United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024 *No. 80*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL CLOUD 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, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

GEORGIA'S BURKE COUNTY LEADING IN AMERICA'S NUCLEAR ENERGY

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southern Company, Oglethorpe Power, MEAG Power, Dalton Utilities, and all partners involved in Plant Vogtle's Unit 4 officially coming online.

At the heart of Georgia's 12th District in Burke County, we are home to Plant Vogtle, where the first two new nuclear reactors to be constructed in over three decades in the United States are now fully operational, representing a key investment in Georgia's energy future. Unit 3 entered commercial operation in July 2023, and now Unit 4 has followed suit.

This historic achievement has been years in the making and proves that America can still do big things. Plant Vogtle is now officially the largest nuclear power station in the country, and I am proud that Georgia's 12th District is a leader in America's nuclear energy future.

As I have said many times before, an all-of-the-above energy strategy is critical to reclaiming American energy dominance, and nuclear—our Nation's largest source of clean energy—has a pivotal role to play.

Throughout the Nation, we have 11,000 utility-scale electric power plants currently under operation, less than 60 of which are nuclear power plants. Even with such a relatively small footprint, nuclear energy accounts for approximately 20 percent of our energy production and approximately 50 percent of all emission-free energy generated in the country.

Nuclear power plants can operate 24/7, providing a stable baseload supply of electricity. This reliability is crucial for maintaining grid stability and ensuring uninterrupted power supply, particularly during periods of high demand or adverse weather conditions.

Since being elected to Congress, I have visited Plant Vogtle on numerous occasions to witness various stages of progress throughout the Unit 3 and Unit 4 construction process. In fact, I visited there just before loading of the fuel and was inside the container right before beginning operation of Unit 4.

Seeing this project come to fruition is nothing short of remarkable. Just last week, I was joined by fellow Members of Congress and industry leaders in Augusta for an informative panel discussion on the benefits of nuclear energy expansion in the U.S., followed by a visit to Plant Vogtle to see the new units up and running.

Plant Vogtle is providing safe, reliable, emission-free energy to consumers and businesses across the Peach State and beyond, with each of the new units able to produce enough electricity to power an estimated 500,000 homes and businesses. It will continue to generate power for decades to come.

This massive accomplishment certainly came with its challenges along the way, but as we do in Georgia, we persevered. This historic milestone is a major win for all Georgians and America as a whole, and I would like to once again congratulate Southern Company, Oglethorpe Power, MEAG Power, Dalton Utilities, and all partners involved in this tremendous success through their perseverance.

I look forward to continuing my work on the House Energy and Commerce Committee to enact innovative solutions that further bolster America's clean energy future. I am proud that our bipartisan nuclear energy package will soon be on its way to the President's desk for signature, which includes my bill, the Nuclear Licensing Efficiency Act, to reform and streamline nuclear licensing and the permitting process.

FUNDING HEAD START

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, for decades, Head Start and Early Head Start programs have provided comprehensive childhood development services to millions of children across America.

Research is showing that participation in Head Start can lead to positive outcomes for our children. By providing children with a strong foundation in their early years, Head Start

helps level the playing field, especially for disadvantaged children, and gives them a better chance at academic success.

House Democrats have made it clear that investing in America's children will always be among our highest priorities. Thanks to investments we have fought for in the budget, we are working to ensure that Federal dollars reach every corner of the country.

In my district, I have secured $23 million for Fresno County and $22 million for Tulare County Head Start and Early Head Start programs. These funds will provide families with health and support services while growing the next generation of leaders in the San Joaquin Valley and in California.

Investing in education is investing in our children's future because when our children succeed, America succeeds.

HONORING YOM HASHOAH, HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize what has been taking place this week in this country and around the world, and that is commemorating Yom HaShoah ending in 1945, recognizing the 6 million Jewish victims who were killed in the Holocaust.

Sadly, on October 7 last year, 79 years after the Holocaust, we witnessed a terrorist organization, Hamas, rape, execute, and take hostages. Over 1,400 Israelis, Americans, and other nationalities were killed, which was the largest killing of Jews since the Holocaust.

There is clear evidence of the rising threat of hate and anti-Semitism being spread here at home and across the world.

I commend President Biden and Speaker JOHNSON yesterday for bringing together a bipartisan gathering to speak against anti-Semitism and the challenges here in America. In the United States, anti-Semitic incidents have soared over 140 percent in 2023, breaking all previous records.

In America, we support free speech and peaceful protests, but disrupting academic education and attacking Jewish students and faculty have no place on college campuses or universities in America. It must be stopped.

We must unmask groups like the National Students for Justice in Palestine for what they are. They celebrated on October 8 the actions of Hamas that took 1,400 Israeli lives.

This is an extension of terrorist groups like Hamas. Hamas' mission statement is to eliminate the State of Israel and to kill Jews, as referenced in their slogan: ''From the River to Sea.'' The river is the Jordan River, and the sea is the Mediterranean. Their purpose is to eliminate the State of Israel and kill Jewish people.

We must work together to break this cycle of hate that is plaguing our society and putting lives at risk around the world. In an era of rising anti-Semitism coupled with fading memory of the Holocaust, we must fight conspiracy theories and ensure the lessons of the past are never ever forgotten.

Last month, I was in Israel, and I went to the Nova concert site to witness the makeshift memorial where 364 concertgoers, innocent people, were killed on October 7.

Last week, I participated in a bipartisan visit of Members to the Holocaust Museum for an exhibit that clearly raises the issues of anti-Semitism in America in the 1920s and 1930s, which was led in part by prominent Americans like Henry Ford and Charles Lindbergh.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and others coming to Washington to go to see this comparative analogy of anti-Semitism from the 1920s and 1930s to what we are dealing with here today. For it is real, and we must do everything together to combat this plague of anti-Semitism, the politics of hate, and the politics of fear. For as the famous historian George Santayana once said: ''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.''

That is why it is important that we recognize this anniversary of the Holocaust and why we remember October 7 of last year. It is not a lingering, distant, fading memory. It is a reality that we have to deal with here today.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

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 in honor of Military Appreciation Month.

With 24 years of service in the Army and now representing a congressional district with a significant Active-Duty and veteran population, I am deeply honored to acknowledge the invaluable contribution of our Nation's heroes.

Military Appreciation Month was proposed by the late Senator John McCain in February 1999. Two months later, Congress voted to officially designate May as the nationally recognized period for honoring the military, culminating with Memorial Day.

Across the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Space Force, there are more than 2.8 million servicemembers worldwide tasked with protecting the freedoms we enjoy here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who serve and have served. May God bless them, and may God bless the United States of America.

HONORING IOWA'S FIRST RESPONDERS AND RED CROSS

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the first responders across Iowa who were on the front lines following the recent tornado outbreaks across the State.

As Iowans, we are no strangers to severe weather. Every summer, we do what we can to prepare for the inevitable derecho, floods, severe thunderstorms, and potential tornadoes.

While we prepare for the worst, Iowa's first responders are the heroes on the ground, quickly jumping into action for people impacted by the horrific storms. Without our first responders, severe weather events like the ones so many Iowans experienced on April 26 would be much more catastrophic and deadly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending these brave heroes and thanking them for their unbreaking commitment to the safety of all Iowans and all Americans.

CONGRATULATING NURSE WENDY DONALD

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Wendy Donald, who was named School Nurse of the Year for 2024 by the Iowa School Nurse Organization.

With more than 25 years of nursing experience and 7 years serving the Muscatine School District, Wendy's dedication shines through. She advocates tirelessly for the inclusion of school nurses in decisionmaking processes and collaborates with educators, parents, and healthcare professionals to meet the diverse needs of our students.

Wendy's proactive approach extends beyond the school walls, working closely with local healthcare providers to promote community health. Her initiatives, such as raising funds for children in the ER, exemplify her innovative thinking and compassion.

As a former nurse, I certainly recognize these attributes. Let's recognize Wendy's profound impact on our community.

I congratulate Wendy on this well-deserved recognition, and I thank her for her service and for inspiring us all.

NATIONAL SKILLED TRADES DAY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Skilled Trades Day, which took place on May 1 this year.

In Iowa and across the Nation, our skilled tradespeople aren't just contributors to the economy, they are the heartbeat of our communities, shaping our infrastructure and crafting the world we live in. From carpenters shaping our homes to HVAC technicians keeping us comfortable, these individuals are the unsung heroes of our local communities.

Today, I stand proud to honor their contributions and reaffirm my commitment to champion their interests in Congress. Let us continue to support and celebrate the skilled trades, ensuring that future generations can pursue these fulfilling and essential careers.

CELEBRATING NEWLY DRAFTED IOWA HAWKEYES

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Iowa Hawkeyes Cooper DeJean, Erick All, Tory Taylor, and Logan Lee for recently being drafted into the National Football League.

Iowa is world-renowned for cultivating athletic talent, and these elite athletes will join 37 other Hawkeyes currently playing in the NFL. Coach

Kirk Ferentz and the entire crew at the University of Iowa have worked tirelessly in support of these players and in their journeys to the premier league in football.

Coach Ferentz and his team deserve the utmost credit for developing a first-class program that makes good players into great players and winners into champions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating these four drafted players and all of the Hawkeyes making their way to the NFL. By the way, it wasn't a fair catch.

As always, Go Hawkeyes.

□ 1015

WE ARE PAYING ATTENTION

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to affirm that we are paying attention.

We were paying attention when 35,000 Palestinians were killed. We were paying attention when over 14,500 children were robbed of their future. We were paying attention as 404 doctors and aid workers were killed, 100 journalists and media workers were killed. Finally, we are paying attention as over 1.1 million people are on the verge of starving to death.

