of fentanyl enters into the country through our ports of entry, smuggled in by, what I would

call, despicable Americans who profit off addiction and death.

But let's go back and say what would happen if their default that they have engineered would actually come to be. The Department of Homeland Security has said that if the default in America act goes into effect, it would lead to 2,400 fewer frontline CBP law enforcement officers. That is 2,400 fewer Border Patrol officers. That means that there are going to be fewer officers to help prevent illegal drugs from entering into our country. That would lead to over 150,000 pounds of cocaine and over 350,000 grams of fentanyl avoiding seizure.

The cuts that they have proposed would lead to more fentanyl coming in because there would be fewer officers on the ground to combat it. That is shameful that they would raise and talk about this bill in the angry and loud ways that they have done without acknowledging that the work that they did several weeks ago would actually make this crisis worse.

In New Mexico, as I noted, we know the pain of addiction and overdose all too well. We have lost too many beautiful lives to addiction and fentanyl.

We need to think about what those solutions are that we would want to do. We would want to increase the funding for substance abuse prevention and treatment block grants. That was one of the amendments that was suggested to this rule by Representative BALINT.

We want to use Representative BLUNT ROCHESTER's amendment, which would have increased education, so stakeholders would know about research and treatment and how to make sure that we make the public aware of these issues.

These are things that Republicans have refused to address in the bills we are looking at today.

I urge my colleagues, I urge those on the other side of the aisle, to really look at what we are doing today. We are doing something that we all agree on, which is addressing a teeny-tiny piece of the fentanyl problem, but we aren't doing what needs to be done in terms of increasing law enforcement, in terms of increasing funding at our borders and for those who are actually doing the work of seizing fentanyl as it comes in, of the law enforcement that must be done. We need to increase that funding, not cut it.

With regard to truck emissions, we cannot tie the EPA's hands. We must keep our air clean. The number of deaths from asthma in children who would survive and not be hurt if this rule goes into effect, would be horrible. I need to tell you that each child who would not be able to breathe because of polluted air is the child that I will think about when I vote on this bill later today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out, first off, that the Republican

House has voted on and passed an increase to the Nation's debt limit. This happened 2 weeks ago. Further action is awaiting in the Senate. Further action is awaiting down at the White House. This House, under the leadership of Speaker MCCARTHY, has acted and acted appropriately.

Furthermore, I would like to point out, in October of 2018, President Trump signed the SUPPORT Act. The SUPPORT Act was the first meaningful step toward countering what was at the time a crisis in this country because of diversion of prescription drugs, the so-called opioid crisis.

Mr. Speaker, it has changed since then. Since 2018, we are now faced with a different disease in fentanyl poisoning brought to us because of an open southern border, because the President has refused to secure the southern border and because the border czar has refused to secure the southern border. As a consequence, we have an unprecedented amount of fentanyl flowing into our country.

Yes, it is quite right, apps on social media have made it easier for kids to get access to this than ever before.

There is some good news. The Food and Drug Administration has allowed for the over-the-counter sale of Narcan that is to begin this summer. That is a good thing. However, that in no way counteracts the increase in illicit fentanyl that is coming across the southern border because of the refusal of this administration to secure our sovereign border.

Back in 2018 when the SUPPORT Act passed, it was largely through bipartisan efforts on the Committee on Energy and Commerce that brought that bill to its signing. Once again, I thank members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and members of the Senate for bringing before us these important pieces of legislation to roll back the damage that President Biden has done in the fentanyl crisis.

Republicans remain united in pursuing a legislative agenda that puts the welfare of Americans above the special interests of a few.

Mr. Speaker, I urge fellow Members to support the rule and support the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 429 OFFERED BY
MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 178.

Mr. BURGESS. 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.

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 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 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STRONG) 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 429; and

Adoption of House Resolution 429, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 467, HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 11, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS"; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 45, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO "WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfi-

ished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 467) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards"; and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans", 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 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)
Alford	Edwards	Jordan
Allen	Ellzey	Joyce (OH)
Amodei	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Estes	Kean (NJ)
Arrington	Ezell	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Fallon	Kelly (PA)
Bacon	Feenstra	Kiggans (VA)
Baird	Ferguson	Kiley
Balderson	Finstad	Kim (CA)
Banks	Fischbach	LaHood
Barr	Fitzgerald	LaLota
Bean (FL)	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Bentz	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Bergman	Flood	Langworthy
Bice	Foxx	Latta
Biggs	Franklin, C.	LaTurner
Billirakis	Scott	Lawler
Bishop (NC)	Fry	Lee (FL)
Boebert	Fulcher	Lesko
Bost	Gaetz	Letlow
Brecheen	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Garbarino	Lucas
Buck	Garcia, Mike	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Gimenez	Luna
Burchett	Gonzales, Tony	Luttrell
Burgess	Good (VA)	Mace
Burlison	Gooden (TX)	Malliotakis
Calvert	Gosar	Mann
Cammack	Granger	Massie
Carey	Graves (LA)	Mast
Carl	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Greene (GA)	McClain
Chavez-DeRemer	Griffith	McClintock
Ciscomani	Grothman	McCormick
Cline	Guest	McHenry
Cloud	Guthrie	Meuser
Clyde	Hageman	Miller (IL)
Cole	Harris	Miller (OH)
Collins	Harshbarger	Miller (WV)
Comer	Hern	Miller-Meeks
Crane	Higgins (LA)	Mills
Crawford	Hill	Molinaro
Crenshaw	Hinson	Moolenaar
Curtis	Houchin	Mooney
D'Esposito	Hudson	Moore (AL)
Davidson	Huizenga	Moore (UT)
De La Cruz	Hunt	Moran
DesJarlais	Issa	Murphy
Diaz-Balart	Jackson (TX)	Nehls
Donalds	James	Newhouse
Duarte	Johnson (LA)	Norman
Duncan	Johnson (OH)	Nunn (IA)

Ogles	Scott, Austin	Valadao
Owens	Self	Van Drew
Palmer	Sessions	Van Dyne
Pence	Smith (MO)	Van Orden
Perry	Smith (NE)	Wagner
Pfluger	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Posey	Smucker	Waltz
Reschenthaler	Spartz	Weber (TX)
Rodgers (WA)	Stauber	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Steel	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Stefanik	Westerman
Rose	Steil	Williams (NY)
Rosendale	Steube	Williams (TX)
Rouzer	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Roy	Strong	Wittman
Rutherford	Tenney	Womack
Salazar	Thompson (PA)	Yakym
Santos	Tiffany	Zinke
Scalise	Timmons	
Schweikert	Turner	

NAYS—208

Adams	Golden (ME)	Pallone
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Panetta
Allred	Gomez	Pappas
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pascrell
Balint	Vicente	Payne
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Pelosi
Beatty	Grijalva	Peltola
Bera	Harder (CA)	Perez
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Peters
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Petterson
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Phillips
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree
Bowman	Houlihan	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Porter
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Brownley	Huffman	Ramirez
Budzinski	Ivey	Raskin
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Cardenas	Jacobs	Ryan
Carson	Jayapal	Salinas
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Sanchez
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Casar	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Case	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Casten	Keating	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Scholten
Cherfilus-	Kildee	Schrier
McCormick	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Chu	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Cicilline	Krishnamoorthi	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Landman	Sherrill
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Soto
Correa	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Courtney	Levin	Stanton
Craig	Lieu	Stevens
Crockett	Lofgren	Strickland
Crow	Lynch	Swalwell
Cuellar	Magaziner	Sykes
Davids (KS)	Manning	Takano
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Thanedar
Davis (NC)	McBath	Thompson (CA)
Dean (PA)	McClellan	Titus
DeGette	McCollum	Tlaib
DeLauro	McGarvey	Tokuda
DelBene	McGovern	Tonko
Deluzio	Meeks	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Menendez	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Meng	Trahan
Doggett	Mfume	Trone
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Eshoo	Morelle	Vargas
Espallat	Moskowitz	Vasquez
Evans	Moulton	Veasey
Fletcher	Mrvan	Velazquez
Foster	Mullin	Wasserman
Foushee	Nadler	Neal
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Frost	Neal	Wexton
Gallego	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Nickel	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	
Garcia, Robert	Omar	

NOT VOTING—8

Beyer	Obernolte	Thompson (MS)
Gottheimer	Quigley	Waters
Kustoff	Simpson	

□ 1359

Mr. SCHNEIDER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WESTERMAN 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. 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. Mr. 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 204, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—217

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

Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)

Beyer
Gottheimer
Huizenga
Johnson (GA)
Kustoff

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)

NOES—204

García (TX)
García, Robert
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
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
Loftgren
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar

NOT VOTING—14

Langworthy
Lynch
McBath
Meuser
Obernoite

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

□ 1415

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO “CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS”

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 429, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 429, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES 11

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards” (88 Fed. Reg. 4296 (January 24, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 11.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11, which rescinds EPA’s rule requiring impractical emission standards for heavy-duty trucks, with huge new restrictions on F-250s, semitrucks, and everything in between—trucks that not only deliver all the goods we rely on but also trucks for our farmers and ranchers, building contractors and landscapers, and countless other workers and small businesses that quite literally keep our country running.

□ 1408

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.

Stated against:

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 231.

The EPA even acknowledges that the new standards are 80 percent more stringent than existing emission standards, but the Agency ignores the fact that new trucks already have 98 percent fewer nitrogen oxide emissions than trucks manufactured 35 years ago.

At a certain point, you start to see diminishing returns.

EPA's regulatory efforts are just the latest step by the Biden administration to electrify the transportation sector and burden American families in the process. The Agency itself emphasizes that the rule will cost truckers between \$39 billion and \$55 billion. In fact, the rule is expected to increase the cost of a semitruck anywhere from \$8,000 to \$42,000 per truck.

As we all know, the cost of these senseless regulations would inevitably be passed on to the American consumer through higher retail prices and increased inflation.

Ohio sits at the crossroads of America, and thousands of trucks travel across my State to transport goods to my constituents and businesses throughout the Nation. An unworkable rule like this one would stop some of these deliveries, cause delays for many others, and lead to shortages for some of our most basic staples.

We should ensure the delivery of essential goods and protect the quality of life for all Americans by passing the resolution before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican joint resolution of disapproval to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's heavy-duty vehicle nitrogen oxide rule.

This resolution is yet another extremist, Republican attack on commonsense steps EPA is taking to protect Americans' health and the environment.

Last December, EPA finalized the rule that sets new standards for heavy-duty engines and vehicles to reduce dangerous nitrogen oxide emissions, also known as NO_x.

Before the EPA action, it had been more than 20 years since the Agency had last updated heavy-duty emission standards for NO_x pollution.

These new standards are needed now because the science is clear: This pollution poses serious threats to public health. The tragic outcomes include premature death, respiratory illnesses like childhood asthma, cardiovascular problems, and other detrimental health impacts.

The trucking industry is a leading source of this dangerous air pollution, and it is especially dangerous for the 72 million Americans who live near truck freight routes across the United States.

The EPA rule will cut NO_x pollution from these vehicles by nearly half in 2045. That is going to make a huge difference because one in three Americans

live in counties with unhealthy air, and 100,000 Americans die every year from premature deaths associated with air pollution.

This harmful air pollution has negative repercussions for all Americans but is especially dangerous for our most vulnerable communities: children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color.

The EPA rule is a critical tool to protect these Americans, improve public health outcomes, and secure the right to clean air for everyone. This rule is expected to prevent up to 2,900 premature deaths, 6,700 hospital admissions and ER visits, 18,000 cases of childhood asthma, and 1.1 million lost schooldays for children.

EPA also estimates that it will result in \$200 billion in health-related benefits. What I mean by that is because you are going to prevent all these sicknesses and loss of schooldays and hours, that actually saves \$200 billion.

The Republican CRA before us that we are debating would abandon all the public health, economic, and environmental justice benefits that come with the EPA rule.

It is also worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that during the rulemaking process, EPA engaged extensively with communities and Tribal, State, and local governments. It also engaged with industry, environmental organizations, and labor groups to promulgate a final rule that is technologically feasible and realistically achievable.

Let me just say again: This rule is completely achievable. That is why industry is generally supportive. I know my colleague on the other side is going to mention different trucking groups that are not, but generally, they were supportive. In fact, the period for judicial review closed in March, and there were no lawsuits filed against it.

Some people may say, why does that matter? For the most part, there is always some group that challenges any rule that EPA puts forward.

But Republicans are moving ahead with this last-ditch attempt to prevent the EPA from protecting Americans' health. They have been putting polluters over people since the beginning of this Congress, and this is just another unfortunate example.

This Republican bill would have dire consequences for EPA's ability to fulfill its mission to protect public health and welfare from dangerous pollution. If enacted, this resolution would repeal the rule and prevent any substantially similar future action by EPA.

That outcome is simply not acceptable. Thankfully, President Biden has already vowed to veto this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, EPA's rule is common sense, achievable, and long overdue. S.J. Res. 11 is a baseless attack on EPA's Clean Air Act authority and obligation to protect Americans and the environment from dangerous air pollution.

This Republican bill would set us back years in addressing dangerous air

pollution, protecting communities, and modernizing our heavy-duty transportation sector.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this joint resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I once again have to point out that we are not only fighting for the right kinds of policies, but we have to fight against outrageous claims that are simply patently false.

That comment by my colleague that 100,000 people per year die from air pollution, that was a figure from 1990. By 2019, that figure had dropped to 60,000 people.

Now, that is not acceptable either, and I think one of the reasons that it dropped so far was because NO_x emissions from truckers had dropped some 98 percent since the late 1980s. So, we are already making great progress with this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), the sponsor of the House companion bill.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 11, which nullifies the Biden administration's heavy-duty vehicle emissions rule.

I am proud to have led this effort in the House, and I commend my colleagues in the Senate for swiftly passing this important legislation.

The joint resolution before us today would overturn the EPA's aggressive heavy-duty vehicle emissions final rule, which provides 80 percent more stringent regulations than current standards and unfairly targets our trucking industry. By imposing these new emissions reduction requirements for vehicle models that are made in 2027 and beyond, it will significantly increase the cost of heavy-duty vehicles.

Whether you own an F-250 or a semitruck, this new regulation will directly affect you. According to the EPA, it is projected to cost between \$2,500 and \$8,300 per vehicle to adhere to this new final rule. Other estimates, such as the one from the American Truck Dealers Association, stated it is closer to \$42,000 per truck.

Mr. Speaker, let me be crystal clear today. Woke bureaucrats in Washington are on a climate justice crusade, using the heavy hand of government to go after the trucking industry that keeps America moving.

In the last three decades, we have made significant strides in the right direction to decrease emissions and increase efficiency. Today's new trucks have reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since the 1990s.

The EPA's final rule is also ineffective, given that it incentivizes older and higher emitting trucks to operate longer due to the expensive technology required for compliant vehicles.

This is unacceptable and yet another blatant example of burdensome government regulation.

Simply put, the EPA has failed to address legitimate concerns for the

trucking industry. However, the EPA unilaterally imposes this detrimental rule, which could lead to a litany of further supply chain disruptions across the country, hit the smaller mom-and-pop trucking companies the hardest, and pass along increased costs to the American consumer.

Amidst record-high inflation and supply chain challenges, more expensive freight costs and fewer truckers on the road will only further perpetuate this problem. This is exactly why it is imperative that the House pass this joint resolution to nullify this burdensome regulation.

I thank OOIDA, Senator FISCHER, and the trucking industry for being front and center on this issue. I proudly support our truckers, our small businesses, and progrowth policies to keep our economy strong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this joint resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), who is the ranking member of our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time and for his steadfastness in standing up for the public health of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Republican's bill, S.J. Res. 11. What my Republican colleagues are trying to do here is roll back a very important Environmental Protection Act rule that was developed to tackle air pollution across America under the Clean Air Act, air pollution specifically that comes from heavy-duty trucks and buses.

For over 50 years, the Clean Air Act has served us well. It is one of our bedrock environmental laws that improves the air that we breathe. It tackles polluting plants and vehicles through using the latest science and technology to constantly evolve and improve.

Oftentimes, the EPA works with industry, as they did here with the trucking industry, to ensure that there is a balance, that we are improving the air we breathe and still maintaining jobs and economic growth over time.

□ 1430

What the Clean Air Act has brought us over the past 50 years has been consistent improvement in the air that we breathe. In fact, there have been dramatic improvements. When we are talking about cleaner air, we are talking about healthier communities and healthier families.

Think about your friends and family members with asthma or heart disease or some kind of lung infection. That is why it is so important to make sure that EPA is constantly evolving in the science and technology we are using in cleaning up our air.

It is important to tackle the problem of heavy-duty trucks and buses. Why? They constitute about 6 percent of the

vehicles on the road, but 59 percent of smog-producing elements: that means nitrogen dioxide, ozone, and particulate matter. The last time that EPA updated their rule relating to heavy-duty trucks and buses was 20 years ago.

Science and technology have evolved. The trucking industry has evolved. We can continue to make progress for American families. Even with the progress that we have made, one in three Americans live in counties with unhealthy air pollution. Back home in the Tampa Bay area, I can think of many communities along the interstate highways and along our industrial centers where there is a lot of traffic, especially from heavy-duty trucks and buses that are really weighing on the air quality in those neighborhoods.

