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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, December 6, 2023.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Scott Franklin to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON.
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 Speaker 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.

THANKING INDIANOLA ROTARY CLUB

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Indianola Rotary Club for giving Indianola third graders over 5,280 dictionaries since its first year in 2003. The Indianola Rotary supports youth leadership and literacy for children and adults. With their literacy focus, they have been able to support and inspire children in our community. I thank Indianola Rotary Club members for the time and effort they have donated to their community.

CONGRATULATING AARON BARTHOLMEY ON HIS GUINNESS WORLD RECORD

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Aaron Bartholomey on the newly announced Guinness World Record for his pencil collection.

In July of 2023, the Colfax Historical Society helped to certify the tally of his record-breaking collection of 69,255 pencils with assistance from the American Pencil Collectors Society. These wooden advertising pencils are mostly from local businesses, and one is recorded as over 100 years old. His hobby began as a child, after going to a flea market with his grandfather, and it now has grown into a world record and a passion for history and local memorabilia.

Congratulations to Aaron Bartholomey on his Guinness World Record, and best of luck in finding his next pencil.

RECOGNIZING KELBY TELANDER

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kelby Telander for his bravery and resilience. As a toddler, Kelby Telander struggled with hearing loss and underwent many surgeries, including a life-changing cochlear implant surgery at the University of Iowa Stead Family Children’s Hospital. While a patient, he was selected to be kid captain at the University of Iowa football game.

As many University of Iowa fans know, before games at Kinnick Stadium, a patient from the Stead Family Children’s Hospital is chosen as kid captain to lead the University of Iowa football team onto the field. For Kelby, this was an impressive experience. I am proud to recognize that over a decade later, Kelby Telander, a former kid captain and patient at Stead Family Children’s Hospital has joined the University of Iowa football team as a linebacker. Kelby is number 25 and recently saw his first career action in the Hawkeyes’ 41-10 win against West Michigan.

I am proud of Kelby Telander for not only joining the powerhouse Hawkeye football team but for his bravery and resilience. Congratulations, and Go Hawks.

HONORING BRITT ORTIZ’ CAREER

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor my friend Britt A. Ortiz and congratulate Britt on his retirement from a long, impressive career in higher education.

The son of Carmen and Arturo Ortiz, Britt grew up in Old Town Goleta, California. His mother, Carmen, was an assembly line worker for a manufacturing plant and later became a floor manager. His father, Arturo, is an electrician.

Britt attended public schools and graduated from Dos Pueblos High School in 1979. He went on to attend the University of California at Santa Barbara as a first-generation college student.

I know his journey well. Though I grew up many miles south of him in the San Fernando Valley, I, too, attended public schools, defying low expectations from my teachers, counselors, and others. Just like other Latino students like myself and Britt, we went on to be first-generation students at UC, Santa Barbara.

With dedication, grit, and hard work, Britt earned his bachelor’s degree in 1985 with a double major in sociology and psychology. Britt went on to receive his master’s degree in educational leadership and policy studies at the University of California, Northridge.
His first full-time job after college was as an outreach counselor for a UCSB partnership program that provided tutoring at junior high and high schools in Goleta and Santa Barbara. This kicked off a long career dedicated to helping students achieve their educational goals.

Seeing a need for dedicated and qualified educators and counselors in the San Fernando Valley, Britt used his acquired skills to motivate generations of Latino and Latina engineers and computer science majors in the history of the College of Engineering and Computer Science at California State University, Northridge.

After mastering his skills in the San Fernando Valley, he returned to UC, Santa Barbara and led the UC system’s largest and oldest precollege academic preparation program. His work helped prepare first-generation, low-income, and underserved students and their families for higher education. Over the course of his career, he also worked to get $4.5 million in grants and funding for various agencies, institutions, and early academic outreach programs that helped students across the State of California succeed and achieve their dreams.

He has done all of this work and more so that students who were often discouraged and overlooked had the support, encouragement, and opportunities to chase after and achieve their dreams regardless of the circumstances they were faced with or what was thrown at them.

I thank Britt Ortiz for all that he has done during his 35-year career. He showed kids what is possible. He gave them the tools they needed to learn. He helped them achieve their full potential, and he helped make their dreams come true.

What makes Britt’s career so special is that as a young boy, he was discouraged from going on to college, but he defied those negative thoughts and actions against him by proving to himself—not to anybody else, but to himself—that if he put his best foot forward, if he always tried his best, if he always gave his best, he could achieve anything.

That is what is amazing about this great country, that no matter who you are, no matter what language you start with, no matter what it is that you are faced with, if you are focused and you take advantage of all the opportunities that are here for you in this great country, you can and will make it.

What is sad is all along the way some people may not believe in you. They may try to discourage you and actually get in your way. Some people may even try to get you thrown out of your school or out of your classroom or what have you for things you have never done.

I say this because I have witnessed these things with my own eyes, but it takes people like Britt Ortiz to prove to young people that those are just lies, and they can be overcome. That is why today I honor Britt Ortiz for his 35-year career of helping young people overcome these challenges and to live their dreams.

NOVEMBER 22 RECOGNIZED AS KIMCHI DAY

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Kimchi Day. Kimchi is a staple Korean banchan, or side dish, consisting of fermented cabbage and other vegetables.

What was once limited to Korean families’ tables is now a culinary icon that reflects the growing Korean cultural influence in the United States since the first Korean immigrants arrived more than a century ago. I am proud to be joined by many Korean Americans from all across the country in the gallery today to celebrate kimchi and the larger contributions that the Korean-American community have made here in the United States.

Later this afternoon, Members and those listening are invited to come to the Cannon Caucus Room at 2 p.m. as we celebrate Kimchi Day with our Korean-American colleagues—there are four of us serving in Congress: Andy Kim, Young Kim, Michelle Steel, and Marilyn Strickland—who have been instrumental in the equal citizenship and civil rights era, bringing our Nation closer to the dream of every man and every woman being created equal. That is the promise of democracy, Mr. Speaker. That is the promise for which he gave his life.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

CELEBRATING HOMEGOING OF LIEUTENANT FRED BREWER, JR.

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 80,000 American military personnel who remain unaccounted for from previous conflicts around the world. These include veterans, nonprofit organizations, and the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency continue to fight tirelessly every day to bring these patriots home and to give them the dignified memorials they deserve.

I rise today to celebrate the homecoming of one of these fallen heroes. Second Lieutenant Fred Lorenzo Brewer, Jr., who after nearly 80 years has returned home to Charlotte, North Carolina.

Born on August 4, 1921, Lieutenant Brewer was raised in Charlotte’s historic Brooklyn neighborhood where his family attended the historic Ebenezer Baptist Church.

After graduating from Shaw University in Raleigh, the segregated South’s first Black college, Lieutenant Brewer was commissioned by the United States Air Force and entered the uniformed service in November of 1942.

His first full-time job after college was as an outreach counselor for a UCSB partnership program that provided tutoring at junior high and high schools in Goleta and Santa Barbara. This kicked off a long career dedicated to helping students achieve their educational goals.

Seeing a need for dedicated and qualified educators and counselors in the San Fernando Valley, Britt used his acquired skills to motivate generations of Latino and Latina engineers and computer science majors in the history of the College of Engineering and Computer Science at California State University, Northridge.

After mastering his skills in the San Fernando Valley, he returned to UC, Santa Barbara and led the UC system’s largest and oldest precollege academic preparation program. His work helped prepare first-generation, low-income, and underserved students and their families for higher education. Over the course of his career, he also worked to get $4.5 million in grants and funding for various agencies, institutions, and early academic outreach programs that helped students across the State of California succeed and achieve their dreams.

He has done all of this work and more so that students who were often discouraged and overlooked had the support, encouragement, and opportunities to chase after and achieve their dreams regardless of the circumstances they were faced with or what was thrown at them.

I thank Britt Ortiz for all that he has done during his 35-year career. He showed kids what is possible. He gave them the tools they needed to learn. He helped them achieve their full potential, and he helped make their dreams come true.

What makes Britt’s career so special is that as a young boy, he was discouraged from going on to college, but he defied those negative thoughts and actions against him by proving to himself—not to anybody else, but to himself—that if he put his best foot forward, if he always tried his best, if he always gave his best, he could achieve anything.

That is what is amazing about this great country, that no matter who you are, no matter what language you start with, no matter what it is that you are faced with, if you are focused and you take advantage of all the opportunities that are here for you in this great country, you can and will make it.
The words of the carol are as follows:

Hail the Sun of righteousness!
Light and life to all He brings,
Rise with healing in His wings.

Mild He lays His glory by,
Born that man no more may die,
Born to raise the sons of Earth,
Born to give them second birth.

Hark! The herald angels sing,
"Glory to the newborn King!"

Mr. Speaker, I hope the history of this beautiful song will remind you of the Christmas season, of what it is all about and what the history is of this hymn.

On behalf of all the people of central Texas and all of Texas, I wish you a merry Christmas and a happy Hanukkah.

HONORING NOAH MACMILLAN

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

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Amherst County teacher John “Andrew” Fister.

Mr. Fister was an exemplary educator who dedicated nearly 25 years of his life to teaching, training, and developing his students.

After teaching Bible, math, and German for 18 years in Ohio, he moved to Virginia to serve 3 years as an academic instructor, helping young adults enter the workforce.

In January of 2022, Mr. Fister joined Amherst County public schools as a math and German teacher. Despite his relatively short time there, he left an indelible impact on the student body.

Mr. Fister was loved by many students, even those not in his classes, and served as a mentor for many who walked those halls.

With a special gift working with students needing a second chance or just a little extra help, he taught them to believe in themselves and to work hard to achieve their dreams.

Mr. Fister’s enthusiasm for life was contagious, and he meant so much to so many in the Amherst community.

Only 50 years old, his time on Earth was too short for those who loved him, but his personal testimony and the influence he had on others will live beyond his life here.
His family and those who knew him best are comforted by the knowledge that he is in Heaven with his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the urgent need to stand up for democracy at home and abroad.

Yesterday, Members of Congress heard from our Secretary of State, our Secretary of Defense, and other senior leaders from the administration on the dire situation in Ukraine and Israel.

While they said the right things, the sense of urgency, the sense of passion is missing from all of this right now. It is missing from this debate, Mr. Speaker.

If we leave next week for the holidays with inaction, Russian will win, and we will begin to hand over Ukraine to Russia and Vladimir Putin.

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching the actions of this Chamber right now in the next 10 days, and the silence is deafening.

Let’s be clear: Both Russia and Hamas seek to destroy democracy, and we must stand with our allies and pass a supplemental aid package now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Ukraine, right now, we risk Ukraine literally running out of bullets if we go 10 days with inaction here in Congress.

If we do nothing by the end of the month, Russia will begin to win in Ukraine. If we abandon Ukraine, Russia will win.

We need to be clear: The silence and inaction we are seeing play out here on the floor of the House means strong support for Russia and their invasion of Ukraine. That is the choice we are making by doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan is rolling over in his grave right now as he watches far-right extremist Republicans standing with Russia and Vladimir Putin. How has the Republican Party become the party of Vladimir Putin?

Mr. Speaker, this place is broken. I want to be clear in what I am saying. We are witnessing a minority of the Republican Conference calling the shots in this Chamber.

A majority of the Republican Conference supports standing with Ukraine, but they have been cowed by the minority in their party, and we continue to see the tail wagging the dog.

To my Republican colleagues who remain silent, the time for action is now. Allow a clean vote on the supplemental funding package for Ukraine and for Israel. We must stand strong with Ukraine and Israel.

Let’s talk about the cost because that has been brought up over and over. If we gift wrap Ukraine for Vladimir Putin over this holiday season, we will spend 100 times more money around the globe containing an aggressive Russia. Moldova and Georgia are next.

This is a national security issue for the American people, and support for Ukraine is in our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to talk about Israel as well. We must stand with Israel and support its right to defend itself.

We must immediately pass humanitarian aid and security aid for Israel so that we can disarm and dismantle Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, 400 Members of this Chamber would easily support a clean security and humanitarian assistance package for Israel. It is shameful that our new Speaker chose to play partisan political games with support for Israel.

For the American people watching, the bill that passed out of this Chamber says we will stand with Israel, absolutely, only if we defund the police for billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. That is the choice that this body had, and it is shameful.

When someone’s house is on fire, we don’t say, hey, we will put out the fire as long as you let us not pay for a bunch of IRS agents to go after billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. You help them when their house is burning down.

Right now, that is what we are watching in Israel with Israel security assistance and humanitarian aid that we need to provide to the Palestinian people in Gaza.

An overwhelming majority of Members support standing with Ukraine and standing with Israel. If we could get a clean vote on this bill on the floor, it would pass, but it is time for action.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the cost because that has been brought up over and over. If we gift wrap Ukraine for Vladimir Putin over this holiday season, we will spend 100 times more money around the globe containing an aggressive Russia. Moldova and Georgia are next.

This is a national security issue for the American people, and support for Ukraine is in our national interest.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to talk about Israel as well. We must stand with Israel and support its right to defend itself.

We must immediately pass humanitarian aid and security aid for Israel so that we can disarm and dismantle Hamas.

Mr. Speaker, 400 Members of this Chamber would easily support a clean security and humanitarian assistance package for Israel. It is shameful that our new Speaker chose to play partisan political games with support for Israel.

For the American people watching, the bill that passed out of this Chamber says we will stand with Israel, absolutely, only if we defund the police for billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. That is the choice that this body had, and it is shameful.

When someone’s house is on fire, we don’t say, hey, we will put out the fire as long as you let us not pay for a bunch of IRS agents to go after billionaires and wealthy tax cheats. You help them when their house is burning down.

Right now, that is what we are watching in Israel with Israel security assistance and humanitarian aid that we need to provide to the Palestinian people in Gaza.

An overwhelming majority of Members support standing with Ukraine and standing with Israel. If we could get a clean vote on this bill on the floor, it would pass, but it is time for action.

Let me say that House Democrats, Senate Democrats, and Senate Republicans all agree on the need to support Israel and Ukraine, and I would even say a majority of the Republican Conference agrees. However, we can’t get a vote on this as long as the far-right extremists in the Republican Conference continue to wag the tail of the dog in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is about the future of democracy for the world. The defining question for our great experiment in self-government is whether we can defend democracy at home and abroad.

We will face that question about defending democracy at home in November, but right now, we need to stand and be counted.

Authoritarianism is on the rise around the globe. We can either stand with democracies like Israel and Ukraine or we can bend the knee to Authoritarianism and be counted.

That is why this Congress must pass the DETERRENT Act, which provides transparency, accountability, and clarity to foreign reporting requirements for colleges and universities across the country.

House Republicans remain committed to delivering a future that is built on freedom for the American people, and that starts with preventing our adversaries from indoctrinating our students with their propaganda and stealing the research of our colleges and universities across this country.

CONGRATULATING THE JAMES WOOD VOLLEYBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE CLASS 4 STATE TITLE

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the James Wood women’s volleyball team for winning the class 4 State title, the program’s second straight State championship.

After working hard all season, the Colonels left it all on the floor and dominated the Hanover Hawks for their sixth 3-0 win in six postseason matches.

These talented student athletes include Kennedy Spald, Ashlynn Spence, Alexis Taylor, Adeline Pitcock, Kyla Wilhelm, Tenley Mattison, Hannah McCullough, Paige Ahakuelo, Brenna Corbin, and Claire Keef.

Throughout each set, the Colonels focused on working together as a team and doing what was necessary to get the job done, demonstrating resilience, adaptability, and impeccable skills.

Under the leadership and encouragement of Head Coach Adrienne Patrick,
the Colonels were on a mission all sea-
son to repeat history, and it ended with
them once again as State champions.
Again, I congratulate the James
Wood women's volleyball team, Head
Coach Adrienne Patrick, parents, fac-
culty, and staff on this incredible
achievement.

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I want
peace. I want a decisive victory over Hamas and an end to its hateful and
destructive reign. I want Israel and Palestine to coexist safely, secure-
ly, and with prosperity for generations to come.

It is difficult to talk about peace dur-
ing wartime, but that is exactly what
we must do. We cannot be distracted by
disengenuous messaging bills that do
nothing but grab headlines with no plan forward.

As a person of faith, I have been
taught not to hate, but I must admit
that I have hated what I have seen in
this Chamber recently. For as I hate anti-Semitism and Islamophobia and
racism, as I despise homophobia and transphobia, as I reject and revile ha-
tred and bigotry of any kind, I am also
disgusted by the way those prejudices have been weaponized in our Chamber.

We voted yesterday on yet another
nonbinding messaging resolution de-
nouncing anti-Semitism. H. Res. 894.

To be clear, I have supported efforts to
push back against anti-Semitism. That is why I am supporting Mr. NAD-
LER's plan to combat anti-Semitism. It is why I am supporting Mr. GREEN's
two-state solution resolution. It is why I signed on to Ms. WASSERMAN
SCHULTZ's letter demanding the safety of students on college campuses.

Let's face facts. That was not what
this resolution was about. This resolu-
tion offers no solutions. It does not seek to bring people together. This res-
olution was a cynical attempt to
weaponize the very real fears of some of our Jewish friends and our neighbors
to push a specific political agenda, one that is strikingly disrespectful to the
Palestinian state, the State of Israel, and the effort to support the cause of free
and sovereign Palestinian and Israeli states.

On Monday, my colleague, Mr. NAD-
LER, laid out how reckless and unin-
formed clause 4 of this resolution is. By
making it the official position of this Congress that "anti-Zionism is anti-
Semitism," we are labeling the thou-
sands of Jews in this country who don't believe their deeply held faith is intrin-
sically tied to the modern State of Israel as anti-Semitic.

This is a real step that we as the
United States Congress can and
should take to combat anti-Semitism in
a productive and bipartisan manner.

Condemning anti-Semitism wherever it
rears its ugly head is critical, but con-
tinuing to vote on nonbinding resolu-
tions week after week after week to
score political, partisan points does not get us closer to a solution. It is dis-
respectful to the seriousness of this sit-
uation.

Until Republicans are willing to ad-
dress rising hate and fascism, we will
be sitting here waiting without being able
to accomplish anything. It is no
better than moments of silence or
thoughts and prayers to sub-
stantive action to back it up, which
were offered during the mass shootings
in our schools, malls, and places of
worship.

We have work to do for the American
people. The rise of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, homophobia,
and xenophobia are a threat to the
American experiment in multicultural
democracy, and there are Members of
this body who are putting in the work
to defend the Union that we built
over the last 250 years.

When Republicans who have been
obessed with these messaging bills are
ready to join us, we will welcome them
with open arms.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IS POW-
ERFUL AGENT FOR FREEDOM,
PEACE, AND DEMOCRACY
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from
Utah (Mr. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker,
American leadership has always been the most influential, powerful agent
for freedom, peace, and democracy.

One month ago, the House stood up
to protect our values and national in-
terests by passing a bipartisan package
of help Israel defend itself from Hamas.

I recently attended a screening of the
footage from Hamas that Chairman
MCCAUL and Ranking Member MEEKS
invited us all to, and I am so grateful
for their leadership to have us do that.
I knew it was footage that would be
tough to see, but I knew it was footage I
needed to see, I won't ever be the
same after having seen that.

As we support our ally, we must take
a comprehensive look at the Biden ad-
ministration's Middle East policy.

Encapsulating all of my thoughts
today in my remarks is a simple con-
cept: When foreign policies, though it
would be desired by all, you can't have it
all. You have to make tough choices
when it comes to foreign policy. You
don't get to have everything that you
would ever want. You cannot have it
all with respect to foreign policy.
I will share a little bit about how im-
portant it is to take a stand.

While I am grateful for President
Biden's clear support for Israel, his ad-
mistration's attempts to placate Iran, the number one state sponsor of
terrorism in the world, have been a
critical misstep.

For the past 3 years, the Biden ad-
ministration has embarked on a deeply
misguided and contradictory quest to
resurrect the Iran nuclear deal while
beguirdingly continuing one of the
Trump and Pence administration's
most successful efforts at peace in the
Middle East, the Abraham Accords, and
the recognition of Israel by its Arab
neighbors in embargos, sanctions, and
economic ties through these accords.

Rather than maintaining the max-
imum pressure campaign that sanc-
tioned and starved Iran of foreign rev-
eue, the Biden administration has
been an enabler of the Islamic Republic.
They have allowed Iranian oil exports
to surge back to levels higher than they
were in 2018 and attempted to unfreeze
billions of dollars in Iranian assets
from foreign banks.

The Iranian regime is flush with cash
thanks to the global energy crisis and
the administration's policy of appease-
ment. Iran uses this cash to fund,
equip, and train a terrorist network
across the region. This includes groups
like Hamas and Hezbollah.

According to reports from The Wall
Street Journal, 500 or so Hamas terror-
ists trained in Iran in the months lead-
ing up to the October 7 attack on inno-
cent Israelis. The Iranian regime has
developed this terror network not just
in Gaza and Lebannon but also in Syria,
Iraq, and Yemen for one purpose: to
cause just enough chaos to make the
Arab world think twice about sustain-
able peace with Israel and the reli-
ability of U.S. diplomacy.

The Biden administration says its
Iran appeasement is geared toward pre-
venting Iran from acquiring nuclear
weapons, a goal I think we could all get
behind, but it has obviously
emboldened Iran and undermined
regional security.

We need our four main regional secu-
irty partners—Israel, Saudi Arabia,
Egypt, and Turkey—to work together
in unity, and we need America to lead
on getting that done.

President Biden's approach creates
tremendous doubt that the United States
is more committed to the secu-
ricy of our partners than to a delu-
sional accommodation of Iran. What
must Riyadh, Cairo, and Istanbul have
thought these past 3 years while
watching the U.S. respond meekly to
Iranian proxy groups disrupting polit-
ical order, trafficking illegal weapons,
and lobbing rockets at American dip-
los in the infamous September 13, 2020
attack in Baghdad?

Iran would love nothing more than
for Saudi Arabia to think twice about
normalizing relations with Israel,
given the current crisis. Iran would
love nothing more than for Egypt to
decline that the opportunity costs for
working with Israel on humanitarian
or economic corridors in Gaza, some-
thing that I have been calling for in a
bipartisan fashion, is too high. Iran would
love nothing more than for Turkey to de-
side that it is more beneficial to work
directly with Iran rather than through
the United States.

The Trump-Pence administration
correctly understood that the Abraham
Accords were the best chance we have for sustainable peace in the Middle East. We are stronger together than we are apart.

President Biden is undermining regional security and unity by appeasing the regional destabilizer: Iran. We must enforce sanctions, communicate clearly that we stand on the side of Israel and our partners, and line up our diplomatic and military commitments with our national interests that are also the national interests of Israel and the Arab world.

IN MEMORY OF PASTOR CHARLES GILCHRIST ADAMS

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, Michigan’s 12th Congressional District mourns the loss of Pastor Charles Gilchrist Adams, a beloved spiritual and community leader. He was an activist in our district whose influence impacted so many of our lives across the State and the world. He was loved and respected by so many.

Pastor Adams served as a lead pastor for the historic Hartford Memorial Baptist Church in Detroit, a role that he held for more than 50 years.

As a pastor, he dedicated his life and mission to service, fighting for justice for our communities and improving the lives of our residents in northwest Detroit. He was a tireless advocate for safe and affordable housing for all and childcare for our working families.

He served as president of the Detroit Branch of the NAACP in 1984, and he also served on the executive board until 1992.

Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in remembering Pastor Charles Gilchrist Adams for his incredible advocacy, leadership, and impact on our district.

May he rest in love, and may his legacy live on in our community.

RECOGNIZING DEARBORN FIREFIGHTERS

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, the 12th Congressional District recognizes two outstanding members of Dearborn’s fire department: Battalion Chief Kenneth Murray, for his 26 years of service, and EMS Coordinator Glenn Owens, for his 25 years of service to our communities.

Battalion Chief Murray started with the Dearborn Fire Department in 1997 as a firefighter. He steadily rose through the ranks, serving as an engineer, lieutenant, and captain before he was promoted to battalion chief in 2020.

Over the course of his career, Battalion Chief Murray has garnered numerous awards and was recognized as Dearborn Exchange Club’s Fire Officer of the Year in 2016. Battalion Chief Murray has been an outstanding public servant to the communities served by the Dearborn Fire Department.

EMS Coordinator Owens began his career as a firefighter in the Dearborn Fire Department in 1998. Over the past 25 years, Owens has served in numerous roles, and he remains steadfast in his commitment to service and keeping our community safe.

EMS Coordinator Owens has been recognized many times over the course of his career in Dearborn for his incredible record, including saving lives and safe driving.

Please join me in recognizing Battalion Chief Kenneth Murray and EMS Coordinator Glenn Owens for their many years of outstanding service to the people of Dearborn in Michigan’s 12th District Strong as we wish them well in their retirement.

ACKNOWLEDGING MY INCREDIBLE TEAM

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I want to take time to acknowledge my incredible team and our accomplishments these past few years for our community. I lovingly call our congressional district 12th District Strong.

At the beginning of this year, we opened three new Neighborhood Service Organizations in Detroit, Inkster, and Southfield.

Throughout the district, our Neighborhood Service Organizations have returned over $5.5 million in constituent services dollars directly to over 8,000 residents, returning alone just this year over $2.5 million to our communities.

We served and responded to over 164,069 letters from our neighbors who advocate for clean water, clean air, utilities for all, and so much more. We have hosted and participated in over 120 events, including coffee hours, townhalls, resource fairs, and more to ensure that I remain accessible to my residents.

In Congress, in our legislative advocacy work from affordable housing to medical debt cancellation and auto insurance discrimination, we have introduced 360 bills, and 39 bills and amendments we’ve successfully passed since 2019.

This year, we celebrated the 1-year anniversary of the Congressional Mamas’ Caucus, where we are committed to advocating for working moms and their families on issues of affordable childcare, paid leave, and ending poverty policies that are incredibly important, as well as something dear to me, combating Black maternal health, and so much more.

We also started the Get the Lead Out Caucus, where we know that no amount of lead is safe for our children or our families.

These accomplishments would not have been possible without our residents’ faith in me and sending me here to the United States Congress to do the people’s work. It has been an honor to serve as the Congresswoman for the 12th Congressional District, 12th District Strong.

I thank all of my team for all of their hard work and tenacity. This is just the beginning of what we will be able to accomplish.

CONGRATULATING THE STEWARTVILLE HIGH SCHOOL TIGERS

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

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Stewartville High School Tigers on winning this year’s Minnesota Class 3A high school football championship.

Stewartville capped off an undefeated season with their 43-13 victory over Annandale in the State championship on November 26 at the U.S. Bank Stadium in Minneapolis.

While this marks the third time the Tigers have made it to the State finals, this year’s win earned them the first-ever championship title in Stewartville’s history.

The Tigers finished their 2023 season with a perfect 14–0 record, and all of us across the First Congressional District are incredibly proud to call them our own.

Congratulations to Coach Mueller, his team, and the entire Stewartville community on this well-deserved title. Way to go, Tigers.

OHIO’S NUCLEAR ENERGY PROBLEMS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the production of nuclear power in our country is an awesome responsibility. Put in the hands of the wrong people, it can be deadly.

Those who operate nuclear facilities must be highly trained and honorable. Recall Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima? They all teach us nuclear power in the hands of careless and, indeed, corrupt people can be deadly to thousands of innocent people.

This morning, let us turn to Ohio’s two financially strapped nuclear plants, both located in northern Ohio, adjacent to our people’s freshwater kingdom, Lake Erie.

In Ohio, the largest corruption crimes in America’s commercial plant nuclear history are being litigated. These crimes are also the largest public corruption trials in Ohio’s history.

Last week, a Federal grand jury in Cincinnati indicted former chair of Ohio’s Public Utilities Commission, Sam Randazzo, on bribery and embezzlement for his role in receiving $4.3 million in kickbacks for what has been labeled the biggest political bribery scandal in Ohio’s history.

The nuclear power company, FirstEnergy, ultimately paid more than $60 million in 2018 and 2019 to bribe public officials like the Speaker of the Ohio House, who has now been sentenced to 20 years in prison.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article entitled “Sam Randazzo, Ohio’s former top utilities regulator, charged with bribery, embezzlement crimes.”
INTRODUCTION
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SAM RANDAZZO, OHIO’S FORMER TOP UTILITIES REGULATOR, CHARGED WITH BRIBERY, EMBEZZLEMENT

(By Jeremy Pelzer, Andrew J. Tobias, and Jake Zuckerman, Zuckerman)

COLUMBUS, OH.—A federal grand jury has indicted Sam Randazzo, the former chair of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, on 11 counts related to bribery and embezzlement, U.S. Attorney Kenneth Parker’s office announced Monday.

The indictment states that Randazzo accepted bribes in exchange for helping FirstEnergy, an Akron-based electric utility, secure its policy priorities, including helping with House Bill 6, the 2019 energy law at the center of a federal bribery probe. FirstEnergy admitted to bribing Randazzo in 2021, but he wasn’t charged until now.

If convicted, Randazzo could face up to 20 years in prison.

The 74-year-old Columbus resident self-surrendered on Monday following his arrest at U.S. District Court in Cincinnati, according to a release. He appeared in federal court that afternoon, wrote a $1 million bond, and before Chief Magistrate Judge Karen Litkovitz at Cincinnati’s federal courthouse. He pleaded not guilty and was released on a bond of his own recognizance.

The 11 counts against Randazzo include: one count of conspiring to commit travel act bribery and honest services wire fraud, two counts of conspiracy to travel, two counts of honest services wire fraud, one count of wire fraud and five counts of making illegal monetary transactions, according to the release. As PUCO chair, Randazzo met with FirstEnergy officials from April 2019 until he resigned in November 2020. Randazzo reviewed requests from gas and electric companies seeking new costs on customers. He accepted $1.3 million soon after meeting with then-FirstEnergy executives Chuck Jones and Mike Dowling in December 2019. Randazzo was allegedly paid $100,000 to become PUCO chair.

Randazzo resigned as PUCO chair in November 2019, days after the FBI raided his Columbus townhouse. In the years that followed, prosecutors were silent about Randazzo, leading to questions about why they were taking so long to decide whether to file charges.

Ashley Brown, a former PUCO commissioner, said the delay cost the state millions by allowing FirstEnergy to get away with its corrupt actions.

In the meantime, electricity customers have continued to pay a fee contained in HB6 that subsidizes a pair of coal plants owned by FirstEnergy and several other utilities.