Yesterday, we were paying attention when Israel began its invasion into Rafah and seized control of the Rafah crossing.

We were paying attention on February 8 when President Biden said that providing periodic congressional reports to Congress enables meaningful oversight.

We were paying attention last month when a nonpartisan task force issued an independent, credible report outlining the Israeli Government's violations of international humanitarian law. In 76 pages of details, they provide example after example of what they call a systematic disregard for international humanitarian law and military best practice regarding civilian harm mitigation by the Israel Defense Forces, including with U.S.-provided arms.

Today, we are paying attention as President Biden's National Security Memorandum 20, what we call the NSM–20, congressional reporting deadline on Israel's use of U.S. arms comes due. We know that Netanyahu's administration has been and is continuing to assure the U.S. Government that it is using U.S. weapons in line with international laws and is not interfering with the delivery of humanitarian aid.

However, given what we have witnessed over the last 214 days, how can we trust Netanyahu's official assurances that they are complying with international law?

How can we be expected to ignore the violations of international law and interference with the delivery of humanitarian assistance we have witnessed in real time?

What are we to say to the constituents whose families are starving, whose loved ones cannot receive medical care, or who never received the promised evacuation from Gaza?

What do we say to the brave and courageous students across campuses, our children, who are defending other children in Gaza who are being murdered with U.S. bombs?

What do we say to the children who are still looking for their mothers under the rubble, as we approach Mother's Day?

The administration's willingness to make exceptions for Israel has got to stop. The actions of the Netanyahu government are exceptional—exceptionally noncompliant with international law and exceptionally unconcerned with human rights. The Biden administration must consider other credible sources of information beyond the Israeli Government as it fulfills its NSM–20 reporting obligations, and the administration must fulfill those obligations today.

I expect that this country will demonstrate our commitment to international law, to human rights, and congressional oversight because we are paying attention. The time has come for the administration to follow through on its warning about Israeli conduct and take meaningful action because if the administration is paying attention, they will enforce both our laws through NSM–20 and section 620I of the Foreign Assistance Act and also international law. Anything less undermines our credibility and is a stain on the legacy of our country's leadership.

WE WERE PAYING ATTENTION ON OCTOBER 7

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, we were paying attention. We were paying attention on October 7. We were paying attention when Hamas, the terrorist organization, slaughtered innocent women and children, elderly citizens of the Nation of Israel. We were paying attention.

Now the world is paying attention as Israel seeks to eliminate Hamas. We stand with Israel. We stand with the citizens of Israel, and we are paying attention not only to Israel as it seeks to destroy Hamas and rid the world of this terrorist organization, but we are paying attention to those in Congress and across the country who are siding with Hamas, who are siding with terrorists, who are siding with murderers.

Remember October 7. We stand with Israel.

JOHN HANDLEY SENIORS HONOR VETERANS

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of John Handley High School seniors. These remarkable students have taken on a significant project to honor alumni from the Douglas School who valiantly served in World War II.

The project involves adding their names to the Patsy Cline Theater at John Handley High School, acknowledging the contributions and service of those veterans alongside those already honored from John Handley.

Douglas School served African-American students in Winchester until its closure in 1966, so the students want to make sure all of the community's World War II veterans are given the recognition they rightly deserve.

The students' work involves a great deal of researching and documenting the names of Douglas School veterans, a crucial step in preserving our history and ensuring the bravery and sacrifices of all of our World War II veterans are honored. So far, they have collected 300 names of World War II veterans and are working to verify that they attended Douglas High School.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding these students and their efforts to ensure that the contributions of our veterans are never forgotten.

CONGRATULATING SALEM HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Salem High School debate team for winning the 2024 Virginia High School League championship, the first in their history.

This historic win came after an impressive performance at James Madison University, where Salem's team showcased their unparalleled skill and determination against the Rock Ridge team, winning with a score of 21–13.

The team was led by Claire Rawlins and Kaylee Christley, whose unmatched skills in policy debate steered Salem to victory. Claire Rawlins has also etched her name in VHSL history by winning titles in both forensics, impromptu speaking, and a debate event in a single year.

In the VHSL competition, Rawlins and Christley went a combined 10 wins and 1 loss while winning the region, super region, and State championships. Their achievements, along with those of their teammates, propelled Salem to this prestigious State title.

I congratulate Salem High School on their State championship in debate and to the students, coaches, and everyone involved in this monumental achievement.

HONORING WWII VETERAN GEORGE BAILEY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize George Bailey, a valiant World War II veteran who joined the Capital Wing Warbird Showcase at Shenandoah Valley Airport as part of his 99th birthday celebration.

George Bailey, who faithfully served in the Army's 283rd Field Artillery Battalion, represents the best of American courage and resolve. His dedication to our country, followed by his distinguished career at Pratt & Whitney showcases the enduring American spirit of innovation and excellence.

At the showcase, George Bailey was given the honor to take to the skies on

a flight aboard the historic Stinson OY–1.

George's enthusiasm for aviation serves as a powerful reminder of the gratitude we owe to our veterans. Their commitment and sacrifices have paved the way for the freedoms and opportunities we enjoy.

As we look forward to celebrating George's 100th birthday next year, with hopes of another flight, I thank George. To all those who joined in this memorable showcase, your dedication ensures that the legacy of our Nation's heroes continues to be celebrated and remembered for generations to come.

APPLE BLOSSOM FESTIVAL CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Shenandoah Apple Blossom Festival's 100th birthday. This year marked the 100th anniversary of the festival's establishment in 1924, despite having hosted only 97 festivals to date because of the profound impacts of World War II and, more recently, the COVID–19 pandemic.

The festival includes 10 days of events, including a carnival, dances, parades, band concerts, and parties. It attracts crowds of more than 250,000 people.

Last week, 500 people joined a celebration at James R. Wilkins, Jr. Athletics & Events Center at Shenandoah University to honor a century of tradition, resilience, and community spirit at the Shenandoah Apple Blossom Festival.

Mr. Speaker, this achievement is an incredible milestone. I extend my utmost gratitude to all those who worked tirelessly behind the scenes to make the Apple Blossom Festival one of the best celebrations in Virginia's Sixth District and nationwide. Year after year, their dedication has created a celebration for our community to recognize and enjoy the rich agricultural heritage of the Shenandoah Valley.

CELEBRATING OPAL LEE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an amazing Fort Worth, Texas, and now U.S. hero, Ms. Opal Lee, better known as the grandmother of Juneteenth. She is an incredible gift to not just Fort Worth but, again, the entire Nation.

This past Friday, she was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for her efforts in establishing Juneteenth as a national holiday. When I say effort, I mean effort. Ms. Opal Lee, literally, at 90-plus years of age, walked across the country and took many steps, literally, to make this happen.

At 97, not only did she receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, but she will also be receiving an honorary doctorate from Southern Methodist University at their upcoming commencement. I am so glad to see all this work that Ms. Opal Lee is doing be rewarded and recognized.

I also want to touch on a few of the other things that she is doing. She has an amazing community garden that feeds people all over Tarrant County and Fort Worth. She also has an incredible food bank that is doing similar work.

I know that everyone is watching what Ms. Lee is doing and proud of her accomplishments and just all of the fame that she has brought to Fort Worth. The United Riverside community is also proud of her, as they get to call her a neighbor.

Keep up the good work. We are proud of Ms. Lee and cannot wait until we get that museum done.

CELEBRATING CHAMPION TRACK ATHLETES ACROSS FORT WORTH

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of some of our young people in Fort Worth.

In 2024, at the Texas Relays, we had three State champions. You may have heard these names before, and it is because they were also State champions in previous meets.

First, I want to highlight Kalani Lawson from Paul Laurence Dunbar High School, who defended her State championship in the girls 4A 100-meter hurdles. She is only a junior. Not only that, she broke last year's record that had been on the books since the 1990s, and she broke her own record again this year in taking home the gold running the 100-meter hurdles in 13.89 seconds.

I also want to take the time to highlight another back-to-back champion, Fort Worth's O.D. Wyatt's Malik Franklin, who won the State championship in the class 5A boys' 400-meter, with a winning time of 47.23. Again, Malik won back-to-back championships. He is also a great student and star of the football team. You should check out some of his videos on MaxPreps. Malik is going to take his talents and continue his track career at Arizona State University. Again, we are very proud of his accomplishments.

I also want to give a shout-out to A.P. Ranch and Greg Sholars, and the coaches out there that are just bringing home those championships for north Texas and working with so many of our kids, really making north Texas one of the great areas for sprinters and distance runners.

Last but not least, I want to recognize Angel Sanchez of Diamond Hill-Jarvis High School. He had an injury last year, but he won the State championship his sophomore year. He claimed the boys 4A 3200-meter and also the mile championship.

During the 3200 meters, he posted a time of 9:14.44, which was nearly five seconds faster than the second-place finisher. In the 1600, he posted a 4:13.08, which is a new class 4A record. Angel has literally raced all around the country. He has been highlighted running in Oregon and running in many other high school meets. Upon his graduation here in a couple weeks, he is going to be headed to Oklahoma State to continue to run. Go Pokes.

We will continue to watch Angel run while he is at Oklahoma State. I really want to congratulate him for everything that he has done for Diamond Hill-Jarvis. That entire community on the north side of Diamond Hill is just extremely proud of Mr. Sanchez and what he is doing and can't wait to continue to see him run.

□ 1030

FARM BILL PRIORITIES

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue calling attention to the need for Congress to pass a comprehensive 5-year farm bill that provides certainty to our agriculture producers while responding to market changes and strengthening the ag safety net.