This is a way, thankfully, for EPA to continue its mission to clean up the air under the Clean Air Act and make sure they are doing it in a scientifically sound manner. They are always working with industry on ways to improve and to protect public health. For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this Republican resolution. Allow the Environmental Protection Agency to cut pollution, improve our health, and save lives. Let's put people over politics and make sure we are doing all we can do to improve the health and lives of our American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11. This resolution reverses EPA's extreme emissions standards for heavy-duty trucks. President Biden is shamelessly pushing electrification of the entire transportation sector without regard for the significant environmental, economic, and national security risks it will cause.

We should not allow the Biden administration to continue implementing this plan without additional congressional guidance.

Heavy-duty trucks are essential to the transport of agricultural products and consumer goods to people across the country. In short, the availability of trucking is directly tied to our standard of living, food security, and ability to afford everyday life.

EPA's heavy-duty trucks rule applies to trucks of all sizes from the Ford F-250 to semitrucks. EPA's own estimates say it could cost more than \$8,000 per semitruck to meet their standards.

The cost will be passed directly to Americans, many who live paycheck to paycheck. Imagine someone who is already being forced to make tough choices for their family at the grocery store, the gas pump, and the pharmacy. Virtually every product they are buying—as well as the ones they can no

longer afford—is transported by a truck at some point.

With the EPA's rule, they will be paying and sacrificing even more for food, clothing, fixing their homes, and trying to provide for their families.

EPA's regulatory effort on heavy-duty trucks would impose extensive and expensive regulations; increase costs for trucking companies, many of which are small businesses; and ultimately fail to significantly reduce emissions.

The American people cannot afford the financial burdens. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress, the elected Representatives of the people, to address Agency overreach, especially when it would directly and negatively impact the lives of Americans and drive inflation higher.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator FISCHER and Representative NEHLS for leading on the Senate and the House resolutions on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment, Manufacturing, and Critical Materials Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

It is said that two certainties in life are death and taxes. Someone suing over an EPA standard must be a close third. Yet, when this rule was proposed, no one from industry or the environmental community challenged it based on EPA's legal authority, the Agency's analysis, or the administrative process. That is because it was carefully developed. It was developed in consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. It is achievable, and it provides flexibility for manufacturers.

Most importantly, it will result in significant health and economic benefits for all Americans—far more than the costs of compliance. Those benefits include fewer premature deaths, fewer hospital visits, fewer missed days of school and work, and yes, fewer cases of childhood asthma.

Despite being a relatively small number of vehicles on the road, heavy-duty vehicles covered by this rule, including semitrucks and buses, are significant sources of NO_x pollution.

This standard will especially help protect the tens of millions of Americans that live, work, or go to school near highways, ports, and other high-traffic, high-pollution areas along our Nation's freight network.

It is hard to believe that the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 were enacted by a vote of 401-25. Protecting public health from air pollution was a commonsense, bipartisan issue. Nearly everyone understood we had to balance industry interests with Americans' right to breathe and breathe safely.

We have reached a point where it is difficult to imagine a potential EPA

air rule that would not immediately be CRA'd by our colleagues in the majority.

This opposition is not based on rigorous analysis, but an ideological belief that anything done to reduce air pollution simply cannot possibly be worth the tradeoffs, even when the benefits would be undeniably huge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to allow EPA to move forward with flexible and achievable public health protections, like this heavy-duty rule. I ask all of my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 11. The legislation will disapprove of the Environmental Protection Agency's misguided heavy-duty vehicle rule that seeks to upend our economy in order to meet President Biden's extreme climate goals.

As a member of the Conservative Climate Caucus, I am not against reducing emissions—far from it. It should be done through innovation, not top-down government mandates that ignore reality. Trucks today show the power of innovation—I drive one of those—having already reduced emissions by 98 percent.

It seems like this administration has closed their eyes to any side effects of their rush to green. From tailpipe emissions regulations that will force people to buy expensive and less practical EVs to new rules on power plants that will threaten the reliability of our electric grid. It seems like the EPA hasn't even thought about the economic and energy security of our constituents.

In their final rulemaking, the EPA said they considered cost when deliberating these regulations. I am not sure how that could be true when they estimate it will cost thousands of dollars per truck to upgrade them with the necessary equipment.

The fact is small-truck owners and operators might not be able to afford these changes and will either go out of business or be forced to pass the cost on to the customer. On top of this, the rule also applies to trucks and equipment used by my farmers and farmers across the country.

Our supply chains are already stretched thin. Inflation is sky-high. Either of these scenarios worsens our economic outlook and raises prices for the consumers across the board. The trucks that haul our food, our energy resources, and our goods will be impacted. This is just the first of several, strict, heavy-duty vehicle emissions rules that the Biden administration is implementing.

In our modern digital economy, people and commerce depend on our truckers more than ever before. This rule will put further strain on our supply chain and increase costs for Michiganders and people across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 11.

Last year, more than 137 million people in the United States were living in areas with unhealthy levels of pollution, and we need to do better for them. It is currently estimated that 72 million Americans are exposed to high levels of air pollution due to their proximity to high-traffic trucking routes. These figures have real consequences, and they cost lives.

With three of California's largest trucking routes cutting through my district, the district that I represent in the San Fernando Valley, these figures are a community reality for us.

After decades of heavy-duty vehicles generating pollution in their backyards, my constituents experienced the injustice of disproportionately high rates of respiratory illnesses, cardiovascular complications, and cancer.

The EPA's heavy-duty NO_x rule is a long-overdue step in the right direction to protect the health and well-being of communities across the United States, including my own.

With this rule, the EPA could prevent up to 2,900 premature deaths per year, 6,700 fewer hospital admissions and emergency department visits, and 18,000 fewer cases of childhood asthma. These are the things that we need to work on in the House of Representatives. These are the lives of our children, grandchildren, parents, and grandparents.

Last Congress, Democrats worked and secured historic investments through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and Inflation Reduction Act to accelerate our progress in developing cleaner zero-emission technologies that will improve public health.

That includes \$5 billion for clean schoolbuses, an effort that I championed alongside Congresswoman HAYES, Senator PADILLA, and Senator WARNOCK.

The Republican-backed S.J. Res. 11 unravels the progress that we have made, and we must do more. It attacks necessary Clean Air Act protections and would repeal the meaningful actions that the EPA has taken.

Today's CRA abandons the American people. It abandons our children. It abandons our grandchildren and future generations. It forces our communities to continue to breathe polluted air and puts them on a path to an unlivable future.

It is important for us to understand that in this great Nation we have technology like no other, and we have capacity like no other. Therefore, all it takes is the political will of us on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing—to make the improvements that I just outlined here.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in Los Angeles where we had first-stage smog

alerts. Today, my children don't know what they are. Today, my grandchildren are being raised in Los Angeles. If we move the clock back, my grandchildren, unfortunately, will be able to speak of these smog alerts, just like I unfortunately had to be subjected to it as a child. We can do better, and we must do better.

Growing up in the neighborhood that I now represent, I was the first councilmember to turn down the expansion of a dump site—another polluting element. Yes, the unions came up to me and said: "We are going to lose 200 jobs. You can't do this." I said: "We must."

We found a solution to recreate those jobs on the same site, to have a cleaner, more effective way of dealing with the trash that the over 4 million people in my city create every single day.

It is really important for us to understand that for us to pass this resolution it will send us backwards and hurt generations today and more generations to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), another very passionate member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1445

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our truckers are the heartbeat of America, transporting about 70 percent of the United States freight. We depend on our truckers more than the left cares to admit or realize. Now they want to attack our truckers, even after the trucking industry has come to the table time and time again, Mr. Speaker.

In 1998, one truck emitted what 60 trucks emit today. They have removed 98 percent of what comes out of the tailpipe. Still, the climate activists and converts will continue pushing their radical green deal on Americans invariably and inevitably damaging our economy and making us reliant on, guess who, China.

The Biden administration should be ashamed of taking a page from California's radical playbook to ban gas-powered vehicles. Over 200,000 Texans are heavy-duty and tractor-trailer truck drivers. Now, let me tell you: We don't want the Federal Government messing with our way of life and our livelihoods in Texas. This dangerous EPA rule would increase costs for the trucking industry and, in turn, would increase costs for communities that rely exclusively on trucking for their freight.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of S.J. Res. 11 to reverse the Biden EPA's new burdensome trucking regulations in order to protect small business truckers and to prevent more inflation and supply chain issues. This is a matter of life and death for our truckers.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 11 to overturn the EPA Clean Trucks rule.

Tens of millions of Americans are exposed to dangerous levels of nitrogen oxide pollution from trucks. Many of them live in low-income communities and communities of color.

I know. I represent the Port of Los Angeles where I am surrounded by four freeways and trucks everywhere. Now, they do move our economy. They move goods from the port out into the communities, and so we acknowledge that, but we are all too familiar with Code Orange or Code Red air alerts warning us not to go outside.

Think about this: Our children cannot go outside and play at the local park because of the air quality, because of the pollution. We know that they are at increased risk for premature deaths, childhood asthma, and lung and heart diseases. If you go to a doctor's office in my district, the doctors there stock up on boxes of inhalers for children that they are waiting to come in because of the air pollution that is causing asthma.

These truck pollution standards were last updated 20 years ago. That is the last time we updated the standards. How long do children need to wait? How long do children need to wait to get clean air?

It has been 20 years. That is how long our communities have suffered without any help. This Republican resolution basically says too bad. We want you to wait longer for clean air. Whether it is Wilmington, California, in my district, or Wilmington, Delaware, across the country and everywhere in between, our communities just want to breathe. Delay is not acceptable.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California such time as she may consume.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Our children have been waiting too long. We must move forward with this EPA truck rule. This is what we need to make sure we are investing and moving toward clean trucks, and we will not stop until every community, no matter your ZIP Code, can go outside without worrying whether it is safe to breathe clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to support clean air for all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), my good friend and another colleague from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution which would overturn the Biden administration's reckless and aggressive emission standard for heavy-duty vehicles.

As a businessman, I came to Congress to reduce the size and scope of the gov-

ernment, and this administration's obsessive pursuit of their rush-to-green priorities would simply devastate the U.S. economy at a time when Americans can least afford it.

Democrats' radical spending spree has resulted in three in five Americans saying rising prices are a financial hardship. Our people are hurting, yet the Biden EPA is moving forward with a top-down regulation that will significantly raise the cost of vehicles and any product transported by truck, including food, clothing, building materials, and other commodities essential to life.

In my district, I have many farmers who use heavy-duty trucks. If implemented, this rule would dramatically increase the price of goods and food. We are already hearing that from folks at the grocery store.

Last year, the Environmental Protection Agency put in place emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles sold after 2027. By their own estimates, the new standards would cause vehicle prices to skyrocket.

We are not talking about a small price hike here. It would be an increase more than \$2,500 for a Ford F-250 and an increase more than \$8,300 for new equipment on semitrucks.

The EPA projects the associated costs of the new regulation could reach \$55 billion over the lifetime of the program. I repeat, \$55 billion. It would also force many commercial truck drivers out of business. This regulation's cost of compliance is so high that owners and operators of trucks would be forced to leave the market or keep less safe trucks on the road.

Mr. Speaker, America simply cannot afford the wildly out-of-control and out-of-touch priorities from this administration. I strongly encourage a "yes" vote on today's resolution to overturn the Biden administration's emission standard for heavy-duty vehicles.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Republican side of the aisle keeps talking about costs. I saw the chart that they put up that talks about costs, and the last speaker talked about \$55 billion. I think that was the cost to the truckers.

The bottom line is that the EPA has an obligation to deal with and try to protect Americans' health and safety. I gave a figure before, which is four times what the gentleman said, about how the cost in terms of lives and the loss of job hours, the loss of education hours, the cost of having to go to the doctor, EPA estimates that all that comes up to \$200 billion. We can argue about costs.

I mean, I don't doubt that there are tremendous costs involved in not putting this rule into effect because of the impact on communities like that of the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

BARRAGÁN) talking about the inhalers that are available in doctor's offices because of the impact on children and their ability to breathe.

The one thing that I really want to stress is that it is almost as if the other side doesn't feel that the EPA has an obligation to address the health impacts because of the costs to the trucking community, and I would just say that that is not true.

The reason that we have an EPA is so that they can study and see what the impact is of air pollution and smog. It is clear. No one has suggested that the EPA doesn't have the power to do this based on the facts and based on the surveys they have done to show what the harmful impact is to Americans of this air pollution that comes from trucks.

This rule would eliminate 50 percent of that by 2045. I don't think it is unreasonable to suggest that that is not a good thing to do. Furthermore, I don't hear any suggestion from the other side to say that, well, rather than do that, we would do something else. It is just: Don't do it. Don't do it. Don't do this rule that, in the opinion of the EPA and those of us on this side of the aisle, is important to save lives and to make Americans healthier.

It bothers me tremendously to see that they are simply getting up on the other side and saying, Don't do this, let's get rid of this rule rather than even suggesting an alternative.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S.J. Res. 11, disapproving the EPA's proposed rule on new emission standards on heavy-duty trucks. The Biden administration is proposing new regulations on heavy-duty trucks that would dramatically raise costs on businesses and consumers.

These rules would require trucks to be equipped with expensive emissions control technology beginning in 2027. The EPA estimates the cost of the technology would be somewhere around \$8,300 per truck, but independent estimates say it could be more than \$40,000 per truck.

This is a huge cost on businesses, especially small businesses who rely on trucking to transport their goods. It will force them to raise their prices or go out of business because they will have to pay more for the supplies and inventories they need. In other words, it is more inflation.

Consumers will have to pay more for everything from food to clothing to building materials at a time when inflation is already at a 40-year high.

Republicans in Energy and Commerce are calling on Congress to reject these regulations. We simply can't afford them. The EPA claims they need to address nitrogen oxide and other

pollutants, yet NO_x pollutants have been reduced by 98 percent since 1988.

This is more of the blind drive to this green ideology, which is both intellectually and environmentally bankrupt. Cleaner air today is due to advancements in engine and fuel technologies, better filtration, and higher efficiencies.

The Senate passed this resolution to overturn this heavy-handed, job-killing rule. I urge the House to do the same.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my good friend and another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman JOHNSON for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 11, a resolution nullifying the EPA's overreaching rule on American trucks.

Mr. Speaker, the American people cannot afford yet another misguided Biden policy. From the gas pump to the grocery store, costs have skyrocketed because of this administration. Now, in their infinite wisdom, they have concluded American trucks need to be regulated with the most stringent standards in our Nation's history, all in the name of the radical, climate-alarmism agenda.

Almost every item found in the grocery store, pharmacy, restaurant, or business is transported on a heavy-duty truck. If this regulation takes effect, Americans will see essential items such as food, clothing, and school supplies cost even more.

It is sad the Biden administration and regulators at the EPA decided their devotion to radical climate goals justify increased suffering for the American people. However, it is a price they are willing to make you pay to achieve their goals. Regulations like this will diminish the quality of life for constituents like mine.

Supporters of this regulation might argue the costs of compliance would be minimal. They would be wrong. The EPA's own analysis found that it would cost over \$8,000 per truck. Furthermore, the bureaucrats at the EPA have a history of underestimating the costs of their heavy-handed regulations.

In 2001, they estimated the cost of their nitrogen oxide regulation to be \$5,000 per truck, but the market analysis found it to exceed \$21,000. The American Truck Dealers Association agrees the EPA estimate is far too low and estimated the true costs to be around a \$42,000 increase per truck, which would mean more inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should not suffer higher costs because of demands made by climate activists. We must nullify this regulation. I support this resolution for the benefit of the American people.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this EPA rule is promulgated by left-wingers, radicals; it is a radical rule. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Just to give you an example, the Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association, which is a nonprofit group that provides technical information on emission control technologies for motor vehicles, concluded that a 90 percent reduction in NO_x emissions is feasible by 2027. Not only are the heavy-duty NO_x rule standards achievable, but they can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.

Since the rule does not mandate the use of any specific technology, despite claims to the contrary, there are multiple compliance pathways available to reduce NO_x emissions.

There are existing technologies that help industry achieve the rule's NO_x requirements, and with the years of lead time built into the rule, technology manufacturers will continue to innovate new and more cost-effective solutions. The rule also supports tens of thousands of supplier jobs dedicated to the commercialization of this technology by 2027.

The problem is that with this CRA, House Republicans are throwing away decades of progress in the heavy-duty transportation sector.

This is not radical. This is not left-wing. This is just practical in a way of trying to protect people's health, while at the same time being very conscious of the impact on the trucking industry and making it possible to move forward with this without any real harm to the industry.

I urge my colleagues to support this innovation of our domestic, heavy-duty transportation technology industry and vote "no" on this resolution.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman JOHNSON for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 11, which repeals EPA's rulemaking on heavy-duty engines and vehicle standards for trucks. The Senate passed this resolution at the end of April, sending a strong message of disapproval. It is time for this body to do the same.