“IT’s hard to imagine why he wasn’t indicted earlier,” said Brown, who also questioned why current and former FirstEnergy officials have been charged so far.

As the second indictment in the HB6 scandal, the operation is the latest in a series of high-profile corruption cases that have shaken the Ohio Statehouse, including an investigation into a lucrative lobbying operation that used millions of dollars to influence politicians and regulators. The investigation has resulted in multiple indictments, including a 2021 indictment of former Ohio Republican Party chair Mike Devillers, Parker’s predecessor as U.S. attorney.

Randazzo, leading to questions about why they were taking so long to decide whether to file charges.

Ashley Brown, a former PUCO commissioner, said the delay cost the state millions by allowing FirstEnergy to get away with its corrupt actions.

In the meantime, electricity customers have continued to pay a fee contained in HB6 that subsidizes a pair of coal plants owned by FirstEnergy and several other utilities.

Randazzo is already a defendant in a civil lawsuit filed in 2021 by Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost. As part of that case, a Franklin County judge ordered the seizure of all of Randazzo’s assets, though that decision is still being appealed.

Randazzo’s indictment comes just weeks after his predecessor as PUCO chair, Larry Householder, was sentenced to 20 years in prison for leading a $60 million bribery scheme using FirstEnergy money to help Householder win the 2018 primary election. Householder was convicted in 2021 of racketeering, money laundering, and other charges related to the case that has been described as the single largest election fraud in state history.

And where is the second footfall—charges against any of the FirstEnergy Corp. executives whose roles in paying out the bribes and soliciting the corrupt actions by Randazzo and others have been detailed in this and prior indictments?

The Randazzo indictment refers to now-departed Executives 1 and 2 at Akron-based FirstEnergy—former CEO Chuck Jones and former Senior Vice President for External Affairs Michael Dowling—as those with the primary contacts with Randazzo over the $3,333,333 bribe FirstEnergy Corp. previously admitted paying Randazzo in a 2021 deferred prosecution agreement.

But they’re clearly not the only FirstEnergy officials privy to the lobbying plans, public relations, and legislative favors Randazzo was helping the company secure, including a lucrative decoupling accounting provision that PUCO staff opposed, modifications to the state’s “two-year savings test” (SEET) that were added to the two-year state budget, and “burning” of
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FINALLY, 11 COUNTS AGAINST EX-PUCO CHIEF SAM RANDAZZO BUT WHY STILL NONE AGAINST THEN-FIRSTENERGY OFFICIALS WHOSE FINGERPRINTS ARE ALL OVER THE CASE?

(From The Plain Dealer Cleveland, Dec. 6, 2023)

Monday’s unsealing of an 11-count federal conspiracy, bribery, wire fraud and embezzlement indictment against former Public Utilities Commission of Ohio chief Sam Randazzo was a welcome sign of prosecutorial progress in the FirstEnergy/House Bill 6 corruption case—but it’s like the first footfall in a long-delayed reckoning with some of the key officials at the heart of the asserted conspiracy.

Our editorial board has repeatedly urged the U.S. Attorney for Southern Ohio, Ken Parker, to explain publicly why such a long time was needed to bring charges against key officials at the heart of the case. Those officials include former state Sen. Shane Wilkin once told Parkers’s predecessor as U.S. attorney, former House Speaker Larry Householder and former Ohio Republican Party chair Matt Borges—came more than three years ago.

And where is the second footfall—charges against any of the FirstEnergy Corp. executives whose roles in paying out the bribes and soliciting the corrupt actions by Randazzo and others have been detailed in this and prior indictments?

The Randazzo indictment refers to now-departed Executives 1 and 2 at Akron-based FirstEnergy—former CEO Chuck Jones and former Senior Vice President for External Affairs Michael Dowling—as those with the primary contacts with Randazzo over the $3,333,333 bribe FirstEnergy Corp. previously admitted paying Randazzo in a 2021 deferred prosecution agreement.

But they’re clearly not the only FirstEnergy officials privy to the lobbying plans, public relations, and legislative favors Randazzo was helping the company secure, including a lucrative decoupling accounting provision that PUCO staff opposed, modifications to the state’s “two-year savings test” (SEET) that were added to the two-year state budget, and “burning” of
a critical PUCO audit about FirstEnergy’s distribution modernization rider (DMR).

According to the Randazzo indictment, “On or about March 4, 2020, Executive 1 messaged Executive 2: ‘I execute my duty as Executive 2 [Randazzo] will get it done for us but cannot just jettison all process. Says the combination of not having a Staff person and other Commissioners that he perceived as a focus on riding out near term regulatory and burning the DMR final report has a lot of talk going on in the halls of PUCO about does he work there for us? He’ll move it as fast as he can. Better come up with a short term work around.’”

An indictment to shed light on the full scope of corruption entailed in FirstEnergy’s actions is needed. It’s possible Parker’s delay in indicting Randazzo over bribes long since acknowledged by FirstEnergy and favors that have come into clearer light in civil cases was because he hoped to turn others into cooperating witnesses—or Randazzo into one himself.

Then there’s the unexpected embezzlement charge against Randazzo in the indictment, accusing him of defrauding another client, the Industrial Users-Ohio, a group of big energy customers, of $1,104,598.

David DeVillers, former U.S. Attorney for Southern Ohio under whose leadership the company was first investigated and prosecuted, told cleveland.com’s Jeremy Pelzer, Andrew J. Tobias and Jake Zuckerman that the embezzlement charge might be a “smoke screen,” taking time to sort out. “It could be they dug into this count, which seems to be completely different, and needed to ferret that out to find out what that was all about,” DeVillers told the reporters.

Either way, it is to be hoped that the indictment of Randazzo will finally cause Parker to rescind his effective hold on important PUCO and other state-level investigations into how both the PUCO and its processes, and the legislative process separately, were so distorted and corrupted, so reforms can be made. That’s especially urgent given that unexplained parts of fatally tainted House Bill 6 right now require electricity customers in Ohio to subsidize—to the tune of more than $230 million so far, according to the Ohio Office of Consumers’ Counsel—two money-losing coal plants, one in Indiana. Shinseki said there should be nearly $6 million short on what it needs to teach the next generation.

I urge judges in the case to take the grid under FirstEnergy’s ownership under safe public conservatorship until a reliable, safe, advanced, modern power in a platform akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

So much more needs to be done to make our communities safe and whole from FirstEnergy’s fraud, starting with making sure that the Benton-Carroll-Salem school system where Davis-Besse is located can be made whole. The value of property in the region has gone down 90 percent, which means the school will have to spend nearly $5 million short on what it needs to teach the next generation.

I urge judges in the case to take the grid under FirstEnergy’s ownership under safe public conservatorship until a reliable, safe, advanced, modern power in a platform akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

May we find the wisdom and courage to confront these nuclear challenges head-on to usher in a new era of clean and responsible energy for the consumers and people of northern Ohio who have been licked so royally over the last nearly half century.

CELEBRATING THE 30-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF A PLACE CALLED HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPUT. Mr. Speaker, since the Davis-Besse plant came online in 1997, its corporate leadership has never understated nuclear power or its dangers. It is only the unionized workers that have saved our lives. The plant shares an old Babcock-and-Wilcox design with the Three Mile Island reactor that partially melted down in 1979. Another plant, Davis-Besse, the Rancho Seco plant in Sacramento, California, permanently closed in 1989.

Davis-Besse itself is now nearly 50 years old and has a dismal reputation within the industry and a history of too many close calls. In 1985, the plant suffered a loss of the main and backup supplies of cooling water because of a series of system failures, and this should have been a wake-up call, but it went unheeded.

In 2020 we faced the worst nuclear safety incident since Three Mile Island when a major hole was discovered in Davis-Besse’s reactor head, endangering the lives of millions of Ohioans and the purity of Lake Erie. The plant’s unionized workers again saved us all.

The Davis-Besse nuclear power plant, with its history of safety violations and close calls, is a clear example of how corporate culture can influence the industry around our country never held them accountable.

The fines and penalties imposed on FirstEnergy have done little to deter misconduct. It is time for us to take bold action and provide a solution with a reliable, safe, advanced, modern power in a platform akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I urge judges in the case to take the grid under FirstEnergy’s ownership under safe public conservatorship until a reliable, safe, advanced, modern power in a platform akin to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 30-year anniversary of A Place Called Home, a nonprofit that has served thousands of at-risk youth and families in the South Los Angeles community.

A Place Called Home provides free programs that focus on job readiness and mental health services as well as art and technology. It allows children to explore creativity through their arts programming.

Earlier this year, they hosted the Latinx Theater Festival in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month, where the children helped with ticketing, light, and sound design for the productions.

A Place Called Home aims to increase children’s likelihood of staying in school and graduating, and in the past 30 years, it has supported more than 500 first-generation students in their journey to college.

They serve 2,000 meals to students every week on top of the thousands more they provide to families at home in California’s 37th District. None of this would be possible without their founder, Debrah Constance, and CEO Norayma Cabot, who work tirelessly with the board and staff every day to support my district’s children and families.

I hope you will join me in celebrating this milestone for A Place Called Home, and I look forward to seeing all that they do in the next 30 years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MIKE WATANABE

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mike Watanabe. He passed away last month after 77 years full of life.

Mike began his service to the Los Angeles community when he joined the Asian American Drug Abuse Program as a counselor in 1975. He saw the impact that drug use had on his friends and community in the wake of the Vietnam war and wanted to find a way to advocate for recovery after earning his master’s degree in social work. He became the executive director in 1982 building a family at AADAP and throughout the Los Angeles area. Mike was a part of the Los Angeles County Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Commission for 16 years, chairing the Asian and Pacific Islander Constituent Committee and supporting several other AAPI-focused organizations all aimed at substance abuse recovery.

His support of early Asian-American community organizations left a lasting impact on the success of today’s non-profits and Asian-American services. We are all the better for having been impacted by Mike’s jovial spirit and passion for community service. He will be greatly missed.

Please take a moment to honor the life of Mike Watanabe. My heart is with his wife, Suzanne, and their family during this time.

GOP THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a moment of truth.

Even as Republicans pose a deep threat to our democratic institutions, we must remember the extent on what we do domestically and upon how we support our allies abroad, like Ukraine.

Ukraine will not be able to fend off Russia if the US and Europe and Republicans will be responsible if they refuse to act to counter war criminal Putin’s anti-West, anti-democracy assault.

I guess that makes sense, since the Republican Party has pledged fealty to Donald Trump, a master anarchist who is focused on destroying our institutions, exploding democracy, and distracting and impoverishing the American people. He is someone who just 2 weeks
ago called people vermin. He is using white supremacist code words.

The global stage is watching us because they are all in for Ukraine and democracy, but Republican isolationism has hurt and will continue to destabilize our democracy, weaken our allies, and remove the United States from the global stage. When we leave, someone far more dangerous will take our place and hurt us more.

No more distractions, confabulations, or proclamations. Mr. Speaker, the time to get serious about this country is right now.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Open our eyes dear Lord. Give us sight in the overwhelming darkness that has blinded us to the light of Your will. The shadow of hatred for our brothers and sisters has blinded us to Your command to live and act in love.

Open our eyes and our hearts and purge the animosity from our world where weapons of war and arms of outright prejudice are set in motion by human hands and triggered by the hardness of our hearts.

Cleanse our hearts from every inkling of hostility wherever it dares to take root within us and however it is displayed by us: in our disdain for Jews or Muslims or another person or group that has fallen out of our favor, and even in the insults we too often toss across the political aisle.

Bring us out from the darkness we have created and call us back to our love for You by following Your command to love one another, that once again we would live in Your light.

Shed Your divine light in our lives such that it would cause us to set down our weapons, abandon our hatred, and walk without stumbling, in the way You have revealed to us. In the power of Your name, we pray that You would grant us Your mercy and illumine Your will for us this day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURPHY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING MAJOR JEFFREY HOERNEMANN

Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor U.S. Air Force Major Jeff Hoernemann of Andover, Minnesota. Jeff lost his life last week along with seven other airmen during a routine training mission off the coast of Japan. He was just 32 years old.

Throughout his life, Jeff had a competitive spirit and was uniquely disciplined. A graduate of Andover High School, Jeff broke school and conference records in the indoor 800 meters and the 4 x 800-meter relay.

As a teenager, he won a $15,000 scholarship with an essay describing his careful budgeting to purchase a bike for triathlons.

After competing in cross country and earning a degree in mechanical engineering from North Dakota State University, Jeff entered the Air Force. In 2016, he became a pilot after completing Columbus Air Force Base’s Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training class.

Jeff dedicated his life to service and made the ultimate sacrifice. Today, across the city of Andover, the State of Minnesota, and this country, we honor his life and preserve his memory. Our prayers are with Jeff's wife, Jess; his parents, Thomas and Catherine; and his brother, Jared.

AID FOR ISRAEL AND UKRAINE

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, we are fidelity with a sores. We have 5 legislative days left to aid our allies, Israel and Ukraine.

Each hour we wait makes it harder for our allies to defend freedom and democracy against tyrants and terrorists.

OMB Director Shalanda Young made it clear this week that the past resources we secured for Ukraine have run out.

Speaker JOHNSON said in Florida, Putin won't stop in Ukraine. He will continue to devour territory and undermine democracy until he is stopped.

My Republican colleagues ask what the plan is in Ukraine and Israel. The plan is to win. The plan is to defeat Putin. The plan is to vanquish terrorism generally and Hamas in particular.

Most Members agree on that plan—300 on Ukraine and 400 on Israel. I urge the Speaker to give us the opportunity to act on that consensus now. Freedom demands it.

HONORING GARY PETERSON

Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Gary Peterson, a dedicated leader hailing from the Tri-Cities, who tragically lost his battle with cancer this past month.

It saddens me that rather than announcing his next greatest achievement, I am instead here to mourn his passing.

Gary was known throughout central Washington, the United States Capitol, and the Department of Energy as a fierce advocate for the interests of the Tri-Cities.

His leadership in our communities proved fruitful for decades, sparking both economic development and innovation for the citizens of central Washington.

His advocacy for the Hanford cleanup mission has been the cornerstone of the success of our region, and I am in awe of the impact he has made over the years.

His immense knowledge, wisdom, and understanding of our community’s priorities was matched by so few, and I have no doubt his name will go down in history with the names of people like Sam Volpentest and Bob Ferguson.

Gary’s legacy includes leading advocacy for the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s campus, supporting the advancements of the Hanford cleanup mission, and advocating for the growing local economy at TRIDEC.

He will be known as a loving husband, father, grandfather, and personal friend. He will be missed, but his legacy will continue to live on.

MISS EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA TEEN ALYSON SHARP

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. Miss North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, there she is: Miss Eastern North Carolina Miss Eastern North Carolina Alyson Sharp.

Alyson’s platform promotes agriculture and, more specifically, the advancement of women in agriculture—girls farm, too.

Her love for agriculture has been inspired by one of eastern North Carolina’s legendary farmers, Pender Sharp of Sharp Farms in Wilson, North Carolina. Pender is Alyson’s grandfather. She refers to him as her “Big.”

As Miss Eastern North Carolina Teen, Alyson remains dedicated to community service. She collected and donated food for a food drive to ensure homeless individuals had a good Thanksgiving Day meal.

Currently, she is working with the Wilson Police Department to make Christmas special and to fulfill the wishes of kids across the city. During her pastime, she enjoys hunting and fishing.

Miss Eastern North Carolina Teen is a crown of most special to me as Alyson brings hope for a brighter future.

BEST COMMUNITIES FOR MUSIC EDUCATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 10 school districts across the 15th District who are recognized as “Best Communities for Music Education” and received the SupportMusic Merit Award from the National Association of Music Manufacturers Foundation.

This recognition is given to schools who continue to provide all children with the opportunity to learn and to grow with music.

The award program acknowledges and celebrates innovative schools and districts that have developed a stronger presence for music education on campus and in the lives of the students.


We congratulate these school districts on this recognition.

CELEBRATING GARTH FAGAN

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today I stand to honor Garth Fagan, a Rochester visionary who profoundly influenced the cultural fabric of not only our local community but the entire world.

As we pay tribute to this extraordinary artist, I acknowledge and celebrate the deep connection between Garth Fagan and the people and places enriched by his vision.

Committed to Rochester’s artistic growth, he established the Bottom of the Bucket Dance Theater in 1970, now known simply as Garth Fagan Dance.

Since then, Garth has inspired and nurtured a new generation of talented artists from around the globe. His innovative choreography has earned him accolades, including a Tony award for Broadway’s “The Lion King,” a production masterfully blending culture and creativity, which will remain forever a testament to his artistic brilliance.

Garth Fagan Dance is truly a national treasure. As he transitions away from his leadership role in the dance company, his profound impact will undoubtedly continue to resonate—captivating audiences for generations to come.

IMPACTS OF INFLATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous decisions by Biden hurts the pocketbooks of Americans. He has increased taxes, raised gas prices, and destroyed jobs, made even more obvious as we enter the holiday season of Christmas and Hanukkah.

Bidenomics inflation has overcome hourly raises, reducing the spending power of Americans by $11,343 annually in the two Biden years.

Under Biden, prices for the same Thanksgiving dinner were 25 percent higher in 2023 than in 2019. As Christmas approaches, Americans are challenged.

In a WalletHub survey, more than one in three Americans are foregoing gifts this year due to Bidenflation.

Republicans, led by Speaker Mike Johnson, will continue to fight to reduce inflation and create jobs. Speaker Johnson is correct that we must support the borders of Ukraine and America.

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

It is sadly clear there will be more 9/11 attacks across America imminent, as finally admitted by the FBI.

RECOGNIZING LAURA PENROD

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

Ms. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an incredible educator in southern Nevada, Ms. Laura Penrod, who has been recognized as Nevada’s Teacher of the Year for 2024.

Ms. Penrod currently teaches at Southwest Career and Technical Academy where she opened the special education department and began working and teaching English soon thereafter.

She brings 17 years of teaching experience to help her students not only in the classroom but also after school, advising several extracurricular activities and in her community as a fearless champion of public education.

Ms. Penrod exemplifies what makes our teachers so special—the drive to do good and always be there for our students.

I wish Ms. Penrod the best of luck as she moves on to the National Teacher of the Year competition, and I am deeply grateful for the impact she has on her students and our community.

RECOGNIZING DR. J. WILLIAM MCRBOERTS

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in special recognition of my dear friend, mentor, and former surgical chairman, Dr. J. William McRoberts, known affectionately as “Mac.”

A native of Rochester, Minnesota, he graduated from Princeton University and attended Cornell University School of Medicine where he was elected class president.

After completing his surgical training at the Mayo Clinic, he was stationed as director of urology at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Bremerton, Washington. He continued to serve in the U.S. Navy as a captain in the Reserves for 20 years.

He began his academic career as an assistant professor at the University of Washington, excelling throughout the ranks and becoming chairman of urology in the division of surgery at the University of Kentucky.

As my chairman, Dr. McRoberts taught me a great deal about patient care, endurance, and professionalism. Despite long and oftentimes grueling hours, he kept a great wit and humor about him, challenging us all not only to be better physicians but better humans. He demonstrated that compassion and surgical skill are not mutually exclusive.

Once he retired from academic life in 2001, instead of just enjoying the fruits of his labor, he has served in under-served areas in Kentucky and for the last 3 years in rural eastern North Carolina.

Now, at the age of 90, I am releasing him of his medical obligation to enjoy his life with his wife, Marley; son, Porter; daughter, Jane; and their grandchildren.

My life has been a better one lived because of his professionalism, humor, and friendship.
IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES IN LAHAINA

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has a proud immigrant tradition, with many of us able to trace our roots across the globe. Few places in Hawaii exemplify our diversity more than Lahaina, where nearly a third of the residents are foreign-born. They came from the Philippines, Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and more. They are the backbone of Maui’s economy, working in hotels, restaurants, retail shops, and golf courses. They clean homes and are caregivers for “keiki,” “children,” and “kapuna,” “elders,” alike.

On a day when fire did not discriminate what it took, Lahaina’s immigrant community bore more than its fair share of loss. A quarter of the deceased hailed to the Philippines. Too many lost documents and savings.

Now, immigrants in Lahaina face impossible decisions. They are too scared to seek out the help that they need, and they are afraid to travel or relocate due to their legal status.

They need our help, and we have to meet them where they are through trusted partners so they can focus on healing and rebuilding.

Four generations ago, my family immigrated to Hawaii with the hope and dreams many in our Lahaina ‘ohana,” “family,” have. We can’t forget our roots, and we must meet this moment with the aloha that they would have wanted.

HONORING MICHAEL MORAN

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

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life, sacrifice, and service of Cortez Police Sergeant Michael Moran, a true American hero who laid down his life in service to our great country and his community.

Sergeant Moran was fatally shot during a traffic stop on November 29, providing a tragic end to a life of dedication and service.

Sergeant Moran answered the call to serve our country as a marine for 9 years before joining the Cortez Police Department in 2012. His life was marked with selfless courage and love, always putting others before himself.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Moran was a shining example for all Americans. His passing is an immeasurable loss for us all, and he was the best that Colorado’s Third District had to offer.

My prayers go out to his family, his loved ones, and the community of Cortez. I pray for God’s surrounding presence to surround them, comfort them, and heal them in this time of mourning.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Moran for his selfless service.

HIGHLIGHTING LACK OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES IN RURAL AMERICA

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

Ms. SALINAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the lack of mental health services in rural America.

As facilities close their doors and providers leave town, many people in our rural communities are forced to travel for miles to get care or forgo care altogether. That is harmful and unfair, which is why I introduced a bipartisan bill to expand access to telehealth services in rural areas.

This legislation will specifically help folks suffering from farming, fishing, and forestry. These industries are critical to our economy and way of life in my district. In fact, Oregon has the second-largest number of Triple-F workers per capita in the entire country. These jobs can also be very stressful, and few seek help due to stigma.

Improving telehealth access will take away that stigma, save folks time and resources, and get more Oregonians the help they need when they need it.

Congress has left rural America behind for far too long. It is time we change that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this very important bill.

CELEBRATING DONALD LEWIS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, FLETC, chief financial officer, Donald Lewis, who is retiring after 40 years of Federal service.

Mr. Lewis started his Federal career when he was just a student back in 1983 as an audit assistant for the Federal Junior Fellowship Program at Kings Bay Naval Base in Georgia. From there, he was able to move up into the procurement career field by taking on different positions with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Strategic Weapons Facilities.

In 2004, Donald joined FLETC and worked in different positions before becoming the current assistant director and chief financial officer. As assistant director and chief financial officer, he provides strategic oversight and executive oversight of FLETC business activities, which include executing and overseeing an annual budget of over $600 million.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Lewis on his remarkable achievements and on his upcoming retirement. His years of distinguished service are extremely admirable.

CHOICE IN AUTOMOBILE RETAIL SALES ACT OF 2023

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 906, I call up the bill (H.R. 4468) to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on May 5, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 29818).

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AGAINST FINALIZING, IMPLEMENTING, OR ENFORCING A PROPOSED RULE WITH RESPECT TO EMISSIONS FROM VEHICLES.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled “Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on May 5, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 29818).
It is troubling that this administration, in a faltering economy, would try to replace reliable, available, functional, and affordable transportation for hardworking Americans with something far less reliable, far less available, far less functional, and far less affordable.

Under EPA’s recent tailpipe proposal, two-thirds of all new cars being sold in America must be electric-powered vehicles by 2032. That is only 8 years from now.

The American people did not ask for this. While the average price of an EV reportedly fell 22.4 percent in the last year in response to lack of demand and government subsidies, they are still far more expensive than a liquid fuel vehicle.

There are also hidden costs: $500 extra annually for insurance; at least $4,000 for battery replacement, and that is the bottom: $1,200 to $2,500 for home charging equipment. That is after you pay to rewire your home.

Range anxiety is still a real concern. EVs need more frequent and much longer stops for charges. The average EV gets about 234 miles per charge compared to 403 miles with a gas fill-up. Plus, cold weather, battery size, and towing weight can shrink battery range significantly.

Any way you look at it, working-class Americans who need reliable and affordable transportation would take a hit from a mandate eliminating their options.

This bill protects our constituents, allowing them to buy the automobile that makes the most sense for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 4468, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. Instead of working with us on legislation to lower costs for consumers, protect public health, drive innovation, and grow the economy, the Republican majority is once again bringing an anti-clean vehicle bill to the floor as part of their politics over people agenda.

H.R. 4468 would block the Environmental Protection Agency from finalizing its proposed light- and medium-duty vehicle rule. It would also block the Agency from finalizing any future standard to cut greenhouse gas pollution from cars. This bill would simply prevent the EPA from doing its job.

House Republicans are trying to legislate away years of innovation in cleaner transportation to put polluters over people agenda.

The Clean Air Act is clear. Mr. Speaker. EPA has the authority and obligation to protect American communities from air pollution that would cause harm to public health and welfare. That includes pollution from the transportation sector, the single-largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollution in the United States.

This pollution affects more than 100 million Americans who live in counties with unhealthy air, and air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths each year.

The EPA’s proposed emissions standards for heavy-duty trucks and light-duty trucks is intended to tackle this pollution head-on. The result: The new rule is projected to deliver $1 trillion in net public health benefits.

Cleaner cars are also a win for consumers who can expect to save an average of $12,000 in fuel and maintenance costs over the lifetime of a light-duty vehicle once EPA standards are in effect.

I will stress that EPA’s proposal is achievable. It will save consumers money and bolster jobs and our economy by promoting American manufacturing. It will reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

With this bill, House Republicans are denying the American people all of these benefits.

The bill is also a direct assault on our domestic auto industry. Decades of regulations and manufacturing have made the U.S. the global leader on clean transportation. American automakers. The bill inappropriately eliminates this leadership.

H.R. 4468 would stifle this innovation and cause detrimental uncertainty for American automakers. The bill includes vague language that will prevent the EPA from ever finalizing regulations for any type of motor vehicle. The bill would lock auto manufacturers in today’s technology in perpetuity, chilling potential advancements in new hybrids, flex fuel, fuel cell, and even internal combustion engines.

None of this makes any sense, Mr. Speaker. This extreme bill would hurt our ability to harness new technologies, which would only weaken our ability to compete with China.

With this legislation, Republicans are telling the American industry to stand down to China in a global challenge. That is just wrong. Rather than ceding that role to China, House Democrats are delivering real solutions with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws are investing in America’s ability to beat our economic competitors, including China, ensuring the United States is the global leader on clean transportation.

H.R. 4468 would seriously hamper the EPA’s ability to address the worsening pollution in America’s communities from air pollution that would cause harm to public health and welfare. That includes pollution from the transportation sector, the single-largest contributor of greenhouse gas emissions and other dangerous air pollution in the United States.
climate crisis and air pollution for vehicles. It would also limit consumer choice, stifle innovation, create uncertainty for American automakers, hurt American global leadership, weaken our ability to compete with China, and deny the American public health and environmental benefits of EPA’s proposed standards.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, this bill does not prevent the EPA from finalizing a rule. It only tells the EPA that it cannot mandate a specific technology and prevents the EPA from issuing rules that limit a vehicle’s availability based on engine type.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the chair of the full committee.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden’s rush-to-green agenda is failing. Just last week, nearly 4,000 dealers across this country sent a letter to President Biden urging him to stop his EV mandates. They said demand isn’t there and the EVs are just sitting on their lots.

The administration has allocated billions for EV charging, yet not a single charger has come online as a result. All of this failed central planning is shipping our future and jobs to China. This is not the future Americans want or deserve.

For more than a century, affordable transportation has helped drive America’s economic success. Our cars have allowed people all across this nation and around the world to increase our mobility and raise our standard of living.

H.R. 4468 ensures that we can keep building on this legacy of American leadership and prosperity. Let’s stop President Biden. He wants us all driving electric. But before we go there, what is the guarantee? Right now, we don’t have a plan for the grid, how we’re going to store the energy, or how we’re going to charge our vehicles. And what we don’t have is a hard docking in the long run.

H.R. 4468 requires that the vehicles be at least 30% more efficient than today’s cars. It is a major emitter of other harmful air pollution. It should not surprise anyone that the EPA is working to fulfill its obligations to protect Americans from harmful air pollution.

This bill prejudices the outcome of that process and will stifle technological innovation. Despite the fact that the process will save lives, save consumers money, and bolster American manufacturing.

More and more Americans are choosing to go electric. They realize that EVs are not only good for the environment but also allow major consumer savings over the life of the vehicle.

Thanks in large part to the incentives included in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, even more of these vehicles and their components will be made here in America.

The legislation before us will undermine the tens of billions of dollars of planned investments to develop and produce American-made clean vehicle technologies by injecting uncertainty into these standards.

For over 100 years, America has been the greatest auto manufacturing nation in the world. If we want to continue to retain that title, we need to embrace the changes that are occurring in the sector. That means supporting the regulatory policies and incentives that would drive us forward to a cleaner and healthier future.

Unfortunately, this bill will stifle America’s new energy revolution before we even seriously get into the race with China and dozens of other foreign competitors.

For the sake of promoting American innovation and to address our pollution challenges and supporting our long-term national economic competitiveness, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Put it in “D” to go forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the author of the bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or the CARS Act.

In April, the Biden administration’s EPA opposed a rule setting light- and medium-duty tailpipe emissions standards that would force two-thirds of new light- and medium-duty vehicles sold in 2032 to be electric.

There is no hiding that the proposed rule is an electric vehicle mandate. Not only does this EV mandate display breathtaking government overreach into the auto industry, but it is also unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic for American consumers.

EVs are $13,000 more expensive than the average, gas-fueled vehicle. Repairs to an EV cost $2,300 more on average, leading to higher insurance costs, over $500 annually.

The proposed standards are also unattainable. Our grid cannot handle the power load that is required, plus most of the country lacks the charging infrastructure needed for the mandate.

We also don’t have access to all the critical minerals to produce the vehicles or the capacity to mine them for use in batteries. China controls most critical mineral mines. China has 78 percent of the world’s cell manufacturing capacity for EV batteries.

Have we already forgotten the disastrous impacts of our dependence on China for our supply chain? I have yet to hear a constituent say we need our supply chains to be more reliant on China.

Opponents of the CARS Act argue that EVs are growing in popularity and prices are dropping. If that is the case, why is the mandate necessary? Just last week, nearly 4,000 car dealers sent a letter to the administration pleading with them to pump the brakes on the proposed rule, citing lack of demand.