My priorities for the next farm bill have not changed. It is in the best interests of our American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers to authorize a farm bill that protects and strengthens crop insurance, incentivizes agriculture trade programs that help Americans remain competitive on the global stage, and conducts rigorous oversight and rolls back overly restrictive regulation and supports agriculture research and development.

Investing in agriculture research, and, particularly, animal health research, supports our Nation's food security and ultimately our national security.

This is especially true today as the Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza virus spreads across wildlife, poultry, and dairy cattle around the country.

My staff and I remain in close contact with USDA regarding the spread, and we are grateful for USDA's efforts to control the outbreak. However, it emphasizes the reality that animal health often does not get the attention that it deserves.

Luckily, HPAI has no proven impact on our country's food supply, but we are starting to see the economic impact of this virus.

Last week, Colombia became the first country to restrict US beef imports coming from States where HPAI is present.

As of yesterday, at least 22 States had issued some restrictions on the importation of dairy cattle from affected States.

By actively investing in research of animal disease, we have the opportunity to allocate resources to the prevention rather than outbreak control.

These investments serve as a more cost-effective approach to protecting our Nation's food supply by limiting animal disease and outbreaks before they spread.

For years, Kansas has led the United States in supporting global food security initiatives. Just last year, the U.S.

Department of Agriculture opened a state-of-the-art National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Manhattan, Kansas.

The facility will conduct research into serious animal disease threats and the potential impact of those diseases.

It is the only maximum biocontainment space in the country where USDA conducts comprehensive research, develops animal vaccines and antivirals, and explores diagnostic and training capabilities.

This facility is just down the street from my alma mater, Kansas State University, and their School of Veterinary Medicine and the Biosecurity Research Institute.

These institutions are the crown jewels of the animal health corridor, creating a scientific hub where world-renowned research happens, leading the world in agriculture research and health.

American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers understand that to turn a profit, we must embrace the data of innovating, adapting, and increasing efficiency.

According to USDA, agriculture research returns $20 in benefits to the economy for every public dollar that is spent.

We save American tax dollars and the risk of disrupting our food supply chain when we adequately invest in agriculture and animal health research.

Despite this, Federal funding has declined in real dollars over the past two decades while other forms of research have increased.

If we continue down this path, we will not only hurt our agriculture producers but also American consumers, American food security, and, in turn, our national security.

We must ensure the farm bill addresses the risk to animal health and better positions us to invest in prevention rather than outbreak control.

Investing in animal health research bolsters the long-term availability of U.S. animal agriculture to be competitive in the global marketplace, provides consumers with safe, wholesome, and affordable food, and ensures agriculture thrives in America.

BUILDING GREEN

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

Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, we all know that our planet is the most important thing we have, which is why we need to make the necessary investments to protect it.

I am proud to announce that I have joined forces with Senator ELIZABETH WARREN to introduce the BUILD GREEN Infrastructure and Jobs Act.

This bill is part of the Green New Deal, and it is a major step toward addressing climate change. It will invest $500 billion over 10 years to electrify and modernize public vehicles and trains across the country, all while building new electric transportation infrastructure in every major city in America.

It will make our transportation networks safer and cleaner from buses to trains to rail. The bill links transit investments with increasing density and affordable housing. It will also help create millions of new green jobs with strong protections for labor.

The BUILD GREEN Act is sustainable, equitable, and most importantly, necessary for protecting our future. We will continue working to combat our climate crisis and supporting a Green New Deal for every single American. Let's pass this bill now and electrify the Nation.

CELEBRATING THE CONSERVATIVE PARTNERSHIP INSTITUTE'S SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Conservative Partnership Institute, otherwise known as CPI, on their 7-year anniversary. I also welcome Ed Corrigan and Mark Meadows into the gallery to recognize this great organization.

In 2017, former Congressman and Senator Jim DeMint began this organization to be an incredible support system for conservatives in Washington, D.C.

CPI was designed to train and unite true conservative leaders in Washington and all across the country to stand up against the swamp.

I consider the CPI a safe haven, a place that feels like home for conservative lawmakers and staff to go to connect, to learn, and to brainstorm.

CPI has shown a great commitment to conservative offices, to conservative Members, to conservative staffers, and to conservative lawmakers alike.

CPI provides everything from regular training seminars on House and Senate procedures, advertisement on floor strategy, communications, budget, and much, much more.

Their vested interest in all aspects of governance plays a large role in the success we have seen from conservative offices and individuals.

The training provided by CPI is top of the line, and its positive impacts are clearly on display not only here in Washington, D.C. but in districts all across the country. Their efforts continue to ensure that we are well prepared in our fight for this great Nation.

I also want to take the time to specifically honor Jim DeMint and his lifelong and tireless fight for freedom, prosperity, and traditional American valves.

Jim represented South Carolina in the House of Representatives and then in the Senate from 1999 to 2013. He led meaningful efforts such as a ban on congressional earmarks and reclaiming control of billions of dollars of wasteful spending.

Today, he and others, including Ed Corrigan and Mark Meadows, spearhead the fight for a new generation of true conservatives.

All over America, the CPI has been a bulwark against the swamp and the support systems for conservatives looking for the right thing to do. The goal is reflected daily in the operations of CPI and the tremendous impact that it continues to spread.

I cannot thank the many patriots who have fought hard to preserve this great American system as we know it, otherwise known as freedom for we, the people.

Please join me in congratulating CPI for their excellence during the first 7 years. It means everything to me and my colleagues and our staffs to have a home at the CPI building.

I am forever grateful to Jim DeMint and others and the entire team at CPI for providing the platform for us to grow even stronger in our American ideals.

I look forward to watching them pave a path forward for true conservatives to thrive and to make America the best that it can be.

CELEBRATING TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, our teachers do not get nearly enough love. Well, maybe during COVID they did when students were all at home, and parents and families suddenly realized just how important those teachers were, but not before or since and not nearly enough.

I am very happy that it is Teacher Appreciation Week, although, honestly, I think we should be appreciating our teachers every single day.

I am so proud to honor outstanding teachers across my community in Pennsylvania's 7th starting with Ms. Jennifer Danzeisen from Palmerton Area High School in Carbon County.

Ms. Danzeisen has worked at the Palmerton School District for more than 20 years, and her students have repeatedly commended her calming presence, her heavy involvement in extracurricular activities, and her commitment to all of them.

On top of her work as the department chair for business and technology classes, she advises the Mock Trial Club and Future Business Leaders of America and coaches the tennis team.

Even while juggling numerous responsibilities, she prioritizes treating all of her students with dignity and respect.

I thank Ms. Danzeisen and all of our wonderful teachers for their commitment to shaping our next generation.

In this teacher appreciation week, I am also proud to recognize Ms. Susan Klotz from Kenneth N. Butz Jr. Elementary School in the Nazareth Area

School District. Ms. Klotz has been an educator in the Nazareth Area School District in Northampton County for 23 years.

In addition to making each and every one of her students feel valued and supported in their learning journey, she is an adviser for the Kindness Squad, working with students to spread kindness not just throughout their school but across our community and even globally.

This year alone, she facilitated the collection of more than 2,000 books for the Cops 'n' Kids program and organized a toy drive for students in the Dominican Republic. Ms. Klotz also spends time mentoring aspiring educators from East Stroudsburg University.

She always goes the extra mile to make school a place where everyone—teachers, students, and families alike—can thrive.

I thank Ms. Klotz and all of our wonderful teachers for their dedication to bettering our community.

This teacher appreciation week, I am proud to recognize Morgan Polony, a third-grade teacher at Steckel Elementary School in Lehigh County.

As a Whitehall High School graduate herself, Morgan is deeply connected to her community, both inside and outside the classroom.

She has served as a high school softball coach, teacher leader, mentor, and active participant in various district committees.

Her students and colleagues know that they can always count on her for encouragement, leadership, and a positive attitude.

Morgan's impact in Whitehall goes beyond teaching. She actively participates in community events and fundraising for organizations like Big Brothers, Big Sisters and the Lehigh Valley Reilly Children's Hospital.

Her presence is felt at her students' sporting events and spirit days where her colleagues said her school spirit is truly unmatched.

We thank Morgan, and all of our wonderful teachers, for her unwavering dedication to our shared community.

CONGRATULATING ADMIRAL JOHN AQUILINO

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

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam would like to congratulate and recognize Admiral John Aquilino, call sign ''LUNG.''

Admiral Aquilino began his career as a midshipman at the U.S. Navy Academy. Upon graduating in 1984, he would go on to receive his aviator wings.

Over his four decades of service in the U.S. Navy, he performed his duties with distinction. From his first fighter squadron assignment to commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, he has stood a most commendable watch.

As the admiral stood his last watch as commander of the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command, he ensured 375,000 servicemembers and civilian personnel maintained a bias toward action and excellence. This was especially the case in his service to the land of America's first sunrise, Guam.

During his tenure as INDOPACOM commander, he led the establishment of the Joint Task Force Micronesia and continually advocated for the Guam Missile Defense System.

His efforts ensured the people of Guam know that the Defense Department is committed to defending the homeland and our allies globally.

As the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command welcomes Admiral Paparo, we would like to take time to thank Admiral Aquilino and his family for their support, advocacy, and commitment to the Navy and our Nation.

Today, we take pause to witness this shipmate go ashore for the final time. May God bless Admiral Aquilino. We wish him fair winds and following seas. Hooyah.

□ 1045

CELEBRATING ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. MOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation celebrates Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, I proudly rise to recognize my community, the island of Guam.