Today's new trucks have reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since 1988, and the EPA's recent rulemaking requires reductions that are 80 percent more stringent. The rule outpaces available technology and would worsen an already tight equipment market.

The EPA's nitrogen oxide rulemaking for heavy-duty trucks would

dramatically increase the cost of new trucks. The EPA admits the rule would cost between \$39 billion and \$55 billion. On a per truck basis, the EPA noted the price of a class 2b truck will increase by \$2,600 and a semitruck will increase by \$8,300. As the costs of trucks increase, the cost of all goods transported by trucks will increase.

Let me give you a primer on health. If you can't afford food and you can't afford medicine, your health will worsen—that is for children, that is for families, and that is for senior citizens.

Additionally, the EPA's rulemaking potentially encourages trucking companies to retain older fleets with greater nitrogen oxide emissions, meaning the rulemaking may result in increased emissions from heavy-duty trucks. If trucking companies cannot afford the new trucks with compliant technology, they will keep older, higher-emitting trucks in operation.

Further, when we don't see the benefits of this rule, i.e., reduced asthma, reduced hospitalizations, or reduced premature deaths, they will again say the rules weren't stringent enough, didn't go far enough.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, small carriers and independent truckers simply cannot afford to overhaul their fleets, farmers cannot continue to produce crops with these standards, and American families can't afford higher prices for everyday goods, medicine, and food.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the CRA.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the vice chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, you would think after years of supply chain disruptions and skyrocketing consumer prices, this administration would make every effort to lower costs and streamline our transportation networks.

The heavy-duty engine and vehicle standard does exactly the opposite. This rule would force owner/operators to leave the market or keep older trucks on the road.

This rule is unrealistic, given the heavy-duty vehicle technology space, and this rule would add at least \$8,000 to the cost of each new semitruck. The cost doesn't go to producers, the people who grow the grain or produce the oil or get the natural gas out of the ground. It goes to the consumers.

Instead of expanding the equipment market and recognizing the significant

reduction of nitrous oxide, this rule is another assault on liquid fuels that will further complicate the supply chain.

North Dakota is a producer State, but we have to get our products to market. We need heavy-duty vehicles to get our goods there. The rule jeopardizes our ability to feed and fuel the country.

The CRA has bipartisan support and for good reason. The underlying rule is unworkable, and I urge my colleagues to support the CRA.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I listened to Ms. BARRAGAN and she talked about the Port of Los Angeles, I was concerned because I don't think we have spent enough time during this debate talking about what I call environmental justice communities. These are communities which, because they are near the port or near places where the trucks predominate or they are concentrated, have such an impact on the local community. That is certainly true in parts of my State as well, in New Jersey.

We all know that air pollution from the heavy-duty transportation sector has serious negative impacts on everyone's health. But these communities near high-traffic roadways experience higher rates of these serious health effects.

We have an estimated 72 million people that live near truck freight routes across the United States, and residents of these communities are more likely to be low-income communities and communities of color.

It should not come as a surprise that my Republican colleagues are once again putting polluting industries over the health and safety of our most vulnerable populations.

Research has demonstrated that diesel traffic, including traffic located on freight routes, is the largest source of NO_x disparity by race in the United States.

Protecting our most overburdened communities is one of the many reasons why the heavy-duty NO_x rule is absolutely critical.

During his first days in office, President Biden made a commitment to uplifting environmental justice and making it a core tenet of his administration. To continue delivering on his promise, just last month, he signed an executive order that will further embed environmental justice into the work of our Federal agencies.

The heavy-duty NO_x rule is just another example of how far the EPA is delivering for environmental justice communities. Reducing harmful air pollution from the heavy-duty transportation sector will have immense benefits for those living near these high-traffic freight routes.

I think it is a shame that the Republicans are essentially turning a blind eye to the disproportionate health harms that are faced by these communities from circumstances outside their control.

We are not going to ignore this, as Democrats, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution in part because of the terrible impact on some of these communities that are near these freight routes and ports, including those in my home State of New Jersey.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this EPA rule would go into effect for model year 2027, which is an extremely tight timeline for compliance. The Truckload Carriers Association commented that the rule outpaces available technology, which means there is not even technology there yet to do the kinds of things that this rule is requiring.

I also point out that there are significant key groups that support S.J. Res. 11: American Trucking Association, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Transportation Intermediaries Association, National Tank Truck Carriers, Truckload Carriers Association, and the National Federation of Independent Businesses, which represents literally thousands of small businesses, many of them small trucking operations across America.

There are some very, very serious technical issues with this rule, as well as some real economic concerns.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his incredibly important leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, every American, every single child and every single family, has the right to breathe clean air.

I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 11, the latest effort from colleagues to put American lives in danger to boost the profits of their corporate, polluter donors.

Heavy-duty vehicles make up just about 6 percent of trucks on the road but generate 59 percent of all nitrogen oxide pollution in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in southwest Detroit thinking those heavy trucks rumbling through our neighborhood, near my school, near where I lived, near the park I played in, was normal. It isn't normal.

In my district and surrounding areas, we see heavy trucks go through our neighborhoods up to 20 more times a day than any other community in Michigan. This is not the kind of life for any family or any resident of our country. It is no surprise that the rates of asthma, lung cancer, and COPD are dramatically higher in my region, in my district, than any other parts of the State.

We see heavy-duty trucks drive outside of our elementary schools, local health centers, and nursing homes every single day. We see premature

deaths, heart attacks, asthma, strokes, and maternal complications. These are just some of the effects from pollution that these vehicles spew into our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to breathe clean air.

Part 1 of President Biden's Clean Trucks Plan is just a small step toward environmental justice for communities that have been left behind for far too long. Our communities, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford a setback like this that is being proposed today. They cannot afford to continue to have their health, safety, and futures put at risk for corporate profits. They don't have another day, another year, another month to live like this.

President Biden will rightfully veto this ridiculous attempt to make our communities even more unhealthy and more dangerous, but I call on the EPA to go even further to make progress in cleaning up our air and water in order to give our residents a real opportunity for a better quality of life.

I invite any of my colleagues to spend a day with me in my district to see for themselves what rampant, unchecked pollution does to a community, to a neighborhood. Talk to any of my seniors who grew up with it, who are literally on breathing machines before they go to bed. This is not the life we want for any American.

I invite you to meet the children born prematurely to parents with asthma and COPD who go to work every day with headaches and chronic respiratory problems. Maybe then you would understand not only the need for this rule to remain intact but to go even further to protect the health of those we are sent here to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the CRA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Congressional Review Act that would overturn yet another radical rule from the Biden administration's EPA.

If you need any more proof of how radical the rules coming out of this EPA are, look to where this bill came from: The Senate. The last time I checked, the President's own party holds the majority in that Chamber, yet they still think this rule is too extreme.

This EPA rule would impose severe emissions reductions that are 80 percent more stringent than the previous rule.

□ 1515

Today's new trucks have already reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by more than 98 percent since 1988. In fact, there is a chart on EPA's own website showing the U.S. reduced six common pollutants by 78 percent between 1970

and 2020, all while increasing miles driven and experiencing dramatic economic growth.

Put simply, this rule is both unnecessary and unworkable. It would make it harder for the truckers who keep our economy moving from doing their jobs—truckers from the Georgia Ports Authority in my district.

The cost of complying with this rule would force truck owners and operators off the road, and that is not acceptable.

Prices are up. Our supply chains are backlogged. We have an administration that continues to strangle our economy with antigrowth and antiworker rules like this.

Mr. Speaker, this needs to stop, and I urge passage of this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress—and I said this before the Rules Committee—that the concern that I have here is this process, in part. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when you do a Congressional Review Act—which is being used today by the Republican side—to essentially get rid of this very important EPA rule to protect public health, if it is passed, not only does the rule disappear, but there can be no action by the agency in this space.

As I continue to point out, the Republican side has not come up with an alternative. Everything that I hear is to say, “We don’t want this rule in effect, and we think the rule is not a good one,” but they don’t address the fact that this rule is seeking to address public health in such a significant way.

Also, I heard my colleague from Georgia, whom I respect a great deal, say: Oh, this was passed by a Democratic Senate.

The fact of the matter is that with the exception of one, every Democratic Senator voted against this resolution, and I think there was one absent. It is hardly the case that Democrats support this. There was only one Democrat who supported it in the United States Senate.

The reason that I am so concerned is not only because this would get rid of such an important rule but because there would be no alternative at this point and no likely alternative in the future.

Let me say that the science could not be more clear. NO_x emissions are dangerous, and they have significant detrimental impacts on public health. The respiratory impacts, which have been mentioned by my colleagues on the Democratic side, associated with this air pollution include wheezing, coughing, shortness of breath, asthma attacks, and even lung cancer.

If those are not serious enough, other health impacts include susceptibility to infections, heart attacks, strokes, metabolic disorders, preterm births, low birth weights, and premature deaths.

In the United States, air pollution is associated with over 100,000 deaths every year. Despite the severity of these negative health outcomes associated with NO_x pollution, my Republican colleagues remain committed to rolling back the very standards that would protect Americans from these harmful impacts.

It is hard for me to imagine that the majority is so set on repealing a rule that would literally save lives and improve the health of millions of Americans across the country, but unfortunately, that is what we face here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by starting with something that Mr. CARTER from Georgia just reminded us all of: A Democratic-controlled Senate passed S.J. Res. 11—a Democratic-controlled Senate. Democrats in the Senate said that this rule is unnecessary and too onerous. They passed the CRA, and they have asked us to do the same.

I heard several things today that I want to put an exclamation point on. I heard from my colleague and my friend, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, that the EPA’s job is to protect the air and water, the environment.

I actually agree with that, but let’s look at the environmental facts that surround this particular rule—a 98 percent reduction in NO_x emissions since the late eighties and early nineties. Look at the cost that this is going to place on the American economy: \$39 billion to \$55 billion.

Many trucking companies are not going to be able to comply with this, so they are not going to buy the new trucks. Instead, they are going to continue to use the old trucks. It is going to defeat the very purpose that this rule was set out to do in the first place. They are just going to keep driving those trucks until they drive the tires off of them.

I heard one of my Democratic colleagues say earlier that if we overturn this rule by passing S.J. Res. 11, we are going to create an unlivable future for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what an unlivable future looks like in rural America, where inflation is already at a 40-plus-year high. Americans—parents and grandparents—are having to raise their own grandchildren because of things like the drug epidemic and having to work two jobs to make ends meet. They are having to choose between putting fuel in the car and buying groceries or paying the electric bill or having health insurance. That is an unlivable future.

When we do something like this rule that continues to cause inflation to go up and up, it puts more strain on American families who are living paycheck to paycheck.

I also heard the term “environmental justice.” What about environmental in-

justice? Mr. Speaker, come to Appalachia. Ride up and down the roads and see the farmhouses where people live paycheck to paycheck and where they struggle like I just described.

The EPA puts forward rules that have no consideration for the economic impacts on the people whom it is going to hurt the worst. Those are the people who get up every day and put their work clothes on.

Ninety-six percent of the trucking industry are small operators. Ninety-six percent are small fleet companies. They are the ones who are the least able to go out and buy this new technology, and they are the ones who are going to more quickly go under and go out of business because of this onerous rule.

Mr. Speaker, this CRA is the right thing to do. Democrats in the Senate said so, and Republicans in the Senate said so. I urge today in the U.S. House that we also say so. Tell the EPA this is a bridge too far.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 11. Let’s overturn this rule.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 11, the latest Republican attack on clean air protections.

Heavy-duty vehicles make up approximately 6 percent of vehicles on the road but generate 59 percent of dangerous nitrogen oxide (NO_x) pollution. This rule, issued in December 2022, is targeted at reducing the air quality impacts of heavy-duty engines beginning in Model Year 2027 and protecting clean air. Changing the standard for heavy-duty engines and vehicles is expected to reduce dangerous NO_x pollution by nearly 50 percent by 2045. This rule was created with trucking, engine manufacturing, and other industry stakeholders and will be the first update to heavy-duty vehicle emission standards in 20 years.

Every American deserves access to clean air, yet approximately 72 million Americans are exposed to higher levels of air pollution due to their close proximity to high-traffic trucking routes. These Americans are more likely to be low-income and communities of color. It is estimated that the EPA’s new rule will lower respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, and cases of childhood and adult asthma caused by exposure to dangerous pollution. I am proud of the historic investments Democrats made last Congress to develop cleaner, zero-emission technologies that will protect public health. Passing S.J. Res. 11 would abandon the progress we have made to address public health concerns and promote environmental justice in our Nation’s infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, not only will S.J. Res. 11 disproportionately harm children, the elderly, and communities of color, but it would block the Biden Administration, or any future administration, from taking meaningful action to curb dangerous NO_x pollution from heavy-duty vehicles.

It should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BABIN) at 4 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards", 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 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 203, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Barr	Buchanan
Alford	Bean (FL)	Buck
Allen	Bentz	Bucshon
Amodei	Bergman	Burchett
Armstrong	Bice	Burgess
Arrington	Biggs	Burlison
Babin	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bacon	Bishop (NC)	Cammack
Baird	Boebert	Carey
Balderson	Bost	Carl
Banks	Brecheen	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)	Harshbarger	Newhouse	Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Chavez-DeRemer	Hern	Norman	Kuster	Omar	Smith (WA)
Ciscomani	Higgins (LA)	Nunn (IA)	Landman	Pallone	Sorensen
Cline	Hill	Ogles	Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Soto
Cloud	Hinson	Owens	Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stansbury
Clyde	Houchin	Palmer	Lee (CA)	Pascrell	Stanton
Cole	Hudson	Peltola	Lee (NV)	Payne	Stevens
Collins	Huizenga	Pence	Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Strickland
Comer	Hunt	Perry	Leger Fernandez	Perez	Swalwell
Crane	Issa	Pfluger	Levin	Peters	Sykes
Crawford	Jackson (TX)	Posey	Lieu	Pettersen	Takano
Crenshaw	James	Reschenthaler	Lofgren	Phillips	Thanedar
Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)	Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Curtis	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Magaziner	Pocan	Titus
D'Esposito	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	Manning	Porter	Tlaib
Davidson	Jordan	Rose	Matsui	Pressley	Tokuda
De La Cruz	Joyce (OH)	Rosendale	McBath	Ramirez	Tonko
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer	McClellan	Raskin	Torres (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Kean (NJ)	Roy	McCollum	Ross	Torres (NY)
Donalds	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford	McGarvey	Ruiz	Trahan
Duarte	Kelly (PA)	Salazar	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trone
Duncan	Kiggans (VA)	Santos	Meeks	Ryan	Underwood
Dunn (FL)	Kiley	Scalise	Menendez	Salinas	Vargas
Edwards	Kim (CA)	Schweikert	Meng	Sánchez	Vasquez
Ellzey	LaHood	Scott, Austin	Mfume	Sarbanes	Veasey
Emmer	LaLota	Self	Moore (WI)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Estes	LaMalfa	Sessions	Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Ezell	Lamborn	Smith (MO)	Moskowitz	Schiff	Schultz
Fallon	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)	Moulton	Schneider	Waters
Feenstra	Latta	Smith (NE)	Mrvan	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Ferguson	LaTurner	Smucker	Mullin	Schrier	Wexton
Finstad	Lawler	Spartz	Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wild
Fischbach	Lee (FL)	Staub	Neal	Scott, David	Williams (GA)
Fitzgerald	Lesko	Steel	Neguse	Sewell	Wilson (FL)
Fleischmann	Letlow	Stefanik	Nickel	Sherman	
Flood	Loudermilk	Steil	Norcross	Sherrill	
Fox	Lucas	Steube			
Franklin, C.	Luetkemeyer	Luna			
Scott	Luttrell	Stewart			
Fry	Mace	Strong			
Fulcher	Malliotakis	Tenney			
Gaetz	Mann	Thompson (PA)			
Gallagher	Massie	Tiffany			
Garbarino	Mast	Timmons			
Garcia, Mike	McCauley	Turner			
Jimenez	McClain	Valadao			
Golden (ME)	McClintock	Van Drew			
Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Van Dwyne			
Gonzalez,	McHenry	Van Orden			
Vicente	Meuser	Wagner			
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	Walberg			
Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)	Waltz			
Gosar	Miller (WV)	Weber (TX)			
Granger	Miller-Meeks	Webster (FL)			
Graves (LA)	Mills	Wenstrup			
Graves (MO)	Molinaro	Westerman			
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Williams (NY)			
Greene (GA)	Mooney	Williams (TX)			
Griffith	Moore (AL)	Wilson (SC)			
Grothman	Moore (UT)	Wittman			
Guest	Moran	Womack			
Guthrie	Murphy	Yakym			
Hageman	Nehls	Zinke			
Harris					

NAYS—203

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Garamendi
Aguilar	Cleaver	Garcia (IL)
Allred	Clyburn	Garcia (TX)
Auchincloss	Cohen	Garcia, Robert
Balint	Connolly	Goldman (NY)
Barragán	Correa	Gomez
Beatty	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Bera	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Craig	Harder (CA)
Blumenauer	Crockett	Hayes
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Davidson (KS)	Himes
Boyle (PA)	Davis (IL)	Horsford
Brown	Davis (NC)	Houlahan
Brownley	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Budzinski	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Bush	DeLauro	Huffman
Caraveo	DeBene	Ivey
Carbajal	Deluzio	Jackson (IL)
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Jackson (NC)
Carson	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carter (LA)	Doggett	Jacobs
Cartwright	Escobar	Jayapal
Caspar	Eshoo	Jeffries
Case	Españillat	Johnson (GA)
Casten	Evans	Kamlaager-Dove
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Fletcher	Keating
Chefrilus-	Foster	Kelly (IL)
McCormick	Foushee	Khanna
	Frankel, Lois	Kildee
	Frost	Kilmer
	Gallego	Kim (NJ)

Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin
Kuster	Omar	Smith (WA)
Landman	Pallone	Sorensen
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Soto
Larson (CT)	Pappas	Stansbury
Lee (CA)	Pascrell	Stanton
Lee (NV)	Payne	Stevens
Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Strickland
Leger Fernandez	Perez	Swalwell
Levin	Peters	Sykes
Lieu	Pettersen	Takano
Lofgren	Phillips	Thanedar
Lynch	Pingree	Thompson (CA)
Magaziner	Pocan	Titus
Manning	Porter	Tlaib
Matsui	Pressley	Tokuda
McBath	Ramirez	Tonko
McClellan	Raskin	Torres (CA)
McCollum	Ross	Torres (NY)
McGarvey	Ruiz	Trahan
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Trone
Meeks	Ryan	Underwood
Menendez	Salinas	Vargas
Meng	Sánchez	Vasquez
Mfume	Sarbanes	Veasey
Moore (WI)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Morelle	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Moskowitz	Schiff	Schultz
Moulton	Schneider	Waters
Mrvan	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Mullin	Schrier	Wexton
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Wild
Neal	Scott, David	Williams (GA)
Neguse	Sewell	Wilson (FL)
Nickel	Sherman	
Norcross	Sherrill	

NOT VOTING—10

Beyer	Napolitano	Spanberger
Bowman	Obornote	Thompson (MS)
Gottheimer	Quigley	
Kustoff	Simpson	

□ 1630

Ms. DELBENE and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SANTOS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I missed today's vote due to a memorial service extending beyond its expected duration. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes due to testing positive for COVID-19. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232, passage of S.J. Res. 11.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had technical difficulties. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following votes due to a family issue. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 230, "nay" on rollcall No. 231, and "nay" on rollcall No. 232.