The range of EVs is another concern. Currently, only one charger could even get me across my district. EVs have almost 80 percent more issues and are less reliable than other vehicles.

Let me be clear: I am not against EVs. I am against EV mandates. A single-battery electric car requires the mining of hundreds of thousands of pounds of minerals. Those minerals are then refined using energy from China’s coal plants. Ironically, an EV mandate is not a silver bullet to reduce global emissions.

Sadly, the biggest loser for this mandate may be the American autoworker, since significantly less labor is required to assemble EVs. The future of those working at engine plants, like the one in my district, are now in peril, too. The administration should side with consumers and innovators, not pick winners and losers.

EVs will play a significant role in the future of the industry, but so should the industry itself. We can become more functional, reliable, affordable, and chosen by the consumer.

Madam Speaker, let’s allow consumers to have access to affordable and reliable cars, encourage American innovation, and set us up to prevail over China.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, a bill that would undermine the Environmental Protection Agency’s ability to prohibit the EPA from implementing emissions regulations and their ability to protect our air quality and our climate.

I thank our ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, and, of course, my great colleague, Congresswoman DINGELL, from the State of Michigan.

The auto industry relies on the EPA and their emissions standards to successfully compete. When the GOP shut down the Federal Government in 2018, our automakers could not roll new automobiles off the line because they...
needed the EPA to do the emissions testing.

This is dangerous legislation, particularly because the EPA serves as a critical partner to our automakers during this very transformative time.

Not only does H.R. 4468 jeopardize public health and the environment, but it hurts our economy and global competitiveness.

Let us not cede technology to China. Let us create, develop and manufacture it here in the United States of America.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House permits it, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would strike the language that blocks EPA regulations based on the limited availability of new motor vehicles. My amendment would restore the EPA's authority and responsibility to set science-based standards that protect our health and climate while supporting American innovation and leadership in the automotive and manufacturing sector.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Bechtel). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, my amendment would ensure the EPA can continue to drive progress in reducing vehicle emissions and advancing clean transportation technology.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Clyde), the co-lead for this bill.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act, that I proudly co-lead with Representative Walberg.

This important legislation would prohibit the Biden administration's EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its radical proposed rule to eliminate electric-powered vehicles. Additionally, the CARS Act would restrict the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to promulgate similar rules moving forward.

In April, President Biden's EPA proposed this radical rule that would set emission standards so high for light- and medium-duty vehicles that automakers would be required to produce a higher percentage of electric vehicles just to comply. This is a de facto electric vehicle mandate on the American people. With this rule's implementation, the EPA projects that EVs could account for as much as 67 percent of new vehicle sales by 2023, as compared to electric vehicle sales of only 6 percent last year.

From assaulting the American people's Second Amendment liberties to the online censoring of free speech, the Biden administration is routinely abusing its power in order to further control Americans' everyday lives. With this new EPA rule, it is very clear that President Biden is now coming for our combustion engine car keys in his war against our way of life.

Restricting consumer choice in the name of the left's Green New Deal garbage agenda represents an illegitimate power grab that hardworking Americans simply cannot afford.

One thing is clear. The American people already burdened by soaring energy prices and record-high inflation cannot be further burdened by this disastrous EV mandate.

I urge my colleagues to support the CARS Act, our commonsense legislation that would help save the American energy sector. It would protect both American consumers and auto manufacturers, and it would stop Biden's authoritarian government overreach in its tracks.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. Schakowsky), the ranking member of our Commerce and Consumer Protection Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, it is known that the transportation sector is responsible for the single largest greenhouse gas emissions. I choose not to contribute to that. I am the proud owner of a Chevy Volt, which is a very affordable, all-electric vehicle—not one of the expensive ones that the Republicans like to talk about. It has zero emissions from the pipe. It is a beautiful little car that most families could afford.

I would say that the legislation that has been proposed actually takes choice away from Americans because it says that the EPA will no longer have the authority to regulate the emissions that are allowed. This will save lives.

This legislation that has been proposed is absolutely dangerous. What we know is that if the EPA can conduct its mission, then we would see 7 billion tons of greenhouse gases that would not be emitted and lives would be saved.

This legislation is so important. The legislation that Republicans have proposed would take away the right of Americans to have a safe environment and health. We say that this legislation is going in absolutely the wrong direction. We want to be sure that no one will vote for it. We will protect the lives of Americans, the right of the American people to be represented by the Environmental Protection Agency, and that we will have a better world to live in. That should be the right that is given to Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have tremendous respect for my colleague that just spoke, but I have to say that this idea that electric vehicles are emission-free is totally unfounded.

In fact, it is totally false. All you have to do is look at where the raw materials come from. Look at how China produces those materials. There are lots of emissions. If the argument is legitimate that we are going to saves lives here, we are going to cost lives over there because they are not concerned about the climate. They are not concerned with the environment, they are not concerned about the people that they use—slave labor in many countries—try to harvest the materials that make these electric vehicles in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Bucshon).

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I support EVs, but this administration continues to push a rush-to-green agenda that prioritizes government mandates over the American people.

The American people have spoken through their shopping habits. EVs sit unsold on lots nearly twice as long as internal combustion engine vehicles due to a lack of charging infrastructure and high costs. On average, EVs cost $16,000 more than internal combustion engine vehicles.

We want to reduce emissions, but EVs are not the solution that the administration says they are. The amount of raw materials in one long-range battery EV could instead be used to make 90 hybrid electric vehicles. The overall carbon reduction of those 90 hybrids over their lifetimes is 37 times as much as a single battery EV. Where are the raw materials developed? Mostly in China.

Should we be dependent on them? Preserving consumer choice is critical to maintaining competition in the automotive markets and ensuring access to reliable and affordable cars for all Americans.

You cannot force Americans to buy cars they do not want any more than you can force energy transitions that cannot be accomplished.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cárdenas).

Mr. Cárdenas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468. I believe the gentlewoman from Michigan has made a powerful argument, but not surprised to see my Republican colleagues bring yet another bill to the floor that puts polluters over people.
Scientists continue to warn us that the world is on its way to getting warmer and warmer and increasing global warming temperatures. If we want to avoid the worst climate changes and the worst disasters, we must reduce our air pollution.

What we must know is that the transportation sector is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, which would limit the Environmental Protection Agency’s ability to carry out its authority to improve transportation.

Yet, today’s bill would kill our chance of getting on the right track and put us on the wrong track. Poor air quality and ever-worsening climate disasters are increasing. Our constituents are already facing these major problems all over our country.

More than 45 million Americans, including many of my constituents, live within 300 feet of major roadways or corridors that contribute directly to negative health effects like asthma, cardiovascular disease, and premature death.

That is right, air pollution is a matter of life and death. Our work here in Congress will determine how liveable our roadways are, whether our neighborhoods will be liveable or not for generations to come.

Today, my Republican colleagues have chosen to abandon a healthy and prosperous future for Americans. Republicans choose Big Oil companies and their profits over people. This is reckless, and I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 4468.

Madam Speaker, I wasn’t here when my Republican colleagues were against Social Security, against Medicare, and now they are against making sure that we have a liveable planet. Please vote “no” on H.R. 4468.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we actually agree on some things with our Democrat colleagues. We agree that we ought to keep the environment clean: the air, water, and land. But throwing money at it, like my Democrat colleagues are trying to do, is not the answer to the problem.

This rule would result in lost middle-class jobs in the United States because we can’t get new facilities and infrastructure even permitted to do these things under the current administration. Until that happens, America will be heavily reliant on China.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, do we live in Communist China? Really, do we live in Communist China? I can’t believe that the Biden administration first wants to ban gas stoves—we had to do legislation to prevent that. Now, they want to ban 67 percent of the manufacturing of regular gas-powered cars by 2032. That is insane.

President Biden and my Democratic colleagues claim they are for the middle class. They always say: We are for the middle class. Well, no, they are not because who can afford these electric cars?

It is the people with a bunch of money. That is who can afford it. Not the middle class.

I am in strong support of this bill to prohibit and prevent this radical regulation against common Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I had to come down to the floor to speak out strongly against the Republican’s pro-China bill.

The Republican Party wants to take us backwards. They want to raise costs on American families, and, in doing so, a lot of people ask why? Why would you attack American auto companies and American jobs? Why would you work against the best interests of the American people, putting money back into their pockets?

It has become clear to me, serving here, especially this Congress this year, that my good friends on the GOP side of the aisle are not working for the country, but to the detriment of the people that we represent back home.

American workers and automakers have made huge innovations in the cars and trucks that we drive. Now, electric vehicles are being built in America, rather than China and other parts of the world, are more energy efficient, they are fun to drive, and that is why American demand for EVs has jumped 350 percent over the past 2 years alone.

U.S. electric vehicles have now zipped past a major milestone. There have been 1 million battery electric vehicles sold in a single year. This year’s sales suggest that a rising number of consumers are making that jump.

Why the change? Because you don’t have the maintenance costs and you don’t have to stop at the gas station. We have a lot of work to do on electric vehicle charging.

It has been the Clean Air Act that has helped American innovators and automakers and workers make our cars more fuel efficient over time. Now, with the historic Inflation Reduction Act passed by a Democratic-led Congress, Speaker, under my leadership, we are bringing those manufacturers and the batteries and the assembly here in America.

It has been announced there is $150 billion in investments across nearly 400 new facilities in U.S. electric vehicle and battery manufacturing in Ohio, in South Carolina, mostly in these red districts. This is a Made in America moment, and we have to reject these kinds of take-us-backward attempts offered by the grand oil party, the GOP.

Why did they do this?

Because they are so tied to fossil fuels and gas and oil that they cannot see what lies ahead of us. That means investing in America for a change. That means having these vehicles manufactured here in America and not being worried about China eating our lunch.

They are the ones that are trying to flood the EU market. Do you think our European allies want to buy Chinese-made vehicles?

No, they want to buy American-made vehicles because they are our allies. Please vote against this pro-China GOP bill.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, again, I agree, vote America. I urge my Democrat colleagues to remember that fossil fuels have raised more people around this planet across the globe out of poverty than any other fuel source on the planet, and America knows how to do that best.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague’s legislation, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

I thank my colleague, Congressman WALBERG, for leading on this important legislation. After 3 years, it has become abundantly clear that the administration’s approach is bad for my Hoosiers and bad for the Nation.

You can’t create demand by forcing supply. EVs continue to pile up on dealer lots across the country and in my district.

Almost daily, we hear of auto manufacturers that are tempering investor expectations because of underwhelming sales. The money is leaving.

Simply put, people are not buying EVs.

EPA’s aggressive rule is a de facto mandate on Hoosiers to switch to EVs.

This legislation would curb EPA’s electrification-or-nothing approach and allow consumers to choose the best type of vehicle that fits the needs of their family.

As I have repeatedly stated, this administration is fundamentally ignoring the reality of energy distribution.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. EVs may make sense for densely populated areas, but the lack of domestic and insufficient towing capabilities do not meet the needs of rural Indiana’s Sixth District.

The CARS Act will begin to bring sensible policy back to the forefront and allow American innovation to lead the way to the next generation of transportation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), who is a member of our committee.
Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, last week, the Department of Energy’s Geothermal Technologies Office released the most comprehensive analysis to date, quantifying the domestic lithium resources in the Salton Sea region of Imperial Valley, also known as Lithium Valley, in the United States. Today, that is a lot of lithium and a lot of electric vehicles, and that will lower the cost of electric vehicles for everyone in our Nation. Lithium Valley is a great example of how domestic solutions exist for our domestic and global supply chains, and my Republican colleagues should be as excited about this analysis as I am. Given their critical mineral supply chain concerns, I would think this is welcome news. However, instead of focusing our efforts on how to best leverage this report to further our domestic lithium production, we are here debating a bill that will do the exact opposite and harm our domestic supply chain efforts.

H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, would prohibit the EPA from finalizing their proposed rule on multipollutant emissions standards, drastically cutting into the development and production of domestic technological innovations, such as electric vehicles and battery manufacturing, that our Nation needs.

Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill in its entirety. In addition to slowing down our country’s ability to compete with China on electric vehicles in the global market, it is a direct attack on our Nation’s ability to curb vehicle emissions and help rural and marginalized communities in our own districts suffering from the highest pollution.

My home State of California and, in particular, my district, California’s 25th, have significant air pollution challenges. As a physician, I have seen the public health impacts of air pollution firsthand. These consequences are serious and have very real bad effects on the lives of my constituents. From having to skip work to deal with air pollution, to associated health challenges to spending money on unexpected healthcare costs, my constituents are experiencing the negative impacts of air pollution every day.

Recently, the American Thoracic Society released its latest “Health of the Air” report, which estimated that we can prevent over 21,000 deaths by cleaning up our air, and a major step in doing so is by reducing vehicle emissions, which this bill will not do.

What we should be doing is following California’s lead by taking concrete steps to reduce dangerous air pollution from transportation modalities. Instead, this bill specifically punishes California for its efforts, and that is unacceptable.

California has chosen to make the health of Californians a priority. This bill should do the same for all Americans, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this environmentally unfriendly and disastrous polluter-over-people bill.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we are seeing President Biden put Green New Deal priorities ahead of Pennsylvania families. By proposing to eliminate gas-powered cars from our roads, the Biden administration is attempting to fundamentally change how Americans drive.

The proposed rule from the EPA assumes that battery electric vehicles will make up 60 percent of new cars in 2030 and almost two-thirds by 2032. The basic facts show us that this assumption is simply wrong and that attempting to ban the sale of internal combustion engine cars, internal combustion engine trucks, and internal combustion engine SUVs that families in Pennsylvania rely on is dangerous.

This legislation is a vital part of stopping the Biden administration’s attempt to manipulate our auto industry. What scares me the most is this is going to enable China to do anything? I am not. I will not cede American leadership to anyone. We cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we are the ones who put the world on wheels.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to invest in our EV transition so we don’t lose to China.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and put a stop to President Biden’s reckless use of agency rulemaking.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), who is a member of our committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I love my colleagues on the other side, but it is just disappointing that, yet again, another Republican messaging bill is coming to the floor intentionally to mislead and harm the American people.

Even the United Auto Workers, who my colleagues say they are helping, say that this bill seeks to inject American revenue to prop up EVs to be as a wedge issue in the culture war.

I remind my colleagues, some of whom are young while some of us are seasoned, that it was years ago when gas prices went up and consumers went for smaller cars. Japanese carmakers were prepared, and our domestic auto industry was flatfooted. We weren’t ready to build small cars, and we took a beating.

We cannot make that mistake again. We need to be ready to innovate, build these electric vehicles now, and do so in a competitive way.

This bill is a blatant attack on the EPA and on our ability to, and how we will and must, compete in a global market. It prevents the EPA from finalizing recently proposed new standards for light- and medium-duty vehicles, which will save consumers up to $12,000 over the lifetime of their vehicles. It will also reduce fine particle pollution that not only harms our environment but leads to increased asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, and premature death.

To be really clear, EPA is not imposing an electric vehicle mandate. EPA’s job is to help China do anything? I am not. I will not cede American leadership to anyone. We cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we are the ones who put the world on wheels.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to invest in our EV transition so we don’t lose to China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and put a stop to President Biden’s reckless use of agency rulemaking.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), who is a member of our committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act. I love my colleagues on the other side, but it is just disappointing that, yet again, another Republican messaging bill is coming to the floor intentionally to mislead and harm the American people.

Even the United Auto Workers, who my colleagues say they are helping, say that this bill seeks to inject American revenue to prop up EVs to be as a wedge issue in the culture war.

I remind my colleagues, some of whom are young while some of us are seasoned, that it was years ago when gas prices went up and consumers went for smaller cars. Japanese carmakers were prepared, and our domestic auto industry was flatfooted. We weren’t ready to build small cars, and we took a beating.

We cannot make that mistake again. We need to be ready to innovate, build these electric vehicles now, and do so in a competitive way.

This bill is a blatant attack on the EPA and on our ability to, and how we will and must, compete in a global market. It prevents the EPA from finalizing recently proposed new standards for light- and medium-duty vehicles, which will save consumers up to $12,000 over the lifetime of their vehicles. It will also reduce fine particle pollution that not only harms our environment but leads to increased asthma attacks, heart attacks, strokes, lung cancer, and premature death.

To be really clear, EPA is not imposing an electric vehicle mandate. EPA’s job is to help China do anything? I am not. I will not cede American leadership to anyone. We cannot let future mobility be dictated to us by foreign competitors when we are the ones who put the world on wheels.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to invest in our EV transition so we don’t lose to China.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have talked to those who are afraid. The dealers aren’t opposed to EV vehicles. There is a rulemaking, and the rulemaking needs to take their input into consideration.

I am a car girl, I was born one, raised one worked in it, and my district depends on it.

Let’s get serious. We need to get to work, and blocking our domestic auto
industry from innovating is no way to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WEBER.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this crazy push to make EVs the only choice for U.S. car buyers without first building out our domestic supply chains for critical minerals is a recipe for dependence on China and, by extension, defaulting to China’s filthy environmental practices.

 Aren’t we already too beholden to China? It really stinks, but, yes, we are.

Moreover, China’s EV companies have announced significant investments to manufacture EVs in Mexico, presumably to gain access to the North American car market.

Why is the Biden White House hell-bent on shoving their EV mandates down our throats?

China is not our friend, Mr. Speaker, and unlike China’s treatment of their very own citizens, we should not be dictating to Americans what they can or cannot drive. In America, we let consumers choose the cars they drive. It is that simple. Even one of our speakers over there said that she chose to drive an EV.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468. This legislation is misguided and will take us backward in combating climate change and air pollution.

If I may offer some brief history from my home State, for much of the mid-20th century, California was plagued by smog. Thankfully, the Clean Air Act allowed California to establish stronger vehicle emission standards than those at the Federal level. Standards like those in my home State empowered the auto industry to produce better, cleaner cars, which expanded American manufacturing and reduced our reliance on foreign oil.

These standards were a win for consumers, for our domestic auto industry, and for meeting our air quality and climate goals. However, H.R. 4468 would erase the decades of progress we have made by blocking EPA from reducing air and climate pollution.

In fact, the only party that would benefit from rolling back EPA’s efforts to slash air pollution is the fossil fuel industry.

This bill isn’t based in science, and it fails to recognize the climate impacts our constituents are already feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Mr. Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act, or CARS Act.

The American people shouldn’t be told by unelected bureaucrats which car best suits their needs and the needs of their families, but the Biden administration is seeking to do so through some backdoor policymaking aimed at taking gas-powered engines off the market.

Let’s be clear: This is not about being anti-electric vehicle. This is about being pro-consumer choice. Demand should be driven by consumer preferences and budgets.

Let’s look at the facts. According to a report from the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, gasoline-powered cars and trucks represented 93 percent of all new vehicle sales in 2022. According to Congressional Budget Office projections, electric vehicles will account for only 30 to 56 percent of new car sales by 2032.

Even with the outrageous incentives for electric vehicles that are being subsidized by taxpayers, which are included in Biden’s so-called Inflation Reduction Act, we will fall well short of EPA’s goal of two-thirds of new car sales being electric vehicles.

No matter how much the government floods the market with requirements that squeeze out internal combustion engines and require electric vehicles, if consumers don’t want to buy the cars, then they should not be forced to do so.

The CARS Act will stop the EPA’s current light- and medium-duty vehicle regulations and, instead, allow consumers and the market to determine the cars and technology needed and save billions in taxpayer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill and consumer choice.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4468, House Republican’s latest attempt to undermine climate change action taken by the Biden administration and dismiss the high risks presented by air pollution for communities like mine.

My district falls within the South Coast Air Basin, which has the worst air pollution in the entire country. Inland Empire residents have higher levels of cardiovascular disease, childhood asthma, and other respiratory diseases compared to the national average as a result.

The EPA’s proposed rule, which this bill would inhibit, reduces car emissions, drives innovation of clean technologies, and improves public health in my district and across the country.

My constituents deserve to breathe clean air and live healthy lives. We should all support EPA’s efforts to address health disparities and combat climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my friend, colleague, and neighbor.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the CARS Act.

President Biden has made it clear since day one that he will use the full weight and power of his office to push a radical climate agenda at the expense of consumer choice and American energy security.

His rush-to-green agenda, drawn up and enforced by Washington bureaucrats, pushes for a one-size-fits-all approach to vehicle purchases.

The Biden administration’s standards would mandate that two-thirds of all new vehicles sold by 2032 be electric. The standards strong-arm manufacturers into building cars that simply do not reflect market demand.

In fact, last month nearly 4,000 car dealers from all 50 States joined a letter to President Biden urging him to slow down the EPA’s proposed rule.

Just last week, Consumer Reports released a survey showing that electric vehicles proved far less reliable than internal combustion engine counterparts.

The survey found that EV model years 2021 through 2023 encountered nearly 80 percent more problems compared to the conventional vehicles. It is no wonder Ford and GM recently announced they are cutting back investments in EV production and reassessing their EV production goals for the first half of 2024.

The American people just aren’t buying them.

Furthermore, the EPA’s rule, if implemented, will increase the strain on our electric grid at a time when misguided State and Federal energy policies are already driving power plants to retirement.

With the passage of this legislation today, we can reaffirm our support of the free market and consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of the CARES Act today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the California Air Resources Board having been a Republican appointee by Governor Pete Wilson and having served two Republican and one Democratic Governor, I have seen the modeling firsthand to know the importance of reducing our transportation emissions. It is through this lens that I strongly oppose H.R. 4468.

This bill would not only prevent the EPA from implementing its newest and strongest emission standards, but it would also block EPA from finalizing vehicle emission standards that indirectly result in the phasing out of any specific electric technology, which could deal a fatal blow to innovation and the deployment of alternative fuel energies, including electric vehicles.
EPA’s proposed standards that this bill would eliminate, reduces 7.3 billion metric tons of carbon pollution and 15,000 tons of particulate matter pollution, which would provide between $83 and $230 billion in health benefits to Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill and partisan efforts to thwart EV development and hinder emissions reductions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill because American consumers are directly impacted by the cost of vehicles.

Unfortunately, the EPA is trying to force Americans into only being able to pick from some of the most expensive vehicles on the market—electric vehicles.

The Energy and Commerce Committee received testimony in April that the average price of an EV is $13,000 more than the average price of an internal combustion engine vehicle.

Detroit News Editorial Board reported last week that the new average EV list price was 24 percent higher than the gasoline vehicle last month, according to CarGurus.

In addition, insurance for an EV is also $44 more expensive per month versus $528 more expensive per year than insurance for gas-powered cars.

EVs are 50 percent more expensive to insure than gasoline vehicles, according to Forbes.

The price of a vehicle is incredibly important to my constituents and those of my colleagues because access to a car is tied to improved economic outcomes for low-income households.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill to preserve affordable vehicle choices for Americans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. McCLELLAN).

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4468. I have listened as the party that is actively trying to strip away America’s personal freedoms and rights is disguising its antisience, antclimate legislation as protecting choice and personal freedom. That is rich.

House Republicans are putting pollutants over people, yet again prioritizing special interests over the health and well-being of Americans.

This deeply harmful bill would undermine the EPA’s authority to finalize proposed emission standards and prevent the agency from taking future action to protect the public from dangerous air pollution.

Their opposition to the rule has very real impacts for our historically marginalized, environmental justice communities, most often low-income communities of color, many of which I represent, who live near the roadways.

We know greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants can cause a host of adverse public health impacts, including higher rates of cancer, respiratory illness, and preterm births, which is why we cannot stand by while House Republicans work to curtail EPA’s authority.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this irresponsible bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is forcing electric vehicles upon Americans by using a tailpipe emission rules designed to phase out vehicles with internal combustion engines.

In so doing, the EPA imposes an unwise restrictive policy and eliminates consumer choice.

The Clean Air Act directs the EPA to reduce pollutant emissions from vehicles themselves; however, electric vehicles are separate products.

They are not emission-controlled devices like catalytic converters in combustion engine cars.

By setting emission standards at a stringent rate, the EPA is essentially mandating production of a different product to comply with tailpipe standards.

This goes beyond existing authority and tries to circumvent congressional powers, and that is illegal.

Instead of rippling away consumer choice, the EPA should do its job and stop enforcing irrelevant rules to meet political objectives. Those in favor of the EPA’s rules here use the term “sound science.” Well, cutting off vehicle choices that have shown tremendous improvements in efficiency with less emissions is denying scientific gains.

What would actually help Americans is driving lower fuel prices through domestic production with reliable base-load power sources like nuclear, hydro, geothermal, natural gas, and clean burning coal.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automotive Retail Sales Act.

A few months ago, the EPA proposed a new rule that would effectively require the vast majority of automobiles sold in the United States to be electric within just a few years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against electric vehicles but I feel very strongly that American families should be empowered to choose the vehicle that best meets their needs rather than having their government make that decision for them.

Mr. Speaker, I represent over 100,000 people who commute from my rural California district back and forth into Los Angeles every single day. For those people, an electric vehicle is not only unaffordable, it is also impractical.

Preserving their ability to make their own choices on this issue is also preserves the market forces that incentivize manufacturers to continue to lower the cost of electric vehicles and increase their quality.

Mr. Speaker, that is good not only for families, but also for the environment. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).
Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Retail Sales Act.

The out-of-touch government dictated EV mandates pushed by this administration are an attack on our way of life in northern Minnesota and across this country.

Many of my constituents not only can’t afford an EV, they don’t want to purchase an EV because they are not compatible with our daily lives. How are we supposed to reliably drive an EV when it’s the potential to lose 50 percent of its range in Minnesota’s subzero temperatures?

Let’s not forget that the critical minerals used to make these EVs are sourced from Chinese Communist Party-controlled mines in places like the Congo and Indonesia—mines that have zero environmental standards, mines that have zero labor standards, and mines that use child slave labor.

Thanks to this administration’s refusal to support responsible, domestic mining, their EV mandate will only increase our reliance on the Chinese Communist Party for critical minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind you and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that most copper nickel find is in northern Minnesota, the Duluth Complex—95 percent of our nickel reserve, over 88 percent of our cobalt, and a third of our copper and other platinum group metals that help make electric vehicles—and this administration just pulled the leases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 4468.

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 Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), an auto dealer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4468, and in full disclosure, I am a car dealer. I am, frankly, the expert in the room.

This legislation would stop the EPA from implementing a rule that is an attack on hardworking Americans and, if implemented, would decimate small businesses and wreak havoc on the pocketbooks of families.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and owner and operator and expert in car dealerships in Texas for over 52 years, I have seen firsthand the impact that overregulation can have on small businesses. Competition drives my industry, not government innovations. By the way, no one wants to buy an EV vehicle.

We are in a country of competition, of risk, and the Federal Government should not be in the car business. We must allow individuals to choose the vehicle that best suits their needs, not the government or Joe Biden.

The EPA’s proposed rule would have heightened impact on hardworking American families with an estimated increase in costs from maintenance to interest costs to lack of equity. It is clear President Biden’s EPA are out of touch with the American people by ignoring out-of-control inflation while pushing a green energy bailout.

The customer is getting hammered again and your local car dealer is getting hammered again. The proposed rule would also increase our dependency on China, something the administration seems determined to ensure happens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and Main Street America and vote for H.R. 4468.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LAMAALFA), my friend and colleague, to close.

Mr. LAMAALFA. Mr. Speaker, what it really boils down to is choice for Americans, affordable choices. Just because we want to be part of the Climate Deja Vu here, constantly crying about climate change doesn’t mean it is going to be good for Americans.

These mandates, for example, on trucks will add $6,000 pounds of weight that is no longer part of the cargo capacity for trucks. On automobiles, it is adding about $13,000 to the price of a car. 

Little credit has been given for how efficient and clean internal combustion engines run. Most of these engines are a big CO2 scam. I remind you; CO2 is only 0.04 percent of our atmosphere.

Let’s go back in the direction of allowing people to have choices of the best manufactured cars that come from right here in America instead of giving it over to China, which is what will happen on the mined products, the labor, so many other things.

Americans can figure out what they like. They certainly don’t need California mandates that have already failed in the past and the Federal Government dictating to them what their choices are in driving.

H.R. 4468 is a good, righteous bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill. I support this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that was my closing, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 118–298.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Washington, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

“(B) Any regulation proposed or prescribed, including any revision to a regulation, under paragraph (1) on or after January 1, 2023, shall not—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and a
Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the CARS Act is to per- mit Americans to buy into their cars, and which manufacturers consider to be standard—whether it is the catalytic converter or the onboard diagnostic system, especially because those regulations were not trying to do away with an engine type—but, rather, to just address the most harmful pollution coming from that car.

Rather than creating any confusion for EPA, automakers, or the public, or leading to unintended consequences or unnecessary litigation, this amendment sets a limit on how far back in time the provisions of H.R. 4468 apply.

Instead of applying to any regulation ever issued in the history of the authority provided under Clean Air Act section 202(a), the manager’s amendment caps the retroactivity of the bill’s provisions to section 202(a) regulations, including revisions, proposed or prescribed on or after January 1, 2021.

By adding this date, the legislation focuses on pushing back on regulations that would have the Federal Government, and not Americans, decide what kinds of cars they should be able to drive.

For over 100 years, Americans have been free to buy their own mode of transportation based upon what is available, reliable, affordable, and functional for their lives. Quite frankly, it was because of these criteria that electric vehicles never took off with American consumers, but the Model T did.

The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that adopting this amendment would have an insignificant net effect on the deficit.

I urge all Members to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would revise the look-back portion of the bill that requires EPA to revise all previous regulations to con- form with the bill’s vague metrics on limiting availability of vehicles.

This amendment would shorten this period to only apply to rules finalized under the Biden administration, so please understand what they are doing here is saying that the only thing we are going to do is essentially, are the rules that were finalized under President Biden. I mean, nothing could be clearer that this amendment is based on politics and not policy by lim- iting the revocation to the Biden adminis- tration.

This amendment does not improve the legislation in any way. It fails to address the fundamental problems with the underlying bill. This amendment is essentially trying to buy back in time to the failed policies of the Trump EPA. We would literally be moving backwards in our efforts to address the climate crisis and decarbonize the trans- portation sector and trying to elimi- nate pollution from Americans.

The amendment doesn’t address any of the concerns that my Republican colleagues claim to have about electric vehicles. This amendment simply dou- bles down on Republicans’ attacks on EPA’s authority, public health, and regulatory certainty.