Over 7,000 miles away from the U.S. mainland resides a proud community of Chamorros, Filipino Americans, Korean Americans, Micronesians, and an array of other ethnicities. We are a melting pot of different cultures and backgrounds united by our shared values and beliefs.

At the core of it all lies ''inafa maolek,'' which means ''restore harmony'' or ''make good.'' The concept of inafa maolek plays a significant role within our Asian-American and Pacific Islander community on Guam. This cultural value encourages community members to uplift one another, take care of each other, and work toward a common goal of unity and harmony.

As Guam's Representative in Congress, I am committed to ensuring that the voices and perspectives of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are heard on the national stage.

During this month, may we continue to pay tribute to the achievements and invaluable contributions of over 50 ethnic groups speaking more than 100 languages and dialects. Let us honor the rich diversity of cultures, traditions, and contributions that the AAPI community has woven into American history.

To my community back home and fellow islanders on the mainland, I extend my warmest wishes during Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN ORDEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the body to discuss the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the Nation's number one antipoverty program for children. That is Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know you know this, but can you imagine that Congress hasn't made an adjustment to Social Security in more than 53 years? Richard Nixon was President of the United States the last time that Congress enhanced benefits for the country. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker, as 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security.

The fund is about to be cut by 20 percent in two ways. If Congress does nothing, by 2034, according to the latest report, it will be cut 20 percent. Basically, the Nation's number one antipoverty program for the elderly will be cut by 20 percent if Congress does nothing, and it hasn't done anything in more than 50 years.

There are some proposals, including Social Security 2100, that would extend and pay for this. There are others, like the Republican Study Committee, that say what they want to do is raise the age. The idea is that people are living longer. Well, that is true. That is a good thing.

If people are living longer, they should be working longer and should be getting less. I don't know how that makes sense, that if you are living longer, when you retire, you should be receiving less.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, for every year you raise the age, that is a 7 percent cut in benefits. Raising the age to 70 is a 21 percent cut. If that were to be enacted, that would cut Social Security 21 percent before 2033—again, leaving our most vulnerable behind.

It is not only, Mr. Speaker, seniors. Social Security is also the number one antipoverty program for children. It is also the disability program that more veterans rely on than they do the VA.

This body, this Congress, is the only body capable of doing this. The President can't do it through executive order. The Supreme Court isn't going to rule on it. The only body that can act is the United States Congress, and it hasn't done a thing.

The American people, especially with 10,000 baby boomers a day becoming eligible for Social Security, are demanding that Congress act.

We have a proposal to enhance benefits. We have a proposal to lift up the more than 5 million Americans who get below-poverty-level checks from their government after having paid into Social Security throughout a lifetime. That simply isn't fair. We have a proposal to give a tax cut to 23 million Americans who currently continue to work because they have to and whose Social Security ends up being taxed.

The Republican Study Committee lays out tax cuts for the extraordinarily wealthy in the trillions. How about we do something for the average

American citizen, the guy who gets up and works every day?

President Biden has suggested what we need to do. Because these programs are all paid for and don't impact the debt or the deficit and are an earned benefit, he has suggested that we have people making over $400,000 pay their fair share. Currently, billionaires pay next to nothing. Millionaires are done paying Social Security on February 2. Everybody else has to pay in.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we own up to our responsibility.

HONORING IRA SULLIVAN

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, just 1 week after his heavenly birthday, to honor one of the legends and icons of jazz music, the great Ira Sullivan.

Ira was many things: a jazz great, an educator, a mentor, a father, a husband, and a friend of mine. I remember first meeting Ira as a jazz student at the University of Miami's Young Musicians Camp Honors Jazz Program.

I remember walking in when I was very young. I think I was in the eighth or ninth grade. He asked me to play vibraphone on a jazz song. I had auditioned as a drummer, so to me that was a very foreign thing. I wasn't hip to the history of jazz vibraphone, so I felt almost like he was asking me to play timpani and play timpani on a jazz song.

Either way, the next day, he came in and gave me a pair of Gary Burton mallets and told me to try playing the vibraphone to jazz. Believe it or not, I was still very confused.

Either way, that decision changed my entire life. From then on, I started practicing jazz vibraphone and became very obsessed with it.

Years passed, and he would always invite me to come back to perform with him in the new class he was teaching, all young people that Ira had inspired and whose lives he changed.

Ira Sullivan also achieved technical skills not achieved by many, a multi-instrumentalist in the truest sense of the word, fluidly being able to play the trumpet, the saxophone, the flute, the drum set, the piano, and many other instruments.

He was born in Chicago but moved to Miami in the sixties to perform and teach. Ira had the ability to be both a jazz great in the history books but also remain an accessible educator for artists of many different levels and calibers.

Ira mentored jazz greats like Jaco Pastorius and Pat Metheny. He also taught high schoolers at the Young Musicians Camp at the University of Miami, where I met him.

Today, I want to honor Ira Sullivan for inspiring so many people.

I stopped playing jazz a few years ago, and I have been telling myself I would get back into it. Just a few days ago, I joined a high school jazz combo from central Florida, Freedom High School, and played drums on a standard tune. I am going to start practicing again in honor of Ira.

May Ira rest in peace, a jazz legend and great teacher.

CELEBRATING ROSEN COLLEGE OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the Rosen College of Hospitality Management at the University of Central Florida.

Established through a transformational $18 million donation from Mr. Harris Rosen, the college advances educational and community development initiatives that bolster Florida's leading industry, tourism and hospitality.

UCF Rosen College is consistently ranked as the top hospitality college in the Nation and among the top five globally, a testament to its educational excellence and leadership in hospitality research.

Committed to advancing knowledge, embracing innovation, and serving humanity through hospitality, the college stands out not only for its top rankings but also for its extensive range of programs that provide a 99 percent job placement rate for their graduates.

It is an honor to be able to represent the UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management here in the Halls of Congress as they propel Florida's primary economic sector forward and enrich our State and the global hospitality landscape.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH HONOREES

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor four extraordinary women for their impact on central Florida and beyond. Their tireless efforts, unwavering determination, and profound achievements have shaped our local history and continue to inspire generations to come. We honor them for their strength of character, unwavering spirit, and profound influence they have on our community.

They are Onchantho Am, associate general counsel at the University of Central Florida College of Medicine; Graciela Noriega Jacoby, chief operating officer for Heart of Florida United Way; Dr. Marie-Jose Francois, founder of the Center for Multicultural Wellness and Prevention; and Pastor Sharon Y. Riley, founder and pastor of Agape Perfecting Praise and Worship Center.

I celebrate these women for all that they are: trailblazers, visionaries, scientists, educators, and leaders. Among countless others, they have left behind a legacy of compassion, innovation, and empowerment in a State that needs that now more than ever.

GOP ATTACKS ON REPRODUCTIVE HEALTHCARE

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the name of freedom, the freedom that women should have to make decisions about their own bodies and have that ability, a sacred freedom that House Republicans are fighting to take away from your mother, your sister, your daughters, and every woman in America.

This week, Republicans are holding votes to say the government should not be involved in households having more efficient appliances, yet they have no problem saying government should tell women what to do with their bodies and limit their access to women's healthcare.

While House Democrats will continue to fight to restore Roe v. Wade so women have the freedom over their bodies, we must call out the extreme Republican agenda that is focused on a nationwide ban to access women's reproductive healthcare.

This assault on women and our freedoms is already underway in many Republican-led States where women are now subject to cruel abortion bans which have brought fear and danger, but also have brought heartbreaking experiences that will have lasting impacts.

For example, in Mississippi, a 12-year-old rape victim was forced to carry a baby to term.

In Ohio, a woman was criminally charged for having a miscarriage after she went to the hospital to seek care when her doctor said that the fetus was not viable.

Republican-controlled States throughout the South and Midwest have passed extreme laws that leave no options for women to access reproductive healthcare. These women have no choice but to travel hundreds of miles to a State where access to care is still available.

A Missouri woman had to travel to Illinois to save her own life after both the States of Missouri and Kansas health systems refused to provide care when her water broke at just 4 months and doctors said she was at risk of losing her uterus.

Mothers who cannot afford to travel out of State for reproductive care have been forced to endure painful pregnancies and risk their own lives when advised of serious consequences.

□ 1100

Bans make access to reproductive care unobtainable for low-income women, many of whom are Latinas and other women of color. Over 6.7 million Latina women live in States that have banned, or are likely to ban, abortions. More than 3 million of these women come from families that earn below 200 percent of the poverty line.

Access to reproductive healthcare is a women's rights issue, and it is a racial justice issue.

Republicans in Congress also want to strip women of their fundamental right

to decide when to start a family. Just look at their policies and their voting records.

Mr. Speaker, 127 House Republicans are cosponsors of a bill that will threaten access to IVF nationwide and have blocked legislation by Democrats that would protect IVF access, and 195 House Republicans have voted against legal contraception. House Republicans voted unanimously against the restoration of Roe v. Wade.

Moreover, extreme MAGA Republicans plan to go further and let States monitor women who are pregnant to restrict their ability to access reproductive care.

House Democrats will not stand by and let MAGA Republicans restrict the freedom of women from getting the lifesaving care they need. We will continue to fight to make reproductive freedom the law of the land and allow women to make decisions about their own healthcare again.

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 11 o'clock and 1 minute 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. DESJARLAIS) at noon.

PRAYER

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

As we face the day that lies ahead, send us out to serve You, dear God. May we be faithful to keep Your commands. May we take time to enjoy the fellowship You provide. May we be eager to be loyal to You and may our deep desire to be worthy of You sustain us when so many other things clamor for our attention.