REQUIRING EACH MEMBER, OFFICER, AND EMPLOYEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES EACH SESSION OF EACH CONGRESS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 435, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 435

Resolved,

SECTION 1. MANDATORY COMPLETION OF PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **REQUIRING TRAINING FOR ALL MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on House Administration shall issue regulations to provide that, during each session of each Congress, each Member (including each Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress), officer, and employee of the House of Representatives shall complete a program of training in the workplace rights and responsibilities applicable to offices and employees of the House under part A of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), including anti-discrimination and anti-harassment training.

(2) **INCLUSION OF INTERNS, FELLOWS, AND DETAILLEES.**—For purposes of this resolution, an individual serving in an office of the House of Representatives as an intern (including an unpaid intern), a participant in a fellowship program, or a detailee from another office of the Federal government shall be considered an employee of the House.

(3) **EXCEPTION FOR PARTICIPANTS IN NEW MEMBER ORIENTATION PROGRAMS.**—If an individual completed a program of training required under paragraph (1) during the new Member orientation program administered by the Committee on House Administration prior to the beginning of a Congress, the individual is not required to complete the program during the first session of the Congress.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Under the regulations issued by the Committee on House Administration under subsection (a), an individual shall complete the program of training required under subsection (a) and file a certificate of completion of such training not later than—

(A) in the case of an individual who is serving as a Member, officer, or employee of the House as of the date on which the Committee first certifies that the program is in operation for the session, not later than 90 days after such date; or

(B) in the case of any other individual, not later than 90 days after the individual first becomes a Member, officer, or employee of the House.

(2) **ALTERNATIVE DEADLINES.**—The Committee on House Administration may include in the regulations issued under subsection (a)—

(A) an alternative deadline for individuals serving as interns and participants in fellowship programs to take into account the duration of their service; and

(B) an alternative deadline for individuals who first become Members, officers, or employees of the House towards the end of a session of Congress to take into account the amount of time remaining in the session.

(3) **SPECIAL RULE FOR FIRST SESSION OF ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS.**—In the case

of the first session of the One Hundred Eighteenth Congress, an individual described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall complete the program required under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS.**—The Committee on House Administration shall consider additional mechanisms to ensure compliance with the training requirement under subsection (a).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING JIMMY WILSON, JR.

(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 in remembrance of Jimmy Wilson. Jimmy was born in September 1946 in Chester, Pennsylvania. After graduating from Savannah High School in 1964, he immediately joined the United States Navy.

After leaving the Navy, Jimmy went on to graduate from Georgia Southern University with a degree in accounting. While in college, he married the love of his life, Barbara.

Post-Georgia Southern, Jimmy worked for Metro Development before launching his business, the James Corde Company.

In 1985, he and Louis Young created Great American Builders, and that soon rose to become the largest home builder in the Savannah area. He was also active in trade organizations, such as Home Builders Association of Greater Savannah and was also inducted into the Home Builders Association Hall of Fame.

Outside of work, Jimmy was an avid University of Georgia football fan, even attending the 1982 Heisman Trophy ceremony.

Jimmy leaves behind his dear wife, Barbara, three incredible children, and his beloved grandchildren.

My sincere condolences go out to the Wilson family during this time of mourning.

THE DANGERS OF FENTANYL

(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 discuss the dangers of fentanyl.

Fentanyl is a powerful opioid that is 50 times more potent than morphine. Two milligrams, or the size of five grains of salt, can cause a possible overdose. Fentanyl is so dangerous that illegal drug makers must wear hazmat suits to avoid contact with the drug. It needs to be stopped, but H.R. 467, the HALT Fentanyl Act, is not the bill to stop it.

The bill would make it easier to arrest and imprison users of the drug,

and that would be a major problem in Black communities nationwide. The Centers for Disease Control said Black Americans died from fentanyl overdoses at much higher rates than any other community.

We do not need another bill to put more Black Americans in prison; we need a bill that criminalizes the drug without criminalizing the drug user.

AM RADIO FOR THE WIN

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

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce our first big win in Congress. One week ago today, I stood right here to take a stand for AM radio in America and call on all car manufacturers to reconsider their decision to do away with it.

Well, I have some great news to report today, Mr. Speaker. Ford has decided to keep AM radio in their 2024 models, including the F-150 made just outside of Kansas City. It is a start, but we are not done. I am now calling on all the other auto manufacturers to follow Ford's lead and preserve AM radio.

This is not just about radios, Mr. Speaker. It is about standing up for the farmers and ranchers who tune into AM radio as they till the soil from dusk to dawn. It is about commuters who rely on AM radio during their morning and evening commutes. It is about accessibility, about making sure that every American, no matter where they live, has access to vital news, weather, and community updates.

Today, we push forward advocating for AM radio, advocating for our constituents, and today we show other car manufacturers what public pressure looks like and tell them like I said last week, I want my AM radio.

STUDENT DEBT RELIEF INITIATIVE

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

Mrs. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose House Republicans' extreme attempt to roll back President Biden's one-time emergency student debt relief initiative.

This bill would undoubtedly jeopardize the financial well-being of millions of Americans. This bill is cruel and would rescind life-changing debt relief of up to \$20,000. Ninety percent of Americans who are eligible to receive this relief earn less than \$75,000 per year.

The bill would also repeal the student loan payment pause and force borrowers to unexpectedly confront months of accumulated payments and interests. Forty-three million borrowers have benefited from the pause and saved on average \$150 per month in

interest. At a time when tuition continues to rise exponentially, countless students and graduates are being crushed by tens of thousands of dollars in student loan debt.

President Biden's cancellation would be transformative for millions of Americans who sought to build intergenerational wealth and improve their economic circumstances through education. While House Republicans try to make it harder for young Americans to survive, my Democratic colleagues and I will continue to fight for much provided relief.

HAPPY 235TH BIRTHDAY TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish the Palmetto State, South Carolina, a happy 235th birthday.

On May 23, 1788, South Carolina became the eighth State to officially join the United States of America.

From the stunning coast of the Grand Strand to the rich farmlands in the Pee Dee, to the rolling hills of the Midlands, to the historic charm of the Lowcountry, and to the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains in the upstate, I cannot think of a better place to call home.

Our \$29 billion tourism industry drives our State's economy. People flock from all over to witness our rich heritage and our incredible atmosphere. We welcome over 40 million visitors each and every year. I have lived in South Carolina my entire life, and I wouldn't have it any other way. Happy birthday to my favorite State, the Palmetto State, South Carolina.

LET'S RESPONSIBLY PASS A DEBT EXTENSION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have claimed that they responsibly passed a debt extension proposal. They did not. They passed a default on America act, which they wrongly called the Limit, Save, and GROW Act. It was, however, a fraud on America act.

Today, the Republicans canceled the scheduled markup on the bills pretending to carry out their pretended policies.

Today, Republicans demonstrated what they have displayed so very often that they are unable to govern and simply use political demagoguery to propose policies that are harmful, unreasonable, and unpassable by their own party. The country needs a responsible and honest opposition party. It does not have one.

The inability of Republicans to move forward on their appropriation bills

proves that point. I urge our Republican colleagues to stop pandering, pass the debt extension. Be responsible. Give confidence to the American economy.

□ 1645

REPUBLICANS' MANUFACTURED DEBT CRISIS

(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, as we stare down a completely manufactured economic crisis, I sure hope we can come together to avoid a default, but the proposal from the far-right wing of the GOP, one that holds our economy hostage to enact extreme budget cuts, would hurt veterans most of all—veterans in my district, across Pennsylvania, and across the United States.

Pennsylvania has the fourth highest veteran population, so I am not talking hypotheticals when it comes to how VHA cuts would impact our veterans.

If they get their way, more than 272,000 Pennsylvania veterans' medical care and outpatient visits would be at risk due to slashed Veterans Health Administration funding. The 29 percent of Pennsylvania veterans who live with disabilities will face more red tape and longer wait times, undermining their much-needed medical care.

This is not what keeping our promises to those who served us, who protected us, looks like. Our veterans and the American people deserve better.

DEMOCRATS ARE THE ONES DEFUNDING VETERANS

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is not the Republicans who want to defund veterans. It is the Democrats.

We have marked up the MILCON-VA bill in subcommittee, and it doesn't have cuts. I don't know where the people on the other side of the aisle suggest we are not supporting veterans. As a veteran myself, I am proud of the work we do.

It is the President who suggested that we decrease from the fiscal year 2023 numbers across the board. Mr. Speaker, that is defense, veterans. That is across the board.

It is the President who wants to cut the defense budget. It is the President who wants to defund our veterans. Shame on the President.

COMMEMORATING THE LEGACY OF LEE WILLIAMS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the legacy of

Lee Williams, a legendary track and field coach at Oscar Dean Wyatt High School in Fort Worth who died at the age of 71.

Mr. Williams began his track and field career as a Poly Parrot and then went on to TCU, where he set the school record for the 400-meter run and mile relay and was a member of the first two relay teams to qualify for the NCAA championship. For these accomplishments, Williams was inducted into the 54th class of the Athletics Hall of Fame for TCU just last year.

Williams went on to begin a legendary career as a track and field coach at Oscar Dean Wyatt. One of his greatest achievements as a coach came in 1998 when his 4-by-100-meter relay team set the national high school record of 39.76, a record that still stands to this day.

Throughout his coaching career, Williams coached 15 all-Americans and won 15 district championships, four regional championships, and two State championships. He was selected to the Texas Track and Field Coaches Association back in 2019.

I will end by highlighting Williams' dedication to the success and mentorship of his students on and off the track. He will always be known as a legend.

I am praying for his wife, Carolyn, his two daughters, and his grandchildren.

MARKING A YEAR SINCE ROBB ELEMENTARY MASSACRE

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

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 24, marks 1 year since the massacre at Robb Elementary in Uvalde, 1 year since 19 children and 2 teachers were murdered, leaving a community forever scarred and parents all across the country holding their little ones closer.

I know my heartbreak won't pass new legislation, but like many parents, I am heartbroken.

I know my outrage won't bring these kids back, but like many Texans, I am still outraged.

I also know that we don't have to live like this. Last year, we finally ended 30 years of inaction by passing gun violence prevention legislation.

We can build on that. We can strengthen background checks, pass red flag laws, and raise the purchasing age of an assault-style rifle to 21. All of these policies are overwhelmingly supported by the American people, but we have to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in looking for common ground because I know I am willing to work with anyone to save lives. The people of Uvalde and all Americans deserve no less.

CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION OF DEATHS OF ALFA BARRIE AND GARRETT WARREN

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, "There is no fair in life and death. If it were, no good men would die young," said acclaimed author Mitch Albom.

Eleven-year-old Alfa Barrie and his friend Garrett Warren, age 13, vanished on Friday, May 12, in my district.

In what would become every parent's worst nightmare, their bodies were recovered from the Hudson and Harlem Rivers late last week and over this past weekend.

Our community is devastated and heartbroken over this tragedy. We draw on our faith during times of tragedy such as this and seek comfort and peace.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Alfa's and Garrett's families, friends, and all those who knew them.

Today, I stand on the House floor and ask for a full and thorough investigation of this horrible event.

CONGRATULATING RICK BUCHER

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I rise today to congratulate Mr. Rick Bucher, assistant director for District 7 of the United Steelworkers, on his retirement.

Rick began his career as a pipefitter with the Steelworkers Local 6103 in Portage in 1978. Throughout his 45-year career, Rick consistently demonstrated his commitment to our union brothers and sisters as he held multiple union leadership roles, including grievance chairman, international staff representative, and District 7 Sub 5 director.

Rick is the embodiment of the unwavering dedication, loyalty, and hard work exemplified by the incredible members of the United Steelworkers.

For his lifetime of exceptional service and outstanding leadership, Rick is worthy of the highest praise, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

SUPPORTING 4-H CLUBS

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, "I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living for my club, my community, my country, and my world."

If it wasn't clear, I am a 4-H'er.

A few weeks ago, I had the privilege of meeting with 4-H student ambassadors from across California. They shared how the 4-H program has empowered them, from building water fil-

ters from reusable materials to developing public speaking and organizational skills.

4-H doesn't discriminate between urban, suburban, and rural communities. I am here today representing Orange County because of my experiences from this 4-H program.

As Congress begins consideration of the farm bill, let's continue to invest in our Nation's young people with robust funding for the 4-H program because our future leaders might be 4-H'ers themselves.

DEBT DEFAULT NOT AN OPTION

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, defaulting on our debt is not an option and would only cause economic uncertainty for eastern North Carolina and rural America at a time when most are just trying to break even.

According to recent reports, a default would kick nearly 96,000 families across the First District off of food and health programs at a time when they can least afford it. It would also jeopardize benefits that support nearly 50,000 veterans in my district, causing delays in the delivery of care and poor health outcomes for our Nation's heroes.

A default that lasts as little as 6 weeks would result in nearly 7 million jobs lost, doubling the unemployment rate to 8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must focus on keeping America's full faith and credit intact.

DEFAULT WOULD HAVE CATASTROPHIC CONSEQUENCES

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

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, June 1, that is when the Treasury estimates that we will no longer be able to fulfill our financial obligations if Congress has not acted.

Defaulting would have catastrophic consequences on our economy. It would shake financial markets, send interest rates skyrocketing, risk millions of jobs, and create higher costs for working families.

We can't allow the full faith and credit of the United States Government to be called into question by defaulting.

I am encouraged by ongoing conversations and discussions that are moving us in the right direction, but we need to get this done.

I am committed to being at the table and being ready to work in a bipartisan way to find short-term and long-term solutions to avert a crisis and get our fiscal house in order.

DOUBLING SENIOR POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I can see some of the faces going, oh, God, they are going to let him speak for an hour. I saw those faces, but there is a lot to share.

First, I tried to cut back on my coffee this evening, so, hopefully, my shared annoyance will be somewhat under control.

First off, to my brothers and sisters on the left, please buy a calculator. It is that simple.

Some basics I want to walk through here. Let's do Democrat math here for a moment. I am sorry. I often try not to be a partisan this brutal, but math is math.

If we have a world where you can't raise taxes on people who earn \$400,000 or less—the Democrat mantra, part of their platform, is no tax hikes for \$400,000 or less income earners, right? You do realize that is 98 percent of taxpayers, meaning there are only 2 percent left that make income over \$400,000. That is how they are going to balance the budget? The math is absurd.

Start to work through how this actually works. You can do a 100 percent tax rate on all of those \$400,000 and over, and you get nowhere near—a fraction of a fraction of a fraction—what is required to handle the shortfalls, the requirement for Social Security and Medicare.

That is the plan the left has given us. It is a great political talking point. It gets you cheers at the neighborhood townhall, and you are lying to them. The math will always win.

Let's walk through this a little bit more. Do you understand the scale, the cruelty, and the immortality of this place and its avoidance? In less than 9 years, the Social Security trust fund is gone.