It does absolutely nothing to support our domestic vehicle manufacturing in- dustry, like boost American competi- tiveness, counter China, or strengthen our economy.

This is just blatantly political, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment as well as the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let’s look at what we have heard today. If we want to help America’s auto workers, then let’s keep them on the job. It takes a lot less labor to make electric vehicles than does to make combustion engine vehi- cles.

If we want to protect the environ- ment, then let’s keep China from doing all the mining and refining of the rare earth minerals and critical materials, and supply chain that we actually need to make electric vehicles here in Ameri- ca.

If we want to stop supporting China, rather than buy Chinese cars, which is where this is ultimately going to go if we continue down this road, let’s per- mit mining and refining of critical ma- terials right here in America so when we do make electric vehicles, and we give the American people a choice about purchasing those vehicles, they are made with American materials mined and refined in America by Ameri- can workers rather than putting money in the pockets of the Chinese Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to think about what the future looks like. We need to rein in the EPA’s egregious rule mandating electric vehicles.

Let me remind you, Republicans are not opposed to electric vehicles. I have a lot of friends who own electric vehi- cles. Not very many of them live in Ap- palachia, rural communities, where they are impractical and unaffordable, but if we want to empower the Amer- ican people with choice, then we need to roll back this EV mandate because the day will come when the only choice that people will have is to buy a car that is manufactured in China by China. That will be the only thing that is going to be available because we can’t get permits here in America to do our mining and refining of those critical materials.

China has already sent signals that they are going to start and have al- ready started withholding those critical materials that we need to make electric vehicles.

The Chinese are setting a trap. God forbid if we let the Biden administra- tion force us to fall into that trap.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4468, the Choice in Automobile Sales Act. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4468 is postponed.
The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the DETERRENT Act, H.R. 5933. The Republican transparency and accountability agenda is on the march, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce has set its sights on postsecondary education.

We delivered the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act, a bill to ensure Title IX funding doesn't go to athletic programs which disadvantage young women.

Just yesterday, we conducted a oversight of anti-Semitism on campus during a contentious hearing with Ivy League presidents.

Now we are considering the DETERRENT Act, a bill that restores transparency and accountability in foreign donations to American universities.

The DETERRENT Act strengthens section 117 of the Higher Education Act, which was intended to protect American universities from nefarious foreign donations.

Unfortunately, many schools failed to report these foreign gifts and funding, leaving foreign actors with a stranglehold on U.S. academic institutions.

A 2019 Senate report found that up to 70 percent of universities fail to comply with the law, and outside experts uncovered nearly $13 billion in previously undisclosed foreign funds.

Of course, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Without transparency, we have no idea the true amount of foreign funds at our universities.

This legislation safeguards our national security in five key ways. First, this bill lowers the minimum foreign gift reporting threshold to $50,000 from its current $250,000. For countries of concern, every penny must be reported.

Second, it closes loopholes that allow foreign entities to hide the true origin or purpose of their gifts.

Every disclosure must include the intended purposes, dates, and person at the institution responsible for accepting the gift.

Third, the DETERRENT Act requires that research faculty at our largest research universities disclose foreign gifts and contracts publicly so the American people can see if academic work is compromised.

Fourth, it reveals foreign investments by the endowments of our largest private universities.

Finally, it sets real, meaningful penalties for universities that fail to comply. Foreign influence is not something our schools should take lightly.

I am proud of my Republican colleagues, Representative MICHELLE LEE, Representative STEVE SCOTT and three of this Committee's most prestigious universities:

I rise to urge support and passage of the DETERRENT Act, is before us today.

Historically, collaborations with global partners—and careful Federal investments in research—have enabled our colleges and universities to make bold, forward-thinking strides in health, science, and technology for people around the world.

Additionally, institutions have collaborated with the U.S. Government to enhance our research by attracting and retaining researchers and scholars from across the world.

These partnerships help drive intellectual and campus diversity, strengthen our national security, and give us an undeniable competitive edge.

Institutions, however, must be transparent about the resources they receive from foreign entities, particularly as the Federal Government invests nearly $30 billion annually in our higher education research and development efforts.

Some colleges and universities, unfortunately, have not complied with all of their responsibilities in those disclosures. Regrettably, H.R. 5933 does nothing to meaningfully protect research security at colleges and universities.

For example, colleges must report any gift from a representative of a “country of concern” no matter the value—even a cup of coffee.

The faculty’s information is then shared in a publicly searchable database, regardless of whether the action was nefarious or not.

This is exorbitant and burdensome—to say nothing about the potential discriminatory effect—and would disincentivize universities from conducting critical research using collaborative partners from around the world.

It would force them to deviate from established compliance and reporting guidelines under section 117 of the Higher Education Act.

Schools are already grappling with recruiting and retaining students and scholars. If passed, H.R. 5933 will stall decades of innovative progress and jeopardize global research initiatives.

Students and faculties are already calling on Congress to improve our higher education system and address discrimination on campus.

However, certain provisions of this bill would only exacerbate the ongoing culture wars that have consumed our colleagues in Congress.

For example, the legislation singles out partnerships with certain countries, targeting researchers based solely on their nationality.

As I have said before, we can achieve accountability and compliance without contributing to anti-Asian, anti-Semitic, or Islamophobic animosity.

I have offered a thoughtful alternative to improve section 117 compliance and support institutions as they evaluate and implement their research integrity and foreign influence policies, and that alternative will be offered during the amendment process.

This amendment builds on the Chips and Science Act and the Presidential Memorandum on government-supported research and development national security policy guidelines.

Specifically, it aligns reporting requirements with those of Federal agencies and requires the Secretary of Education to go through negotiated rulemaking to address key implementation aspects of section 117.

We must take targeted and thoughtful steps to protect our research and development initiatives without jeopardizing our global partnerships that will benefit us all.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL).

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman, Dr. FOXX, for yielding time.

Actually, this has nothing to do with an anti-Asian bill. This is my bill, and we want to protect our children from this propaganda.

Yesterday, before the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the executive branch, leading our Nation’s most prestigious universities failed to demonstrate the most basic levels of humanity when discussing anti-Semitism on campus.

Make no mistake: Their lack of moral clarity shows exactly what happens when we permit hostile foreign actors like Qatar, Iran, and Communist China to buy influence on our college campuses.

They give money without return, actually, there is no such thing as a free lunch. That is why today I am offering a legislative solution to crack down on this crisis in our higher education system.

That is why I rise today to urge support and passage of the DETERRENT Act.

Justice Brandeis once said: Sunlight is the best disinfectant. As we saw yesterday, our college campuses are infected.

The DETERRENT Act brings desperately needed sunlight by strengthening transparency and disclosure requirements under section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.
While the previous administration reinvigorated the use of this tool, the current administration has repeatedly downplayed the threat of foreign actors and failed to take meaningful steps to protect our students, research, and national security. If the President will not act, Congress must.

The DETERRENT Act has three pillars to strengthen section 117. The first pillar brings much-needed transparency.

Foreign adversaries look for any loophole to hide their intentions. This is especially true for states that pose the greatest threats to our Nation, like Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea.

The DETERRENT Act eliminates these loopholes by lowering the foreign gifts reporting threshold from $250,000 to $50,000 for all foreign donors and eliminating the threshold entirely for those from countries of concern.

The bill also requires the disclosures include detailed information about the foreign entity, intent of the gift, and the complete text of any contracts with the concerned entities.

The second pillar of my bill establishes accountability. For too long, schools have adopted a take the money first, ask questions later approach to billions of dollars in foreign funds. As reporting and congressional oversight revealed in the case of UC Berkeley in my home State of California, these problematic relationships are often discovered years after the fact when the damage has already been done.

Requiring timely transparency for institutions receiving foreign funds means ensuring the penalties for non-reporting are more than a slap on the wrist.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I urge every Member or the need to vote "yes" on the DETERRENT Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will quote from a letter we received from the Asian American Scholar Forum in terms of the effect this bill would have on Asian-American researchers. It is a long letter, but I will read one paragraph.

"The DETERRENT Act would further chill participation in research by signaling to researchers and institutions that scientific collaboration is discouraged and effectively deter economic institutions and scholars from engaging with Chinese-American and immigrant colleagues and peers out of fear of punishment or heightened scrutiny. The DETERRENT Act's definition of a 'foreign source' includes not just individuals overseas but those with lawful immigration status in the United States such as students or nationals. As a practical matter, the DETERRENT Act would force scholars and researchers to scrutinize the immigration status of potential collaborators and would deter them from collaborating with individuals who may be perceived to be immigrants. Moreover, many scholars would not have access to private information, such as the immigration status of their peers, making this practically a difficult or impossible requirement for faculty, scholars, and researchers to meet. Additionally, the reporting requirement for contracts of no monetary value as it pertains to foreign entities and countries of concern as defined by the DETERRENT Act would significantly chill communications, as it may be perceived as an agreement."

This would obviously have a chilling effect, and that is one of the reasons we are opposing the DETERRENT Act.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Good).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I support the DETERRENT Act, and I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

Education is a battleground for influence, and it seems that foreign countries understand this better than some Members of this body.

On our watch, the Federal Government doles out billions in taxpayer dollars to fund expensive degrees that empower an anti-American agenda while these woke universities secretly collect checks from hostile nations and watch their endowments grow and grow.

The DETERRENT Act would strengthen existing law, requiring colleges to publicly report gifts and contracts with foreign countries. Under the DETERRENT Act, this information would be publicly available on a searchable database because taxpayers, parents, and students deserve to see who is buying the opportunity to influence the next generation of Americans.

The DETERRENT Act would further expose disturbing data that has recently come to light. At least 200 American colleges declined to report a total of $13 billion in contributions from authoritarian countries like Qatar, China, and Saudi Arabia.

For some reason, the Biden administration has halted many of the existing investigations of reporting violations and has declined to enforce current law. Why would that be? Could it have something to do with the $14 million donated to the Penn Biden Center from unnamed contributors in China?

MR. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I add unanimous consent that the letter from the Asian American Scholars Forum from which I quoted be entered into the RECORD.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's request will be covered under general leave.

Hon. Virginia Foxx. Chairwoman, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. SCOTT. Ranking Member, Committee on Education & the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairwoman Foxx and Ranking Member Scott:

Asian American Scholar Forum (AASF) respectfully submits this letter to provide feedback on H.R. 5933, the Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERRENT) Act. We write to express our concerns in opposition of the DETERRENT Act, which will have a chilling effect on Asian American and Asian immigrant researchers and all scholars from participating in U.S. scientific innovation, and will chill open science and innovation more broadly.

AASF is a national non-profit, non-partisan organization that works to promote...
academic belonging, openness, freedom, and equality for all. AASF accomplishes this through education, research, advocacy, and building up leaders within the Asian American scientific and academic community. AASF is one of the leading Asian American national civil rights organizations on science and research security policy as it relates to the Asian American community, including profiling concerns. Our membership includes the National Academy of Engineering, the National Academy of Medicine, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts & Sciences members as well as past and current university presidents, provosts, vice presidents, associate deans, and current and current department chairs. AASF is a member of the National Council for Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA), a coalition of 47 national Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) organizations serving to represent the interests of AANHPI communities and to provide a national voice for Asian American and National Hawaiian Pacific Islander issues.

In January 2021, the Trump Administration issued NSPM–33, which directed federal agencies and academic institutions to protect the U.S. from suspected espionage and terrorist development “[while] maintaining an open environment to foster research discoveries and innovation.” In January 2022, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) issued guidance to implement NSPM–33. In addition to protecting “security and openness,” the guidance seeks “to be clear so that we cannot learn researchers can easily and properly comply” and “to clarify and simplify how researchers disclose information to the federal government.” The guidance notes that if our policy approach “addresses research security challenges” significantly diminish our superpower of attracting global scientific talent—or if they fuel xenophobia against Asian Americans—we will have done more damage to ourselves than any competitor or adversary could. So we need a thoughtful and effective approach. Further, OSTP noted that “is important to avoid undue, vague, and implicit pressures on researchers, as this could create a chilling atmosphere that only can contribute to damage the U.S. scientific enterprise.” In light of the White House’s NSPM–33 and the current process within federal agencies and academic institutions to harmonize and update new requirements and policies, we are concerned with the addition of the DETERRENT Act in its entirety. Moreover, we have several serious concerns about the provisions that would result in significant negative impact to the Asian American and scholarly communities.

NEW DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE DETERRENT ACT WILL HINDER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NSPM–33, CREATING CONFUSING AND ADDITIONAL UNDUE BURDENS ON ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS AND RESEARCHERS.

As indicated by the NSPM–33 guidance, transparency and clarity of any federal requirements with disclosure of information is critical not only for compliance, but also for safeguarding our national security. Currently, academic institutions and federal agencies are working to implement the reporting and disclosure requirements under NSPM–33. With this implementation process underway, any new reporting requirements will create confusion and additional burdens on academic institutions and researchers. Transparency and clarity of process will help everyone—from researchers, academic institutions, and governments—and promote effective and meaningful transparency. Disclosure requirements at this time will be counterproductive to that process.

Additionally, it is critical to ensure that federal agencies and academic institutions follow the NSPM–33 mandatory anti-discriminatory provision, engage with the diverse communities of scholars and students, and that such processes are in place within federal agencies and academic institutions to protect the rights of Asian and Pacific Islander students. Further, we note that the act’s definition of a “foreign entity” and “foreign space” could significantly diminish the superpower of attracting global scientific talent-or if they fuel xenophobia against Asian Americans—we will have done more damage to ourselves than any competitor or adversary could. So we need a thoughtful and effective approach. Further, OSTP noted that “is important to avoid undue, vague, and implicit pressures on researchers, as this could create a chilling atmosphere that only can contribute to damage the U.S. scientific enterprise.” In light of the White House’s NSPM–33 and the current process within federal agencies and academic institutions to harmonize and update new requirements and policies, we are concerned with the addition of the DETERRENT Act in its entirety. Moreover, we have several serious concerns about the provisions that would result in significant negative impact to the Asian American and scholarly communities.

Third, we are very concerned with how low the threshold is for the requirements and, in particular, those of Chi-no Chinese descent, Chinese Americans, particularly those of Chinese descent and scholars, will be further chille d against Chinese Americans and immigrants, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The Asian American and immigrant communities are currently living in a climate of fear. A survey conducted between December 2021 and March 2022 of 1300+ faculty members nationwide found that although an overwhelming majority of the survey respondents (88 percent) agreed that the U.S. leadership in science and technology, many feel unsafe (72 percent) and fearful of conducting research (42 percent) in the U.S. due to harassment and computing science faculty, life science faculty, federal grant awardees, and senior faculty. Around 67 percent of the survey respondents reported that they feel unsafe (72 percent) and scholars, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The Asian American and immigrant communities are currently living in a climate of fear. A survey conducted between December 2021 and March 2022 of 1300+ faculty members nationwide found that although an overwhelming majority of the survey respondents (88 percent) agreed that the U.S. leadership in science and technology, many feel unsafe (72 percent) and fearful of conducting research (42 percent) in the U.S. due to harassment and computing science faculty, life science faculty, federal grant awardees, and senior faculty. Around 67 percent of the survey respondents reported that they feel unsafe (72 percent) and scholars, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The DETERRENT Act will worsen the existing chilling effect on Asian American and immigrant communities, hurting their ability to participate in American society and contribute to our country through their leadership and research. The Asian American community has a long history of being targeted and stigmatized as national security threats based on our race, ethnicity, religion, or ancestry, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. More recently, federal agency programs such as the Justice Department’s now-defunct “China Initiative,” raised concerns about researchers, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign governments, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a new wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The Asian American and immigrant communities are currently living in a climate of fear. A survey conducted between December 2021 and March 2022 of 1300+ faculty members nationwide found that although an overwhelming majority of the survey respondents (88 percent) agreed that the U.S. leadership in science and technology, many feel unsafe (72 percent) and fearful of conducting research (42 percent) in the U.S. due to harassment and computing science faculty, life science faculty, federal grant awardees, and senior faculty. Around 67 percent of the survey respondents reported that they feel unsafe (72 percent) and scholars, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a new wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

The DETERRENT Act will worsen the existing chilling effect on Asian American and immigrant communities, hurting their ability to participate in American society and contribute to our country through their leadership and research. The Asian American community has a long history of being targeted and stigmatized as national security threats based on our race, ethnicity, religion, or ancestry, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. Moreover, federal agencies would not have access to private information such as the immigration status of their peers, making this practically a difficult or impossible requirement for researchers to meet. Additionally, the reporting requirement for contracts of non-monetary value as it pertains to foreign entities and countries of concern as defined by the DETERRENT Act would significantly chill even normal, everyday communications, as it may be perceived as an agreement.

Second, the public disclosure requirements in the DETERRENT Act raise serious concerns that the sharing of information and research will be used and protected by the receiving agencies. The Chinese American and Pacific Islander communities have already experienced years of heightened scrutiny and concerns of racially biased surveillance and prosecution. We need to move forward with care and caution rather than further encroachment into their rights and privacy.

Third, we are very concerned with how low the threshold is for the requirements and, in particular, those of Chinese descent and scholars, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a new wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.

Furthermore, the harsh penalty provisions under Section 117a for the Department of Education to share information with national security and intelligence agencies both pursuant to the DETERRENT Act and retroactively, raises serious concerns about how the shared information will be used and protected by the receiving agencies. The Chinese American and Pacific Islander communities have already experienced years of heightened scrutiny and concerns of racially biased surveillance and prosecution. We need to move forward with care and caution rather than further encroachment into their rights and privacy.

Third, we are very concerned with how low the threshold is for the requirements and, in particular, those of Chinese descent and scholars, particularly scientists, researchers, and scholars of Chinese descent. While there are legitimate concerns about the activities of the People’s Republic of China and foreign government, the increasing pressure on federal agencies to scrutinize scientists, researchers, and scholars, along with rising xenophobic public rhetoric against U.S. officials, have further fueled anti-Asian sentiments at home and instigated a new wave of fear, profiling, and violent targeting of our communities.
Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I proudly rise today in support of Congresswoman STEEL’s DETERRENT Act.

The world is on fire, and evil is spreading globally. We cannot permit American colleges and universities to be compromised. Our adversaries are determined to subvert our national interests, and today’s modern battleground now includes American college campuses.

When American higher ed administrators receive incentives and gifts from adversarial regimes, it sends a clear message that influence on campus is for sale and that American universities are open for business.

Simply put, this is profit over patriotism. I will go a step further and call it anti-American.

It is important to understand that when our universities receive millions from countries that are antithetical to American values, there are strings attached.

Under section 117 of the Higher Education Act, colleges and universities must disclose any foreign funding to an institution exceeding $250,000. Yet, in 2019, a Senate report found that 70 percent of colleges chose to evade, hide, and cheat to avoid compliance with this law. Only 30 percent of administrators overseeing our educational institutions deemed it important to follow the law put in place by Congress with oversight authority. This is incredibly concerning, and it must come to an end.

I am proud that my bill, the Reporting on Investments in Foreign Adversaries Act, the RIFA Act, was included in Congresswoman STEEL’s landmark legislation. This is the latest step to hold private industry accountable for their financial partnerships with foreign countries and entities hostile to the United States.

There is a disturbing lack of accountability for these partnerships with endowments by foreign countries. Many of these countries seek nefarious influence within American universities, which undermines our national security.

By bribing American academic institutions with billions of dollars, our adversaries corrode the minds of American students with anti-American and pro-Marxist propaganda. This poses a threat to our national security, research and development efforts, intellectual property, and academic freedom as a whole.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, the manipulation of our children on American soil paid for by the American taxpayer is unacceptable.

For the sake of our Republic and the millions of taxpayers Americas, we demand a higher standard, full transparency, and more accountability for college administrators who are complicit. We cannot be satisfied with anything less.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on the DETERRENT Act. Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, despite my colleagues’ claims, the DETERRENT Act would only burden colleges and universities and jeopardize global partnerships while doing nothing to help them comply with existing compliance and reporting guidelines.

House Democrats tried several times to ensure that the legislation included attainable, commonsense provisions for these institutions. For example, in committee, I offered an amendment to build on the Chips and Science Act and the “Presidential Memorandum on United States Government-Supported Research and Development National Security Guidelines,” aligning reporting requirements precisely to those Federal agencies that are already reporting with the Department of Education and requiring the Department of Education to go through negotiated rulemaking to conform those reporting requirements. Unfortunately, the Republican majority did not agree to it.

Mr. Chair, Democrats are committed to helping institutions comply with the law, but we must always strike a balance between enforcing the law and fostering safe campuses for students, scholars, and faculty.

Regrettably, the legislation before us does nothing to achieve that goal. It would only drive deeper wedges into higher education systems at the expense of students, faculty, and our country’s global innovative efforts.

Mr. Chair, as I indicated, in that letter from the Asian American Scholar Forum, they said: “As a practical matter, the DETERRENT Act would force scholars and researchers to scrutinize the immigration status of potential collaborators and deter them from collaboration with individuals who may be perceived to be immigrants,” and the zero limit on monetary value for gifts “would significantly chill even normal, everyday communications.”

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5933, and I yield back the balance of my time.
adversaries, but more importantly, it will send a strong message to our constituents: We are good stewards of your votes.

While I know we cannot restore public trust in the university system overnight, requiring a basic level of transparency for foreign donations and accountability from universities is a great first step.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ‘yes’ vote on the DETERRENT Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

H.R. 5933

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Agencies Expunging in Nefarious Transactions Act’’ or the ‘‘DETERRENT Act’’.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) is amended to read as follows:

(1) the name of the individual, department, or benefactor at the institution receiving the gift or carrying out the contract;

(2) the intended purpose of such gift or contract, as provided by such foreign source, or if no such purpose is provided by such foreign source, the intended use of such gift or contract, as provided by the institution;

(3) in the case of a restricted or conditional gift or contract, a description of the restrictions or conditions of such gift or contract;

(4) whether, with respect to such gift or contract, as provided to the institution by such foreign government that approved the contract, as provided to the institution by such foreign source, or carrying out the contract;

(5) the total fair market dollar amount or dollar value of the gift, as of the date of submission of such report;

(6) the date on which the institution received such gift;

(7) with respect to a contract—

(A) the date on which such contract commences;

(B) the date on which such contract terminates;

(C) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(D) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(E) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(F) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(G) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(H) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(I) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(J) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(K) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(L) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(M) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(N) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(O) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(P) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(Q) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(R) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(S) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(T) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(U) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(V) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(W) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(X) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(Y) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(Z) as applicable, the date on which such contract commences;

(aa) maintain an unredacted copy of the contract until the latest of—

(bb) upon request of the Secretary during an investigation under subsection (f)(1), produce such an unredacted copy of the contract; and

(cc) an assurance that in a case in which information is required to be disclosed under this section with respect to a gift or contract that is not in English, such information is translated into English in compliance with the requirements of subsection (c)(5).

(b) retroactive.

(1) aggregate gifts and contracts disclosed in such report shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

(2) non English shall be translated, for purposes of such disclosure, by a person that is not an affiliated entity or agent of the foreign source involved with such report.

(3) public inspection.

(1) database requirement.—Beginning not later than 60 days after the July 31 immediately following the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section (including any report submitted under this section before the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act) are made publicly available in electronic and downloadable format, including any information provided in such reports (other than the information prohibited from being publicly disclosed pursuant to paragraph (3));

(B) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database;

(II) an assurance that the institution will—

(i) the name of such foreign government;

(ii) the department, agency, office, or division of such foreign government that approved such gift or contract, as applicable; and

(iii) the physical mailing address of such department, agency, office, or division.

(2) name and address of foreign source.—The Secretary shall not disclose the name or address of a foreign source that is a natural person.

(3) inclusion of information.

(1) database requirement—Beginning not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act, the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

(2) foreign source ownership or control.—Each report to the Secretary required under subsection (a)(2) shall contain—

(A) the legal name and address of the foreign source that owns or controls the foreign source; and

(B) the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control; and

(C) any changes in program or structure resulting from the change in ownership or control.

(D) translation requirements.—Any information required to be disclosed under this section with respect to a gift or contract that is not in English shall be translated, for purposes of such disclosure, by a person that is not an affiliated entity or agent of the foreign source involved with such report.

(E) public inspection.—

(1) database requirement.—Beginning not later than 60 days after the July 31 immediately following the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act—

(A) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which all reports submitted under this section (including any report submitted under this section before the date of the enactment of the DETERRENT Act) are made publicly available in electronic and downloadable format, including any information provided in such reports (other than the information prohibited from being publicly disclosed pursuant to paragraph (3));

(B) not later than 30 days after receipt of a disclosure report under this section, include such report in such database;

(C) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report is with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

(i) a foreign source that is a foreign government;

(ii) a foreign source that is not a foreign government; and

(D) with respect to a disclosure report that does not include the name or address of a foreign source, indicate, as part of the public record of such report included in such database, the fact that such report did not include such information.

(F) name and address of foreign source.—The Secretary shall not disclose the name or address of a foreign source that is a natural person (other than the attributable country of such foreign source) included in a disclosure report—

(A) as part of the public record of such disclosure report described in paragraph (1); or

(B) in response to a request under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘‘Freedom of Information Act’’), pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of such section.

(G) interagency information sharing.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a disclosure report from an institution in compliance with this section, the Secretary shall transmit an unredacted copy of such report (that includes the name and address of a foreign source disclosed in such report) to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Agencies Expunging in Nefarious Transactions Act’’ or the ‘‘DETERRENT Act’’.
"(f) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any institution that is required to file a disclosure report under subsection (a) shall designate, before the filing deadline for such report, and maintain a compliance officer who shall—

"(1) be a current employee or legally authorized agent of such institution; and

"(2) be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for—

(1) maintaining accurate compliance

anewel with foreign gift reporting requirements under this section.
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(1) any report received by the Department of Education under section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011f) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act; and
(2) any contract referred to in paragraph (1) that—
(A) has the meaning given such term in section 117(g); and
(B) is under such paragraph containing such information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1); and
(3) any contract with a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is more than $4,000, considered alone or in combination with other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commenced and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates.
SEC. 4. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.
The Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 117 the following:
''SEC. 117. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.
''(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN POLICY AND DATABASE.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each institution described in subsection (b) shall maintain—
''(I) a policy requiring covered individuals employed at the institution to disclose in a report to such institution on July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the year in which such enactment date occurs—
''(i) any gift received from a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is more than $4,000, considered alone or in combination with other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commenced and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates;
''(ii) any contract entered into with a foreign country or foreign entity of concern in the previous calendar year, the value of which is more than $4,000, considered alone or in combination with other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commenced and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates;
''(iii) purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern; and
''(B) other than such a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern, is further amended by inserting after section 1001 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, the following:
''SEC. 117C. INVESTMENT DISCLOSURE REPORT.
''(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN POLICY AND DATABASE.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each institution described in subsection (b) shall maintain—
''(I) a policy requiring covered individuals employed at the institution to disclose in a report to such institution on July 31 of each calendar year that begins after the year in which such enactment date occurs—
''(A) any gift received from a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is more than $4,000, considered alone or in combination with other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commenced and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates;
''(B) any contract entered into with a foreign source in the previous calendar year, the value of which is more than $4,000, considered alone or in combination with other contracts with that foreign source within the calendar year, and including the date on which such contract commenced and, as applicable, the date on which such contract terminates; and
''(II) a contract referred to in subparagraph (I); and
''(A) has the meaning given such term in section 223(d) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (42 U.S.C. 6803); and
''(B) shall be interpreted in accordance with the Guidance for Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum 33 (NSPM-33) on National Security Strategy for United States Government of the United States, and any development published by the Subcommittee on Research Security and the Joint Committee on the Research Environment in January 2022; and
''(C) includes any professional employees, as defined in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201).
''(b) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each institution described in subsection (a) shall designate, before the submission of such report, an individual to be the person certifying accurate compliance with the reporting requirements under this section, and such individual shall—
''(1) retain such information as is necessary to accurately certify compliance with the reporting requirements under this section, for personally certifying accurate compliance with the reporting requirements under this section, and such individual shall—
''(2) certify the institution has, for purposes of filing such report under subsection (a), followed an established institutional policy and conducted good faith efforts and reasonable due diligence to determine the accuracy and valuations of the assets reported.
''(C) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN POOLED FUNDS.—The term 'foreign source' and 'gift' have the meanings given such terms in section 117(g); and
''(B) receives under paragraph (1).''
''(c) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN POOLED FUNDS.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 4968(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to such specified institution, the term 'foreign source' and 'gift' have the meanings given such terms in section 117(g); and
''(D) accurate reporting under paragraph (2) of the information required to be disclosed under paragraph (1); and
''(ii) affiliation, agreement, or similar transaction with a foreign source involving the use or exchange of funds, likeness, time, services, or resources of covered individuals employed at an institution described in subsection (b); or
''(iii) purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern; and
''(B) does not include any fair-market, arm's-length agreement made by covered individuals for the acquisition, purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from a foreign source other than such a foreign source that is a foreign country of concern or a foreign entity of concern.
''(2) the term 'covered individual'—
''(A) means—
''(i) a gift referred to in paragraph (1) (if a gift) or received; or
''(B) receives under paragraph (1).''
''(B) a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) begins; or
''(iv) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(v) the name of the individual making the disclosure; and
''(vi) the date of the enactment of this Act; and
''(ii) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(B) is searchable and sortable by—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the attributable country with respect to which information was disclosed;
''(C) are searchable and sortable by—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign country or foreign entity that is a natural person);
''(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and shall—
''(i) the date that is 4 years after the date on which—
''(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and shall—
''(I) the terms 'foreign source' and 'gift' have the meanings given such terms in section 117(g); and
''(ii) the term 'covered individual'—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(B) a contract referred to in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) begins; or
''(ii) the attributable country with respect to which information was disclosed;
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign country or foreign entity that is a natural person);
''(C) are searchable and sortable by—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign country or foreign entity that is a natural person);
''(B) receives under paragraph (1).''
''(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and shall—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign country or foreign entity that is a natural person);
''(A) makes available the information disclosed under paragraph (1) beginning on the date that is 30 days after receipt of the report under such paragraph containing such information and shall—
''(i) the date received (if a gift) or the date commenced (if a contract); and
''(ii) the name of the foreign source (other than a foreign country or foreign entity that is a natural person);
(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘investment of concern’ means any specified interest with respect to any entity:

(i) a foreign country of concern;

(ii) a foreign entity of concern;

(B) SPECIFIED INTEREST.—The term ‘specified interest’ means any specified interest with respect to any property described in clause (i) or (ii).