These are, indeed, challenging times, but we trust that You hold them in Your care. Give us wisdom to appreciate the steadfastness of heart and soul our service to You requires.

In a world where efficiency all too often overrides effectiveness, may our goal be Your intent for our energies. While whole communities are rent by the contest of wills and divided by the race for power, may we live into Your plan which transcends all selfish desire. As we watch as even the slightest disagreement becomes grounds for discord, may we step up and step in to be instruments of the reconciliation You desire for Your creation.

Make us strong and courageous. You have commanded us to serve You and have blessed us with Your trust. We need not fear nor be dismayed, for You, O Lord, are with us this day and in the days ahead.

In Your abiding love we stand, and in Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CARL 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Avery M. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RECOGNIZING DOUG STRALEY

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the extraordinary service of Louisa County School Superintendent Doug Straley.

Mr. Straley has worked tirelessly for many years to improve the lives of students, teachers, and staff in Louisa County Public Schools. For his effort, Mr. Straley was named the 2024 Virginia Superintendent of the Year by the Virginia Association of School Superintendents, recognizing his outstanding leadership of the county schools.

Mr. Straley began his career as a teacher and served as an athletics director, high school principal, and assistant superintendent before assuming his current position as superintendent.

As a lifelong resident of Louisa County, Mr. Straley has proudly dedicated 29 years of service to Louisa County Public Schools. His contributions to the Louisa community are immeasurable, and he is a most worthy recipient of this award.

I thank Mr. Straley for his exceptional achievements in Louisa County. I wish him continued success as he strives to impact students in the county.

I am honored to represent Superintendent Doug Straley and all the incredible public servants of Virginia's Fifth District.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Nurses Week and to celebrate the incredible contributions and sacrifices that nurses make each and every day.

As an occupational therapist myself, I have seen firsthand how important nurses are, not only in the delivery of healthcare but in their daily interactions with patients. They build connections and tend to a patient's needs, serving as the main conduit to a patient's medical care.

My grandmother, Dechantal O'Brien Kennedy, was a nurse. My mother, Mary Wilson Kennedy, was a nurse for more than 54 years and went on to teach nursing at D'Youville University in retirement.

We should be grateful to our nurses, but we need to do more to support them. This Congress should prioritize the passage of H.R. 2530. This legislation will mandate specified minimum nurse-to-patient ratios in hospitals, ensure Medicare payments reflect those ratios, and empower nurses to speak up if those ratios are violated.

It is common sense that we protect patients and reduce burnout and fatigue among nurses. It will save lives. Let's get it done.

BIDENFLATION HURTS FAMILIES

(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, disastrous decisions by Biden and far-left Democrats continue to cause distress for families and destroy jobs.

The Federal Reserve announced that they would keep interest rates at a two-decade high because of Bidenflation, making homeownership unattainable for millions of Americans.

Biden has produced the highest inflation in 40 years, with higher prices every day since he took office. Egg costs are up 49 percent, baby food is up 31 percent, electricity is up 29 percent, poultry is up 24 percent, and coffee is up 20 percent.

Corrupt Judge Merchan has unintentionally confirmed the deranged Big Government corruption to defame Donald Trump. This helps Donald Trump. This corrupt judge now will be my guest. I invite him to come in January

to the inauguration of Donald Trump, which he unintentionally is causing.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who successfully protected America for 20 years as the global war on terrorism moves from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. We don't need new border laws. We need to enforce existing laws. Biden shamefully opens the borders for dictators as more 9/11 attacks across America are imminent, as repeatedly warned by the FBI.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

(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 May as Mental Health Awareness Month. Mental Health Awareness Month has been a cornerstone of addressing the challenges faced by millions of Americans living with mental health conditions.

By breaking the stigma and talking about depression, anxiety, and other conditions, we can help those affected to seek the quality care that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, by bringing attention to mental health, we can elevate the conversations surrounding mental health. We are focusing on prioritizing mental health and acknowledging it is okay to not be okay.

If you are suffering or feel alone, please reach out for help. It is important to remember that you are not alone.

This month, reach out to your loved ones and check in. By starting the conversation, we are one step closer to ending the stigma surrounding mental health.

REMEMBERING MARINE CORPS MAJOR GENERAL JEROME GARY COOPER

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Marine Corps Major General Jerome Gary Cooper.

Cooper began his career at the University of Notre Dame, receiving his bachelor's degree in finance, while participating in naval ROTC. He then joined the Marine Corps. During the Vietnam war, he became the first African American to ever command a Marine Corps infantry company.

Among his many accolades, he was awarded the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts. In 1988, he was promoted to Major General at the Headquarters Marine Corps.

In 1989, President George H.W. Bush appointed Cooper as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Then, President Clinton appointed him as U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica.

Cooper leaves behind a legacy of sacrifice, heroism, and inspiration to all. He passed away in Mobile at the age of 87 and will be remembered for his priceless service to our Nation. Oorah, Marine.

REAUTHORIZING THE FAA

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to pass a full reauthorization of the FAA.

Right now, we have a Federal Aviation Administration that is operating under 20th century technology. Full reauthorization ensures the United States remains the gold standard on the world stage in aviation by bolstering U.S. technology and restructuring the FAA to improve efficiency.

As a matter of fact, the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024 includes a handful of amendments many of my colleagues have worked with industry experts on for several months, one of which I was proud to have included in the House-passed version. This amendment encourages private-sector investment in hypersonic technology so we can remain competitive on the world stage.

Our aviation sector drives over 5 percent of the GDP and supports 11 million jobs. Full authorization ensures that our skies remain safe, and our aviation industry stays competitive. I urge my colleagues to get this good piece of legislation across the finish line.

STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS SCHEMES

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address President Biden's student loan bailout schemes.

Just weeks ago, the President unveiled a new executive action even after the Supreme Court shut down his previous attempts to let people off the hook for their loans. He is not just trying to unilaterally cancel student debt; his agencies have been working to make the student loan repayment process dysfunctional.

On one hand, the Federal Student Aid Agency is paying contractors who service student loans less money, and that agency has acknowledged that the level of service for student loan holders will suffer as a result.

On the other hand, the CFPB is using its enforcement authority to pursue these same contractors for the reduced levels of service that are the result of these same FSA cuts. It seems like a plan designed to break the entire student loan system.

Americans can't let the Biden administration's plan succeed. We need a return to principled fiscal policy that encourages personal responsibility, a responsibility that supports the health of the American free enterprise system.

ALS SUFFERERS SHOW STRENGTH

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ALS is a neurological disorder that affects thousands of people worldwide. Recently, I had the privilege of meeting two incredible advocates living with ALS, and their courage and determination deeply moved me.

One of them is Lou Hall, a fellow Air Force veteran who was diagnosed in 2020 after undergoing several surgeries. With his wife, Tammy, Lou is working tirelessly to raise awareness about the importance of early detection.

Troy Tatum, an ordained Disciples of Christ reverend, was diagnosed in early 2022. Since his retirement, Troy and his wife, Leigh Ann, have provided unyielding support and encouragement to others.

To Lou and Troy, I greatly admire your strength, resilience, and unwavering commitment to a cure. Your stories are a testament to the human spirit and power of hope.

CYCLING FOR HOPE THE MISSION

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the past 8 weeks, my friends, Ken and Rowan, have peddled 3,500 miles across this country to address the national homeless crisis and to raise funds to provide homes.

Founded 15 years ago in the San Fernando Valley, Hope the Mission has grown to become the largest rescue mission in the country, operating 23 interim housing shelters with 2,700 beds and serving over 3 million meals annually.

Hope will be adding 11 new projects in 2025, including five permanent supportive housing sites. I might point out that they are able to provide these housing sites at less than a quarter of the cost done by local government in the Los Angeles area.

Hope works to treat the unique needs of the housing insecure, operating shelter sites for families and for other victims of domestic violence, offering mental health services as well as shelter.

Ken and Rowan have put their bodies on the line more than once, not only bicycling across the country, but they also lived for 4 days on the streets. They also lived for 4 days in a car, and they previously ran to Las Vegas from Los Angeles.

I look forward to continuing to support Hope's efforts. I hope my colleagues, particularly in the Los Angeles area, do so as well. I am pleased to

have secured $2 million for them for homeless services, another $2 million for mental health services, and just this year almost a million to provide modular affordable housing.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO ''STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121''

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to ''Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121'', and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 109

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to ''Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121'' (87 Fed. Reg. 21015 (April 11, 2022) and a letter of opinion from the Government Accountability Office dated October 31, 2023 (which was printed in the Congressional Record on November 1, 2023, on pages S5310–5312), concluding that such Staff Accounting Bulletin is a rule under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) will each control 30 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan resolution of disapproval. This resolution is an essential effort to protect consumers and foster innovation in digital asset markets.

It is also critical to stop the Securities and Exchange Commission's regulatory power grabs and efforts to circumvent the Administrative Procedure Act.

I thank my friend Congressman FLOOD of Nebraska, a leader on financial innovation and digital asset policy, for introducing this bipartisan resolution.

Staff Accounting Bulletin 121, or SAB 121, is one of the most glaring examples of the current Securities and Exchange Commission's reign of overreach.

Through SAB 121, the Commission is trying to dictate how financial institutions and firms safeguard Americans' digital assets, in particular here, digital assets, under the guise of so-called staff guidance.

Let me explain why this is deeply concerning. Because they call it a staff guidance, the Securities and Exchange Commission could avoid public comment and the rulemaking process governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, or APA.