Many of us on the Republican side spent the previous year trying to find a moral way, working with Democrats, to save Social Security. Instead, the Democrat plan, right there from that podium, when President Biden got up during the State of the Union, and said: Promise me you won't talk about or touch Social Security or Medicare. The room all applauded.

You just sentenced American seniors to the doubling of poverty. In 9 years, the United States doubles senior poverty because those seniors take a 25 percent cut in their checks.

That is the plan. Does anyone see the cruelty?

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, is this what we have become?

It is an idea that is saying, well, this polls really well if we blame Republicans for wanting to talk about it.

This polls really well. This gets us re-elected.

In 9 years, we will double senior poverty, but it is okay because most people will never hear that. They will never understand it, and they will never know that.

Then, we will do some sort of a big tax hike in the future and crash the economy, and it will still not come close to what is necessary.

If we don't have a revolution in the cost of healthcare, do understand what is coming. The CBO's own numbers, if we do the inflation adjustment on it, we are scheduled to borrow about \$128 trillion over the next 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, 100 percent of that borrowing is the shortfall of Social Security if we choose to backfill it. There is the big tax hike or the incredible debt financing. The other 75 percent, so—what?—\$86 trillion, \$87 trillion when we add in the financing cost, is the shortfall in Medicare.

This is what goes on around here. It is the lying to the American people about the math.

Let's walk through this. Stabilizing the debt at about 95 to 97 percent, which is always what the economists told us we needed to do, if you did that without spending restraints—remember, the fight right now over the debt ceiling is we basically, as Republicans, are saying that we have to communicate to the world debt markets that we take our debt seriously. It is more than just raising our credit limit. We are going to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I will show you the words from S&P. In 2011, we were downgraded not because of the debt ceiling fight. We were downgraded because we did not communicate to the world and the debt markets that we were going to take debt seriously.

It is a decade later, and the debt is dramatically worse. The demographic curve now is crushing us, and the proposal from the left is to just spend more money. Don't worry about it. We will tax people over \$400,000, even though it is 2 percent of the population. We can take every dime they have, and it doesn't do anything.

One more time, Mr. Speaker, if we are to stabilize U.S. sovereign debt at 95 to 97 percent of GDP, if we don't do anything on the spending side—remember, we are trying to do something on the spending side. So, we do what Democrats have proposed, saying “don't do anything,” then you have to go from our current sort of 15 percent payroll tax—that is your FICA tax, paying into Social Security, Medicare, and unemployment—you have to go to 24 percent. That is the Democrat plan.

FICA taxes go up to 24 percent, and you have to do a national value-added tax on top of everything else. So, everything just went up.

Remember a value-added tax is that, every step of production, you add another 20 percent. This is not paying off any debt. This is just stabilizing enough cash flow so that in order to

hold that about 95, 97 percent of debt to the size of the economy, you need a 20 percent VAT and a FICA tax that is actually at 24 percent.

That just provides stability. That doesn't pay anything off. That is the plan.

Realize, Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of the speeches that come from behind these microphones. It breaks my heart because there are things going on in our society. We are getting old very fast. There is a horrible article out today about seniors living on the street.

Think about what is going to happen in less than 9 years when those seniors get a 25 percent cut in their Social Security checks.

That is the plan: Avoid it until the last moment, and maybe we will just cut them.

Social Security over the 75 year is \$202 trillion underfunded.

There is an unwillingness here to tell the truth to the American people. We got old. We got 67 million baby boomers. The end of the baby boom is calculated to be around 1964 births. So, we have a few more years before they all are 65 and into their earned benefits.

What is this place doing to grow the economy and crash the price of healthcare? Nothing. However, we are going to have theater around here about talking about the debt ceiling, and Republicans will actually want to bend a little bit of the spending, so we are scheduled to borrow—what?—\$20 trillion, \$21 trillion over the next 10 years.

We are talking about dialing back \$4 trillion, and that is the end of the world? It shows you just how perverse this place is, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the other data shows that, between 2020 and 2022, there is some \$362 billion still left in the \$5 trillion in stimulus.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, we went through that little thing called the pandemic? We basically spent \$5 trillion trying to mitigate its damage and keep the economy stable. Fine. There is about \$362 billion that is unspent.

Our really difficult proposal in our debt ceiling that the Democrats are screaming, “Oh, how dare you?” isn't after the \$362 billion. We are after \$30 billion of it. Give us back \$30 billion of that. It is 8 percent of the money, and it is the end of the world.

Mr. Speaker, have our politics become that perverse here that we are willing to lie to the American people about the math, make up things, and destroy my children's future? Remember, I have a 10-month-old and a 7-year-old. Do my children have the right to live as well as we do?

Right now, CBO's math says that, in 24 years, U.S. taxes double. If any of you plan to be working 24 years from now, Mr. Speaker, at that moment, your taxes will be double today's. Corporate taxes, tariffs, and all types of income tax, everything will be doubled

in the United States just to maintain current services.

That is the math. The math will win, or we can just do what we do around here and pretend that we will just tax rich people.

They don't have enough money. You can take every dime from every billionaire in America, and you cover—what?—about 16 months of borrowing, and then it is all gone. These are the ideas of the brain trust here.

So, one more time, let's try to understand the reality. There are actually some solutions that could be bipartisan if we look at the math on what is going on in healthcare costs with our brothers and sisters with diabetes and obesity in America.

Mr. Speaker, if you just took on those two things, you could actually make a major impact on borrowing and spending and economic growth, and just plain morality, for our brothers and sisters out there who are dying at shockingly young ages.

I don't know if I brought the chart—we will see if I have it here—of what is happening to prime-age working males and the fact that longevity in America is going backward the last couple of years. When you dial into it obesity, drugs, car accidents, suicides, and firearms, we have a sick society.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show you a board in a little bit that says that in less than 18 years, the United States has more deaths than births. Half the States today have more deaths than births.

It is math. Demographics drive the budget. The budget is on a calculator, yet it is so much easier to lie. I am saying that word over and over, if you have noticed, because we are not telling the truth.

Mr. Speaker, one more time, the math may be uncomfortable, but it is real. If you look at this chart—and I often start with that one. Don't look at 1965. Let's look at 2022. This is our spending pie chart. It is just easy, and it is simple.

Do you see this part here, this green and this blue? This is defense, and this is discretionary. Everything else is on autopilot.

According to CBO from 2 or 3 months ago, we can get rid of every dime of discretionary. There is no more White House, no more EPA, and no more anything, and you can get rid of every dime of defense. This is according to CBO because I know we all sat and read it. In 9 years, we get rid of all discretionary spending and still have to borrow a couple hundred billion dollars, and that is without backfilling a dime into Social Security.

Remember, then, CBO a couple of weeks later did an update on Social Security, saying, oh, in 9 years, it is out. It is gone. A 25 percent cut to our brothers and sisters who are 65 and older, double senior poverty, and we already have to borrow a couple of hundred billion dollars a year just to cover the mandatory in 9 years.

That is where we are going. It is the math. I know we all bathe in the facts because we don't want to mislead our constituents on how much trouble we are in.

One more time regarding the debt ceiling fight: Did anyone go pull up their copy of the 2011 Standard and Poor's report? I have heard multiple folks here refer to it. We got downgraded one tick from AAA to AA+. Read the report. It was not about the debt ceiling fight. It basically clearly says that it is because we provided no vision of what we were going to do about U.S. sovereign debt.

We are a decade later, and the numbers are dramatically worse. Some of that being worse is not Democrat and not Republican. It is COVID, demographics, and the number of missing Americans in the labor force. We have about 3½ million workers who have just disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, understand there is a number of us who believe that tomorrow we can just say: "A clean debt ceiling. Just keep borrowing money." We get downgraded. It happened in 2011. The rating agency did not believe we were serious.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, if two rating agencies did this exact same rating, then the stress in U.S. sovereign markets is real because, all of a sudden, lots of States, lots of governments, and lots of bond funds can no longer hold U.S.—because we can have one of the three big rating agencies downgrade us, but we can't have two.

Has anyone picked up the damn phone and called S&P, Moody's, and said: Hey, can we just keep borrowing money and provide no vision?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, our brothers and sisters on the left said: "Hey, we did that Inflation Reduction Act," which is an Orwellian name, "and we had some deficit reduction in there."

Of course, now that it has been rescinded, there is no deficit reduction in there.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show you the receipts coming in and the additional actual costs of the grants and giveaways on green energy. It doesn't reduce the deficit.

Once again, the only times this place almost—I think 1993 was the last—or, excuse me—'83 was the last time this place actually did some deficit management without being up against a debt ceiling.

Of course, also understand, at that time, Social Security was about to go broke. We had these guys named Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill who got together and said that we were going to do the moral thing, that we were going to save Social Security.

They got together and did something on debt, deficit, and Social Security. The problem was that was supposed to be a solution that took it out for at least another 15, 20 years from now. Something has gone horribly wrong.

We also saw with the COLA that just happened in Social Security, where

there is this 8-plus point COLA, we just lost an entire year of actuarial life in Social Security. That is one of the reasons it is now 9 years.

If core inflation stays where it is at right now, then this next COLA won't be 8. Could it be 4? Could it be 5? If it is, then be prepared to lose almost another year of the actuarial life of Social Security.

□ 1715

Let's actually walk through some of the things that have gone on. To my brothers and sisters on the left, does anyone remember way, way back—let's call it 2019.

Democrats controlled this body. You had a Republican in the White House. Democrats would not agree to a clean debt ceiling hike.

2019. I know that is a long distance for us to try to remember, but the requirement of the deal that finally was struck was \$324 billion in additional spending and the lifting of caps which also raised about another \$300 billion in spending.

Is that the left's version of a clean debt ceiling?

Come on. This was only how many years ago. This is what happened last time. This is where they are.

The absolute disingenuous nature of this place to come behind these microphones and say clean debt ceiling; how dare the Republicans try to bend the spending curve and save the country.

Come on. Live by your own standards. Once again, look at all of the debt ceiling deals.

Do I need to walk through Gramm-Rudman, the balanced budget amendment, the omnibus?

How many of you remember some of the really popular ones: PAYGO and all those things. This is a list. Every single one of these is because of a stressor on the debt ceiling.

Some of these were when Republicans controlled the Congress. Some of these were when Democrats controlled the Congress.

This fantasy here, we should just do a clean debt ceiling because that is what we always do, that is an absolute lie. Look at some of the big things that actually made a difference in this country. Go back to Gramm-Rudman in 1985 and 1987. They were up against debt limits.

The deficit reduction authority. PAYGO. Remember, PAYGO basically got renewed multiple times; in 1990, 1993, 1997, 2010. It basically had multiple ways of managing. If you were going to spend more, it had to end within a certain time, or it had to be offset.

The Budget Control Act, which is the big one from 2011. I am going to show you it was wonderful up until we cheated on it because this place couldn't actually live under its own constraints that it agreed to.

The debt limit increase. We raised it to \$14 trillion, 700 billion.

Now public debt is what, \$28 trillion?

Total debt, if you take the money we borrow functionally from agencies or trust funds, those things, we are at what, 32? 32.4?

You have a little problem, though. This is the disingenuous thing this place did. We had the Budget Control Act. It was going to be a trillion, 700 billion. This was between 2013 and 2021.

There were discretionary savings under the Budget Control Act, except the desire here—and this was Republicans, too. I would love to blame Democrats only, but this was Republicans, too.

Mr. Speaker, 27 percent of those savings never happened. It never happened because we couldn't live under sequestration.

When you walk down the hallways here in the Capitol, and there are armies of people coming into your office all day long, what do they want? They want more money. Understand, Washington, D.C., is about the money.

January 2020 to present. Nondefense outlays are up 18.8 percent. Defense outlays are basically flat.

What is going on?

Now, most of this is because of Democrat control. This is their desire. They pumped up all sorts of new spending authorizations, but now we have a little problem.

Let's go to right now, last month's number.

How many were paying attention to the CBO monthly updates and saw that entitlement spending in the first 7 months of this year is up 11 percent?

Most of that is actually inflation adjustments and within Medicare. Medicare went up about 16 percent in spending. Most of that is actually driven by inflation calcs.

Did anyone pay attention to the receipts?

If you look into the tables in depth, there is a pretty substantial fall in capital gains.

There is a 10 percent fall in tax receipts. They are not revenues; they are tax receipts. I know we wrote revenues on the board, but receipts is the proper term.

In the first 7 months of this fiscal year, we have an 11 percent increase in the spending of entitlements and a 10 percent decrease in our receipts, our revenues.

What is fascinating is some of the economists are saying that falling receipts are going to continue because most of it is in the capital gains category.

If you have had a big inflationary cycle—we have seen this before in the United States—during times of inflation, most of the capital gains you have are fake.

The value of your asset didn't go up. It just got more expensive. Say you have a building. Oh, wow, it is worth a lot more money today. You are going to go buy the exact same building.

Did your building do something special? Did it really go up in value, or was it just inflation?

We are going to tax people like crazy on inflation.

Now, some things we are starting to index. We don't do it on capital gains.

The other fragility we need to deal with—I have a chart. I did not bring it tonight because I figured I had enough of them.

Go to your annual CBO scoring, and within there, there is a table that basically says if you added 2 points, a 2-point increase in the financing of U.S. sovereign debt, so a 2 percent increase over—I think the number was, like, 25, 28 years from the previous decade—at the end of that 25, 28 years, every single dime of receipts goes to pay interest. There is no more money for anything.

A 2 percent increase in the baseline interest costs over the next three decades consumes every dime of projected tax receipts. That is the world we live in.

How many people come behind these mikes and tell the truth about the math?

Let's take a look at what we have just experienced so far in the first 7 months. You do understand just in the role we have right now, here are our new issues and the portion of the refinancing of U.S. sovereign debt so far in the first 7 months, our interest costs are already up 40 percent.

The first 7 months' carrying costs will be over \$100 billion more just because of interest. You don't think debt markets, even if we raise the debt ceiling, aren't going to look and say, wow, you guys are borrowing \$51,000 every second. In 9 years, we are scheduled to borrow over \$90,000 a second.

You don't think debt markets are going to start requiring a premium?

There is some great literature. Actually, I think one was in *The Wall Street Journal* yesterday or maybe over the weekend talking about long-run interest rates looks like they are setting new baselines.

Be prepared for a future where dramatically more of our spending is this. It is just the financing costs. Revenues, budget surpluses, including adjustments for timing effects, Federal outlays, yada, yada, yada.

Basically, our spending is up \$274 billion. This is functionally from baseline at the end of 2022, so functionally from April to April, much of my baseline cost there is up 73 percent.

This board may explain it better. Year-to-date deficits. There were discussions at the end of last fiscal year that the 2023 fiscal year could be \$1.4 to \$1.5 trillion in borrowing.

A couple people were predicting, hey, when you kick in inflation, it might get to 1.6. Right now, that board from April, if you take that and line that out to the end of the fiscal year, you are going to get close. You may not cross it, but you are going to get close to a \$2 trillion borrow this year.

Think about some of the things we are fussing with each other about, and yet, the wheels are coming off immediately around us.

How many people are paying attention to what is coming into the Treasury right now and going out of the Treasury?

Does anyone care?

Are we so basically intent on I have got to push money out the door to get my votes because that is how I buy my election?

You have to understand how fast the numbers are falling from us. Year-to-date deficits look like they will be 236 percent more from the baseline of 2022.

Here is the chart I ran ahead of, but sort of working out the math, if I continue what happened in the April receipts and my April spending, if you carry it out, you are getting close to \$2 trillion borrowed this year.

I wanted to do a bit of this. Government spending binges, not tax reform, have been the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt to GDP.

There is a concept out there—for anyone that geeks out on this stuff, if you have an idiot who basically says it is tax reform, okay, look at the long range.

Since the 16th Amendment, you start to look at what is sort of the modern tax era after World War II, when we have had very high marginal tax rates, very low marginal tax rates, combinations where we raise corporate taxes, lower, all the combinations out there. We almost always get within a band of about 18 to 20; 19, 20 percent revenue receipts to the size of the economy. It is a magic number, but we always—we have these charts when we have had these high margin rates, low margin rates.

For some reason, the tax receipts that come in stay within that band. If you want more money, grow the economy. That seems to be the only way you get more tax receipts in the long run. You get a spike, and then boom, it goes back to that mean.

That comes from liberal economists, conservative economists. There just seems to be this nature that the economy comes back to: this is what society, the nature of our economy is willing to send in Federal tax receipts.

Here is part of the coming crisis. Just this decade—and remember, this board is already a year or so out of date—in functionally nine budget years, our spending will be over 24 percent of the size of the economy; 24.3. Actually, I think that number may be light because this board is about a year old. We are projecting our tax receipts to come in—and I should explain this—about 18 or a little over 18 percent.

When you start talking these big numbers, particularly in a time of inflation, the dollar amount is often distorted.

Really, as economists, if you are talking with them, they are going to do percentage of the GDP, of the economy.

The reason you do that, you can have high inflation, low inflation, so a percentage makes more sense. What happens in a world just like this board

says, this is what we are projected to do in 9 years.