(2) SPECIFIED INSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘specified institution’ means any institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials of the Department to discuss possible database improvements to the database described in section 117(d)(1), including—

(I) receiving and responding to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions regarding compliance with the requirements of section 117A, 117B, and 117C, and

(II) providing and maintaining a database users guide annually, including information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

(B) creating a standing user group (to which each appropriate district court of the United States, or the department of the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, is to request such court to compel compliance with the requirement of the section that has been violated.

(C) COSTS AND OTHER FINES.—An institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of a section listed in paragraph (1) pursuant to paragraph (2) shall—

(A) pay to the Treasury of the United States the full costs to the United States of obtaining compliance with the requirement of such section, including all associated costs of investigation and enforcement; and

(B) be subject to the applicable fines described in paragraph (4).

(4) FINES FOR VIOLATIONS.—The Secretary shall imposing a fine on an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of a section listed in paragraph (1) as follows:

(A) SECTION 117.—

(i) FIRST-TIME VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to an additional calendar year, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than twice the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to an additional calendar year, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than twice the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.

(ii) SUBSEQUENT VIOLATIONS.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to clause (i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117 with respect to any additional calendar year, the Secretary shall impose a fine on the institution with respect to any such additional calendar year as follows:

(I) In the case of an institution that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117 with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a reporting requirement under subsection (a)(1) of section 117, such fine shall be in an amount that is—

(aa) not less than $50,000 but not more than the monetary value of the gift from, or contract with, the foreign source; or

(bb) in the case of a gift or contract of no value or of indeterminable value, not less than 1 percent, but not more than 10 percent, of the total amount of Federal funds received by the institution under this Act for the most recent fiscal year.
The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The CHAIR recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina. Ms. Foxx. Mr. Chair, my amendment makes technical edits to the underlying bill while also clarifying certain language on gifts, enforcement, and the timeline for the subsequent Government Accountability Office study.

The DETERRENT Act includes commonsense disclosure exemptions for information and intellectual property rights, except when they involve national security. My amendment clarifies the definition for intellectual property of national security concern by citing the existing Commerce Control List, which includes categories such as chemicals, avionics, and aerospace. If a transaction with foreign nations involves these sensitive industries, it should be disclosed.

Defective noncompliance of section 117 is the central motivation for this bill, so my amendment also includes language to ensure the Secretary follows the law and brings civil action against noncompliant entities. This means even a recalcitrant administration, like the Biden administration, would have to treat noncompliance with the seriousness it deserves.

Lastly, my amendment adds language requested by the GAO to help it effectively measure the implementation and interagency coordination of provisions in the DETERRENT Act. Communication is key to combating malign foreign influence, and the GAO study will identify ways to improve that communication and coordination.

Mr. Chair, with this amendment's simplistic nature, I hope for its easy passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this appears to be technical and clarifying. That is always a good thing, and I hope that we will adopt the amendment.

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

Ms. Foxx. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and supporting this very technical amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx).

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 26, line 10, insert "(other than the name or any other personally identifiable information of a covered individual)" after "paragraph (1)".

Page 27, line 22, strike "the period at the end and insert ":" and "."

Page 27, line 22 insert the following:
"(4) for purposes of investigations under section 117D(a)(1) or responses to requests under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), the names of the individuals making disclosures under paragraph (1)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CAREY) and a Member opposed to it.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, after line 4, insert the following:
"(E) INELIGIBILITY FOR WAIVER.—In the case of an institution that has been fined pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), (B)(i)(C)(i), or (D)(i) with respect to a calendar year, and that knowingly or willfully fails to comply with a requirement of section 117, 117A, 117B, or 117C with respect to any 2 additional calendar years, the Secretary shall prohibit the institution from obtaining a waiver, or a renewal of a waiver, under section 117A.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the DETERRENT Act, a bill that will work toward preventing foreign influence within America’s institutions, colleges, and universities by strengthening section 117 of the Higher Education Act.

Section 117 requires colleges and universities to report contracts with and gifts from a foreign source that, alone or combined, are valued at $250,000 or more for each calendar year.

My amendment will prohibit repeat-offending institutions from obtaining waivers that allow them to accept donations or gifts from countries or entities of concern.

Some countries and entities, like China, pose a particular concern to the United States, and as such, institutions that are required under this act to obtain special waivers if they wish to accept donations, gifts, or contracts from them.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. I still have deep concerns about section 117 of the bill, because it places a target on the backs of researchers who work with foreign collaborators and would create a chilling effect for both international research and retention of international faculty and scholars, but this amendment would take the identifying information out and remove that target. I think that is a good direction.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chair, while I certainly want to ensure that institutions remain compliant with section 117, many compliance problems can be minimal or unintentional. Colleges and universities obviously be held accountable for those problems and subsequent violations can be punished more severely, but a permanent ban seems very excessive as a mandatory penalty in all cases.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I think I made my point clear. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 17, strike "4" and insert "5".

Page 26, line 14, strike "4" and insert "5".
The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer yet another amendment on the DETERRENT Act. It again deals with section 117, which requires colleges and universities to report contracts or gifts that total over $250,000 in a given year. It is, I think, very important because of the nefarious influence that some foreign governments might exert on our youngest and most talented minds. When Secretary DeVos, in 2019, initiated investigations into just 12 universities to ensure compliance with section 117, the Department found that $6.5 billion of previously unreported foreign gifts and contracts were revealed. Despite this demonstrating a clear need for increased investigation and enforcement, the Biden administration’s Department of Education refused to open investigations under section 117 to ensure institutions aren’t hiding foreign investments.

Think about that for a second: 12 institutions, $6.5 billion of gifts revealed, when they were essentially audited. That is scary. It is unbelievably frightening.

The underlying bill does not require institutions to maintain certain information about foreign gifts and contracts, including unredacted versions, which would allow for future investigations, if needed.

However, my amendment would change the minimum length of time that they must maintain this information from 4 years to 5 years. It is a step in the right direction. It is really rather minor, 4 to 5 years. The yearlong extension, why this is relevant, is because of the potential influence in the administrations—regardless that administrations last 4 years at a time—this would be protected with 5 years.

If we have a Department of Education that is uninterested or unwilling to investigate potential foreign influences in our institutions, this added extension of that 1 year could become very impactful.

This should be, I think, in my humble opinion, a completely bipartisan and noncontroversial amendment. It can go both ways. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have concerns about a future Republican administration, this just adds that extra year of protection.

This will also work toward restoring legislative branch relevance, as we see the executive branch continually year over year, regardless of what party is in power at the White House, eat away at our constitutional oversight, and, frankly, our authority in powers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment and in favor of the underlying bill.
The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this is an amendment that we should be able to accept. The problem is that it is hard to imagine how the college could comply with it.

Any association with a terrorist organization obviously should be avoided. You are not dealing with the terrorist organization; you are dealing with an organization that then has an affiliation with the terrorist organization. There is no way for the college to know.

I would hope that we would not force the college into complying with something they would have no way to comply with.

Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, there is adequate capacity for colleges and universities across this country to identify the source of funds such as this.

In fact, we know all too often that there are individuals even working within the Federal Government who have real and have associated themselves with actions of Hamas. We have the technology to do so. And simply expecting that universities do their due diligence and then disclose to the American people, students, and support that of those universities is certainly not a bar too great for them to meet.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and have the right to close.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chairman, I will read the short amendment.

It says: “Any affiliation of the foreign source to an organization that is designated as a foreign terrorist organization pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

It is hard to imagine how a college could always know exactly who has an affiliation with what.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MOLINARO).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 22, strike “$50,000” and insert “$1.”

Page 38, beginning on line 3, strike “not less than $50,000” and insert “$1.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is really rather simple. It is about transparency. It is about simply moving the reporting requirements. My amendment reduces the threshold for the value of gifts that must be reported from $50,000 to $1. It simply lowers the threshold. Mr. Chairman, this is about transparency.

The underlying bill, which represents a solid and sorely needed first step, advertises much-needed transparency. If we are going to stop America’s foreign adversaries from targeting our Nation’s educational institutions and students, we need transparency at every level.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this lowers the threshold to $1. Any gift from any source, every gift or contract from any country—if you have some Canadian collaborators or somebody from Great Britain offering you coffee and donuts, you have to report it on a searchable database. I think that is an absurd amount of reporting that would have to be done.

This would create backlogs at the Department of Education and take too much time away from the scrutiny of the reports that need to be looked at.

Mr. Chair, I hope we do not pass this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the Trump administration discovered $6.5 billion in previously unreported foreign money to universities from adversarial countries.

In response to the terrorist attack against Israel, I think it is important that we make it tougher. That we make it tougher to unilaterally influence our universities and our students—the future of America.

Qatar, an anti-Semitic country, earlier this week accused Israel of committing genocide, has contributed $5 billion to U.S. universities. There are billions of dollars going unreported. Saudi Arabia has contributed $3 billion. This can’t be allowed.

We have foreign adversaries, adversaries of Israel, adversaries of the West, adversaries of America donating to universities, and we need to know. That is all we are asking.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, our universities across America have opened the doors to working-class Americans and impoverished Americans to be able to access a better life and education.

I speak to this amendment that indicates that any donation, as much as $1, has to be under this particular act.

First of all, this is a blanket representation that our universities are taking moneys from terrorists. I am outraged to say that the University of Houston, University of Texas, Texas Southern University, and Prairie View A&M would be in the position of taking money from terrorists.

If you pass this amendment, you implore the innocent persons who are giving donations and the work of our universities attempting to provide dollars to educate more Americans—more impoverished Americans who simply have families that cannot afford for them to go to school. This is outrageous.

I want everybody to know that under this particular act, $1 has to be reported. That $1 may come from a grandmother or that $1 may come from a hardworking parent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Generous and kindhearted people from the faith institutions that many of our universities come under. Mr. Chair, you are going to ask them to vet or to determine whether terrorists are involved. It is not the question of whether terrorists are involved. I want this Nation to be protected. We now realize that we are subject to a lot of terrorist potential because of the times we are in. I take it seriously. I am on the Homeland Security Committee.

Nevertheless, this $1 is to make a mockery of the hard work of many folks at “working-class” universities and colleges, our community colleges, and 2-year colleges that themselves receive donations from people who are grateful that they allowed them to be a vocational nurse or welder and, because of that opportunity, they were able to make a living for themselves and their families.

We must have rational and reasonable thinking here. I am grateful for America’s hierarchy of education because so many people come here to be educated.

Mr. Chair, let us vote this amendment down. Let us not do this and undermine the educational system of this Nation and the Constitution.
Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I think it is important to understand that we are in a new day. October 7 changed the world.

Qatar, for example, has praised Hamas. They have literally praised the systematic rape of women and the torture and rape of little girls. Surely, my colleagues understand why reporting donations is so paramount.

I can’t stand by and pretend that this isn’t going on. Qatar is trying to buy forgiveness—$500 million to Hamas. How else do you pay for, Mr. Chairman? How much is enough to absolve their sins?

I am appalled that anyone would be opposed to this. We need reporting. We need transparency. We are in a new day. The West is under attack.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I could go on about Al Jazeera, which is funded by Qatar, praising the torture. They were cutting off the genitals of men. They were cutting off the breasts of women. They were gang-raping women.

Foreign contributions need to be found out, discovered, and disclosed. The only way to make sure that nothing is slipping through the cracks is to lower the threshold.

There is no reason to oppose this amendment. If the universities are doing nothing wrong, then they have nothing to hide.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment. It is common sense, and it takes a stand against the atrocities that took place in Israel, the pay-fors, and the forgiveness that Qatar is trying to buy through our American universities.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned billions of dollars from countries, and he mentioned some countries of concern. Countries of concern already have to report zero-dollar and zero gifts. This just adds all other countries.

There is no need for the bill to go from the present law of $250,000 and up reports down to $50,000 for countries that are not countries of concern down to $1 to scrutinize billion-dollar gifts from countries of concern.

These reports are not free to comply with. The estimated costs of compliance are in the hundreds of thousands of dollars under the bill already.

Mr. Chairman, if you were to explode the number of reports that would have to be made if this amendment is adopted, there is no telling what the costs will be to the colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we defeat the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to section 7 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 118–298.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 18, strike "and"; Page 16, line 7, strike the period and insert "; and"; Page 16, after line 7, insert the following subparagraph:

"(F) an international organization (as such term is defined in the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288)))."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 906, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOWX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I would like to begin by thanking Chair FOXX for her hard work in an effort to try to right our country and the committee that she so artfully presides over.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply adds international organizations to the bill’s definition of foreign source, including them in the bill’s reporting requirements. It uses the definition found in 22 U.S.C. 288, which reads, in part: “a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation.”

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, Americans are all too aware of the influence of international organizations such as the United Nations or the World Health Organization. As just one example, the World Health Organization was one of the so-called authorities trying to dismiss the lab theory, with the assistance of prominent academicians and the Chinese Communist Party.

Many of our adversaries, such as China and Iran, are active participants in these organizations, much to my dismay and to the dismay of many Americans.

The fact that Iran was appointed to Confucius Institutes or an organization antithetical, maybe anti-Semitic, from the Middle East that is sending endowments and funds to universities to influence the minds of those who are participating in education at those universities. It is important not only for citizens to know but, quite honestly, for our Federal Government and the security agencies to keep an eye on what is happening on campuses but the very minds on those campuses, whether it is Confucius Institutes or an organization antithetical, maybe anti-Semitic, from theMiddle East that is sending endowments and funds to universities to influence the minds of those who are participating in education at those universities. It is important not only for citizens to know but, quite honestly, for our Federal Government and the security agencies to keep an eye on.

Mr. Chair, I remind my good friend on the other side of the aisle that I had a bill some time ago to require this reporting, which is already required in many aspects and many respects, but universities, even with the requirement, don’t keep the information and don’t report any of it at this time.

Isn’t that a peril to national security?

If we actually want to strengthen security in our country for our citizens, then I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, but, again, transparency is key. Universities have become, unfortunately, as we have seen in our public media on this very day and all too often, hotspots for international insurmountable activity in our country, things that are antithetical to our country and our way of life, things that we have never seen before, anti-Semitism on American university campuses.

If those things are being stoked, inflamed, encouraged, and paid for by international organizations at all, then Americans ought to know that.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the American Council on Education, which I, along with 18 national higher education organizations, sign.

The CHAIR. The gentleman’s request will be covered under general leave.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.

Hon. HAKEME JEFFERIES,
House Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKERS JEFFERIES AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFERIES: On behalf of the American Council on Education and the undersigned higher education associations, I am strongly in opposition to H.R. 5983, the “Defending Education Transparency and Ending Rogue Regimes Engaging in Nefarious Transactions (DETERREMD)” Act, which the House is scheduled to consider on the floor this week.

While we understand the concern regarding foreign funding to U.S. institutions of higher education, we believe the DETERREMD Act is duplicative of existing interagency efforts, unnecessary, and puts in place a problematic expansion of the data collected by the U.S. Department of Education that will broadly curtail important needed international research collaboration and academic and cultural exchanges.

Institutional higher education share a strong interest with the government in safeguarding the integrity of government-funded research and protecting academic freedom and free speech from foreign influence and/or interference. Our community takes the reporting requirements regarding foreign gifts and contracts seriously.

Section 117 of the Higher Education Act very seriously. Indeed, our associations and our institutions continue to work with federal agencies to implement existing requirements under NSP-3, which is targeted at improving research security and addressing concerns around federal funding. We are also engaged in discussions with new requirements under the recently passed CHIPS and Science Act and ensuring compliance with statutory requirements enacted in previous National Defense Authorization Acts.

Since 2018, when issues with foreign gift reporting were raised by Congress and policymakers, there has been a substantial increase in Section 117 reporting. In response to questions before the House Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this year, the Department of Education has reported that over the past two years and is on track to receive the most Section 117 reports of any administration. Just this year, the most recent reporting dataset shows nearly 5,000 additional foreign gifts and contracts with transactions valued at nearly $45 million as of October 2023.

Section 117 continues to improve our ability to bring more attention to the issue of foreign funding to our institutions.

However, the new Sections 117A, 117B, 117C, and 117D greatly expand Section 117 in a way that will be very problematic for colleges and universities seeking to engage in important and advantageous partnerships with foreign countries and entities. We would also note that the recently released 2023 annual report to Congress by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission made several recommendations regarding Section 117 but did not recommend these overly expansive and problematic new reporting requirements. (I.e., reporting requirements regarding each new provision are listed below:)

Section 117A “Prohibition on Contracts with Certain Foreign Entities and Countries” would mandate that each owner of a foreign entity, or a foreign entity itself, report those investments with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern, on an annual basis, to the U.S. Department of Education. Those investments would then be made public on a searchable database. As written, this would likely capture a small number of private institutions of higher education and does not serve to achieve any significant national interests, especially given that all U.S. institutions of higher education already comply with Treasury rules regulating their investments, including the recent Executive Order 14056 regarding outbound investments in certain sensitive technologies, and in countries of concern.

However, there is significant confusion and uncertainty for research faculty and staff, who are frequently working with foreign partners (because their personal financial information will be made public). Section 117C would create new “Investment Disclosure Reports” for certain institutions of higher education (private institutions with endowments over $5 billion or public institutions with “investments of concern” above $250 million). Those institutions would need to report those investments with a country of concern or a foreign entity of concern, on an annual basis, to the U.S. Department of Education. Those investments would then be made public on a searchable database. As written, this would likely capture a small number of private institutions of higher education and does not serve to achieve any significant national interests, especially given that all U.S. institutions of higher education already comply with Treasury rules regulating their investments, including the recent Executive Order 14056 regarding outbound investments in certain sensitive technologies, and in countries of concern.

However, there is significant confusion and uncertainty for research faculty and staff, who are frequently working with foreign partners (because their personal financial information will be made public). Section 117D would establish new fines regarding compliance with Section 117 and the new subsections of Section 117. The legislation would put into statute the tie between Section 117 and an institution’s Program Participation Agreement (PPA), which governs an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.

In addition, the new proposed fines to a school’s Title IV participation in an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.

In addition, the new proposed fines to a school’s Title IV participation in an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.

In addition, the new proposed fines to a school’s Title IV participation in an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.

In addition, the new proposed fines to a school’s Title IV participation in an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.

In addition, the new proposed fines to a school’s Title IV participation in an institution’s ability to access Title IV federal student aid. For the past several years, the Department of Education has tied PPAs to Section 117 compliance. However, this legislation goes further by creating additional new mandatory requirements.
Act is the wrong action to take to address our institutions. However, the DETERRENT Act would lower the reporting threshold from $250,000 to $50,000 for some gifts and contracts with, or entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the aggregate dollar amount of such gifts and contracts attributable to a particular country and the intended use of such gift or contract.

Congress should examine the research security provisions in the CHIPS and Science Act, recent National Defense Authorization Acts, and NSP33 that are currently being implemented and not simply add duplicative and confusing regulations. A recent survey from the Council on Governmental Relations found that over the past four years, universities have spent considerable funds to comply with federal requirements to address inappropriate foreign influence on research. The survey found: “The projected year one average total cost per institution for compliance with the Disclosure Requirements, regardless of institutional size, is significant and concerning. The figure ranges from an average of over $100,000 for smaller institutions to over $1 million for mid- and large institutions. Although some of these expenses are one-time costs, a sizeable portion will recur annually, with recurring compliance costs. Overall, the cost impact to research institutions in year one is expected to exceed $50 million. Further, all research institutions will experience significant cost burdens due to administrative and stressful, and smaller research institutions with less developed compliance infrastructure may be disproportionately affected.”

The DETERRENT Act would greatly increase these costs to our institutions, while also duplicating reporting requirements and provisions already being implemented.

We urge Congress to consider the language included in the 2021 Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) (S. 1200) and 2022 House-passed America COMPETES Act (H.R. 4521), which proposed bipartisan fixes and improvements to Section 117. We urge Congress to reexamine that language, incorporated as an amendment in the PETES Act (H.R. 4521), which proposed bi- partisan fixes and improvements to Section 117. We urge Congress to examine that language, incorporated as an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Education and Foreign Affairs Subcommittee Chairwoman Nita Lowey (D-N.Y.) and Ranking Member Mike McCaul (R-Texas).

Act, recent National Defense Authorization Acts, and NSP33 that are currently being implemented and not simply add duplicative and confusing regulations. A recent survey from the Council on Governmental Relations found that over the past four years, universities have spent considerable funds to comply with federal requirements to address inappropriate foreign influence on research. The survey found: “The projected year one average total cost per institution for compliance with the Disclosure Requirements, regardless of institutional size, is significant and concerning. The figure ranges from an average of over $100,000 for smaller institutions to over $1 million for mid- and large institutions. Although some of these expenses are one-time costs, a sizeable portion will recur annually, with recurring compliance costs. Overall, the cost impact to research institutions in year one is expected to exceed $50 million. Further, all research institutions will experience significant cost burdens due to administrative and stressful, and smaller research institutions with less developed compliance infrastructure may be disproportionately affected.”

The DETERRENT Act would greatly increase these costs to our institutions, while also duplicating reporting requirements and provisions already being implemented.

We also urge Congress to examine the language included in the 2021 Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) (S. 1200) and 2022 House-passed America COMPETES Act (H.R. 4521), which proposed bipartisan fixes and improvements to Section 117. We urge Congress to reexamine that language, incorporated as an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Education and the Workforce Ranking Member Bobby Scott to the House Rules Committee, and work with the Administration to improve Section 117 in a way that addresses national security concerns while also providing the tools necessary for educational and academic and cultural exchanges.”

Mr. Chairman, I think that applies to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members vote "no" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY). The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows: Strike section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ”DETERRENT Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.

Section 117 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 117. DISCLOSURES OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.

"(a) Disclosure Reports.—

"(1) AGGREGATE GIFT AND CONTRACT DISCLOSURES.—An institution shall file a disclosure report described in subsection (b) with the Secretary not later than July 31 of the calendar year immediately following any calendar year in which—

"(A) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, without regard to the value of such gift or contract, the information described in paragraph (2) is knowingly false, or the report is false; or

"(B) the institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, the value of which is not less than $250,000, and the report is false; or

"(i) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the aggregate amount of such gifts and contracts received from or entered into with such foreign government;

"(ii) for gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, any foreign source, the amount, the date, and a description of such gift or contract;

"(iii) the intended purpose of such gift or contract, as provided to the institution by the foreign source, or if no such purpose is provided by such purpose is provided by such source, the intended use of such gift or contract, as provided by the institution.

"(2) For gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source, without regard to the value of such gift or contract, the information described in paragraph (1) is considered true and correct if the information is provided to the institution by the foreign source or, if unknown, the principal place of business, for a foreign source that is a natural person; or

"(i) the country of incorporation or, if unknown, the principal place of business, for a foreign source that is a legal entity.

"(C) the date on which the foreign source assumed ownership or control; and

"(D) any changes in the ownership or control structure resulting from such ownership or control.

"(3) An assurance that the institution will maintain a true copy of each gift or contract agreement subject to the requirements under this section, until the latest of—

"(A) the date that is 4 years after the date of the agreement;

"(B) the date on which the agreement terminates; or

"(C) the last day of the period of which applicable State public record law requires a true copy of such agreement to be maintained.

"(4) An assurance that the institution will—

"(A) produce true copies of gift and contract agreements subject to the disclosure requirements under this section upon request of the Secretary, the Secretarial audit or other institutional investigation; and

"(B) ensure that all contracts from the foreign source are translated into English, as applicable.

"(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES FOR RESTRICTED AND CONDITIONAL GIFTS AND CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), whenever any institution receives a restricted or conditional gift or contract from a foreign source, the institution shall disclose the following to the Secretary, translated into English:

"(1) For gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign source other than a foreign government, the amount, the date, and a description of such gift or contract;

"(2) For gifts received from, or contracts entered into with, a foreign government, the amount, the date, a description of such conditions or restrictions, and the name of the foreign government.

"(c) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Beginning not later than 30 days before the July 31 immediately following the date of enactment of...
the DETERRENT Act of 2023, the Secretary shall—

"(1) establish and maintain a searchable database on a website of the Department, under which each report submitted under this section—

"(A) is, not later than 60 days after the date of the submission of such report, made publicly available (in electronic and downloadable format);

"(B) can be identified and compared to other such reports; and

"(C) is searchable and sortable by—

"(i) the date the institution filed such report;

"(ii) the date on which the institution received notice of the amount required under this section, or to comply with the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(4) pursuant to the assurance made under such subsection, in an amount that is not more than 250 but not more than 50 percent of the total amount of funding received by the institution under this Act (other than funds received under title IV of this Act).

"(2) indicate, as part of the public record of a report included in such database, whether the report was submitted by the institution with respect to a gift received from, or a contract entered into with—

"(A) a foreign source that is a foreign government; or

"(B) a foreign source that is not a foreign government.

"(e) RELATION TO OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

"(1) REQUIREMENTS.—If an institution that is required to file a disclosure report under subsection (a) is in a State that has enacted requirements for public disclosure of gifts from, or contracts with, a foreign source that includes all information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, the institution may file with the Secretary a copy of the disclosure report filed with the State in lieu of the report required under such subsection. The State in which the institution is located shall determine whether such assurance is the Secretary may require to establish that the institution has met the requirements for public disclosure under State law if the State report is filed.

"(2) USE OF OTHER FEDERAL REPORTS.—If an institution receives a gift from, or enters into a contract with, a foreign source, where any other department, agency, or bureau of the executive branch requires a report containing all the information required under this section for the same or an equivalent time period, the report may be filed with the Secretary in lieu of the report required under subsection (a).

"(f) MODIFICATION OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall appoint and maintain a single point of contact to—

"(1) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions of higher education regarding compliance with the requirements of this section; and

"(2) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in subsection (d), including—

"(A) improving upload functionality by allowing institutions to upload one file with all required information;

"(B) publishing and maintaining, on an annual basis, a database user guide that includes information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

"(C) creating a user group (to which capítulovies of the field are invited) to discuss possible database improvements, which shall—

"(i) include at least—

"(I) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

"(II) 2 members representing non-profit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

"(III) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

"(IV) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in section 335(a) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(a)); and

"(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements; and

"(D) publishing, on a publicly available website, information with respect to each recommended improvement described in clause (i)—

"(i) following each meeting described in subparagraph (C)(ii), recommended database improvements; and

"(ii) the rationale for such decision.

"(g) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AND GIFTS.—

"(1) EXCLUSIONS.—The following shall not be considered a gift, from, or contract with, a foreign source under this section:

"(A) Any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made on behalf of students that is not made under contract with the foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such student covering one or more elements of such student’s cost of attendance.

"(B) Any agreement or subagreement with a foreign source, including agreements with a foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such source, that is intended to be identified with a registered industrial and intellectual property rights, such as patents, utility models, trademarks, or copyrights, or technical assistance, that are identified by the Department, is associated with a national security risk or concern.

"(C) Any payment from a foreign source that is solely for the purpose of conducting one or more clinical trials.

"(2) INCLUSIONS.—Any gift to, or contract with, an entity or organization, such as a research foundation, that operates substantial programs of health-related biomedical or behavioral outcomes.

"(h) COMPLIANCE OFFICER.—Any institution that is required to report a gift or contract under this section shall designate and maintain a compliance officer who—

"(1) shall be a current employee (including such employee in another job title or capacity) of the institution; and

"(2) shall be responsible, on behalf of the institution, for compliance with the foreign gift reporting requirement under this section.

"(i) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT.—The Secretary shall appoint and maintain a single point of contact to—

"(1) receive and respond to inquiries and requests for technical assistance from institutions of higher education regarding compliance with the requirements of this section; and

"(2) coordinate and implement technical improvements to the database described in subsection (d), including—

"(A) improving upload functionality by allowing institutions to upload one file with all required information;

"(B) publishing and maintaining, on an annual basis, a database user guide that includes information on how to edit an entry and how to report errors;

"(C) creating a user group (to which capítulovies of the field are invited) to discuss possible database improvements, which shall—

"(i) include at least—

"(I) 3 members representing public institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as defined by the National Center for Education Statistics);

"(II) 2 members representing non-profit institutions with high or very high levels of research activity (as so defined);

"(III) 2 members representing proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102(b)); and

"(IV) 2 members representing area career and technical education schools (as defined in section 335(a) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302(a)); and

"(ii) meet at least twice a year with officials from the Department to discuss possible database improvements; and

"(D) publishing, on a publicly available website, information with respect to each recommended improvement described in clause (i)—

"(i) following each meeting described in subparagraph (C)(ii), recommended database improvements; and

"(ii) the rationale for such decision.

"(j) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AND GIFTS.—

"(1) EXCLUSIONS.—The following shall not be considered a gift, from, or contract with, a foreign source under this section:

"(A) Any payment of one or more elements of a student’s cost of attendance (as defined in section 472) to an institution by, or scholarship from, a foreign source who is a natural person, acting in their individual capacity and not as an agent for, at the request or direction of, or on behalf of, any person or entity (except the student), made on behalf of students that is not made under contract with the foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such student covering one or more elements of such student’s cost of attendance.

"(B) Any agreement or subagreement with a foreign source, including agreements with a foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such source, that is intended to be identified with a registered industrial and intellectual property rights, such as patents, utility models, trademarks, or copyrights, or technical assistance, that are identified by the Department, is associated with a national security risk or concern.

"(C) Any payment from a foreign source that is solely for the purpose of conducting one or more clinical trials.

"(2) INCLUSIONS.—Any gift to, or contract with, an entity or organization, such as a research foundation, that operates substantial programs of health-related biomedical or behavioral outcomes.

"(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term ‘clinical trial’ means a research study in which one or more human subjects are prospectively assigned to one or more interventions to evaluate the effects of the interventions on health-related biomedical or behavioral outcomes.

"(2) the term ‘contract’—

"(A) means any agreement for the acquisition by purchase, lease, or barter of property or services from the foreign source, for the direct benefit or use of either of the parties, except as provided in subparagraph (C)(ii), including an agreement where the object of the transaction with a foreign source that is more than the amount of the gift or contract with the foreign source, except for the agreement between the institution and such student covering one or more elements of such student’s cost of attendance.