This is where the public gets to give an opinion back or expertise back to the agency so they can improve the rulemaking by listening to the public. This is a longstanding process here in the United States.

Not only did the Securities and Exchange Commission bypass Congress and the Comptroller General, but the Commission did not even consult with other financial regulators, prudential regulators responsible for overseeing banks prior to issuing SAB 121.

Thanks to the work of the House Financial Services Committee and my friend Senator LUMMIS, the GAO rightly deemed SAB 121 a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act, providing Congress with the opportunity to right the wrong of the agency action.

SAB 121 requires financial institutions and firms that are safeguarding their customers' digital assets to hold those assets on their balance sheet.

That means banks would be required to take on significant capital liquidity and other costs under the existing prudential regulatory framework.

This essentially makes it cost prohibitive for financial institutions to custody their customers' digital assets.

This is a massive deviation for how highly regulated banks are traditionally required to treat assets they hold on behalf of their customers.

Now, this is the point that everyone can understand. This is a change that harms consumers and makes them less protected. It is not a change for the better, clearly.

It limits the options for consumers and increases concentration risk to the financial system. Perhaps even worse, it could leave Americans' assets vulnerable in the event of a bank failure, just as we saw with Silicon Valley Bank last year.

If you want Americans' assets to be protected, they should be held in custody, not on a bank balance sheet. If you want Americans to be able to engage with digital assets safely and securely, banks, which are some of the most highly regulated entities in our country and in the world, are probably the best places for them to be kept. Unfortunately, SAB 121 makes this nearly impossible.

We hear a lot from our Democrat colleagues about consumer protection. If that concern is genuine, and I think it is, they should support Congressman FLOOD's bipartisan resolution before us today.

Let me give you one example of why this guidance is problematic. The Securities and Exchange Commission recently approved 11 Bitcoin ETFs, which allow everyday investors to gain exposure to this new technology. It is a decade old, but it is relatively new.

Of those 11, zero—and I repeat, zero—use banks as their primary custodian. Instead, all that risk is now concentrated in a few entities.

Let's do a quick recap. The Securities and Exchange Commission through Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 upended traditional custody practices.

Just like you hold a stock with a stockbroker, it is held in custody. That means if that entity goes bankrupt, your asset is still protected. It is held in custody and safeguarded as if it is in a safe.

We want digital assets to be treated the same way that we treat other assets and be protected. This staff accounting bulletin upends traditional custody practices for banking institutions and makes a joke of the rulemaking process and ignores other regulatory agencies and market participants that are impacted by this bulletin. That is a bad process with even worse policy outcomes.

If you want consumers to be protected in digital assets markets, vote ''yes'' on this resolution. If you want to return bank custody practices to the tried, tested, and successful approach that we have had in this country for centuries, then vote ''yes.'' If you support financial innovation, you should vote ''yes,'' as well.

Finally, if you want to send a message that rogue regulators cannot circumvent Congress and our well-established rulemaking process, vote ''yes.''

Let's bring a level of common sense into the world of the digital asset debate or crypto and bring consumer protection back to this marketplace where it needs to be.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this Congressional Review Act.

Finally, I thank Congressman FLOOD on the Republican side and Congressman NICKEL on the Democrat side for their leadership on this important topic.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 109, a Congressional Review Act resolution that would overturn accounting guidance for crypto

assets from the Securities and Exchange Commission known as Staff Accounting Bulletin 121, or SAB 121.

The bill's sponsors have falsely asserted that this bill is meant to address a narrow concern from a particular special interest group, but, in reality, it is drafted in a way that is far broader than this narrow concern.

The collateral damage caused by this CRA resolution would be far-reaching, causing significant harm to investors, consumers, public companies, and the safety and soundness of our capital markets.

The bill takes a sledgehammer to fix an issue that may merely need a scalpel, and it does so because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not only interested in doing the bidding of special interest groups, they are also interested in attacking and undermining the SEC in every possible way, as they have done relentlessly since the beginning of this Congress.

SAB 121 is highly technical guidance, therefore, let me break it down simply. SAB 121 has been in place for 2 years, and it only applies to companies that hold crypto assets on behalf of their customers.

This is known as providing custody services. SAB 121 provides guidance for these companies in two respects.

First, it advises companies on how they should disclose crypto assets that they have in custody, and second, it advises companies on how they should record those crypto assets on their balance sheets.

The first prong of the guidance I described on disclosure of crypto assets is critical to providing transparency for investors and the public on volatile crypto assets.

This kind of transparency helps prevent the kind of fraud and mishandling of crypto assets that led to the collapse of major crypto companies like FTX. In fact, this disclosure guidance has been broadly supported by industry and advocate stakeholders alike.

The second prong of SAB 121 advises relevant companies on how to record crypto assets on their balance sheets.

Under the guidance, the amount of the liability should correspond to the fair value of the crypto assets they are obligated to safeguard.

This ensures that the company providing custody services has sufficient resources to secure these assets for the users against any theft, loss, or other misuse that could result in financial consequences.

The SEC has explained that this guidance is prudent due to the unique risks and uncertainties associated with crypto assets.

The sponsor of this resolution has tried to reason that this bill is meant to respond to a narrow concern from largely custody banks, but it really has much more far-reaching, negative consequences.

Specifically, this special interest group has raised concerns that the second prong of SAB 121 that I described on accounting mechanisms would interact with existing bank capital requirements in a way that would absolutely make it cost prohibitive for them to provide custody services for crypto assets.

To be clear, even this special interest group has expressed support for the disclosure guidance in SAB 121. They are only concerned about how the accounting guidance applies to their balance sheet.

In fact, a letter sent by the special interest group requests ''targeted modifications'' to address this concern.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Bank Policy Institute, the American Bankers Association, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

FEBRUARY 14, 2024.

Hon. GARY GENSLER,
Chair, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GENSLER: The Bank Policy Institute (''BPI''), the American Bankers Association (''ABA''), the Financial Services Forum (''the Forum''), and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (''SIFMA'') (collectively, the ''Associations'') write to request that the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') consider targeted modifications to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 (''SAB 121'') to address recent policy developments and the challenges that SAB 121 has posed for U.S. banking organizations since it was issued on March 31, 2022.

As the two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121 approaches, the Associations believe now would be an appropriate time to examine and discuss the implications of SAB 121 for regulated banking organizations. There have been several relevant developments during this two year period, including the GAO report issued in October, approval of certain Spot Bitcoin ETPs, and the SEC's proposed rule on Safeguarding Advisory Client Assets that would cover the custody of digital assets if finalized as proposed. The Associations believe that SAB 121 can be modified to mitigate the specific challenges identified herein without undermining the stated policy objectives of the Commission to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements.

The Associations are happy to continue to serve as a resource and work collaboratively with the Commission to provide recommendations that would ensure that investors are provided the requisite disclosures while allowing responsible innovation to occur. The Associations and Commission share the common goals of ensuring the highest levels of investor protection and implementing policies that advance principles of market integrity and financial stability.

We believe the recommendations set forth in this letter are consistent with those principles and would remove unintended barriers for well-regulated U.S. banking organizations to engage in certain activities. Below we describe the drivers behind this request and suggest targeted modifications to SAB 121.

I. BACKGROUND

Since SAB 121 was issued in 2022, the Associations have articulated their concerns regarding the Bulletin to the Commission both in writing and in meetings with Commission staff. The foremost concern identified and discussed is how the on-balance sheet requirement of SAB 121 negatively impacts U.S. banking organizations and investors due to the associated prudential implications. The Associations have underscored that on-balance sheet treatment will preclude highly regulated banking organizations from providing a custodial solution for digital assets at scale. Moreover, the Associations have highlighted that the on-balance sheet requirement, coupled with the overly-broad definition of ''crypto-asset'' in SAB 121, will have a chilling effect on banking organizations' ability to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) more broadly.

U.S. banking organizations' experience over the past two years has confirmed that SAB 121 has curbed the ability of the Associations' members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. In comparison, in-scope entities of SAB 121 other than U.S, banking organizations have not suffered the same effects. For example, digital asset custodial services are currently offered by various non-banking organizations, thereby keeping activity outside the prudential perimeter and avoiding the necessary oversight by regulators. Indeed, if regulated banking organizations are effectively precluded from providing digital asset safeguarding services at scale, investors and customers, and ultimately the financial system, will be worse off, with the market limited to custody providers that do not afford their customers the legal and supervisory protections provided by federally-regulated banking organizations. The Associations continue to urge the Commission to work with industry to adopt solutions that could mitigate the described challenges.

II. CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON U.S. BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

The Associations highlight two specific examples of the negative impact of SAB 121 on banking organizations, investors, and the financial ecosystem:

(1) Spot Bitcoin ETPs: The Commission recently approved 11 Spot Bitcoin ETPs, allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem. We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the same ability to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

(2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets: Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations' ability to meaningfully engage in

DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of ''crypto-asset'' in SAB 121: ''a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.'' Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could be considered a ''crypto asset'' and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended. The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks' use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121's application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

III. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Associations request that the Commission consider the following targeted modifications to SAB 121 to address the above concerns:

Narrow the definition of ''crypto-assets'' to clarify and confirm the exclusion of certain asset types and use cases. SAB 121 is premised on the risks posed exclusively by cryptocurrencies, and traditional financial assets recorded or transferred using blockchain networks should be excluded because they do not present the same risks as cryptocurrencies; the use of DLT does not change the underlying nature or risk of traditional assets. Moreover, certain exclusions for products wherein the underlying activity relates to the offering of a Commission-approved product should be clarified.