Our spending will be—24.3 percent of the entire economy will be being spent by the Federal Government, but we are only going to be taking in 18.2.

You already have the other boards that talk about well, you can raise taxes, but the amount of receipts you are going to get are going to fall back into this mean.

That delta, that gap, is what will take down this Republic if you carry that out for another 20 or 30 years.

Now, for the most uncomfortable board I am going to show tonight, and this one—it is not Democrats, it is not Republicans, it is demographics. It is what we are.

If I were to walk around the Capitol and knock on everyone's door, from the most liberal Member to the most conservative to the most libertarian to rural or urban and said: For the next 30 years, what is the primary driver of U.S. debt?

How many would look you in the eye and say the debt for the next 30 years? 100 percent of borrowing. The new calculation is about \$128 trillion over the next 30 years. 100 percent of that is borrowing, 75 percent is Medicare, 25 percent is if we backfill Social Security. The rest of the budget actually has a positive balance.

This board upsets people because how many of us are willing to get in front of our community townhall and say: If we don't have a revolution in healthcare costs, we could consume—and understand, when you start talking about the total numbers here, you are talking about approaching 200 percent of debt to GDP.

□ 1730

How many of you think the world continues to want to buy U.S. bonds? We are not Japan; we don't save every other dollar we earn. We can't internally finance our own debt when we get to those levels, but that is what is coming. It is not Democrat. It is not Republican. It is demographics. We got old.

There are solutions here. There is a solution that we could have that was moral to try to save Social Security, but as I started with, Democrats decided it was a better campaign issue than a morality issue. Fine, let's be a country that is heading toward doubling poverty for seniors because that is the plan right now, "I am not going to talk about it."

However, you can't make this go away. As healthcare inflation continues to be more than double baseline inflation, this number is running away from us.

Could we maybe have an attempt to have an honest sit-down with the most liberal Members and the most conservative Members, and saying, do you know that 33 percent of all U.S. healthcare spending is diabetes?

Would we be willing to have an honest conversation about obesity in

America and how we now have six States where over 40 percent of the population now is obese, and it is killing young people?

The heart disease, the other cascaded diseases, 5 percent of the population is over 50 percent of all healthcare spending.

Do we love and care for people? Why don't we understand the morality of helping, doing the right thing and building a bunch of clinics to help people manage their misery is not a solution.

Curing the damn disease is, and there are ways to do it.

We are doing a math project right now with some of the Joint Economic Committee economists, trying to say what would happen if I took my Medicare, Medicaid, Indian Health Service, my VA populations, took those who are morbidly obese and said we are going to give you GLP-1's. We have got to talk about it. It is real.

There was a time in this place it was uncomfortable to talk about smoking. There was a time when they actually smoked here. Within three decades, we had a cultural revolution of sorts that is much healthier. It saved and extended lives, up until the last couple years now where we see U.S. mortality going the wrong way.

This number is burying us. It is not Democrat. It is not Republican. It is demographics. The solution also doesn't need to be Democrat or Republican. It is moral. It is just hard to talk about because it doesn't fit our typical rhetoric.

You will get people who will say: Well, I just want every dime I put into Social Security and Medicare. All right, great, that would be a great deal.

Do understand, the average couple in America, and this board is about a year out of date, will have put in about \$625,000 over a lifetime into Social Security. They are going to get back \$698,000. That is about a \$72,000 SPIF.

You would have done much better if you had been allowed to put a small portion of that in the market. You would have done much better. We all have our TSP here, our thrift savings account. Could you imagine if Americans had been allowed to put just a portion of their Social Security into that?

Do you remember the wars around here 20 years ago? "You are talking about privatizing Social Security." Instead, you made America poor. Great. However, you won the politics. America is much poorer today. Great. Good job.

Here is the primary driver, here is the punchline. This is the primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt and almost no one is willing to talk about it. That average couple will have put about \$161,000 into the Medicare trust fund. The Medicare trust fund, as everyone here knows, only covers about 38 to 40 percent of Medicare spend. The rest comes out of the general fund.

You put in \$161,000, and you get out \$522,000. We are recalculating this num-

ber. We think this number may have now jumped all the way close to \$600,000. That delta, from this \$522,000, from you putting in \$161,000, multiply that by just the baby boom population of—what?—67 million, you just found where most of the debt for the next 30 years comes from.

It is not that hard. A couple batteries in a calculator, you would be amazed what you can figure out.

The brain trust out there. I am sorry, I take that back. So many people have been misled for so long with complete folklore about the debt, so I have this one woman in Phoenix area that literally every other day says: "You know if we just got rid of your salaries and your pension, we could balance the budget." I always say, "We are probably already overpaid for what we do or at least what we accomplish."

However, you see the little sliver here? I tried to build a calendar, what would happen on a calendar if I could say here are my days of borrowing. Remember, we are borrowing \$51,000 a second. If you got rid of all of Congress' salaries and pensions, it is about 18 to 19 minutes of borrowing for an entire year. That is all it is. If you get rid of every dime of foreign aid, it is about 12 days of borrowing.

We need to stop misleading the public.

I have things on here where if you doubled the corporate tax, you would get about 6 weeks of borrowing covered.

The scale that is here today and the scale in a decade is almost double. Do we understand the scale that is coming? It is demographics. We got old. It is just really hard to stand in front of an audience and say that, but it is math.

Look, I can belabor this, but I have some of the charts to walk through, and I am going to do another presentation when we get back on the 2017 tax reform of here is what it is scored to have cost and here is what we found in additional receipts and revenues. Even if you do the baseline scoring from a few years ago, it is just a fraction compared to even—the Inflation Reduction Act, the green spending in there is now being scored by Goldman Sachs and those to be \$1.2 trillion, and the reconciliation on tax reform was—what?—1.6? Do you start to understand the scales? We make up numbers around here.

Look at the 2017, you see the little green slice here? That is using the baseline score of \$2.74 trillion without the offsetting dynamic score added to it, and that is just saying, hey, if my brothers and sisters on the left want to say: "It was the tax reform." Huh? You don't understand, just the green energy grants, giveaways, credits, whatever the pop culture term is, it is functionally half of everything that was in the tax reform if you use the base score without the dynamic effects.

Back to demographics. End of the decade. How many of us have used this

chart? It basically says, 1960 we had 5.1 workers for everyone who was 65 and older, basically receiving Social Security benefits. End of the decade, you functionally have two workers. So you and your partner have your own retiree.

Is anyone seeing the math problem?

There is something called a dependency ratio. This one is really fascinating because if you want to even think globally, the United States is actually in tough shape. We are much better off than much of the rest of the world, though.

Let's take the world's three biggest economies. I only put this one on because it interests me. You see this line here? The dependency ratio is worker compared to those out of the economy, right? Do you see this line crashing down? That is China. China is about to just roll over. The numbers, there has never been a major society, anything like this. It is going to be fascinating over the next couple decades what happens. There is an economic argument that many of the bad acts that you and I see that China engages in are the investments or those things that they are desperate to build annuities because their available worker population is crashing. Even more interesting, do you know that youth unemployment in China is almost 20 percent? They are graduating universities, and they don't want factory jobs. They want white-collar jobs.

We should really understand what is going on with those who we consider our competitors. The United States, we start to roll over here. It is upon us. This is our future. We need to not be scared of the things that bring disruption but productivity to our society.

If you are scared of AI, okay. Maybe read an article or two about it but understand the potential productivity that brings to society. Get used to the concept that you go to your favorite fast-food place and there is a robot behind there flipping the burgers. We don't have the available populations, and importing poverty doesn't work because the way we do entitlements in the United States. The offset cost doesn't work.

Remember, if I ask the room, what is U.S. fertility this last year? We are down to 1.7, and that is actually a tick back up from the pandemic. You remember how many people thought during the pandemic we were going to have this baby boom? Just the opposite happened. We are at a 1.7 fertility rate. You need—what?—2.1 just to stabilize population.

Understand, today forward, the school districts in your neighborhood will have fewer children. Are you prepared to understand that is our future? Remember the data point before, in 18 years, more deaths than births in the United States. Now sit down and fix Social Security with me, and you understand the problem of the math.

This chart makes people upset, and it is math. If you take prime age populations, 25 to 64, functionally in—that

looks like it is about 8 years, so functionally the end of the retirement of baby boomers hitting 65, this chart basically says if you take the prime age working population, 25 to 64, 40 percent of our society will be over 64, they will be 65 and up.

There is a chart that basically says in a decade or so, if you do from birth to the top end of the age scale, about 22 percent of the population in total will be 65 and over. If you do prime age, it is 40 percent.

Is that Republican or Democrat? It is demographics. How much time do we spend around here talking about that?

One or two more boards, Mr. Speaker, and we are done. Yes, I am waiting for applause on that.

Median age of first marriage. Why would you put up median age of first marriage? Remember how we just talked about fertility rates, we are getting old as a society, more deaths than births? We actually have some really interesting things going on in society, and no one here really seems comfortable talking about it because you get attacked, but there is something wrong going on in society. We have some charts I did not bring today that talk about the number of males and females entering university life, and we have some major universities where males are graduating, not exactly but almost, half as much.

Okay, do you understand what that basically means, the marriageability gap and those things? There is something horribly wrong in our society. We need to have a conversation about it. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is going on around us. We may not be able to change it, but we need to understand what it means.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many minutes I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 14 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, my last board, and then I intend to yield to my friend.

Look, this is the chart I was going to end with. Remember how we have been talking about what is happening when we start to have more deaths than births? Understand, that 18-year number, it doesn't just stop there. You basically have a society, as you get into 2041, 2043, we continue to fall more and more. We will have a population decline in the United States.

Understand the responsibility for someone like me on Ways and Means, the responsibility of all of us here, we have promises to keep. We made promises about Medicare. We made promises about Social Security. If you understand the demographics are ahead of us, you understand the difficulty, and it is why so many of the proposals—"If we just raise this tax"—and when we finally get the actual scoring on it, it doesn't actually work. It doesn't stop us from hearing it quoted all the time, but when you actually read the actuarial reports, the math doesn't work.

This is us. This is our country. It is continuing. It doesn't have to be

dystopian. I come back, what is the single biggest thing you could do that is both moral and incredibly great economics and a major bend on the debt? All of us get together and decide we are going to take on diabetes, we are going to have an honest conversation of disrupting obesity, we are going to maybe look into should GLP-1's be available, should we actually take on some issues within the farm bill, which is always so difficult to talk about, of helping our brothers and sisters manage because there is some amazing math out there that says if you look at much of urban income inequality, is it racism? Is it education? You actually dig into the datasets, it is health. The number of our brothers and sisters who are sick or are taking care of grandma because she has gone blind because of diabetes, is that Republican or Democrat to be willing to dive into an issue like that? I will argue it is just moral.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

□ 1745

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCHWEIKERT for yielding me the time as I rise to speak on some of the exact same things that he talked about. They are boring and uncomfortable, but they are necessary conversations that the country has to have, just like family has to have these conversations when things maybe aren't going so right.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak briefly about our national debt.

Our national debt, as it is called, is the sum of our country's annual deficits over the course of time. Last year's deficit plus the prior year's deficit plus interest, and so on, have accumulated to over \$30 trillion.

This is a staggering number that exceeds the GDP of our country. If you simply put a 4 percent interest factor on that number, it is \$1.2 trillion a year in interest alone.

Now, how did we get into this current situation?

Mr. Speaker, let me give you a couple of dates and numbers.

On December 29, 2022, the day President Biden signed the 4,000-page omnibus bill increasing spending into law, the Daily Treasury Statement showed that our country, the United States of America, was at 99.8 percent of the statutory debt limit.

I will say that again, Mr. Speaker: 99.8 percent of the statutory debt limit the day that President Biden signed the omnibus bill, December 29, 2022.

Any responsible person, Mr. Speaker, would have addressed the debt limit before signing an omnibus bill to increase spending.

Let's just remember and talk about that omnibus bill for a second.

It was drafted without the input of House Republicans. Not a single House Republican voted for the bill. It was drafted by Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, and President Joe Biden. Unfortunately, some Senate Republicans supported it, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I was 3 years old when President Biden was first elected to public office. Together, all combined, President Biden, Speaker PELOSI, Leader SCHUMER, they have over 100 years of combined time in Washington, D.C.

Don't you think they discussed that we were at 99.8 percent of the national debt limit when they passed the omnibus bill? Don't you think they discussed that they could have put one sentence in the omnibus bill, a sentence that simply read: The statutory debt limit of the United States is increased by the amount of funds necessary to fund this omnibus bill. One sentence in 4,000 pages—117 combined years of political experience. One sentence and we would not be having the debt limit discussions that we are having today.

I promise you, they discussed it. They made a conscious decision not to include the debt limit on the omnibus bill because they wanted to create the very situation that we are in right now, a conscious decision to force the country to the edge of default so they could blame House Republicans for the mess they created.

Over the past 28 months—that is, since President Biden was sworn into office—Democrats spent over \$3 trillion without a single Republican vote, \$3 trillion in a piece of legislation that they called the American Rescue Plan and the Inflation Reduction Act without a single Republican vote. This is outside and in addition to the normal appropriations process. They did this under the guise of reducing inflation and rescuing America.

Where are we after one-party rule and severe government overspending? The debt on December 29, \$31,326,000. The day that President Biden signed the omnibus bill, that is what it was. The day he was sworn into office, it was \$27,751,000.

Are you \$3.5 trillion better off than you were 2 years ago, America?

On April 26, House Republicans passed the Limit, Save, Grow Act, a bill that would prevent default and rein in spending, and sent it to the Senate. The Senate has done nothing.

On April 27, President Biden reiterated that he still would not negotiate with House Republicans.

Now, finally, less than 10 days prior to the estimated X date of a default, President Biden has agreed to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, we have a spending problem, a spending problem that has led to a deficit problem, a deficit problem that has led to a debt problem. Make no mistake about it, the current created crisis that we are facing with regard to the X date on the debt limit is a political crisis created intentionally by people who had over 100 years of political experience and knew exactly what they were doing when they intentionally omitted language from the omnibus bill that would have increased the debt limit to get us out of the current situation that we are in.

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

THE HONORABLE DAVID N. CICILLINE'S FAREWELL REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House for the last time as a Member of this esteemed body. It has been the honor of my life to represent the people of the First Congressional District of Rhode Island in Congress.

At the end of this month, I will be stepping down from this position to become the president and CEO of the Rhode Island Foundation, one of the Nation's oldest and largest community foundations. I am excited to begin this extraordinary opportunity to build upon the work that I have been leading in Congress and to continue to make a meaningful impact on the lives of Rhode Islanders.

I would not be standing here today if not for the people of Rhode Island who placed their faith and trust in me to represent them in Congress. Every day over the past 12 years, I have put my heart and soul into the work we do here to improve the lives of every Rhode Islander and to protect our great democracy.

I thank my current and former staff, especially my longtime chief of staff Peter Karafotas and my district director Christopher Bizzacco. I cannot thank them and the rest of our staff enough for all of their hard work and dedication over the years.

I am particularly grateful for two people who have worked for me for more than two decades: Rita Murphy and Roger Suchite.

I have been blessed with the most committed, passionate, and talented staff on the Hill who have established a reputation for our office of excellence and effectiveness. They allowed me to take the lead on many more things than anyone thought possible.

Every day, they showed up and gave their all to help the people of Rhode Island, even when their own personal safety was at risk. I am so proud of everything we have accomplished together, and I know that everyone on my staff will go on to do bigger and better things.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an incredible honor to work with my friends and colleagues day in and day out to address the challenges facing our country.

It has been a special honor to serve alongside my colleagues in the Rhode Island delegation, Senators JACK REED and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, and Congressmen JIM LANGEVIN and SETH MAGAZINER. While our delegation may be small, we never let that stop us from delivering big for our State. Their col-

laboration and friendship have meant the world to me.

One of the hardest parts of leaving this job is leaving behind so many dear friends: HAKEEM, JOE, TERRI, JAMIE, PRAMILA, ROBIN, FREDERICA, BILL, MARK, LUCY, VERONICA, MAXINE, MELANIE, ERIC, DEBORAH, GRACE—and the list goes on and on.

We have been through so much together over the years, and I will always cherish our friendship. I know that we will continue to stay close even after I leave Washington.

Let me say a special word about two colleagues, Speaker Emerita NANCY PELOSI and Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO.

I first came to know Speaker PELOSI while serving as mayor of Providence. I will forever remain in awe of her genius and extraordinary leadership and all the kindness she has shown me over the years. She has been a powerful ally in all of my biggest priorities during my time in Congress.

I thank Speaker PELOSI for the honor of serving as an impeachment manager to defend our democracy.

ROSA DELAURO has been my most important mentor, my friend, and my inspiration. She set a standard for all of us of hard work and deep commitment on every important issue facing our country. At every single moment I have turned to her for advice or support or help of any kind, she has been there. She has been like a sister to me, and our friendship will endure forever.

In fact, the only time she has ever been wrong is her claim that New Haven pizza is better than pizza in Providence.

I was first elected to Congress in 2010 as one of only nine new Democrats in the House. We modestly called ourselves the Noble 9. We were one of the smallest freshman classes ever.