"(3) the term ‘foreign source’ means—

"(A) a foreign government, including an agency of a foreign government;

"(B) a legal entity, governmental or otherwise, created under the laws of a foreign state or states;

"(C) an individual who is not a citizen or a national of the United States or a trust territory or protectorate thereof; and

"(D) an agent, including a subsidiary or affiliate of a foreign legal entity, acting on behalf of a foreign source.

"(4) the term ‘foreign source’ means—

"(A) means any gift of money, property, resources, staff, or services; and
Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute, rather than the underlying bill, to enhance institutions’ ability to protect against foreign influence.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute from Mr. SCOTT. Instead of taking the threat of foreign influence seriously, this amendment is a mere slap on the wrist for campuses and includes gaping disclosure loopholes. This is insufficient to protect our students and institutions from our worst adversaries.

The amendment first makes it easier for foreign sources to be undetected, doubling the threshold for contracts to $100,000 and allowing gifts under $250,000 over a 3-year span to go unreported.

Bad actors will seek any possible way to avoid transparency about their attempts to harm America through their influence over American postsecondary education, and a strict threshold is essential to stop that from happening.

The annual thresholds in the DE-TERRENT Act are simple and align with other requirements in existing Federal law.

Shockingly, this amendment includes no differences for America’s biggest enemies: countries of concern and entities of concern. In my colleagues’ minds, gifts from Russia and Iran are the same as gifts from England.

I find it alarming that my colleagues are trying to make it easier for countries of concern to find ways to influence our universities.

The DE-TERRENT Act uses a tailored list of countries and individuals, pulled from existing law, that have a proven track record of being security threats and actively working against the United States.

The Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute also has terrible carve-outs that provide gaping loopholes for cunning adversaries. The amendment prevents disclosure of the names of foreign sources and who at the institution is responsible for receiving the gift.

These loopholes will make it easier for foreign sources to conceal their relationships and schools to feign ignorance, rendering disclosures all but useless.

Finally, the Democrats provide no real incentive for schools to comply. Their fines for violations go as low as $250. After three consecutive years of violations, the Democrats’ fine only goes up to the full amount of the gift.

This is a laughable drop in the bucket compared to the billions in foreign contributions. Money talks, and institutions are trying to make it easier for countries of concern to find ways to influence our universities.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute, rather than the underlying bill, to enhance institutions’ ability to protect against foreign influence.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to offer this Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5933.
The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, it should be clear to all that there is not one American, not one Member of Congress, not one Democratic Member of Congress, as well, joined with colleagues who reasonably understand our mutual commitment to the national security of this Nation, who wants any interference with the important research that is being done by universities across America.

They are the hope of the world. There are brilliant students who come with complete innocence here to the United States to create global research that will help not only this country but the world.

I want that to continue. I want the bad actors to be wiped out. Clearly, as my friends have now moved from China to the Middle East, Hamas and Hezbollah, they are terrorists, but I am yet to find a dollar from them to any legitimate institution here in the United States.

What I will say is that we have a system in place. It builds on the chips and science of the President with a memorandum on government-supported research.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, we already have a process to weed out and stop it. I can’t imagine stopping research at the Yales and Harvards and Princetons, but I also can’t imagine stopping it from the ordinary universities across America.

Let us support the present legislation and the U.S. Department of Education and stop blaming our educational institutions for being terrorists.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in the committee chair’s remarks, she mentioned that there is a difference between countries of concern and other countries. I remind her that we just passed an amendment that essentially eliminated that difference. A recorded vote was requested, and perhaps she could join me in trying to defeat that amendment to the bill.

The motion in the nature of a substitute significantly increases the gifts and contracts that need to be reported compared to present law. It takes a more moderate approach to national security than the underlying bill, which I think is an extreme approach.

It will be very difficult for colleges to comply with. For that reason, I hope that we adopt the Democratic amendment in the nature of a substitute and, if not, defeat the underlying bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, my friend from Virginia and I have been doing really very well in working in a bipartisan manner recently, and I hate for things to come between us, but his amendment in the nature of a substitute really does do a lot of damage to the underlying bill.

There is no enforcement mechanism. There is no difference for malign actors. We have evidence to show that these foreign gifts are having an impact on the number of anti-Semitic demonstrations on the campuses. We know that foreigners are doing a lot to undermine our beliefs and values in this country.

We need to be aware of where money is coming from, from other countries and particularly from those countries that we know want to destroy us.

Mr. Chair, I have to very strongly oppose the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on it.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 118–298 offered by Mr. MOYLAN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, with Mr. STEUBE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 118–298 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that had been 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 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 372, noes 39, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]

**AYES—372**

**NOT VOTING—28**

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**NOES—39**

Mr. CARSON and Ms. TOKUDA changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. NEAL, VARGAS, Mses. SEWELL, ESHOO, SCANLON, Mr. MOGHERINI, and Ms. WEXTON changed their vote from "no" to "aye," so the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LALOTA. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 698.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, due to the tragic shootings at UNLV, I have been working with law enforcement and the public to address the situation, and I was absent from the floor and the vote on the Molinaro Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 5933.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 698, Agreeing to the Molinaro Amendment to H.R. 5933.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6. printed in part B of House Report 118-298 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. Scott of Virginia, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OffERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 213, not voting 24, as follows:

AYES—202

Adams
Alquist
Anderl
Anshin
Barr
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bost
Bradley
Branch
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Burgos
Buie
Bulinski
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carlo
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casan
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Cheer
Clarke (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davis (KS)
Davis (NC)
DeLauro
DelBene
DelBianco
Dingell
Doggett
Eads
Espaillat
Evans
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garzone
Garcia (IL)
Garcia, Robert

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOES—213

Aderholt
Adams
Amedee
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baier
Balderson
Barnes
Bartels
Bass
Bean (FL)
Beu
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Best
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Burris
Calvert
Carney
Carfaro
Carney (NJ)
Casada
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chaffetz
Cline
Cloud
Coles
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis
DeLauro
DelBianco
DeLauro
DeLauro
Dent
DeLauro
DeLauro
DelBianco
Dingell
Doggett
Eads
Espaillat
Evans
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garzone
Garcia (IL)
Garcia, Robert

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Barfield
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING--23

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

Mr. CARSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING--23

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING--23

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING--23

Allen
Balint
Bailey
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker
Baker

Wasserman Schultz
Waters

Waterman Coleman
Williams (GA)

Wilson (FL)
Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700.

Stated against:
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). There being no further amendment under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEUBE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5933) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional information in disclosures of foreign gifts and contracts from foreign sources, restrict contracts with certain foreign entities and foreign countries of concern, require certain staff and faculty to report foreign gifts and contracts, and require disclosure of certain foreign investments within endowments, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundary amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 700, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

Yeas—246

Nays—170

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 700.
Ms. Stevens moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4668 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 4, beginning on line 9, strike clause (i) (relating to limited availability of new motor vehicles based on engine type), and make such conforming changes as may be necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the pre¬

question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. Speaker, on that

the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

question is on the passage of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote was taken by electronic de¬

will be a 5-minute vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote will be taken by electronic de¬

The question was taken; and the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote will be taken by electronic de¬

The question was taken; and the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote will be taken by electronic de¬

The question was taken; and the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote will be taken by electronic de¬

The question was taken; and the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote will be taken by electronic de¬
The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The Speaker pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The Speaker pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 216, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:
Representative JAMAIL BOWMAN of New York knowingly pulled a fire alarm to cause panic and stop the House from doing its business. This is a felony, plain and simple. It is not difficult to understand.

Capitol Police were forced to waste resources investigating rather than doing their job to keep the Capitol safe. USCSP determined BOWMAN broke the law, and he was indicted by the Attorney General of the District of Columbia. Realizing no number of excuses could get him out of this, Mr. BOWMAN pled guilty.

As a former principal of the Cornerstone Academy for Social Action in New York City, Mr. BOWMAN should know the consequences of pulling a fire alarm to cause panic. In New York schools, the policy is clear. When a student commits a crime on campus, police are called, and that student is either suspended or expelled.

One would think Representative BOWMAN would hold himself to the same standards as he held his students to. I don’t think that is a lot to ask.

The Republican majority held our own former Member accountable after the House Ethics Committee found he engaged in criminal behavior. It would be hypocritical for the House Democrats to not join us in holding one of their own Members accountable who actually pled guilty to breaking the law.

I do not submit this resolution lightly, Mr. Speaker. Article I, Section 5 of our Constitution gives the House the solemn responsibility to discipline Members for disorderly behavior. As conviction demonstrates, Representative BOWMAN sought to cause panic to delay official proceedings of this House.

I urge my fellow Members to vote “yes” on my resolution and to hold our colleagues accountable when they break the law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a profoundly stupid resolution. Under Republican control, this Chamber has become a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all. Republicans have focused more on censuring people in this Congress than actually improving this country in any way. What a waste of time and money. They have turned this place into a joke.

They came into the majority talking a big game, but have delivered nothing, not a single, damn thing. They talk about passing bills that help people we represent or improving this country in any way. What a waste of time and money. They have turned this place into a joke.

What we are doing is distracting from the fact that the Republican agenda has been a total and complete failure, the least productive Congress in history, the most rules failed in a single year. They drugged America to the brink of default twice, almost shut down the government, wasted weeks fighting about who should be Speaker, and hitting each other in the hallways.

We should be talking about important issues like the Children’s Health Insurance Program. We should be addressing healthcare costs, helping Americans build economic security, competing with our adversaries abroad, and investing in our people at home.

We just had the shooting in Las Vegas. We should be talking about preventing gun violence in this country, and you have us here talking about how someone tried to go out the wrong door of the Cannon House Office Building.

Honestly, what the hell is wrong with you?

Congressman BOWMAN apologized. I want to read his statement so we can be clear about what we are talking about here today. “Today, as I was rushing to make a vote, I came to a door that is usually open for votes but today would not open. I am embarrassed to admit that I activated the fire alarm, mistakenly thinking it would open the door. I regret this and sincerely apologize for any confusion this caused.”

He messed up. Like many of us do every day, he was rushing to get to votes. Guess what? No one was hurt. No one’s life was put in danger. Votes went on like nothing happened. Anyone who works here knows that a fire alarm going off across the street wouldn’t impact votes here in the Capitol.

I find it terribly ironic that we are talking about censuring Mr. BOWMAN, yet we never censured any of our colleagues who tried to overturn the election on January 6 or who failed to respond to a subpoena or who put our national security in danger by storming the SCIF with their phones.

In fact, to the contrary, MIKE JOHNSON, the new Speaker of the House, held a press conference yesterday about the January 6 video footage. Something he said stuck with me:

We have toiber some of the people’s faces who participated in the events of that day because we don’t want them to be retaliated against and charged by the DOJ.

Just to be clear, Republicans want to protect the insurrectionists, shield them from accountability, the people who worked with rioters who smashed windows, desecrated this building, and tried to take down our democracy. Not our doors; America’s doors, America’s officers, America’s windows. This is America’s building that Trump’s mob defiled.

Speaker JOHNSON wants to protect the mob but has us here debating this absurd censure. What a pathetic exercise in retaliation and revenge. What a petty thing it is to bring this garbage to the floor. Sadly, it is just a typical week for this disgraceful Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To use that logic, then all those people should have just said "sorry," and we would move on, right? No, we don’t do that.

Let’s take a little bit of offense to “What the hell is wrong with you?” I will tell you, there is nothing wrong with me. I took an oath to defend the Constitution, and that is exactly what I am going to do. I am not going to apologize for it. I am going to hold the Constitution. It is very simple. We really shouldn’t even have this debate. If you break the law and you follow due process, there are consequences to your actions, even if you say “sorry.”

We can try all of the diversion tactics that we would like. It doesn’t change the fact that someone broke the law and that someone should be held accountable. It is disappointing, Mr. Speaker, that their own party can’t hold them accountable, that they have such hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, we all remember that day, September 30, 2023, at 11:59 a.m. That was when the Democrats actually called for a motion to adjourn. It was a tactic to stop the vote from taking place when we were just 12 hours away from a government shutdown. It was certainly an attempt to interfere with an official proceeding. It was a tactic to stop the vote even further. Perhaps the most egregious thing we saw was when one of the Members—remember, we are Members of Congress—and a Member on the other side of the aisle pulled a fire alarm to disrupt proceedings. It was certainly an attempt to interfere with an official proceeding.

Now, the speaker who spoke on his behalf said, no, no, no, he was rushing for a vote. That is what the statement from Mr. BOWMAN was, that he was rushing for a vote. Then why, after pulling that alarm, did he show up to vote an hour later? If he was in such a rush to come to the Capitol to vote, why did it take him an hour to actually cast his vote?

That is the question that he should be answering, because nothing else truly makes sense. The bottom line here is that he was charged with a crime, and he was convicted by the police. He did break the law, he did plead guilty, and we need to hold that Member accountable. That is why we have brought this resolution today.

It is not pathetic. What is pathetic is somebody who is a grown adult pulling a fire alarm when they are in high school. As a high school principal, Mr. BOWMAN knows very well the old fire alarm trick, and there would be accountability for his students if they pulled the fire alarm.

That is why we are here today making sure there is accountability. That is all that this is about. It is not just accountability if Republicans do something. There is accountability if anyone in this Chamber does something, commits a crime, pleads guilty. That is what we are doing today.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we speak here today, conflicts are raging around the globe, and the American people are wondering exactly what they want us to do. Democracy is under siege. Putin is salivating at the prospect that Republicans might abandon Ukraine. Seventy thousand child care centers are on the verge of shutting down because the GOP let vital funding expire. We don’t even have a budget, despite the fact that we voted for those top-line numbers back in June.

This ridiculous censure is how the Republicans are spending the time of this Chamber and the time of the American people. The MAGA majority should be embarrassed if they are still capable of shame. Republicans filled this censure the same day they decided to shield the identities of January 6 rioters.

I do have to hand it to the majority. They have managed to both push an extreme agenda and be a do-nothing majority. They have done nothing to make families freer, safer, or more confident in their future. Instead, they have voted against lowering the cost of insulin, affordable housing, and gun safety. They have done nothing to promote freedom, but they do not miss an opportunity to vote for abortion bans, book bans, and tax cheats.

Just last week, the majority’s leadership said no to holding George Santos accountable after a motion to expel was made by the Republican chairman of the Ethics Committee, but today they bring this to the floor? A censure isn’t a substitute for a policy agenda. It isn’t filler when you have nothing to offer the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this sham resolution.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, it was said by our friends on the other side of the aisle that this censure motion is profoundly stupid. What is profoundly stupid is an adult man, who has been elected as a Member of Congress, held to a high esteem, pulling a fire alarm like a child, like throwing a tantrum. What is worse is that he violated the law. He broke the law when he did it.

It wasn’t just something to say, oh, I am sorry. He broke the law because he wanted to obstruct the meeting of this body, the vote of this body. The January 6 individuals have been talked about. If someone had done that on January 6, they would have been put in jail. The American people know it.

They see that there is a double standard. They see that this side of the aisle cleans up its House. The other side is going to let people who have committed crimes continue to sit in office. The other side of the building is going to clean up, and we have a legitimate to be answering, because nothing else truly makes sense. The bottom line here is that he was charged with a crime, and he was convicted by the police. He did break the law, he did plead guilty. Immediately. The legal process on this matter has played out.

In no way did I obstruct official proceedings. The vote took place and the time of the censure was set by this Committee and the time of the censure was determined by the Republican Party. They see that there is a double standard on this side of the aisle, and the American people know it. The standard on this side of the aisle is high. What is clear today is the standard on that side of the aisle is not.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will say it again, this resolution is profoundly stupid.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is painfully obvious to myself, my colleagues, and the American people that the Republican Party is deeply unprofessional and unable to legislate. Their censure resolution against me today continues to demonstrate their inability to govern and serve the American people.

Over the last 3 years, I have tirelessly fought for my district and my constituents by bringing over $125 million to the district. I helped save members of my community over $7 million and resolved over 6,500 constituent concerns.

I have introduced over 50 bills, resolutions, and amendments, and I had two bills on STEM education passed in the historic Chips and Science Act.

Even today, as Republicans force a censure on me, I introduced a new bill, the College Athlete Right to Organize Act, to ensure college athletes get paid for their time and hard work. No matter the result of the censure vote tomorrow, my constituents know I will always continue to fight for them.

Fighting for my district includes working to prevent a government shutdown. Just over 2 months ago, I was rushing to the Capitol to vote and prevent a Republican shutdown. When I tried to exit a door that I usually go through, it didn’t open, and due to confusion and rush to go vote, I pulled the fire alarm.

I immediately took responsibility and accountability for my actions and promptly resigned. Immediately. The legal process on this matter has played out. In no way did I obstruct official proceedings. The vote took place and Democrats were able to ensure we avoided a government shutdown.

Unfortunately, Republicans are here trying to rehash an already litigated matter. This is a matter in which the Republican-controlled House Committee on Ethics decided not to proceed with any further investigation.

When I was elected to represent. Instead of passing meaningful legislation for the American people, some Republicans are
using this censure to waste our time and money. They are trying to make you forget about all of the rights they want to destroy.

They are trying to make you forget they want to take away your reproductive rights, your voting rights, your health care, your Social Security, and your Medicare.

House Democrats have been trying to focus on and address the issues the American people care about.

Can we please, please, please address the affordability crisis?

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are struggling to put food on their tables, pay their rent, and keep the electricity on.

Can we address the issue of gun violence?

Just this week, we broke the record for the most mass shootings in a year and we have lost over 35,000 people due to gun violence.

Can we address our crumbling public school infrastructure?

Kids are learning in schools with asbestos, no air conditioning, and mold. It is hurting their ability to learn, grow, and thrive.

Can we put an end to our massive spending on weapons and war, and instead invest in our communities and our kids?

The number one thing I tried to do as a middle school principal and as an educator for 20 years was to teach my students when they made a mistake, they owned up to it, they took responsibility, and they held themselves accountable. That is exactly what I did. Yet, we are still here.

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

Mr. Speaker, although your district may appreciate all of those accomplishments, are we supposed to just forget about the crime that you committed?

Perhaps, in education, maybe we should have studied a little harder. If you commit a crime, there is a penalty to that crime. You don’t get to say: I committed a crime, but I did all these good things. All these good things erase this crime over here. It doesn’t work that way.

Again, I will say that it is not profoundly stupid to hold up the Constitution. The left may believe holding up the rights of the Constitution is profoundly stupid. I don’t believe we do. I will again say that this hearing and this censure is not profoundly stupid. It is actually a hearing of where we followed the law.

Mr. Speaker, the other fact that I may want to correct—I will correct the truth with maybe the other half of the truth: immediately means right away. So when you say, “I immediately” took action, “I immediately”—well, the incident occurred on September 30, October 26 was when you pled guilty. I think that is a little bit longer than immediately. Again, maybe math wasn’t my best subject either.

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

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

On September 30, while the House considered crucial legislation to avoid a government shutdown, Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN pulled a fire alarm to disrupt proceedings, a crime for which he pled guilty. Let me repeat that again. A crime for which he pled guilty.

As a career firefighter, who served for 25 years in the city of Miami, 9 years of which I served as its chief, I know just how serious this is. Every time a firefighter responds to an alarm, they are putting themselves and the public at risk.

While that is a risk that we are willing to take to protect life and property, we should never put our first responders and the public at risk by pulling a false alarm. In fact, in 2021, over 40 police and firefighters died and were killed while responding to an alarm.

While Representative BOWMAN initially claimed that he pulled the alarm thinking it would open a locked door, we know that that was a blatant lie. After pulling the alarm, Representative BOWMAN can be clearly seen on camera ripping down the emergency exit signs and fleeing the scene. He had every opportunity to alert Capitol Police to his mistake but chose not to.

Had it been a simple mistake, I wouldn’t be here. It wasn’t a simple mistake.

It is disgraceful that a Member of Congress would go to such lengths to break the law and put first responders and the public at risk to prevent the House from voting to keep government open so our Federal workers can receive their paychecks.

For obstructing the House, putting first responders and the public at risk, and breaking D.C. laws, Representative BOWMAN should be censured before the House.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman talks about following the Constitution. Really? Coming from that side, it is laughable to hear that. There was silence about the crimes of Donald Trump; silence about what happened here on January 6. Silence.

Do you want to talk about opening a door?

The people who stormed this place broke down doors trying to kill people. Silence. I don’t want to hear any lectures about upholding the Constitution. There is nothing but silence about the crimes of those who attacked this Capitol on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about my colleague, Mr. JAMAAL BOWMAN, who I have the privilege of serving on two committees within this very Congress: the Education and Labor Committee and the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

I have seen Mr. BOWMAN fight for disability rights, childcare, affordable prescription drugs, and affordable housing. He has stood up to attacks on public education, attacks on teachers, and cuts to school nutrition. There is a unique and vital perspective Mr. BOWMAN brings to education issues in this Congress.

In his freshman term, he served as a subcommittee chair for Energy. He was a Conference committee member on the Chips and Science Act, advocating for diversity, equity, and inclusion, so that the jobs and profits could go to every day Americans.

This man does not deserve to be reprimanded. We should heed the leadership that he brings to education issues. He looks at AI and he asks: How can we solve the problems of tomorrow? If we could all do such a thing.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ALFORD).

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I really don’t take any joy in being here standing before you today to address this matter of grave concern.

Mr. Speaker, this is not trivial. This is not stupid. This is profoundly important; a solemn duty that I do not take lightly. This is not personal. This is not partisan. It is to protect this very body.

Representative JAMAAL BOWMAN was criminally charged and pleaded guilty to falsely pulling a fire alarm. While I applaud his confession, that doesn’t mean this is without consequences. This was not a mere lapse in judgment. It was not a mistake. It was not an accident.

It was an intentional, calculated attempt to disrupt the very democratic process by halting a critical vote on this very floor, voting for government funding. If you don’t believe it, watch the video.

What should our response be as a House to this willful act of obstruction?

Mr. Speaker, to this point, nothing has been done.

This inaction sends a very dangerous message: that a Member of Congress can break the law and the norms of this institution to obstruct a vote without any consequences. We must rise above partisan politics and hold our own accountable.

The integrity of our democratic process, the safety of our community, the trust of the American people, and the function of this body demands nothing less.

We cannot allow the reckless, calculated actions of one individual to overshadow the critical work that this
body does. I am sure that Mr. Bowman is a fine Representative for the people of his district. This is not a joyous day for anyone here on this side of the aisle. This is a sad day for this body.

It is an even sadder day if we do nothing about this egregious act. I recommend that the entire body vote "yes" for the censure.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, let me just respond to the gentleman by saying that this isn't a political or partisan is. I don't know what the hell is. This is a pathetic display that we are seeing here on the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Aguilar), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. Aguilar. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution because House Democrats want a functioning House of Representatives. We are in the midst of the least productive Congress since the Great Depression. This obstruction is what happens when extreme MAGA Republicans dictate the agenda.

The majority is fixated on censures, expulsions, and impeachments. Meanwhile, the American public is worried about making ends meet.

Where is the Republican urgency around lowering costs? Where are their solutions for their constituents who are worried about rent, groceries, and utilities?

The truth is that they have no plan and no solutions. They are taking orders from the former President and being led by the most extreme members of their Conference.

However, when House Democrats held the majority, we passed the bipartisan infrastructure law, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the bipartisan Chips and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act. These laws are creating good-paying jobs, lowering energy costs, and making schools safer in communities across this country.

A vote for this resolution will further divide this body at a time when we should be coming together to make the needs of the American public front and center.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues from New York. Mr. Bowman, and I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. McClain. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. McClain. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lawler).

Mr. Lawler. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced the resolution to expel disgraced former Congressman George Santos. It was warranted. It was warranted because he defrauded the voters and defrauded donors, and he is facing a 23-count indictment.

He did not belong in Congress. I was willing to take on a member of my own party and reduce our majority by one because it was the right thing to do.

Now, as a Congressman from the 17th District of New York, I share Westchester County with Mr. Bowman. I have gotten to know Mr. Bowman throughout the course of my tenure here in Congress. We have even flown home together to Westchester County Airport.

What happened on September 30 was wrong. I am sure he is embarrassed. He should be. As a former middle school principal, he understands the difference between a locked door and a fire alarm. To suggest that somehow he was confused is laughable.

As the video evidence shows, he did pull the fire alarm. It didn't open. Nonetheless, he then took down the signs. He threw one on the ground, carried one, walked over to the fire alarm on the wall, and pulled the fire alarm. It didn't say: Pull to exit. It didn't say: In case of a locked door, pull the fire alarm and the door will open.

No. It said: In case of emergency, pull fire alarm.

He then proceeded to throw the other sign on the ground, and he ran past seven—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven—Capitol Police officers and did not utter one word about accidentally and embarrassingly pulling a fire alarm.

In fact, when the BOLO went out and the Capitol Police came to question him about it, he lawyered up. He then went and met with Leader Jeffries.

That is not taking accountability right away. That is not taking responsibility. In fact, a few days after it happened, he called me directly to ask me: Please don't get on a censure or an expulsion resolution.

I said to him: I will not do anything until I hear from the Capitol Police as to what happened.

He told me: Oh, I won't be charged. They are dismissing it. I didn't do anything.

They ended up referring it to prosecutors. He was charged, and he pled guilty.

I don't think he should be expelled. I think what he did was wrong. I don't think it was an accident. It was absolutely purposeful as the Democrats were pulling all sorts of stunts that day, including walking single file in to vote by paper even though they all had their electronic voting cards. Hakeem Jeffries was doing his magic in the Capitol Police as to what happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Lawler. The number of times I get calls from your constituents and the amount of time I am inundated with requests from your constituents, like when you shut your office down for 2 weeks in August—all the offices shut down. Do you know how many cases we had to take on?

Calls came from Jewish constituents who don't feel that they can go to you for help.

They don't think it is funny. The people of Westchester County don't think it is funny.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this censure.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my Republican colleagues: Are you listening to yourselves talk?

We are in the House Chamber. Heads of state address this body. We have debates about war and peace, and you are talking about a fire alarm? I mean, give me a break.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. Ocasio-Cortez).

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Mr. Speaker, I think the Republican side of the aisle made the case quite clearly today as to why we should not vote for censure.

Right now, you can tell how weak their arguments are because they are grasping for straws, trying to do their best.

My Cousin Vinny impersonation as to breaking down what happened here with a fire alarm.

Jamaal Bowman has more courage in his pinkie finger than the entire Republican Party put together. That is exactly why they are moving to censure him today.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what is actually going on. New York Republicans are so embarrassed that they posted up George Santos, got him elected to office, and then had to turn around and vote to expel him that they want to distract the entire world from their massive embarrassment.

New York Republicans are so embarrassed that they have not accomplished a damn thing for New Yorkers this entire year that they have to find a distraction, so they have decided to target one of the first Black men to ever represent Westchester County in the United States Congress for censure. This is what today is about.

Moreover, New York Republicans are so unfocused and so unable to make
JAMAAL BOWMAN did not tell the Capitol Police that he pulled the fire alarm even though he admitted himself that, when he makes a mistake, he would tell his own students: If you have made a mistake, own up to it and take accountability for your actions. He should have told Capitol Police immediately that he made a mistake, as he claimed.

It wasn’t a mistake, Mr. Speaker. It was on purpose. It was intentional. It was all in part to play the games and the shenanigans that the Democrats were pulling that day as they were trying to block the continuing resolution that was being considered on the House floor.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the fire alarm was pulled minutes after the Democratic whip made a motion to adjourn.

More importantly, he was intentionally playing his part to obstruct an official proceeding.

By the way, this is the same thing that has been used against January 6 defendants and is still being used to this day. They are being locked up, held in pretrial detention, and being prosecuted by the Department of Justice nearly 3 years later for obstructing an official proceeding, which is exactly what JAMAAL BOWMAN, a Member of Congress, did on September 30.

We have a two-tiered justice system in Washington, D.C. Regular people walked into the Capitol. By the way, many nonviolent offenders walked in open doors. Some of them who also were standing out on the lawn and never entered the Capitol are being charged for obstructing an official proceeding.

Yet, JAMAAL BOWMAN says that it was a mistake and that he should get a pass. His colleagues make excuses for him and don’t treat the people the same way.

Do you know what is unserious, Mr. Speaker? Having a justice system that doesn’t hold everyone accountable and doesn’t treat people the same way. This is an outrage, and this is a disgrace to this institution and this body.

For someone who is a former principal and who punished his own students for intentionally pulling fire alarms to make up petty excuses and think that his own constituents and the American people will buy his lie is a slap in the face to his voters, the people whom he represents, this entire country, and every single one of us who serves in this body.

I would also add that if anyone is going to be charged and forced to remain in jail, forced to be serving prison time for obstructing an official proceeding, then JAMAAL BOWMAN should face the same sentence of every single January 6 defendant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this censure resolution, and I thank Representative MCCLAIN for introducing it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is really rich to get a lecture from someone about civility who stood on this House floor and screamed and interrupted the President of the United States during his state of the Union, or somebody who continues to circle the wagons and cheer on the insurrectionists who attacked this Capitol violently on January 6.

The last person off the House floor on that day, and I saw what happened. Then for people to come down here and defend those actions, it is pathetic and disgusting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, they are so desperate. You all are so desperate to distract from the fact that you all have nothing to improve the lives of the American people or end the ongoing genocide.

Now, you are trying to shift the focus by baselessly attacking Representative Bowman to score cheap political points, comparing him to the white supremacists on January 6 who were smashing windows in the Capitol and screaming: “Hang Mike Pence.” Give me a break.

Your inability to govern is so obvious to the American people. You all can’t even find enough Republicans to pass a budget or even keep a Speaker. This is yet another attempt to silence a person of color in this Chamber. We all see it.

This is all about the fact that Representative Bowman calls out your hypocrisy. The Republicans need to leave him alone and get a grip. The Republicans should do something that will actually improve the lives of the American people that you all represent. Nothing to improve the lives of the American people or end the ongoing genocide.

Mrs. McClairen. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind you that we talk about baseless claims. If I am not mistaken, Coach Bowman made a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore.
a complete and total embarrassment. Extreme MAGA Republicans have stooped to a new low, and that is very difficult based on the events that have taken place under this Republican majority throughout this year.

Jamaal Bowman has taken public responsibility for the fire alarm incident. He has apologized, explained the circumstances under which it occurred. He has been held publicly accountable by the D.C. Superior Court, paid a $1,000 fine, and the Ethics Committee, under a Republican chair, on a bipartisan basis here in this Congress made clear that no further action was required.