Exempt banking organizations from on-balance sheet treatment but maintain the disclosure requirements: As described previously, SAB 121 answers three questions, and the Associations' and its members' are primarily concerned with the first question: how an entity should account for its obligations to safeguard crypto-assets (the on-balance sheet treatment). We do not object to the requirements imposed in the answer to the second question (disclosures in Fnancial statements). Exempting banking organizations from the on-balance sheet treatment but requiring them to make certain disclosures about their digital activity would mitigate the concerns raised by banking organizations without undermining the goal of SAB 121 to promote disclosures to investors. Balance sheet disclosure may be appropriate where the controls are not adequate to protect investors from the risk of custodied assets, which is not the case for banking organizations that are subject to robust oversight from the federal banking agencies. The required disclosures in the answer to the second question are broad and may include disclosures in the description of business, risk factors, and management's discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operation, and such information will still ''enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements about these risks, thereby assisting them in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.''

IV. CONCLUSION

The Associations and their members appreciate your attention to the issues raised in this letter. Given the upcoming two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121, certain policy developments, the experience of U.S. banking organizations, and the evolution in technology since the guidance was first issued, we believe it is an appropriate time to reflect on the intended goals of SAB 121. We request a meeting with you and Commission staff to discuss the issues and proposed modifications set forth above.

We appreciate the Commission's attention to this important topic and look forward to engaging with you further.

Respectfully submitted,

BANK POLICY INSTITUTE,
AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
FINANCIAL SERVICES FORUM,
SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND FINANCIAL MARKETS ASSOCIATION.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill does far more than implement targeted modifications, as this letter proposes.

This CRA resolution would overturn all of SAB 121, not just the part that this special interest group has complained about.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious whether my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have actually read this letter from the special interest group that they are trying to pander to or whether they are bothered to consult the largest custody bank in the United States, the Bank of New York Mellon, which holds in custody more than $45 trillion in customer assets because they told me that they do not want this CRA and did not push for it in any way because they share our concerns about the bill being overly broad.

□ 1230

The consequences of using a CRA, rather than a more narrowly tailored bill, go beyond simply overturning SAB 121 entirely when the aforementioned concerns from special interests only have to do with one little piece of it.

If this resolution is passed, the SEC would be prohibited from issuing any guidance in the future that is substantially similar to this one, including disclosure guidance on this issue. This means that the SEC would not be able to simply turn around and narrowly address this one little concern while preserving the rest of the guidance. It also means that while the crypto industry clamors for the SEC to provide for clarity, this resolution would tie the SEC's hands, making it harder for them to provide the clarity that the industry purportedly wants.

I am further concerned that if this resolution is passed, industry and investors alike will no longer be able to receive timely guidance from the SEC staff, as this resolution is also intended to be a warning. Passing this resolution would have broad and negative consequences for all public companies and their investors, with implications for the entire securities market, not just crypto.

The SEC has issued numerous staff accounting bulletins. The one being repealed today is No. 121, which has helped companies understand how SEC rules apply in specific situations.

If the SEC were to pull back in this regard, it would be particularly harmful to smaller companies with less resources dedicated to compliance and could result in more enforcement actions as they struggle to understand how to best comply with SEC rules.

Chairman MCHENRY and I have worked well together to find common ground on crypto issues like stablecoins. However, instead of finding ways to work together, Republicans are recklessly pushing this harmful, partisan resolution.

Let us not forget, the SEC is our cop on the block and should be supported because they protect our investors.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Government Accountability Office's October 31, 2023, decision on the ''Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121,'' which can be found online at: https://www.gao.gov/assets/870/862501.pdf.

The decision makes clear that the accusations that the ranking member is making about how broad this is are simply not the case. It is a very targeted removal of the staff accounting bulletin that broadly affects digital assets, not one bank.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD), the sponsor of the resolution and a leader on innovation on the Financial Services Committee and broader policy.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCHENRY for yielding.

I am pleased to speak in support of my bipartisan resolution, H.J. Res. 109, a Congressional Review Act resolution for the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121, or SAB 121 for short.

I thank Congressman NICKEL and Senator LUMMIS for working with me on this resolution and for the chairman's leadership in getting this to the floor.

This is something of a complicated issue, as you have heard today, so I will break it down into a few different components.

First, I will begin by explaining what a staff accounting bulletin is. Staff accounting bulletins are technical accounting guidance for public entities. They are typically noncontroversial in nature and, importantly for this debate, are not rules. Guidance is not supposed to dictate a major change in policy. That is what our notice-and-comment rulemaking process is for.

This specific bulletin effectively requires banks to put digital assets held in custody on their balance sheet. Simply put, that is not how custody usually works.

As a Federal Reserve Chairman once said: ''Custody assets are off balance sheet, always have been.''

This bulletin upends custodial practice for banks, and it effectively keeps banks out of this market entirely. That is not good for consumers or investors.

Next, let's talk about the process, as the chairman has already mentioned. There were two major process fouls by the SEC in issuing SAB 121.

Number one, the SEC is not a bank regulator, and SAB 121 affects a core banking activity: custody. Yet, the SEC issued this bulletin without even talking to the regulators first. Think about that. The SEC issued this without even talking to the prudential regulators. That is an incredible oversight, particularly given the bulletin's unusual treatment of custodial assets.

Number two, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office determined that this bulletin is effectively a rule. In other words, the SEC got caught trying to circumvent the APA and the due diligence requirements that come with it.

Now, let's talk about solutions. The easiest way to fix this problem is for the SEC to simply rescind the bulletin themselves and work with the prudential regulators on an alternate solution.

Despite the fact that this bulletin was issued through a faulty process and despite the negative ramifications of keeping banks from taking custody of retail investor assets, the SEC has been unwilling to have any conversation about making changes.

That leaves us with no choice. Congress needs to act through the Congressional Review Act to rescind SAB 121.

Finally, let me briefly address an argument that Ranking Member WATERS and some of my Democratic colleagues have made on this issue. I have heard this argument that the CRA should not be applied to an accounting bulletin, but let's contemplate the alternative. What are the implications if we fail to pass this resolution?

This is an instance where the nonpartisan GAO outright said the SEC circumvented the proper regulatory process.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, think about why the Congressional Review Act was passed in the first place: to give Congress the ability to check a regulator that has gone astray. If we don't pass this resolution, we are effectively giving the green light to our regulators to bypass the APA rulemaking process with impunity.

This isn't just about the SEC or bank custody. This is about providing a necessary check to executive branch power. Regardless of your feelings on the banking policy or the SEC, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution for the sake of upholding the authority of the institution we serve in.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters.

Number one is a letter dated April 27, 2023, sent by Fed Vice Chair Michael Barr to Senator LUMMIS, discussing the impact of SAB 121 on Fed-regulated financial institutions.

Number two is a letter dated April 18, 2023, sent by FDIC Chairman Gruenberg to Chairman MCHENRY and Senator LUMMIS, in response to their March 2, 2023, letter.

Number three is a letter dated February 28, 2024, sent by the Conference of State Bank Supervisors to Chairman MCHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS, outlining the unintended effects SAB 121 could pose on consumers and markets.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, DC, April 27, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2023, regarding the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (''SAB 121'') published on April 11, 2022.

As you know, the Federal Reserve is not responsible for the general accounting policy for public companies and, as such, Federal Reserve staff were not consulted by the SEC regarding the development and issuance of SAB 121. For accounting and reporting purposes under U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), assets held in custody are generally not recognized on the custodian's balance sheet—as the custodian does not control the assets—and we defer to the SEC on these matters. However, I would note that state member banks may provide safekeeping services, in a custodial capacity, for crypto-assets if conducted in a safe and sound manner and in compliance with consumer, anti-money laundering, and anti-terrorist financing laws.

By law, regulatory reports and statements required to be filed with Federal banking agencies by all insured depository institutions must be uniform and consistent with U.S. GAAP. In light of SAB 121, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) issued supplemental instructions to the Call Report related to SAB 121. The supplemental instructions state that an institution that determines that it is appropriate for it to apply SAB 121 for SEC or other financial reporting purposes should complete its Call Report consistent with the classification determination made for SEC or other financial reporting purposes. Institutions are encouraged to consult with SEC staff on the scope and applicability of SAB 121.

The Basel Committee's prudential treatment of crypto-asset exposures applies to various types of exposures to banks, such as exposures held as securities on balance sheet or through derivatives. However, the Basel standard does not generally apply to custodial assets.

The Federal Reserve continues to take a careful and cautious approach related to current or proposed crypto-asset-related activities at each banking organization and will continue to ensure that legally permissible activities are conducted in a manner that is safe and sound, and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, including those designed to protect consumers.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL S. BARR.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT
INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, DC, April 18, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUMMIS AND CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for your letter of March 2, 2023, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) regarding the accounting and regulatory capital implications of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121).

FDIC staff was not consulted by the SEC before the issuance of SAB 121 and has not been advised of any plans by the SEC to modify or withdraw SAB 121. By law, regulatory reports and statements required to be filed with Federal banking agencies by all insured depository institutions must be uniform and prepared in a manner that is no less stringent than U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). In accordance with U.S. GAAP, assets held in custody are generally not recognized on the custodian's balance sheet, because custodial assets provide no economic benefit to the custodian and the custodian does not control the assets.

Beginning in June 2022, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, of which the FDIC is a member, issued Supplemental Instructions for the Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income (Call Report). Those instructions state: ''An institution that determines that it is appropriate for it to apply SAB 121 for SEC or other financial reporting purposes should complete its Call Report consistent with the classification determination made for SEC or other financial reporting purposes.'' The FDIC encourages institutions to consult with SEC staff on the scope and applicability of SAB 121. Reporting custodial assets on-balance sheet in accordance with SAB 121 would be no less stringent than U.S. GAAP.