The country and Rhode Island were just starting to recover from the Great Recession, and Democrats had lost the majority by 60 seats. Let's just say, it wasn't the easiest time to be a freshman Democratic Member of Congress.

Like most Americans, I was convinced that this place was completely broken, but I was determined to try to change that.

I came to Washington with my eyes wide open. I knew there were Members of Congress who were only interested in being combative and making headlines, but then I realized there were some Members who were interested in working together to get things done for the country.

Don't get me wrong, at times it could be incredibly frustrating and even disheartening to work with people who may agree with you on one issue but completely disagree with you on everything else, including how you live your own life.

I think it is important for the American people to know that there are a lot of people in Congress who put their country over party and work hard every day to improve the lives of their constituents and all Americans.

My first few years in Washington, I immersed myself in my committee assignments, the Small Business, Budget and Foreign Affairs Committees. I focused on trying to bring back American manufacturing jobs and help Rhode Island get back on its feet after the recession.

In 2014, I left the Budget Committee and moved over to the House Committee on the Judiciary to try to tackle some of the most pressing issues facing our country, including immigration, gun safety, LGBTQ+ equality, and campaign finance and criminal justice reform.

During the committee organizing meeting in 2016, Chairman NADLER convinced me to take the ranking member spot on the Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust Subcommittee, which at the time, to be honest, wasn't exactly the first choice for most committee members.

Chairman NADLER gave me great advice. He told me that sometimes you should take an assignment to stretch your mind and learn something new. I took that to heart.

From that moment forward, I learned all I could about antitrust, and I quickly realized just how important antitrust policies were in promoting competition and innovation to protect workers, small business, and our economy by providing consumers with more choices.

As the ranking member, I developed a great working relationship with Chairman Sensenbrenner. Over dinner, we would discuss our work on the subcommittee, and more importantly, we got to know each other better outside the Capitol and without the partisan noise.

It showed me that Washington wasn't completely broken and that you could get things done by developing productive working relationships and even friendships with colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

In 2016, I was elected by my colleagues to serve in House Democratic leadership as co-chair of the Democratic Policy and Communications Committee, which was responsible for developing the long-term messaging for House Democrats.

Working alongside now-Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES and former Member Cheri Bustos, we developed the For the People agenda that helped bring Democrats back into the majority in 2018.

It was during that time that I developed a real friendship and deep respect for the remarkable talent of HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who I know will be the next Speaker of the House.

Even though I was responsible for the Democratic messaging in the House, I stayed committed to finding Republican colleagues who I could work with to get things done for the American people.

That is what I did, on some of the biggest issues facing our country, from protecting our democracy to gun safety

to LGBTQ+ equality and antitrust reform.

I developed strong working relationships and friendships with some of my Republican colleagues, including KEN BUCK and BRIAN FITZPATRICK, as we found common ground on important issues.

□ 1800

Even when we didn't see eye to eye on other policies and priorities, I respected their commitment and dedication to public service.

As chair of the Antitrust Subcommittee, I expanded on the bipartisan work of Jim Sensenbrenner and I and started by launching a 16-month bipartisan investigation into the digital marketplace.

In partnership with Ranking Member BUCK, we examined Big Tech's anti-competitive practices, documenting them in a 450-page report that informed our bipartisan, six-bill package to rein in Big Tech and finally modernize our antitrust laws.

For decades, our government failed to enforce antitrust laws on the burgeoning tech industry for fear of stifling innovation, which led directly to the problems we see in the industry today.

I am proud that some of our measures became law last Congress, reviving antitrust law and drawing important attention to these issues. I am especially thankful for the friendship and dedication KEN BUCK brought to this effort at great political cost to him.

None of this would have been possible without the extraordinary work of my chief counsel, Slade Bond.

While Democrats held the majority, I also tried to end discrimination against LGBTQ+ Americans through the Equality Act. This bipartisan bill, which would end discrimination against LGBTQ+ Americans in employment, housing, credit, education, and public accommodations, is the most extensive civil rights legislation to pass the House since the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

It passed out of the House twice, in large part because of the extraordinary leadership of Speaker PELOSI, with bipartisan support. It is only a matter of time before it becomes law, especially with my dear friend MARK TAKANO now leading the effort. I will be forever grateful also for the early and really critical support of the late John Lewis in this effort.

On the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have had the privilege of working with the great Chairman GREGORY MEEKS, and I have worked with Republicans, including MIKE MCCAUL, JOE WILSON, and ANN WAGNER to advance American national security interests abroad and promote diplomacy throughout the world.

With some of these colleagues, I established the House Diplomacy Caucus in the wake of attacks on U.S. diplomats in Ukraine following the first impeachment.

I also led numerous efforts to promote international human rights. Last Congress, we passed the Global Respect Act in the House to prevent individuals who commit gross human rights violations against LGBTQ+ people from entering the United States.

In January, President Biden signed the Justice for Victims of War Crimes Act into law, legislation I authored with Republican Congresswoman VICTORIA SPARTZ and with a bipartisan group of Senators.

On the Judiciary Committee, I was able to continue the work I started on gun violence prevention as mayor of Providence and as a founding member of Mayors Against Illegal Guns.

Following the Pulse nightclub shooting in the summer of 2016, I worked with the late John Lewis, now-Minority Whip KATHERINE CLARK, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, and Congressman JOHN LARSON to organize the first-ever sit-in on the House floor to demand that the Republican majority take action to address gun violence in this country.

Over the past 12 years, I have sponsored numerous gun safety bills to ban assault weapons, outlaw ghost guns, close the fire sale loophole, ban bump stocks, prevent people convicted of violent hate crimes from owning a gun, improving the background check system, and to create an active shooter alert system.

Once again, I was able to find colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with me on some of these bills, including the assault weapons ban and the active shooter alert. Last summer, we passed legislation to reinstate the assault weapons ban with bipartisan votes in the House for the first time in 30 years.

Even during the most difficult times, like January 6, two impeachments, and a global pandemic, I have never lost faith in the resiliency and strength of our democracy.

It is not always pretty or easy, but we have always come out stronger on the other side because of the powerful heroes of democracy who serve in this place and fight to preserve it every day. I still believe in our democracy and the ability of Congress to tackle big challenges and improve the lives of all Americans.

We did that with the American Rescue Plan, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, the Respect for Marriage Act, and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

I leave this body knowing that I left it all on the field and did everything I could to keep Americans safe from gun violence, to end legal discrimination against LGBTQ+ Americans, and to shine a bright light on the antitrust issues posed by Big Tech.

Every day, I woke up and came to work with the goal of improving the lives of Rhode Islanders and all Americans. That is what has motivated me every day for the last 28 years in public office, and I have done my very best to deliver on that promise.

While I may be leaving Congress, I will never stop fighting for what I believe in, and I will always be proud of the work we have done together.

I have taken this final opportunity to speak on the floor of this historic institution to highlight some of what we have been able to achieve over the past 12 years when we let understanding, integrity, and the willingness to find common ground take the lead in our work.

I come from a State whose motto is "hope." As I leave Congress, I want to leave with this parting word, hope. Hope for our democracy and for this institution. For centuries, the United States has been the hope of the world. We are the Nation where freedom, equality, opportunity for all, and unity have made us a beacon of hope in some of the darkest times in human history.

For generations, men and women have fought to preserve our way of life, and many have given their blood, sweat, and even their lives for it. Yet today there are forces working to undermine our democratic institutions and our shared values.

This institution has the sacred responsibility to honor the sacrifices made by so many in the work we do every day, in the way we treat one another as colleagues, and in our commitment to let truth, not fear; reason, not extremism; and respect for all, not division; lead our every effort.

Our unity as a Nation and the ability of our democracy to withstand the test of time depends on the resolve of this institution, those who serve in its Halls, and the people whose votes are their voice in this government to keep that hope alive.

Mr. Speaker, I once again extend my deepest gratitude to the people of Rhode Island for giving me the greatest honor of my life, the opportunity to represent you for the past 12 years here in the Congress of the United States.

May God bless you and protect you. May the spirit of hope forever endure in this institution and the people who serve in it.

May God bless the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the final time to speak in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER).

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE DAVID N. CICILLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. MAGAZINER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of Members who have come to express their gratitude to Congressman CICILLINE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker Emerita.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank

you for bringing us together so that we can pay our respects and gratitude to the great Congressman from Rhode Island.

On a personal note, just listening to his comments there, he and Congresswoman DELAURO have a competition about pizza. They don't know that most people come to San Francisco to learn how to make pizza. I say that in sharing the pride we take in our Italian-American heritage, and the knowledge that we have about food.

In any event, I thank Mr. CICILLINE for his great leadership in this Congress. He has been a champion on policy issues. He spelled them out here.

I will never forget the day that he joined John Lewis, KATHERINE CLARK, JOHN LARSON, and others, to have a sit-in on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, they did not tell us that they were doing this because as leadership we would have said you are not allowed to do that. They could anticipate that I might say that. They just protected the leadership from having to make that statement, and they launched their sit-in on the floor of the House.

It was very successful because, by coincidence, we had planned a rally about gun violence prevention, and they were having a sit-in on gun violence prevention on the floor of the House.

The whole world found out about it because Mr. TAKANO spread the word through his telephone, even though the Republicans turned out the lights in the House and nobody could see what was going on in here. He spread the word through his telephone. Actually, it became a sit-in heard around the world. I thank Mr. TAKANO, John Lewis, and Mr. CICILLINE.

You heard him talk about the issues and the knowledge he has about them, the judgment he has about prioritizing and the legislative strategic thinking of trying, in the most possible way, to be bipartisan and to be transparent and to be accountable.

Representative is a job title Mr. CICILLINE has. It is his title, and it is his job description for representing the people of Rhode Island. He loves his district. He loves his State. He loves his country.

By being a Representative, coming to the floor and speaking for those people, every time he did, he did so with great pride. Again, he is a man of many issues and many talents. He also has many ethnicities.

When he came, I thought, oh, good, we have more Italian Americans in the Congress. I would see him at the Italian-American events. When I would go to Jewish events, he would be there as a Jewish Member of Congress. Of course, there was the LGBTQ+ community. So he was a man for all seasons, all ethnicities, all orientations. That made him a very great Representative for our entire country across the board.

There are many Members who want time to sing the praises of this great man. I have many stories I could tell

about how, in his role as leader in our Democratic Policy and Communications Committee, DPCC, he made our message more effective, by how he gave guidance to Members and how he mentored others after they came here.

I give him some points for having been the mayor of Providence because when you are mayor you are a manager, you have to get things done. He brought that administrative skill to a legislative job, and we all benefited from it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MAGAZINER for yielding time. As I say, we all have a lot to say about DAVID CICILLINE, and we will take other opportunities to do so. For tonight, I not only thank him for his leadership but for his leadership in this body and the rest. For the beautiful presentation he made about our country this evening, his patriotism, his service, his call to duty, and his being so effective in doing all of the above, I thank Mr. CICILLINE.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this really is a bittersweet moment. I am so honored to have the opportunity to be here tonight with colleagues, with the Speaker Emerita, to say a few words to honor our colleague, a dear, dear friend, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE.

He embarks on a new challenge, president and CEO of the Rhode Island Foundation, one of the largest and oldest community foundations in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than pizza which separates Congressman CICILLINE and myself, there really are more Italians in Connecticut than there are in Rhode Island. I know about San Francisco, but it is Connecticut and Rhode Island, and we go back and forth here. Our numbers in Connecticut are larger than your numbers any day of the year.

Congress is a really wonderful, wonderful institution and a place to be. It really has to do with the people that you serve with. You make a lot of acquaintances in the House of Representatives, but you can count your friends probably on one hand, maybe two.

DAVID CICILLINE has been my friend. That is a friendship that occurs in the good times and in the bad times, in those up moments and the down moments when you know that someone always has your back and is there for you, no matter what. DAVID CICILLINE has always been there for me no matter what.

We had a bond from the moment he arrived in Congress. I kept saying "Chichilline," and he said, CICILLINE. It was the Italian simpatico, a brother and a sister.

It was my privilege to serve with DAVID since he joined more than a decade ago, 12 years ago. He has distinguished himself as a fighter for Rhode Island, a champion for working, middle-class families everywhere. He doesn't shy away from a fight, and he knows how to get things done.

He is a trailblazer for LGBTQ+ rights. The first openly gay mayor of a major U.S. city. In Congress, he has been a leading voice on human rights, civil rights, marriage equality, gun safety, antitrust, bringing back manufacturing jobs, and so much more—taking on the tech industry.

His passion and his commitment to these causes has made him one of the most effective legislators in the House.

□ 1815

He spoke himself about his fight to prevent gun violence, which is at his core. DAVID was a founding member of the bipartisan coalition, Mayors Against Illegal Guns, led the sit-in on the House floor in 2016 with the iconic John Lewis, Democratic whip KATHERINE CLARK, my colleague from Connecticut JOHN LARSON, and we did sit in the well here.

The Speaker Emerita was right. We didn't tell the leadership because they would have said no, but we were convinced that we had to do it and to be here. That was to protest inaction on gun violence. DAVID, like John Lewis, is not afraid to get into good trouble when fighting for what is right.

He responded to the ongoing epidemic of gun violence in this country by authoring the assault weapons ban when I was there when people told him not to do it. They said, don't do it. He said, I am going to do it. And that passed in the House last July. Not an easy vote for some, but he knew that it was the right thing to do and he fought like hell to make it happen.

Tireless champion in the fight for justice and equality. He fought to enact the Equality Act, the conscious of the House on this issue. He led the bipartisan passage for the Respect For Marriage Act, federally recognizing same sex and interracial marriage, which President Biden signed into law last August, a monumental achievement in advancing civil rights.

He has been there next to me when we have fought together on so many issues for women and families—protecting the right to choose, push for pay equity, passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, passing the child tax credit, a passionate and eloquent voice standing up for middle-class and working families across the board, and a dedicated ally to do the work and be there with you in the trenches. DAVID CICILLINE is not afraid to be in the trenches.

DAVID CICILLINE may be leaving the House of Representatives, but his work continues, his legacy continues. I am so sad really to see him go. I am proud that he will now have an opportunity to build, to expand on so many of the issues and work that he did here in the Congress and further improve the lives of all Rhode Islanders.

I know he will continue to be a fearless advocate for the people of Rhode Island and for the causes he believes in and the causes he believes are right.

DAVID CICILLINE knows why he became a Member of the Congress. He understands the power of this institution;

its ability to transform people's lives. He didn't come like some these days to dismantle the institution, but to push the edge of that envelope which could help to make a difference for the people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss him. What an honor it has been for me to serve with him and, more importantly, what a pleasure it has been for me to call him my friend and my brother.

Next time I am in Providence, and I hope that will be soon, we can get a drink at Clementine Cocktail Bar and plan some good trouble together. May God bless him, my dear and wonderful friend. Without a doubt, I will miss him.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MAGAZINER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to follow the Speaker Emerita and Ms. DELAURO in offering my words of farewell to my good friend, DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

I thank Mr. POCAN for allowing me to go first. It was very gracious to allow me this honor to follow two such great Members who felt compelled to come to the floor, to make sure that our friend, DAVID CICILLINE, knew how well he is thought of, what regard we hold him, what esteem we hold him in.

I wish I could recount everything and to touch upon all that DAVID has brought forward into this institution, the ideas that he has carried through his legislation could really fill up this whole hour and that would be unfair to the other Members who also wish to come and bid him an honorable farewell, but let me focus on just a few things: One, it was a great honor to be on this floor the day after the Pulse Nightclub shootings and to see DAVID, along with the iconic John Lewis and KATHERINE CLARK, take action to not just be frustrated, but to get into some good trouble. I was thinking that this moment needed to be amplified and so I took out my cell phone and started to stream the events when all the television cameras were turned off, the lights were turned out, and it was an entire night of all of the members of the Democratic caucus expressing their frustration at not doing more than thoughts and prayers.

What happened at the Pulse Nightclub shootings touched the LGBTQ community, which DAVID and I are members of, and I watched with great admiration at how DAVID made sure to work with the Congressional Black Caucus to touch that sacred 1964 Civil Rights Act and to work with them to craft a bill that would add the words, "gender identity and sexual orientation" to that sacred document which protects so many classes of people in the United States and for which we still need to accomplish this act.

I am honored and touched that DAVID will entrust the Equality Act in my hands to get it across the line. He can be sure that he will be on the invitation list in the front row when the President of the United States signs that bill into law.

Let me say as a final reflection that former Speaker PELOSI has always talked about this being the greatest intellectual resource, the Members, that is, the Members of this Congress are a huge intellectual resource. Let me say that no more is that exemplified than in the hearings that DAVID CICILLINE held on antitrust.

Antitrust is a complicated, dense topic. He spent months, actually years, pouring through the academic research and the views of law professors to understand antitrust law in our country, and he brought forward as witnesses the heads of Facebook and Google and contended with great economic forces in our country, but all in the service of making sure that average Americans have a chance at privacy, have a chance for competition; that not all the resources will get sucked up and not all the advantages are held by big corporate entities.