It begs the question: Why is the author of this resolution and the extreme MAGA Republicans on the floor of the House wasting time and taxpayer resources trying to undermine the credibility of Jamaal Bowman?

He is someone who is doing his best to serve his constituents, including in some of the poorest sections of the Bronx, and extreme MAGA Republicans have us on the floor with this sad and silly charade.

Now, the extreme MAGA Republicans have said, including the author of this resolution, that this is about law and order. Give us a break. All you have done is demonstrate throughout the years, including on January 6 and thereafter, that you are not the party of law and order. Extreme MAGA Republicans are the party of lawlessness and disorder.

As a matter of fact, the author of this resolution has endorsed Donald Trump, with multiple indictments. Someone who undertook a crime wave over and over and over again, proudly smirking now that she stands behind Trump, with multiple indictments.

As a matter of fact, the author of this resolution voted to overturn the will of the American people on January 6, and then came back, like the majority of her extreme MAGA Republican colleagues after the violent insurrection, after the Capitol was overrun by a violent mob, after more than 100 Capitol Police officers were seriously injured, and then voted still, not for law and order, not for accountability, and not for the Constitution. You voted with the insurrectionists.

Give us a break, lecturing us about the Constitution and law and order. Your own record suggests that is a phony argument. Nobody is buying it.

The American people aren’t buying it. We will make sure the people of Michigan won’t buy it.

It has been very interesting watching extreme MAGA Republicans in this debate acting like detectives on the House floor. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Perry Mason. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Matlock. Extreme MAGA Republicans pretending to be Cagney & Lacey, not even worthy of being held to the standard of Inspector Gadget and Ace Ventura: Pet Detective. That is how embarrassing your display on the House floor has been.

This is a serious matter. Your behavior on the House floor is a serious matter, and I have the floor. I have the floor.

The behavior of the extreme MAGA Republicans censuring Member after Member after Member has brought disgrace to the institution, to the House of Representatives.

This behavior has brought disgrace; not the underlying censure. There has been accountability in the ways that we have all described. The effort to weaponize the censure—what happened, Mr. Speaker, to civility? What happened to trying to foster an environment where we can solve problems on behalf of the American people?

We don’t take these arguments of civility seriously because the overwhelming majority of the extreme MAGA Republicans supports the violent insurrectionists and supports the insurrectionist-in-chief, twice impeached, under Federal indictment repeatedly for breaking the law and violating the Constitution.

We are not going to let it happen. We are not going to let extreme MAGA Republicans distract the people of Michigan, distract the people of New York, distract the people of America. We are on the House floor wasting time talking about fire alarms—not the economy, not inflation, not affordable housing, not lowering costs, not the gun violence epidemic that continues to claim the lives of our young people all across America. Extreme MAGA Republicans have us on the House floor talking about fire alarms. How silly is that under these circumstances?

Social Security is under assault. Medicare is under assault. Reproductive freedom is under assault. The Affordable Care Act is under assault. Democratic Party is under assault, and extreme MAGA Republicans are wasting time on the House floor talking about fire alarms under these circumstances.

There are extreme MAGA Republicans. It is petty, it is pathetic, and it is petulant.

Now, House Democrats have said from the very beginning of this Congress that we will find bipartisan common ground with our Republican colleagues on any issue whenever and wherever necessary in order to make life better for the American people on any issue, but we will push back against Republican extremism whenever necessary and you have crossed a line once again.

We will call out MAGA extremism in the loudest, strongest, most direct way possible. This extreme MAGA Republicans’ do-nothing Republican Congress has done nothing to improve the lives of the American people all over the land. This do-nothing Republican Congress has failed to solve a single problem on behalf of hardworking Americans.

If extreme MAGA Republicans are going to continue to try to weaponize censure as is being done on this floor right now, going after Democrats repeatedly week after week after week because you have nothing better to do, then I volunteer. Censure me next. That is how worthless your censure effort is. It has no credibility, no integrity, and no legitimacy.

Republicans should censure me next. I will take that censure and I will wear it next week, next month, next year like a badge of honor. I will go home, sleep well, and say to myself, today was a good day.

Mrs. McClain. Mr. Speaker, therein lies the problem. I am one of the so-called MAGA Republicans which, again, I don’t apologize for.

Under MAGA Republican leadership, I might remind everybody, crime was down—or excuse me, crime was up—crime was down under the last administration. Clearly, crime was down. The economy was up.

All of these problems that we are dealing with in this Congress today, Mr. Speaker, have been created by the Biden administration and created by my friends on the left. That is the truth. Those are the facts.

Under the MAGA Republicans, how many wars were we fighting overseas? Zero. What was the crime rate? Down. Again, we have some serious problems since Joe Biden and this administration, took office, and therein lies the problem.

You want to talk about law and order. You want to talk about Cagney & Lacey and Ace Ventura, that is cute. That is cute.

Mr. Speaker, you want to talk about a disgrace to this body? Doing investigative work and actually following due process, that is what we are supposed to do. That is what I thought we did.

I will not apologize for following law and order, but under the Democrats’ law and order, you shouldn’t go through any investigation. You should just on a whim do some impeachment. That is what the other side of the aisle does.

We clean up our locker room, but when you commit a crime, it is unfortunate that we have to bring this to the table. As much as they want to compare us and call us names, they can continue to do that, but the facts speak for themselves. We waited until an investigation was completed before we brought this censure resolution. We
didn’t do it on a whim. That is law and order. If that is Cagney & Lacey, following due process, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle could use a little investigative reporting and some detective work themselves. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I grew up not understanding why people throughout the country didn’t hold Congress in high regard, but I can just imagine the people turning on C-SPAN, turning on the news, hearing the arguments that we are hearing from the other side of the aisle, and then it just makes sense to me.

Let’s recap what the American people have witnessed over the last few years: A Member who physically assaulted a colleague, a Republican Member who tried to bring a gun on the House floor, a Republican colleague who brought January 6 insurrectionists into the Capitol.

This is the least productive Congress that we have had since the Great Depression, and this entire party is pushing us toward a shutdown and economic collapse daily, but it is Congresswoman Bowman, who is a thoughtful former educator and staunch defender of democracy, who they want to censure. We are all part of a waste of time. No wonder half of this country did not vote when they turned on the TV and see their leaders wasting time like this.

We need more educators in Congress like Congresswoman Bowman, not fewer, and maybe if we had more educators here, they would be able to give my Republican colleagues a class on how to truly govern.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Bowman is a brilliant, committed, progressive Member who has dedicated his life to equity and opportunity for kids. He is a leader in economic justice. He is a leader of the Green New Deal for public schools, and legislation to pay artists what they are worth.

He made a mistake. He apologized. He paid the fine. The Ethics Committee declined to further investigate the matter. That should be the end of this.

However, what are we doing here? Republicans would rather waste time with political stunts and demonizing a Black Member. They want people to forget that they want to strip healthcare from Americans. They want people to forget that they want to cut Social Security and Medicare, the two most important and trusted programs in the country, and want people to forget that they are denying election results on that side, your right to vote.

Right now they will do anything to distract from what they are really doing. There is nothing to show for the majority but chaos, infighting, and cruelty.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I just have to end with this. Just a few weeks ago, Congressman CHAP ROY stood on the floor of this Chamber and called for his fellow Republican colleagues to “come clean” about why they support a former President currently running for President that is facing 91 Federal and State indictments.

It is clear she doesn’t know what is up or down because we sit on the Education and the Workforce Committee together talking about how she wants to help our kids, but all she wants to do is criminalize their ability to exist as individuals.

It makes sense that she doesn’t know what is up or down because she keeps talking about accountability, and she doesn’t understand that criminal charges are accountability. Pleading guilty is taking accountability. That is what the gentlewoman has done.

The only reason we are here is because she wants more time on camera. It is to make sure there is an ability to send a fundraiser asking for money.

This censure is not necessary because this gentleman has already been held accountable.

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we need to be accountable to this body.

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

Mr. MCOGVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise because we are tired of extreme Republican antics that seek to put politics over the needs of people.

Under Republican leadership, the House has successfully passed just 14 bills. Some of these were bills to put an impending government shutdown, which we all know was only avoided thanks to the Democrats. They need their complete and utter inability to govern resulted in an entire Chamber of Congress being unable to perform its basic duties for 17 days, 17 failed Speaker votes, and multiple failed Speaker candidates. Their House is not in order.

Republicans haven’t delivered on any top public priorities like strengthening Social Security, delivering environmental protections, or boosting our economy. Politically motivated censures like this one that target Black and Brown Members of Congress like this one are not only a waste of time, they are a distraction.

The people aren’t falling for it. Republicans should actually legislate rather than play useless political games like this attempt to censure Representative Jamaal Bowman.

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

Mr. MCOGVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I apologize to the American people. I apologize to the Republican majority is not one of them.

Republicans are disconnected, dysfunctional, discriminating, and a disappointment to the American people. Let’s not pass the buck to fund our public schools, but they will bring this resolution to attack Congressman Bowman, a champion for students, a lifelong educator, a duly elected Member of Congress, and a strong Black man. He honors the legacy of the many brilliant Black men who came before him.

A quick history lesson: We are approaching the anniversary of when Joseph Rainey became the first Black Member of the U.S. House of Representatives in December of 1870. Just like Jamaal Bowman, he fought for public education and civil rights, and he had to deal with double standards and racism in Congress.

This censure is just the latest in this Chamber’s racists saga of telling Black men that they don’t belong in Congress.

To the Black men of this Nation, know that you belong everywhere.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Jamaal Bowman is fighting for you, and I am fighting for you right alongside him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

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

Congressman Bowman has taken accountability for his mistake, and even Republicans on the Ethics Committee agree that this is a waste of time.

We have got 99 problems, but a functional government of the Republican majority is not one of them.
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Hon. Mike Johnson,

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: Following my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability effective today.

Sincerely,

Chuck Edwards, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on the Budget:


Hon. Mike Johnson,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR Speaker Johnson: Following my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the House Committee on the Budget for the 118th Congress, effective today.

Sincerely,

Chuck Edwards, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability:


Hon. Mike Johnson,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. Speaker: I respectfully inform the House Republican Conference that I resign my membership on the Committee on Oversight and Accountability for the remainder of the 118th Congress, effective immediately. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve on the Committee under the leadership of Chairman Comer. I am proud of the Committee’s accomplishments and look forward to continuing this important work on behalf of the American people.

Sincerely,

Kelly Armstrong, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability:


Hon. Mike Johnson,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. Speaker: Following my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress, I hereby resign from the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability effective today.

Sincerely,

Chuck Edwards, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:


Hon. Mike Johnson,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR Mr. Speaker: On behalf of the American people, I urge a "no" vote on this pathetic, stupid resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Again, I will end as I began, by apologizing to my friends know that. It is about deflecting from how unhinged this majority is. They had to expel one of their own Members last week, for God’s sake. They had the first Speaker in history to resign. They have nothing to show for an entire year in the majority. Nothing. They have done nothing. They have wasted time on stupid measures like this. Nothing.

This whole exercise is just nuts. For Republicans, it is all about appeasing their orange overlords in Mar-a-Lago who can do no wrong.

They don’t care about governing. They aren’t fit to govern. They aren’t concerned about the serious and complex issues facing this country, the world, or the people we represent. For them, being in power is all about retaliation and revenge, and the destruction of their perceived enemies. It is time for the Republican Party to grow up.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to waste another second on this meaningless resolution. This is pathetic. The Republicans have turned this Chamber into a place where trivial issues get debated passionately and important ones not at all.

My friends have done nothing—not a damn thing—for the people that they say they represent. How can anybody on the other side of the aisle go home with a straight face and say that they are representing their constituents? They have produced nothing for them. They have turned this place into a joke.

It is sad that we are here today. Again, I will end as I began, by apologizing to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this pathetic, stupid resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. McClain. Mr. Speaker, in case my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need clarification, I want to make it clear, the American people know that they are not better off than they were 4 years ago, and they know it is Democrats in this Congress and the White House that have put them in this anguish as we see today just to clear things up.

All we have heard from congressional Democrats is excuse after excuse for Representative Bowman’s criminal behaviors. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that if a Republican did what Mr. Bowman did, that every single Member on the Democratic side would be down here calling for censure, if not expulsion.

Mr. Bowman himself, despite pleading guilty, said it was an accident. How? Someone looks at a sign that says “Fire” and thinks, hmm, I wonder what this will do? Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability:


Speaker Johnson: I am writing to inform you of my intent to leave my seat on the Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure following my recent appointment to the Committee on Armed Services.

If anything, further is needed from me or my staff, please don’t hesitate to contact my office at [Redacted] or email Jordon.Wood@mail.house.gov.

Sincerely,

Lance Goeden, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:


Speaker Johnson: I am writing to inform you of my intent to leave my seat on the Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure following my recent appointment to the Committee on Armed Services.

If anything, further is needed from me or my staff, please don’t hesitate to contact my office at [Redacted] or email Jordon.Wood@mail.house.gov.

Sincerely,

Lance Goeden, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.
ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McClain, Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 913

Resolved, That the following Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Edwards.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Gooden of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY: Mr. Cloud (to rank immediately after Mr. Grothman) and Mr. Waltz.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Ms. Maloy.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Ms. Maloy.

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

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

There was no objection. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5933, DEFENDING EDUCATION TRANSFARENCY AND ENDING ROGUE REGIMES ENGAGING IN NEFARIOUS TRANSACTIONS ACT

Mrs. McClain, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5933, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. McClain, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Hakeem Jeffries, Democratic Leader:

DECEMBER 6, 2023.

Hon. Mike Johnson, Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 5(a)(4)(A) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I designate the following Members to be available to serve as Members of the Investigative Subcommittee established by the Committee on Ethics during the 118th Congress:


Sincerely,

Hakeem Jeffries, Democratic Leader.

NATIONAL MINERS DAY

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, on this National Miners Day, I rise to recognize all miners across Montana who work tirelessly to keep our lights on and our country safe.

It is truly an honor and a privilege to represent the State of Montana in Congress—a State whose founding history lies in the hardworking hands of miners.

It is no coincidence that Montana is nicknamed the “Treasure State.” As seen on our State’s great seal and State flag: a pick, a shovel, and a plow along with the words “Oro y Plata.” “Gold and Silver.” In Spanish, are depicted front and center, symbolizing our State’s diverse natural resources and our rich history of farming and mining.

Earlier this year, I led an energy tour and brought several Members of Congress to Montana to visit the Stillwater Mine in Columbus and the Rosebud Mine in Colstrip so they could see firsthand the work our miners do and how critical they are to our national security and powering America.

On this day and every day, I thank Montana miners for their indispensable role in the production of domestic energy that keeps America safe, thriving, and powered.

HONORING GLEN SCHALLER

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I honor the life and highlight the memory of Glen Schaller—a teacher, organizer, labor leader, political and policy strategist, and a friend of many in California’s 19th Congressional District.

After high school, Glen traveled the country. He found his way to Santa Cruz, fell in love with that special place, and he felt it necessary to make it his home. He studied at Cabrillo College and UCSC and worked in early childhood education for 25 years.

Glen found that he loved helping vulnerable people as a teacher, as an activist, and as an ally for the LGBTQ community for which he was named Ally of the Year and Grand Marshal of the annual Pride parade.

Glen also played a key role in the local Democratic Central Committee and was a political coordinator for the Central Coast Labor Council.

In that position, I can tell you he made sure that local public servants truly understood what it takes to fight for workers and working families.

Another admirable quality of Glen was that he just didn’t focus on politics, but also on policy. He was a directer of a local workforce development board, and he fought to prevent closure of local public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I say to his son, Devon, please know that your father impacted so many people in so many ways. By finding Santa Cruz, Glen found his purpose in fighting for equality so that everybody has the same foundation for opportunity and success on the central coast of California.

HONORING ANTHONY WHITE

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

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sympathies to the family and friends of Anthony White for the tragic loss of their father, husband, friend, and coach.

My remarks will be particularly directed to Anthony Jr. and Olivia Grace.

I met their father 25 years ago this very week when I actually voted for him to be the next Wendy’s High School Heisman recipient, an award given to members of the community that excelled in athletics, academics, and citizenship.

He then later went on to play University of Utah football, and his crowning achievement was taking a school that hadn’t seen success for years and turn it into a championship team in Buena Park in southern California, most recently creating that same type of success for Santa Ana Junior College.

Anthony was an incredible human being that will leave a legacy that is beyond description. I hope they can always remember what he has done for not only them as his dad but every community and every person he has touched. We are all better for knowing Anthony. Losing him has been tragic.

We want San to know that her husband has touched so many of us, and we want to just share with her that we will be here for her after his passing.

We offer our prayers and condolences to his entire family.

KEY PIECES OF LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Loebsach) announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Moore) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.
Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to be here tonight to talk about some of the key pieces of legislation House Republicans are championing this week, from fighting President Biden’s unfair student loan program to protecting consumer choice in purchasing a vehicle to holding universities accountable for their influence from foreign adversaries. We are laser focused on putting Americans’ interests first.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the vice chair, for hosting this Special Order with me here tonight.

I appreciate you and others standing here to highlight House Republicans’ wins and to advocate for our conservative values.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the problems America is facing and what Congress must do to get this country back on track.

Our grandchildren deserve to live in a country that still stands for freedom, and I serve in Congress to work toward building that future.

Freedom tomorrow means upholding the constitutional rights of all Americans today. That is the lens through which I view my job in Congress and the measuring stick I use for every piece of legislation I consider.

I have highlighted the path forward in my four-part commitment to the big first and House Republicans’ commitment to Americans.

Number one, Congress needs to create an economy that is strong. According to the congressional budget report, America is $33.5 trillion in debt, and the Federal Government is deficit spending more than $1 trillion every year.

Our energy independence has eroded, small businesses are laboring under burdensome regulations and taxes, and rampant inflation is a tax on everyone. We need to end Washington’s spending as we examine the budget, growing the economy, curbing inflation, and decreasing Federal spending.

We need to cut red tape and burdensome regulations for agriculture producers, business owners, and for all Americans. We need to preserve the family-owned farms and small businesses throughout our country.

Earlier this year, the House passed The Limit, Save, Grow Act to reduce government spending, reclaim unspent COVID relief money, and promote pro-growth economic policies.

The House and Senate passed my resolution to prohibit the listing of the lesser prairie-chicken as endangered or threatened. The House and Senate also passed a joint resolution to prohibit President Biden’s Waters of the U.S. rule from having the force of law.

A strong economy is good for everyone: the whole supply chain, businesses, parents, students, everyone. Ensuring a strong economy remains our commitment.

Number two, this Congress needs to create a country that is safe. Violent crime is on the rise, drug addiction is spiking, and many parts of our country are in chaos.

Meanwhile, we are still hearing calls from Washington Democrats to defund the police, and the Biden administration is failing to address our open southern border where fentanyl, criminals, and people caught up in human trafficking rings flood into our country.

We need to defend America’s national security and food security. We need to support our troops and invest in an efficient, effective military. We need to secure the border, stop illegal immigration, end the fentanyl crisis, and support the police.

Number three, Congress needs to create a government that is accountable. As I meet with Kansans, I hear concerns about Big Government, sweeping legislation, and the American people demanding that their voices be heard.

I sponsored the States Handling Act, which would codify the Boots to Business program, a training course administered by the Small Business Administration through which veterans and their families learn the fundamentals of business management.

We passed the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act and the Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act, which would empower domestic producers to restore American energy independence.

Our energy independence has eroded, small businesses are laboring under burdensome regulations and taxes, and rampant inflation is a tax on everyone. We need to end Washington’s spending as we examine the budget, growing the economy, curbing inflation, and decreasing Federal spending.

We need to cut red tape and burdensome regulations for agriculture producers, business owners, and for all Americans. We need to preserve the family-owned farms and small businesses throughout our country.

The House and Senate passed my resolution to prohibit the listing of the lesser prairie-chicken as endangered or threatened. The House and Senate also passed a joint resolution to prohibit President Biden’s Waters of the U.S. rule from having the force of law.

A strong economy is good for everyone: the whole supply chain, businesses, parents, students, everyone. Ensuring a strong economy remains our commitment.

Number two, this Congress needs to create a country that is safe. Violent crime is on the rise, drug addiction is spiking, and many parts of our country are in chaos.

Meanwhile, we are still hearing calls from Washington Democrats to defund the police, and the Biden administration is failing to address our open southern border where fentanyl, criminals, and people caught up in human trafficking rings flood into our country.

We need to defend America’s national security and food security. We need to support our troops and invest in an efficient, effective military. We need to secure the border, stop illegal immigration, end the fentanyl crisis, and support the police.

Number three, Congress needs to create a future that is built on freedom. As I meet with Kansans, I hear concerns about Big Government, sweeping executive orders, and infringements on the basic rights enshrined in our Constitution.

We must preserve America’s constitutional freedoms that protect the lives of unborn children and their mothers. We need to educate students in American history and civic engagement. We also need to improve access to rural healthcare, including access to telehealth services.

We must support those who fought to defend our freedoms by improving access to healthcare and increasing transparency at the Department of Veterans Affairs and working to reinsure the civilian life after military service.

House Republicans passed the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act to penalize healthcare practitioners who fail to provide care for an infant that is born alive from an attempted abortion.

I sponsored three pieces of legislation that would modify the Biden administration’s rulemaking to prohibit funds for abortions and abortion referrals.

The House passed the Parents Bill of Rights Act to ensure that rights of parents are honored and protected in America’s public schools.

I sponsored the States Handling Access to Reciprocity for Employment Act, or SHARE Act, which would improve the current licensing process for healthcare providers and increase the number of licensed providers able to serve communities across State lines.

We passed the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act and the Veteran Entrepreneurship Training Act, which would codify the Boots to Business program, a training course administered by the Small Business Administration through which veterans and their families learn the fundamentals of business management.

America is the strongest, most free nation in the world because our Founders declared that our freedoms do not flow from the government or a king but from God, who created us all with inalienable rights.

Number four, Congress needs to create a government that is accountable. Congress has the responsibility to conduct both rigorous oversight of the executive branch and investigation into possible corruption and criminal activity within the Federal Government.

We need to rein in the White House’s abuse of power, hold Washington accountable, end the President’s war on fossil fuels, and empower domestic producers to restore American energy independence.

The House passed the Reduce Exacerbated Inflation Negatively Impacting the Nation Act, or the REIN IN Act, which would require the President to provide an inflation impact estimate with respect to executive orders.

I also sponsored the More Accountability is Necessary Now Act, or the MANN Act, six pieces of legislation that I do every Congress which would require the President to report to Congress on executive orders.

The House passed the Lower Energy Costs Act, which would increase the production and export of American energy and reduce the regulatory burdens that make it harder to build American infrastructure and grow our economy.

Through the legislation we all support, I have worked to unleash American energy, cut taxes and red tape, secure the border, and investigate the scandal and corruption surrounding President Biden and Hunter Biden.

I will always stand for freedom in the face of government overreach because whether you are a parent, a child, born or unborn, a student, a farmer, or a...
small business owner, you don’t need the Federal Government trying to control your life.

Serving as the Representative for the Big First District in Kansas continues to be the honor of a lifetime. There is a lot of work left to do, but with prayer and hard work, I really believe that the greatest days in this Nation are yet to come.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BACH), who chairs the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and for his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to imagine an admittance that goes out of its way to increase our dependency on an adversarial nation hell-bent on our demise here in the United States of America. That is precisely what is happening—all because the left hates oil and gas and fossil fuels. I represent a district that is the epicenter of energy in east Texas in the greater Houston region.

Communist China wishes nothing more than to see America burn to the ground. If we are going to shift markets, going to demand for electric vehicles continues to give Beijing an ever-increasing advantage in seeing this quest through.

Let’s look at some of the facts. Nearly 80 percent of the world’s cell manufacturing capacity for EV batteries is controlled by none other than Beijing, the People’s Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of the world’s lithium-ion battery megafactories are in the People’s Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of graphite, the single largest mineral component of EV batteries, electric vehicle batteries, is refined in the People’s Republic of China.

Yet, using increased reliance on China isn’t alarming enough, let’s look at how electric vehicles are faring on the home front.

Just a few weeks ago, in my own office, I had a number of car dealers from my great State of Texas visit to share the latest on EV—electric vehicles—sales. Given how much the Biden administration talks about EVs, you would think that they are selling like hotcakes. Big surprise, or maybe not, they are actually selling like $50,000 paperweights.

I recently saw a great line in The Wall Street Journal: “You can subsidize a buyer into the auto showroom, but you can’t make him buy.”

The truth is that dealers can’t get EVs off their lots. Texans don’t want vehicles that they can’t rely on. While I am a huge supporter of electric vehicles, the electric vehicles aren’t ready for prime time, and forcing them on the American people will not change that reality.

By unilaterally mandating unrealistic emission standards for vehicles in an effort to shift markets, this administration has dealt serious damage to the entire automotive sector.

Unfortunately, even with this information, the White House would still force Americans to buy electric vehicles.

Out of concerns for our manufacturers, dealers, national security, and, more importantly, American families, it is time for this administration to return to reality. Fossil fuels are the only reliable energy source that we have. If we are going to shift producing and using them, we will soon be bowing the knee to the demands of Communist China.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very true remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had a lot of important discussions this Congress, but there is one important discussion that I truly believe we need to take very seriously. It is section 702 of the reauthorization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

I want to remind us that our main job as Representatives of the people is to protect people’s rights to life, liberty, and property. We will never have equal opportunities and will always want to have equal outcomes, but the equality of rights is the job of Congress and the legislature.

We know very well that the constitutional rights of Americans have been violated.

I am going to cite some excerpts from the report that the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board just issued recently. That board was created to oversee due processes, and the issue in line was the reauthorization. It is actually run by Democrats, and the chair is appointed by President Biden.

This is from the report: “The board finds that section 702 of the FISA significantly impacts privacy and civil liberties risks, most notably from U.S. person queries and batch queries. Significant privacy and civil liberties risks also include the scope of permissible targeting.”

It also talks about new types of procedures that have been recently authorized, in 2022, and we had challenges about collection that some thought Congress would put a stop to. However, it says that the new procedures that we just authorized were used in a widespread fashion. It could be extraordinarily intrusive.

It also says the board finding a risk of overboard government collection of communications is very real and can cause harm with no individualized judicial review of targeting decisions. We had an almost 300 percent increase in surveillance since 2013, double in the last 5 years.

This search is very concerning since there is no specific review of that. Also, it says that a lot of things that are collected could be political, religious, and social advocacy. There are significant concerns about this program overall.

The changes that the FBI has done, they say, have not been sufficient to protect privacy and civil liberties. It is also actually confirmed by the internal audit of a recent report—the most recent was in May 2023 when the internal audits of the FBI was talking pretty much about over 90 percent of queries not having any evidence of justification for these queries, and surveilling many Americans. They don’t record and don’t recall, so they want all the liability. It is a serious issue.

We had some discussions, and I think that the Judiciary Committee has somewhat a bill. At least it requires a warrant for queries of a U.S. person. Still, both the bills that the Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee are proposing lack some very serious considerations.

There is no outside review of what data is collected, and this is something the board pretty much recognizes. As an agency, they collect information on Americans, but they cannot assess how much. At least it requires a warrants. At the least, it requires a warrant to be some sort of sampling by a FISA court when they do certification to start figuring it out because, ultimately, there is a potential that our agencies have access to be able to collect without warrant the metadata. They could do some auditing of that. The board brings these concerns, but also there are concerns with documentation.

I think Congress should have for us—we do it in other areas, and in accounting, we do it, too—where, through evidence and documentation, we can have preventative controls in systems. When queries are run, there is evidence of review and evidence of approval and justification by the FBI as to why they acted the way they did. Even this looks like that potentially violates the rights of U.S. citizens and many Americans.

I think the magnitude of this problem is significant, and the magnitude of violations could be very material. I think this makes it even more serious in its consideration before we reauthorize the section.

The other thing the board talks about is national security. It is an important section, but actually, the agency didn’t prove that queries that they are doing actually give justification to what they are doing to provide them more expansion on that.
I think we need to put up more guardrails, and I hope we will have more discussions on this issue and this bill if they are going to move forward in the way they are because I want to remind us that if we are not willing to stand up for the rights of Americans here, I don’t know why we are even in Congress.

This Fourth Amendment right is a significant right, and it is a bipartisan issue. I hope we will take a more serious look at how we can improve this FISA reauthorization before it is reauthorized and have better legislation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank all the Members for participating tonight.

When government grows, freedom shrinks. As conservatives in Congress, we must not compromise on freedom. Our sworn duty is to uphold the constitutional rights of all Americans, and I encourage all of my colleagues to remember the solemn oath that we all took to do so and support legislation that will aid us in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE), from the First Congressional District, and the cochair of this Special Order, for his closing remarks.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Biden is once again circumventing the rule of law and leaving hardworking Americans who never went to college with a $559 billion bill to cover unpaid student loans.

House Republicans will bring to the floor H.J. Res. 88 expressing our disapproval of President Biden’s Saving on a Valuable Education, SAVE, plan which would drastically alter the Income-Driven Repayment program and make America’s student loan program even more expensive for taxpayers. Let’s be clear: This sets the precedent that Federal education loans do not need to be repaid.

Using American tax dollars to give a blanket subsidy to those who earn disproportionately more money than others is government at its worst. For those who never went to college, for those who are struggling with inflation and don’t need more money flooding into a broken system, and for those who already paid off their loans, any effort to wipe the slate clean is completely unfair.

And yet, while many other House Republicans, support universities focusing on a strong ROI to keep costs down. We support Federal student loan reforms. We do not support blanket student loan forgiveness for political pandering in an election year.

Even though the system has plenty of room to improve, it is my job to highlight ways the State of Utah is getting it right. Utah has the lowest average student loan debt per borrower in the country and the lowest percentage of graduating college campus with student debt. The University of Utah’s medical school and nursing program at Weber State University work to hold down student debt by designing instructional schedules to allow students to work while attending college.

I have had to apologize multiple times to constituents in the First District who built businesses after paying their way through school or other programs, only to have their hard-earned dollars transferred to folks who have chosen a career and a different approach that required carrying some debt that they planned for.

Now, with the government saying they don’t need to plan for it, we are teaching our children the exact wrong thing that made our country so great. I am deeply frustrated that I am going to have to continue to apologize.