That intellectual resource, that ground work that he laid, I am confident is going to work itself through this Congress because both sides care, both Democrats and Republicans, care about this issue.

It was overshadowed by a much more attention-grabbing figure, and it was frustrating to me that more of America, more of the media could not pay attention to the important work that DAVID CICILLINE was doing.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a lot longer, but that would be unfair to all the others here who want to pay their respects to a tremendous Member of Congress. Instead, I say farewell to DAVID and thank him for his service, and I will miss him in this body.

Mr. MAGAZINER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to be able to be here today to salute my friend, a fine man, a good man, and someone who has served our country so admirably over the course of these last 12 years in DAVID CICILLINE.

There is a quote from President John Adams that I want to share, our second President who once said: "But I fear that in every assembly, members will obtain an influence, by noise not sense; by meanness, not greatness; by ignorance, not learning; by contracted hearts, not large souls."

There are many places in our country in which his fears ring true today, but one of the places where it does not is in Rhode Island where, for the better part of the last decade, the people of Rhode Island could rest easy knowing they had elected a leader who would serve them admirably. A leader whose common sense was on full display as a Member of the House leadership team.

I can remember very early in my tenure in Congress 5 years ago learning from and being mentored by DAVID CICILLINE as he chaired the House Democratic Policy and Communications Committee, always willing to help a new Member navigate the experience of serving in Congress.

His greatness was on full display during the course of the investigation that he led as chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee. As his vice chair during that subcommittee investigation, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, firsthand just how hard he worked day in, day out.

The entrenched interests and the concentrated power that he fought against day after day to ensure that that investigation would be done and that ultimately the American public would benefit from it. Of course, his learning was on full display during the course of both Presidential impeachments over the course of the last 4 years, but, in particular, during the second impeachment when Mr. CICILLINE and I stood together on the floor of the United States Senate when his fidelity to the Constitution and his role in defending our democracy was on full display to millions of Americans.

He has been an effective Representative for the people of Rhode Island. He has been a tireless leader here in the United States Congress. He has done his country and his State a great service. He has been a dear friend, a dear, dear friend to so many of us in Congress.

In the last 5 years I have been here on the floor for quite a few departing speeches from Members, people I considered friends. I have yet to come to one in which the Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, the Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the Equality Caucus, the Speaker of the House, the former chairman of our caucus have all gathered, except for today. It is a reflection of just how special DAVID CICILLINE is, the reach and breadth of the support and friendships that he developed within the House Democratic Caucus, which I believe will last long after he has left this hallowed Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I say thanks to Mr. CICILLINE, the gentleman from Rhode Island, for his service to our country. We will miss him, and we look forward to seeing him again.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island, DAVID CICILLINE, for his great work in Congress. He has been an LGBTQ+ leader, he has been a progressive champion, he has been a Judiciary Committee leader, and he has been a mentor to many of us in Congress, including myself. I am going to really miss having him and his wisdom in Congress.

I think a lot of people are going to miss him across the country. If you care about gun violence, you are going

to miss DAVID CICILLINE. He was the author of the assault weapon ban, so important as we have shooting after shooting after shooting with an AR-15. His bill would help address that in this country. He always goes above and beyond. Every time in this Chamber when there is a moment of silence and no moment of action around gun violence, it is so disheartening for everyone around the country, but that day that has been talked about when he was one of the organizers sitting down and taking over this Chamber to have a moment of action is one of the few times, in fact, the only time that I saw that in my 10½ years in Congress.

If you care about progressive values, you are going to miss DAVID CICILLINE. He was a progressive caucus leader. As chair of the DPCC, he led in articulating our values for Democrats, and he did an amazing job in doing that.

□ 1830

If you care about democracy, you are going to miss DAVID CICILLINE. Being an impeachment manager is a huge undertaking. You have, trust me, all kinds of people around the country who disagree with you saying all sorts of interesting things. DAVID did an amazing job in standing up for this country and for everyone who cares about our democracy in that role.

If you care about consumer issues, you are going to miss DAVID CICILLINE. As the chair of that subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee dealing with antitrust and tech issues, he was fighting on behalf of consumers so that we could have more affordable cost of goods, so you didn't just have a few monopolies running everything.

If you care about equality and LGBTQI+ rights, I guarantee you are going to miss DAVID CICILLINE. He was the chair of our Equality Caucus for a very long time, and he was the lead author of the equality bill.

Most importantly, DAVID has been a role model for LGBTQ youth across the country. It is not easy still, even in 2023, to be out and gay, especially in this body with people who still are attacking trans kids as a last gasp against equality. DAVID has been our leader and a senior member of the Equality Caucus, and we so respect all of the work that he has done.

I am going to miss his positive leadership style, I am going to miss his commonsense vision, but, most importantly, I am going to miss his friendliness.

DAVID CICILLINE has been a great mentor to many of us. We know he is going to do great back in Rhode Island, and I, too, am going to get to Clementine's.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues. I was fortunate to hear the "deaness" of our delegation speak earlier.

I am not very good at farewells or good-byes. I am far better at hellos. We could never say goodbye to such an engaging, compassionate and caring individual, which is reflected in the legislation that he has put forward, reflected in the way that he has represented the people of Rhode Island, how he has engaged himself on this floor with individual Members, what he has done time and again, leading with his heart, but using that great brain power and strategy to get things done on behalf of people.

I know it has been mentioned about our beloved colleague, John Lewis, and staging that sit-in here on the floor, but I believe that that is something that everyone who was serving here at the time will never forget.

Again, it was his leadership, it was his compassion, and it was his heart. He is a man amongst men who demonstrates that daily.

I love and respect him. I will miss him but not for long, because we will always be together. By now, I think just about the whole Congress is headed to Rhode Island for a drink at Clem's.

I thank him so much for his service. I thank him so much for his commitment to the people of Rhode Island. The country is better off because DAVID CICILLINE has served and represented the people of Rhode Island here in the people's Chamber.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the distinguished congressional career of one of Rhode Island's finest public servants and my good friend, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, who will be retiring from the House this week.

A born and raised Rhode Islander from a proud Italian and Jewish family, David served as a State representative before making history being elected as the first openly gay American to be mayor of a major city.

In his two terms as mayor of Providence, DAVID restored ethics and vitality to city hall, and he was then elected to represent the First Congressional District in 2010.

For over a decade, DAVID has served the people of Rhode Island with honor, courage, and decency in the House of Representatives. Through his work on the House Judiciary Committee, Representative CICILLINE has become a nationally recognized leader in the fights to prevent gun violence and enforce antitrust laws to protect working Americans.

As chair of the Congressional Equality Caucus, DAVID has helped lead the charge for LGBTQ+ rights. DAVID also

served ably on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chairing the Middle East, North Africa and Global Counterterrorism Subcommittee in the last Congress and he served multiple leadership roles in the House Democratic Caucus.

Our Nation will always be indebted to DAVID CICILLINE for his role in holding former President Trump accountable for inciting the deadly assault on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. DAVID cowrote the Articles of Impeachment as the attack was still in progress and ably served as a House impeachment manager.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say how much I will miss DAVID's energy and intellect in the House, but DAVID's lifetime of service is not yet complete. Come June, he will be taking on his new role as president and CEO of the Rhode Island Foundation, one of the Nation's foremost community foundations.

I look forward to working with him in his new role, and I join all of Rhode Island in thanking him for his many years of dedicated public service to our State.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 24, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1032. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Douglas D. Jackson, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1033. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Contractors Participation Under the DOD Test Program for a Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan to Meet Their FY19 Negotiated Goals", pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637 note; Public Law 114-92, Sec. 872(d)(2); (129 Stat. 939); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1034. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report to Congress, "2020-2021 Report to Congress on Organ Donation and the Recovery, Preservation, and Transportation of Organs"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1035. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification that for calendar year 2022, the legitimate commercial activities and interests

of chemical, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical firms in the United States were not significantly harmed by the limitations of the Convention on access to, and production of, those chemicals and toxins listed in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1036. A letter from the Chair, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-1037. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corps' FY 2022 report on the No FEAR Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-1038. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's bankruptcy judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation and analysis for the 118th Congress, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 152(b)(2); Added by Public Law 98-353, Sec. 104(a); (98 Stat. 338); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BONAMICI (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CHU, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ROSS, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. BEYER, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Mr. TRONE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CASAR, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGUE, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. IVEY):

H.R. 3596. A bill to prohibit the use of corporal punishment in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 3597. A bill to direct the President to impose sanctions on the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 3598. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to conduct a comprehensive study assessing the Chinese Communist Party's role in the distribution of fentanyl in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. MANNING, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 3599. A bill to reform the immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Ways and Means, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, Education and the Workforce, Foreign Affairs, Oversight and Accountability, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. ROSS, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CASE, Mr. LIEU, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. VICENTE GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mr. RYAN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mr. MRVAN):

H.R. 3600. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the VA Work-Study program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASAR, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. EZELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 3601. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for a certain work-study allowance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who pursue programs of rehabilitation, education, or training on at least a half-time basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 3602. A bill to prohibit the intentional hindering of immigration, border, and customs controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 3603. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 3604. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to license lending institutions to make loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 3605. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award institutions of higher education grants for teaching English learners; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 3606. A bill to improve the English language and literacy skills of English language learners and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 3607. A bill to establish high-quality dual language immersion programs in low-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KILEY, Mr. BERA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DUARTE):

H.R. 3608. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 28081 Marguerite Parkway in Mission Viejo, California, as the "Major Megan McClung Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself and Ms. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 3609. A bill to ensure that broadband maps are accurate before funds are allocated under the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program based on those maps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Ms. CHU, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 3610. A bill to repeal the Alien Enemies Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 3611. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SELF, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. BRECHEEN):

H.R. 3612. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit investments under the Thrift Savings Plan in certain mutual funds that make investment decisions based primarily on environmental, social, or governance criteria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend title XXVIII of the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the sunset of authority to make certain appointments for National Disaster Medical System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 3614. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on offshore wind development vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and 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 Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 3615. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out a demonstration program for projects that improve electric grid resilience with respect to wildfires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Ms. PETERSEN, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.R. 3616. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to include medications and medical equipment for the emergency treatment of known or suspected opioid overdose in aircraft emergency medical kits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MFUME, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CROCKETT, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 3617. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the authority to provide a wig and treat traction alopecia under the TRICARE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas (for himself and Mr. MOSKOWITZ):

H.R. 3618. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage schools to conduct independent facility security risk assessments and make hard security improvements, and for other purposes; 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. SANTOS:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution condemning the Chinese Communist Party for the Wuhan Lab “leak” causing the deadly COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H. Res. 437. A resolution censuring and condemning Adam Schiff, Representative of California’s 30th Congressional District; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 438. A resolution condemning the rise of antisemitism and calling on elected officials to identify and educate others on the contributions of the Jewish American community; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MFUME):

H. Res. 439. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

lowing 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. BONAMICI:

H.R. 3596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is: Education

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 3597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the President to impose sanctions on the People’s Republic of China.

By Mr. SANTOS:

H.R. 3598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Constitution, Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Secretary of State to conduct a comprehensive study assessing the Chinese Communist Party’s role in the distribution of fentanyl in the United States.

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 3599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Immigration

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

Modernizing the VA Work Study program.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to “regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

The single subject of this legislation is:

To create 5 year pilot program that makes half-time student veterans eligible for the VA Work-Study Program.

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 3602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Increasing penalties for TCO spotters.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 3603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Program.

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 3604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to license lending institutions to make loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation funds teacher preparation programs that train future EL teachers.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §1 and 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation supports family literacy programs which help parents and children learn to communicate in English.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §1 and 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation supports the implementation of dual language immersion (DLI) programs in low-income communities.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 3608.

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:

renaming a post office

By Mr. MEUSER:

H.R. 3609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Oversight of FCC

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 3610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Civil Rights

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

Trade

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 3612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit the Thrift Savings Plan from offering ESG mutual funds.

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 3613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

The single subject of this legislation is:

Health preparedness

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

Workforce

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 3615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the fol-

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: 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 single subject of this legislation is: improve electric grid resilience with respect to wildfires

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 3616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill is about requiring the FAA to include medications and medical equipment for the emergency treatment of known or suspected opioid overdose in aircraft emergency medical kits.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 3617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The Recognition of Traction Alopecia in Service Women Act would Amend U.S. Code 1074 C to add traction alopecia and wigs as a covered medical treatment under TRICARE, the uniformed services health care program for active duty service members. It would also direct the Secretary of Defense to create regulations and training materials warning of the risk of traction alopecia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 3618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishes two pilot programs through the Department of Justice to improve school security. One funds schools vulnerability risk assessments and the other provides funding to make hard security improvements.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. MILLS.
H.R. 79: Mr. MANN and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 82: Ms. SALINAS, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 243: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 333: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 337: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 343: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 412: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 472: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 491: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 524: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 528: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.
H.R. 584: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 642: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 655: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 668: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 681: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 700: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 833: Ms. TOKUDA and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 875: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 895: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
H.R. 902: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 906: Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. VASQUEZ, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 911: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 925: Mr. BARR and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 949: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 957: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 969: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 987: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. STEIL, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1096: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BUSHON, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. OGLES, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BACON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mrs. HOCHIN, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. LALOTA, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. OMAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BARR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1097: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MOONEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 1111: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.
H.R. 1147: Mr. BACON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1209: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 1230: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 1235: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1259: Mr. CASAR.
H.R. 1267: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 1282: Mr. BANKS, Mr. IVEY, and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 1293: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1297: Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SELF, and Mr. NEHLS.
H.R. 1322: Mr. LANDSMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1394: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 1401: Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1406: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1413: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 1437: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1439: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1450: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1459: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1462: Mr. SMUCKER and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 1505: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 1509: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1510: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 1526: Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1542: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1606: Mr. MOLINARO and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 1624: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1634: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1637: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1639: Mr. KILEY and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1641: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 1643: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1646: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 1649: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1658: Mr. MRVAN and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 1659: Mr. MRVAN and Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.
H.R. 1666: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 1691: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 1719: Ms. ROSS and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1721: Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 1741: Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 1753: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1755: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1761: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 1774: Ms. DE LA CRUZ.
H.R. 1776: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1784: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1788: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 1794: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 1801: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 1818: Mr. BARR, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1826: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1832: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. PORTER, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1839: Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. NEHLS.
H.R. 1843: Mrs. PELTOLA.
H.R. 2370: Mr. DELUZZIO.
H.R. 2384: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2385: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 2406: Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 2412: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. Cárdenas.
H.R. 2445: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2447: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2448: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2451: Mrs. BICE, Ms. LEE of Florida, and Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2457: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 2458: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2508: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 2537: Ms. CARAVEO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 2544: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 2601: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2619: Mr. VASQUEZ.
H.R. 2630: Mr. MULLIN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2643: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2662: Ms. LEE of Florida.
H.R. 2664: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 2665: Mr. MANN, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. MOLINARO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 2672: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida and Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 2697: Ms. CHU, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. RUPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2707: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 2708: Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2725: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 2745: Mr. MANN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 2783: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2801: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 2808: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2826: Mr. YAKYM.
H.R. 2827: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2829: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2837: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2844: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2855: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2871: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2873: Mrs. FLETCHER.
H.R. 2874: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 2878: Ms. MACE.
H.R. 2891: Mr. MOLINARO.
H.R. 2918: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2923: Mr. CARSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WILD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. MCCLELLAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 2937: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 2965: Mr. LAWLER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2976: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2981: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 2996: Ms. MACE and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3011: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 3038: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 3039: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3046: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3074: Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 3099: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
H.R. 3100: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H.R. 3103: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3129: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.R. 3131: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 3142: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3146: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3152: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3159: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 3162: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3170: Mrs. HAYES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. IVEY.
H.R. 3175: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 3202: Mr. STANTON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 3207: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3239: Ms. TITUS and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3246: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3256: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 3276: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3281: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3328: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3329: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3337: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 3357: Mr. OWENS, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3358: Mr. FINSTAD and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3363: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3373: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H.R. 3375: Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3381: Mr. FRY and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3391: Ms. SALAZAR and Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 3393: Mr. LUTTRELL and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3394: Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California.
H.R. 3397: Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3398: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3407: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 3409: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 3413: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 3420: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3439: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3444: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK and Ms. BROWN.
H.R. 3470: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3472: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3474: Mr. IVEY and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3475: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MACE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 3481: Ms. BALINT, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 3491: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3492: Mr. ROY, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 3494: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3502: Mr. CROW, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3519: Ms. CROCKETT and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3539: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 3545: Mr. CARSON, Ms. MACE, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3547: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3548: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 3557: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mrs. CAMMACK.
H. J. Res. 25: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. RUIZ.
H. J. Res. 54: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LEE of California.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. IVEY.
H. Res. 234: Mr. BARR and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H. Res. 262: Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BOWMAN.
H. Res. 272: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. IVEY.
H. Res. 339: Mr. MEUSER.
H. Res. 365: Mr. STEIL and Mr. AMODEI.
H. Res. 372: Ms. SHERRILL.
H. Res. 376: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 382: Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 389: Mr. ALLRED.
H. Res. 409: Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 413: Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 432: Ms. TOKUDA and Mr. IVEY.