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

CONCERN FOR OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, concerned about our country, and I am concerned about our willingness as Members of Congress to meet the moment, to stand in the gap, to validate the hope placed in us as the Republican majority, to stand in the gap and to meet the moment to deal with the great crisis, the threats facing our country.

I will begin by mentioning our national debt. The days of spending without consequence are over. We have 40-year-high inflation as a result of unprecedented, excessive, reckless spending. We are on track this year for a $2.5 trillion deficit. We are running a monthly deficit of about $200 billion a month.

We are suffering the consequences with 40-year high inflation and grocery prices where Thanksgiving dinner costs 40 percent more than it did when this President was sworn in 3 years ago. Gas prices are up, utility prices are up, housing prices are up, rent prices are up, and then you have got interest rates.

The American people are suffering further under 20-year high interest rates, interest rates that have been increased by the Fed in a futile attempt to try to combat inflation. Historically, you raise interest rates because you have a hot economy and you are trying to ward off inflation. In this case, the inflation has been caused by the unprecedented levels of spending, and then we have further exacerbated this, this administration, this Federal Reserve under this President, with interest rates that have put home prices out of reach for most Americans.

Now, we have got our credit being downgraded. Two credit rating agencies have downgraded our debt, which will further cause us to go up and payments on our national debt to increase even more.

The snowball effect of $34 trillion in debt, record interest rates, a $200 billion monthly deficit, is taking its toll. Now, with the government saying they don’t need to plan for it, we are teaching our children the exact wrong thing that made our country so great.
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that. In fact, one of the Republican appropriators over there said: We don’t do that; we don’t pay for supplementals.

Wow. You know what? That individual was correct. It had never been done before we did it, but they don’t want to do that.

Instead, they want to leverage a controversial spend of $61 billion for Ukraine funding by leveraging what Israel needs, our good friend in the Levant. That is what they want to leverage.

You know what they throw in there, as well? They throw in some money for Taiwan; they throw in some money for the border. I won’t get into the border until you yield more time, but I will tell you this: That money they are talking about for the border is not to stop the 10,000 to 12,000 people per day coming into the country; it is to facilitate their entry and dispersion throughout the country.

If you think we are going to rise to the moment when we are dealing with a group of people across the way, the leadership over there, that have proposed that—and I am seeing, sadly, a momentum for that to happen right here in this Chamber—I would tell you the black pill has been swallowed, and there is trouble and tough sledding ahead for the United States of America because the people who have been elected to fight that are acquiescing.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate his bringing up the supplemental, because I want to give Speaker Johnson credit for what he did with that House supplemental.

The supplemental, the $106 billion package that was proposed by the President and the Senate majority leader of the Democrat-controlled Senate, represents everything that is wrong with Washington.

To the point, we are running a $200 billion deficit, and yet we have a supplemental, which again, as he said, means we don’t pay for it. We add it on; we tack it on; we borrow more; let’s borrow $106 billion. Virtually everyone in Congress, I think—certainly all Republicans and most Democrats—want to support one of our true allies on the global stage—one of our, I would submit, two or three allies at a minimum—Israel, through the brutal terrorism of Hamas. We want to come to the aid of our friend and our genuine ally Israel and give them the help that they need, but Israel doesn’t have $34 trillion in national debt. Israel is not running a $200 billion deficit. Israel is fiscally solvent. We are not. Even for something so worthy as this cause, we have a responsibility to pay for it, if we can, and we can.

Therefore, Speaker Johnson met the moment and said let’s pay for it by taking some of the $80 billion that was allocated for the $7,000 IRS hires in the inflation increase act last summer, let’s cut $14 billion from there to pay for the $14 billion for Israel, and it passed on a bipartisan basis in this Chamber. Twelve Democrats voted for it.

Honestly, I thought, you know what? We are plowing new ground in the House. We are separating the Israel aid. We are not doing again that which is represented here in Washington, which is all that is wrong with Washington. We say, we are going to hijack or hold hostage our desire to support Israel. We can’t give them that $14 billion unless you also give them that $92 billion that has nothing to do with Israel: $60 billion for Ukraine, as was said, humanitarian support for Hamas, and more money for Mayorkas to process illegals in the country more quickly and more deceptively, another ill-defined, disastrous humanitarian system. We are going to hold hostage $14 billion for Israel with the $92 billion we have got to choke down.

I thought when Speaker Johnson and this Republican majority rose to the occasion with the support of 12 Democrats, who courageously crossed the aisle and did the right thing, that the Senate would have to take it up, that they wouldn’t hold up support for Israel on a bipartisan bill just because it was paid for and just because it was going to cut by $14 billion the $80 billion for Ukraine. We are not going to do anything with regard to the supplemental unless you actually give us border security. It isn’t policy anymore because the policy doesn’t work unless you have a lawful, rule of law type of agreement. We don’t. We flat out don’t.

This administration is lawless. They are not going to follow the law. They are not following the law now. They are not following the law on FISA, which is why we have to reform FISA. They are not following the law on the border policies and the border laws. This is why we have got to say we are going to stop funding a government that is lawless and surveils American citizens and allows our country to be overrun.

Did you know that in Portland, Oregon, they had more than 300 fentanyl overdose deaths in the first 3 months of this fiscal year? They are on track for over 1,200.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Just in Portland?

Mr. BIGGS. Just in Portland. I am telling you that this is a regime that is okay with dismantling our country. It is time that we stand up and say no more.

I am happy to talk about any other topic that you want.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I want to go back to what you were talking about in the supplemental, actually on the spending, as well as on the FISA reforms.

This is a town of power and persuasion of leverage. I’m not sure we effectively know how to use leverage when we have it. We are a town that does things the body that wouldn’t do things when we have to, when there is a deadline and when there is the pressure.

You talked about relieving the pressure on the FISA reforms because of
the approaching deadline, the expiration of the current authorization. Why would we be so fearful of that expiration to the extent that we are unwilling to force upon the Senate the reforms that we are trying to pass out of the Judiciary Committee? The Judiciary Committee voted 35-2 on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis that would pass this body if we put it on the floor today.

The Senate apparently isn’t so worried about the expiration that we think they will take up our bill and pass it. There we would relieve the pressure to reform FISA so it doesn’t expire.

You can apply that to the debt situation. We had another continuing resolution where we extended the Biden, Pelosi, and Schumer policies and spending levels into mid-January and early February with the promise that we work on passing our remaining five bills.

I am sorry to say and disappointed to acknowledge, we have not had any demonstrated effort to bring those remaining five bills to the floor. We don’t have the commitment to the top line total spending levels. Our commitment to cut spending, no matter how modest, to cut spending from a year ago. This is something Congress hasn’t done—you know your history better than I do—in how many years, where they cut the spending year over year.

We relieve the pressure. And then instead of trying to work during the time that we have to pass these spending bills, we are not doing it as we approached January 19. I expect this body is going to go home next week and not report for nearly a month to work on the spending bills that, in theory, we are supposed to pass before January 19’s expiration, this continuing resolution.

Where is our unified commitment? We talk a lot about unity here. Unity requires a unified mission, a unified purpose, and a unified vision to accomplish what?

We would point to so many existential crises created by our friends on the other side, the Democratic majority when they had control, the Senate majority, and the White House. I think you might agree, the two most pressing are the two we mentioned tonight: the border and the spending.

What, in the words of one of my favorite movies, “The Untouchables,” Sean Connery saying, “What are you prepared to do?”

Mr. BIGGS. It is my suggestion and I am going to offer a humble suggestion. Mr. GOOD of Virginia. You cannot do anything if we don’t stop the border invasion. It is a border invasion. As we come to Congress?

Mr. BIGGS. What I would tell you is that when you have—let’s take Lukeville, Arizona, a small port of entry. There are people going from Phoenix and Tucson down to the Sea of Cortez and they are going to go down to Rocky Point, which is a lovely seaside village. It is a small town, and people that are coming to the town. If it is closed now. Do you know why it is closed?

Because so many people, groups of 1,000 illegal aliens, are coming to that port of entry. There is no way to process them. There is no way to get them to Ajo or the Three Points Station or the Casa Grande station because that takes hours. They closed that down.

You can now see sitting there 1,000 individuals. If you look closely, you would see there aren’t 100, or a child in that 1,000. They are all men ages 18 to 35 from multitudes of nations.

You say: What are we willing to do? I am going to offer a humble suggestion. Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I thought you might.

Mr. BIGGS. It is my suggestion and it is this: This administration is lawless and has no desire to enforce the laws already in place. What I would say is, how do you incentivize them?

Do you incentivize them by allowing them to keep the FRA spending?

Do you incentivize them when you say, okay, I will tell you what, we are going to keep your Green New Deal subsidies that you said would not cost more than $350 billion, which will now cost more than $2 trillion?

Will you do anything if we don’t stop funding the things you desire?

The answer is no.

What I would say is, we know that Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and veterans’ benefits will continue on. Why not then identify that we are going to pay for ICE, CBP, the air traffic controllers, TSA, the military men and women, and then say that is it, Mr. Biden. That is all we are going to continue funding. That is the basic minimum to make sure that Americans are safes.

We refuse to do more spending. By the way, we are having to borrow significant portions of that. We refuse to keep borrowing money and go in debt so future generations will go bankrupt until you secure the border with demonstrable and measurable metrics.

I will give you one example. Yuma, Arizona. Yuma has one hospital and there are about 80,000 people in Yuma. The emergency room on most days is completely filled with illegal aliens. The local people, people who are going to have babies. If there is a woman ready to deliver, do you know where she is going?

She is driving 3 hours up to Phoenix or 3½ hours over to San Diego. The people with heart conditions that need procedures on an emergency basis, same thing, they are getting Air Evac up to Phoenix or to San Diego.

Here is the deal. Under the last full year of Donald Trump as the President, do you know what they had?

They had a total of 8,600 encounters. That is for a year. Do you know what they are doing in a week now?

About 8,000 a week. That is under this administration.

Do you think it is not a crisis? Go down there and talk to the planters who have had to literally plow under fields because these people come across, they go walking through the fields. Those are sensitive fields. Why is that important?

Because more than 90 percent of all green vegetables provided to this country during the winter months come out of Yuma, Arizona. It is a hazard to our food supply.

This administration doesn’t care if it is a hazard to food supply. They don’t care if you have got 1,200 people going to die of fentanyl overdose in Portland, Oregon. They just don’t care. They are not going to actually follow the law, so we have got to incentivize them.

If we do not have the courage to incentivize them, then why the hell did we come to Congress?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. You cannot overstate the harm being done and the damage to our country by this border invasion. It is a border invasion. As we have had hearings on this issue in the Budget Committee or in the Education and the Workforce Committee, my friends across the aisle don’t like that I call it a border invasion. Do you not care about the border invasion?”

They just don’t like me to call it a border invasion. This is on purpose. This is intentional. Every resource and every effort directed to the border over these past 3 years from this administration has been with the intent to get as many illegals, as quickly as possible and as successfully as possible, into the country.
To your point, why would we continue to fund and give billions of dollars a month—hundreds of billions of dollars a month—to a lawless administration that is perpetrating this kind of harm on the country? I want to say that never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the United States than what is happening with this border.

I will say it again. Never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the United States than what this President has done with the border. Give me an example of something that comes close.

The American people are counting on us. They gave us the majority a year ago because we ran on fiscal responsibility. We have not met that responsibility. We ran on securing the border, yet we continue to maintain the spending levels and policies with continuing resolutions and extensions that don’t deliver for the American people.

They trust us, and they are putting their faith in us to stand in the gap to be that one barrier to the policies under which they are suffering and that are destroying the America that we know and love.

I am proud to serve with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to serve with the gentleman from Arizona and many of my colleagues here in Congress who are ready to do what needs to be done, to make the tough choices, to cast the tough votes, and to honor the trust and faith that the American people placed in us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to serve with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Good).

Let me say two things. I am more than willing to be here over the next 5 weeks if it means that we can work to get these issues addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you one more reason why you should not be giving up on FISA and why you should not be extending it. It is because the authorities and warrants issued before April 10 will continue on into 2023. We will have lost, perhaps even forever, our ability to reform a program that has been weaponized against the United States of America and our beloved fellow citizens.

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

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

ISSUES IGNORED BY THE MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to talk about some issues that our press corps has not adequately covered. All of these issues will be brought to the fore sometime in the next 3 months, and well-informed citizens should have an opinion on them. That means that, to a degree, the press corps has to do a good job of educating the citizenry.

The first issue I am going to talk about one more time is immigration. There is some time in the next 8 weeks in which an agreement is going to have to be reached regarding the huge problems we have on our border. These problems have been largely ignored under the Biden administration, and it is time that something be done.

I want to recount right now that, in the most recent months, we are having about 240,000 people cross the southern border. Every month, we hit new records for that month. In October, we again exceeded where we were 12 months ago and 24 months ago.

In addition to the fact that we have about 240,000 people crossing the southern border, we have a situation in which about 9,000 unaccompanied minors, people under the age of 18, are coming here without either parent.

We also have a situation where of the about 240,000 people crossing the border, about 60,000 are what they call got-aways. In other words, they have had no contact at all with the officialdom of the United States Government. Of course, these people are particularly dangerous because they haven’t even gone through the perfunctory check that other people go through when they show up at the southern border.

It should also be pointed out that the United States is not being pikers at all when it comes to allowing other people into this country. The American citizenry should know that, in the most recent year available, over 1 million people were sworn in as new citizens to the United States. This is the third highest on record at a time when we are following a year that was over 900,000. We are kind of in unprecedented territory for a 2-year period.

When I was a child in the 1960s, by comparison, about 100,000 people a year were sworn in in the United States. We worked that way up in the 1980s to be about 200,000.

So, when we say 1 million people a year are being sworn in as citizens of the United States, this is the third highest record. Nobody can say or should be able to say that we are not doing our fair share in welcoming more people into the United States.

It should also be pointed out that the number of people who are being deported from this country is now a fraction of what it was a few years ago. In fiscal year 2019, about 270,000 people were deported. In the most recent year available, that number has fallen to 72,000.

On one level, we are multiplying the number of people coming across the border by a factor of 10, and then once people come here and break the law or whatever, we are now kicking out or deporting about one-quarter of the number that we were 4 years ago.

The Biden administration has not cared about this at all. However, there are going to be multiple discussions with the Biden administration not only with regard to appropriations bills that are coming up but supplemental bills that are coming up.

This is the biggest crisis facing America today. We are permanently changing the United States by allowing this many people to come across the border.

I want to point out to the American public that John Adams said that our Constitution was fit for a moral and religious people and totally unfit for anybody else.

Insofar as we are allowing people in our country who do not have a love of freedom and who want to turn their lives over to the government, we are going to ruin our country. It will no longer be the wonderful country that we grew up in. When we invite this many inappropriately vetted people, this is a definite concern.

There is also a concern for the American Government. We are right now in a position where we are borrowing 22 percent of our budget. A significant number of people crossing the southern border are going to have to be taken care of by the Federal Government. They won’t be able to find jobs. Not only will they not be able to find jobs, but they are coming here without complete families. Their children are going to be educated. President Biden promised during the 2020 election that he would provide free healthcare to people coming here illegally. We are doing that. That is also very expensive at a time when we don’t have money for more.

As a result, I think it is a situation that has to be cleaned up and finished before we pass any more of what we call supplemental bills in this Chamber.

In particular, people are asking for tens of billions of dollars in aid to Ukraine. I think everybody would like to see them get that money, but at a time when we are already trying to fund the southern border, I don’t think we have that money until that problem is cleaned up.

I hope the American citizen is paying attention to this.

Again, to summarize, 10 times as many people are crossing the border as there were 4 years ago. The number of people being kicked out, usually for breaking the law, being deported, is about one-quarter of what it was 4 years ago. The number of people who are being sworn in legally—when people come here legally—there are over 1 million right now. We are near historical highs on that level.
I hope the American press corps reports these numbers. They should certainly be in the paper. It should certainly be in the paper when eventually we get new information on the number of people who have come into this country in November.

Mr. Speaker, all you have to do is look on television to see it is getting worse and worse. That is an issue that not much attention is being paid to.

The next thing I want to talk to the American people about is what we call appropriations bills. Here in Congress, if things are done right, we do not pass one budget at the end of the year. We pass 12 separate bills as we divide the government into 12 separate agencies.

There are disagreements between the House and the Senate regarding each one of those bills. However, one of the things that touches all of these bills is the degree to which the Federal Government is going to get involved with diversity regarding what we could call affirmative action—or an obsession with judging people by their race or judging people by their gender. This is a debate that is going to have to be had between the Republican-led House and the Democratic Senate right down the line.

We have had a situation where we have been identifying people by race since Lyndon Johnson really kicked this idea into gear in 1967. At that time, companies that had at least 50 employees and did over $100,000 of business with regard to the Federal Government had to submit information annually to the government.

As a practical matter, it meant that businesses were advised to pay attention to race when they hired somebody, when they promoted somebody, and when they let somebody go. It also meant that the Federal Government was paying attention to race and gender when government contracts were made. We have a bureaucracy that is advising American big businesses that are doing it in-house.

Right now, President Biden’s goal is to greatly increase these roles of bureaucrats when hiring decisions are made in Federal agencies so that when we do government contracting and government grant writing, we are paying increasing attention to where people come from or where their ancestors came from.

In another area, the Biden administration is currently trying to set up a new ethnic group to get preferences or special consideration, and that is the group called Middle Eastern and North African people.

It is a little bit unusual, but the American citizenry should be aware of this. They should be aware that the government is currently in the process of adding this group to the number of people who are going to get preferences. Before they do that, there should be a debate of whether this is necessary or not.

It is kind of interesting in that I read some information on this topic. Historically, I think the reason for this type of thing was the feeling that people had been taken advantage of or were not given a fair shake in the past. Right now, people who are considered Middle Eastern and North African actually make considerably more than the average American. The American median household income across the board is slightly under $100,000 a year. Middle Eastern and North Africans are making about $115,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, even if you buy into the idea that the Federal Government should be looking at people not on the basis of who they are today but on where their ancestors came from, we are really not in a position where we can say that these people have been put upon or not been treated very well. When I go home and talk about these issues, I find that almost no people that I know are aware that we are about to add Middle Eastern and North Africans to the affirmative action mix, which means that the American press corps is not doing its job. It is kind of a fundamental change in a given group if they apply for a government job, if they apply for a government grant, or if they are getting a government contract. If there are going to be preferences, then it is something that should be openly discussed on editorial pages, on talk radio, and what have you.

I think the American press corps has largely hidden this fundamental change in the way things are perceived, and it is time we have an open debate with regard to this.

It is a little bit interesting because other groups that are supposedly subject to discrimination or supposedly are different also do better than the average American. Right now, the wealthiest subgroup of Americans are Indian Americans. Also very wealthy are people from the Philippines, people from China, and people from Cuba. All of these groups, they are apparently being discriminated against, but actually, they are doing better than the average American right now.

I wonder why we would set up a bureaucracy to keep track of what these people are doing or making sure they somehow get preferences.

A debate is going to be had throughout putting together these appropriations bills, and in each one of the bills, that debate will, to a degree, focus on whether President Biden gets his new committees or commissions in every government agency doing all that he can to highlight differences between people and judge people by where their ancestors came from.
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Before I move on from this topic, I should point out that these people self-identify. Insofar as you hear that discussion, the people brought into a well-running company or a well-running government agency, in order to buy into that, the government, in determining whether or not you are a member of a preferred group, allows you to be a member of that group if you are maybe only a quarter or a half of that ancestry, which seems a little bit unusual.

We can, for example, a quarter Mexican and have yourself classified as a person bringing a diverse view to the world, even though you perhaps have never set foot in Mexico and grew up in an average American suburb and even though you probably need help from the government, we allow people to self-identify. People who are one-half or one-quarter members of a group get preferences of that group.

I think it is something that ought to be discussed, as well, before we continue down this path and give the Biden administration any more victories in these appropriations bills by hiring new bureaucrats to enforce the new laws.

These bureaucrats, people with majors in diversity, are not all hired by the government. They have become increasingly common in large industry. I think they are afraid of lawsuits or whatnot, so big businesses hire these people and decisions as to who is going to be hired are increasingly made in big business to meet the targets that these diversity specialists give people. Of course, it can mean, in hard feelings as people are judged not by their skills but, to a certain extent, by their ancestry.

I have talked before about what happens in other countries where we have affirmative action. Hard feelings develop over time. Sometimes they result in civil wars, as they did in Sri Lanka. In any event, I think the efforts that the Biden administration is making to hire new groups and to increase the apparent number of people who are advising our government agencies as to who to hire, before this goes up, it ought to be subject to an open debate. It is not being debated. I think it is not as being debated because the mainstream media has not explained to the American public the huge role that these groups play or these occupations play in personnel decisions, both in private businesses and in the government.

The other thing that I want to bring up is kind of a leftover from President Biden and his last State of the Union Address.
President Biden has talked about his respect for members of the trans community, and he has done what he can to highlight them in a positive light. I want to bring to the public’s attention a book I have read, “When Harry Became Sally,” in which a discussion is made about how people who come out as transgendered, particularly when they are young. I think it is of interest when our society is deciding how to deal with these people to read it. I think only one side of all these things, some of which are irrevocable, will continue down this path. I also leave you with statistics on the number of people crossing the border and whether we can continue down this path. I also leave you with a little bit of information as to how we can still go down the transgender path.

Mr. Speaker, these are my comments for the week, things that I hope the press corps picks up on a little bit to educate the public. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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 8 o’clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2670, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2670) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Conference report and statement on proceedings of the House of December 6, 2023, published in Book II.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC-2486. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Agreements Concerning Procedures for the Implementation of the United States Economic Assistance Provided in the 2023 Amended Compact Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1921(f); Public Law 108-188, Sec. 101(f); (117 Stat. 2725) (H. Doc. No. 118–87); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2029. A bill to amend the Siletz Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering rights of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. 118–300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama: Committee on Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2670. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 118–301). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 6610. A bill to provide for the modernization of the postal service process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. Himes):

H.R. 6611. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to make certain reforms to the authorities under such Act, to reauthorize title VII of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. HEIN, Mr. ROY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. BRECHER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CRANK, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. FURS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. OGLES):

H.R. 6612. A bill to amend section 50 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens.
of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (for himself, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. TONY GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 6613. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish Regional School Safety Development Centers to provide consultation for schools to develop or improve a school safety plan based on evidence-based practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. TONY GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 6621. A bill to provide technical assistance to communities underrepresented and distressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. BRAU):

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a carbon border adjustment based on carbon intensity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. EMMER (for himself, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 6623. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTUMER, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KEN OF NEW JERSEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CARL, Mr. DOOGEE, Mr. ALEX CORDERO, Mr. FLORIDA, Mr. NIEBUHR, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CARRAJAL, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 6624. A bill to amend the Justice for United States Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Act to provide rules for payments to Havlish Settling Judgment Creditors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRY (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mr. HIGINSON OF LOUISIANA, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Mr. WEBER OF TEXAS, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BROS, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 6625. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report about the effects on national security of the surveillance conducted by the People’s Republic of China via the high-altitude surveillance balloon shot down in the airspace of the United States in February 2023, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6626. A bill to take certain actions with respect to Saudi Arabia in response to the shootings that occurred at Naval Air Station Pensacola in Florida on December 6, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes; to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GREENE OF GEORGIA:

H.R. 6627. A bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from bringing a civil action against a State under section 9 or 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899, for certain border security measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GROMAN (for himself, Mr. CARSTEN, Ms. STENFALK, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER OF TEXAS, Mr. JOHNSON OF OHIO, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HIGINSON OF LOUISIANA, Mr. STARK, and Mr. KNOG, Mr. CRISCIMONI, and Ms. VAN DYNE):

H.R. 6628. A bill to provide direct hire authority to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to hire employees as needed; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA, Mrs. MCATH, Mrs. CHERFILS-MCCORMICK, Mr. COURTCR, Mr. DAVIS OF NORTH CAROLINA, Mr. BICKETT OF CALIFORNIA, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LEHMen FERNANZ):

H.R. 6629. A bill to modify the YouthBuild program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JACKSON OF NORTH CAROLINA (for himself and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 6630. A bill to prohibit individuals and entities from owning more than 75 single-family residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. CHAvez-DeReemer, Mr. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA, and Mr. MANNING):

H.R. 6631. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to recognize digital skills and digital literacy as critical education and labor priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 6632. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make timely decisions on applications of retail food stores to accept benefits from recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance through on-line transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. LUNA (for herself, Mr. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN OF FLORIDA, Mr. STRUBE, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GIMenez, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MILLS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. DUNN OF FLORIDA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BEAN OF FLORIDA, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. CAMMACK, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. LEE OF FLORIDA, Mr. BELRAKES, Mr. CHERFILS, Mr. CASTOR OF FLORIDA, Ms. LOIS FRANDEL OF FLORIDA, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. WILSON OF FLORIDA):

H.R. 6633. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9355 113th Street in Seminole, Florida, as the “Army SSG Ryan Christian Knauss Memorial Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. McBARY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTRO OF TEXAS, Mr. CASH, Mr. BARRAGAN, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CASTRO OF TEXAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DELZIO, Mr. DESALVADORI, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA OF CALIFORNIA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN OF TEXAS, Mr. KRISHNASWAMTI, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZZI, Mr. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETE CORTEZ, Mr. POCONA, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TUGDALE, Ms. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA, and Mr. MOTA):

H.R. 6634. A bill to increase the capacity of the Department of Labor and labor enforcement agencies of States in response to mass labor violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.
By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BOHRER): H.R. 6635. A bill to prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services from treating pregnancy as an illness for purposes of approving abortion drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BOHRER: H.R. 6636. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion are notified, before giving informed consent to receive an abortion, of the medical risks associated with the abortion and the major developmental characteristics of the unborn child; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. BOHRER): H.R. 6637. A bill to prohibit regulations implementing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act from applying to abortion or the coercion of abortion or abortion-related services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on House Administration, and to the Committees on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOYLAN: H.R. 6638. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to adjust the number of cadets to be nominated to the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Coast Guard Academy for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mrs. TAYLOR, Mrs. WATSON-COLEMAN, Mr. THANEY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROBERTO GARCIÁ of California, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. GARCIÁ of Illinois, Ms. LOFREN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. GOMEZ): H.R. 6639. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to update the Federal poverty line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. PANETTA (for himself and Ms. LOFREN): H.R. 6640. A bill to secure the rights and dignity of marriage for Disabled Adult Children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mr. THMPN: H.R. 6641. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to establish a working waterfront Task Force and working waterfronts grant and loan programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POSEY: H.R. 6642. A bill to require the disclosure of foreign support provided to a recipient after the award of a research and development award, for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOLDMAN of New Hampshire, Mr. HOMSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGOV-D OYVE, Mr. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PINOHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia): H.R. 6644. A bill to amend title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to provide for the timely payment of black lung benefits, to amend the federal bankruptcy law to provide for liability stemming from black lung disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROY (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama): H.R. 6645. A bill to terminate membership of the United States in the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. BUCSHON): H.R. 6646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the order in which the business credits are taken into account by corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THANEDAR: H.R. 6647. A bill to strengthen the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THANEDAR: H.R. 6648. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to ensure consideration of affordable housing in the reconnecting communities pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THANEDAR: H.R. 6649. A bill to facilitate non-motorized border crossings across the Gordie Howe International Bridge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THANEDAR: H.R. 6650. A bill to amend and extend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for investment in Community Development Financial Institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIFFANY (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. GONZALEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GRASSLEY, Mr. HARLEY, Mr. KIM of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of California, Mr. ROLFCO, Mr. MACDONALD of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KAMLAGOV-D OYVE, Mr. KING of New Jersey, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MIKES, Mr. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NICKEL, Mr. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SHAKOWSKY, Ms. SYKES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TOMKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida): H.R. 6652. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MCCLAIN: H.R. 6653. A resolution appointing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS): H.R. 6654. A resolution urging the Government of Ukraine to review and modify its decision to suspend adoption by foreign nations with a view to resuming such adoptions, particularly in cases where the mutual concerns of the Governments of Ukraine and of the United States can be substantially addressed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE: H.R. 6655. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 625) to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H.Res. 6, the following statements regarding: (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ISSA: H.R. 6610. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8. The single subject of this legislation is: The legislation modernizes the system by which the State Department processes passport applications.

By Mr. TURNER: H.R. 6611. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8. The single subject of this legislation is: To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to make certain reforms to
the authorities under such Act, to reauthorize title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:
H.R. 6612.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 8, clause 18; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To clarify who is eligible for birthright citizenship.

By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 6622.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Defending American industries and workers.

By Mr. EMMER:
H.R. 6623.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
To require the reauthorization of the YouthBuild program, and to improve program services and flexibility.

By Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina:
H.R. 6630.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Taxes.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
The single subject of this legislation is: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the credits in subchapter A of such Code are taken into account by corporations in calculating the applicable percentage of such credit for investment in a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI).

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:
H.R. 6643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is: To recommend and suggest improvements or enhancements for such non-motorized traffic as bicycles and pedestrians, on the Gordie Howe International Bridge. It also requires a report from the Comptroller General within two years of the bridge’s opening, evaluating the progress made in suggesting improvements or incentives for such non-motorized traffic.

By Mr. THANEDAR:
H.R. 6650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 Article I of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is: This bill allows investors a business-related tax credit for investment in a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI). The applicable percentage of such credit is 3% for the first 10 years of investment in a CDFI with a 1% increase after the initial credit allowance date and for investments without a fixed term or duration.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York:
H.R. 6651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
The single subject of this legislation is: Postal bill.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:
H.R. 6652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is: Small business loan data collection.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 33: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 38: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 41: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 175: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 177: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 190: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 451: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina.
H.R. 533: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 537: Ms. LEFKO.
H.R. 563: Mr. DISSAULNIER.
H.R. 620: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 661: Mr. DUNN of Florida and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 700: Ms. BROWN and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 770: Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER.
H.R. 807: Mr. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 102: Mr. MURPHY of California.
H.R. 1087: Mr. POCAH of Arizona.
H.R. 1097: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 1186: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1386: Mr. WIGHT.
H.R. 1397: Ms. SPARROW.
H.R. 1472: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1483: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1624: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 1634: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
H.R. 1680: Ms. SLOCUM.
H.R. 1797: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1818: Mr. ALLEN and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.