The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) published its final standard on the prudential treatment of crypto-asset exposures in December 2022. The BCBS standard outlines that consistent with the leverage ratio standard, crypto-assets are included in the leverage ratio exposure measure according to their value for financial reporting purposes, based on applicable accounting treatment for exposures that have similar characteristics. The standard states that crypto-asset exposures include on- or off-balance sheet amounts that give rise to credit, market, operational and/or liquidity risks. Certain parts of the standards, such as those related to operational risk, are also applicable to banks' crypto-asset activities. The FDIC does not view the BCBS standard as being in conflict with the SEC's SAB 121, although the agency does acknowledge that the SEC's SAB 121 would require institutions to hold capital against custodied crypto-assets.

The FDIC continues to actively monitor activities associated with digital asset by regulated banking organizations that includes digital asset custodial activities. The FDIC will continue to ensure that legally permissible activities are conducted in a safe and sound manner and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, including those designed to protect consumers.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. If you have additional comments or questions, please contact me or Andy Jiminez, Director, Office of Legislative Affairs.

Sincerely,

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG.

CSBS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2024.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, House Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN MCHENRY AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: On behalf of the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, I write to relay our concerns with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (''SAB 121,'' or ''the Bulletin''). The Bulletin, issued without public consultation, unilaterally upends traditional custodial accounting obligations. As written, SAB 121 could lead to significant downstream effects for custodial firms subject to prudential regulation.

State regulators strongly support appropriate customer protections and a safe and sound financial system. Further, we appreciate the SEC's effort to provide guidance concerning novel activities such as custodial services for ''crypto-assets.'' However, decisions with wide-ranging implications across the banking sector should be made in consultation with prudential regulators at both the state and federal level and only after an opportunity for public notice-and-comment. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) ruled in October 2023, SAB 121 qualifies as a rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and, as such, should have been made available for public comment.

While custodial activities may have once elicited images of only safe deposit boxes holding valuable physical objects, today's banks hold a variety of both physical and electronic assets. More recently, bank customers have been increasingly interested in banks' ability to custody crypto-assets, including cryptographic keys. While the nature of the underlying assets may change and prudential risk management requirements may vary from asset to asset, the accounting and regulatory principles applicable to such custodial assets should be consistent. In unilaterally departing from well-established accounting principles for safeguarding custodial crypto-assets, SAB 121 ignores existing regulatory frameworks in place to ensure custodial activity is conducted in a safe and sound manner.

Failure to take public comment or consult with other regulators on a cross-jurisdictional issue like this could result in substantial unintended consequences. Two areas of potential side effects from this opaque rulemaking include:

Potential Asset Concentration. The Bulletin requires on-balance sheet accounting of crypto-assets under custody, which is a significant departure from the treatment of other assets held under custody. Due to the prudential regulatory implications of on-balance sheet accounting, this would likely require custodial institutions to raise significant funds to maintain adequate leverage ratios—a step many industry participants have indicated would be prohibitive to providing these custodial services for customers. Not only is this model inconsistent with the principle that similar activities should be regulated in a similar manner, but it could also result in an unnecessary and potentially risky concentration of custodial assets outside of prudentially regulated institutions.

Loss of Insolvency Protections for Customers. Applying on-balance sheet treatment for crypto-assets may inappropriately subject customer assets to creditors' claims in the event of the insolvency of an institution offering custody products and services. In a traditional bankruptcy proceeding, assets accounted for on-balance sheet are typically subject to creditor claims. Conversely, assets held in custody for the benefit of customers are considered accounted for off-balance sheet—and thus protected in bankruptcy—because they remain the assets of the customer. Requiring custodied crypto-assets to be accounted for on-balance sheet risks losing the bankruptcy remote protections of custody services. This is an important distinction from the treatment for a broker-dealer that would be subject to a different form of bankruptcy under the Securities Investor Protection Act.

These are only two unintended side effects that SAB 121 could impose on markets and consumers in an evolving technological environment.

History repeatedly demonstrates the shortcomings of rulemaking in a vacuum. Without significant consultation with peer regulators and comments from the broader public, these types of missteps are all too common, particularly with new and innovative technologies. We support robust consumer and market protections in this growing and evolving asset class and stand ready to provide Congress and our federal regulatory partners with our experience and expertise. However, given the lack of adequate consultation and opportunity for public comment, and the potential for significant detrimental effects, we have significant concerns with SAB 121.

Sincerely,

BRANDON MILHORN,
President and CEO.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, number four is a letter dated February 29, 2024, sent by the American Bankers Association to Chairman MCHENRY and Ranking Member WATERS, expressing support for H.J. Res. 109.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 29, 2024.

Re Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to ''Staff Accounting'' Bulletin No. 121'' (H.J. Res. 109).

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCHENRY AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: The American Bankers Association (ABA) welcomes and supports H.J. Res. 109, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval for the Securities and Exchange Commission ''Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.'' which was recently introduced by Reps. MIKE and FLOOD (R–NE) and WILEY NICKEL (D–NC).

ADVERSE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON BANK DIGITAL ASSET PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

In March 2022, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) released Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121) to address perceived risks to publicly traded companies that safeguard crypto assets for their customers. Under SAB 121, an entity responsible for safeguarding cryptocurrency assets for platform users must present a liability on its balance sheet at fair value to reflect that obligation, as well as a corresponding asset. SAB 121 is a departure from the banking industry's historical practice of treating custody assets off-balance sheet, and this accounting treatment effectively precludes banks from offering digital asset custody at scale since placing the value of client assets on balance sheet will impact prudential requirements such as capital, liquidity, and other mandates.

On February 14, 2024, ABA joined with several other financial trades in a joint letter to the SEC. In the letter, we noted that U.S. banking organizations' experience over the past two years with SAB 121 shows that it has curbed the ability of our members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. We gave two concrete examples:

(1) Spot Bitcoin ETPs

The Commission recently approved Spot Bitcoin Exchange Traded Products (ETPs), allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem.

We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the *same ability* to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

(2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets

Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of Distributed Ledger Technology (DLT) to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations' ability to meaningfully engage in DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of ''crypto-asset'' in SAB 121: ''a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.''

Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could be considered a ''crypto asset'' and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended.

The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks' use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121's application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

In the February 14 letter, we made several recommendations for changes to SAB 121

that would mitigate the specific challenges identified above without undermining the stated policy objectives of the SEC to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements. We also asked for a meeting to discuss those changes, but as yet have not had a response from the SEC.

ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES FOR CONSUMERS

Banks have long provided safe and well-regulated custody services to investors for securities and other assets. However, the implications of SAB 121 mean few banks are currently offering custody services for digital assets, leaving consumers with few options for a safe, well-regulated custody service for digital assets.

In fact, many have turned to non-bank market entrants that are not subject to prudential regulation and examination and are not subject to robust capital and liquidity requirements. This unregulated activity can expose consumers and counterparties to significant harm.

CONCLUSION

We applaud Representatives Flood and Nickel for their leadership on this important issue. The SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 represents a significant departure from longstanding accounting treatment for custodied assets and threatens the banking industry's ability to provide its customers with safe and sound custody of digital assets, Limiting banks' ability to offer these services leaves consumers with few well-regulated, trusted options for their digital asset portfolios and ultimately exposes them to risk.

We encourage you and your membership to favorably report this resolution out of the Committee. We would be pleased to meet with you and your staff to discuss how Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 inhibits consumer access to safe, sounds access to digital asset custody services.

Sincerely,

KIRSTEN SUTTON,
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,
American Bankers Association.

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

This is my response to the gentleman from Nebraska. My Republican colleagues have claimed that the SEC failed to consult with prudential regulators on SAB 121, but if this resolution is passed, the SEC will effectively be barred from consulting with prudential regulators in order to issue revised guidance on this matter.

Again, the plain consequences of this bill do not match the purported goals of the bill's sponsor and supporters. If Republicans wanted the SEC to consult with prudential regulators and reissue modified guidance, they should do that. This bill does the opposite. It actually prevents the SEC from consulting with prudential regulators in order to reissue modified guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the crypto industry comes before our committee almost every week saying: We want clarity. Then the SEC provides the clarity. Now, the friends of crypto are here to abolish the clarity, to not only take away release 121, which requires that the custodians of crypto indicate that on the balance sheet, but to prevent the SEC from issuing a revised version of 121 that could call for that same disclosure to be made in footnotes.

It is very clear to me, as co-chair of the bipartisan CPA Caucus, that the financial statements must reflect the incredible risk that banks take when they become custodians of billions and hundreds of billions of dollars, supposedly, worth of crypto.

Now, why the uniqueness of crypto? We have seen Sam Bankman-Fried. He was the face of crypto. He is now facing only a quarter century in jail, which seems rather light. The crypto industry would tell us that Sam Bankman-Fried was just a single snake in the crypto Garden of Eden. The fact is, we have learned since Sam Bankman-Fried's indictments that crypto is a garden of snakes. It is uniquely problematic. Why is that? Because crypto's whole purpose is to facilitate evading American law and to help criminals. Who does it attract? It attracts criminals.

What is the comparative advantage that crypto has as it attempts to become a currency and partially displace the dollar and the euro? Is it more stable? Certainly not. Is it more useful to buy something? You can go to Rayburn and buy a sandwich for $1—well, okay, $8, but you can't buy a sandwich anywhere in this complex for a bitcoin. It is not a better medium of exchange. It is not a better measure of value. What advantage does it have? It is secret.

Now, the best way to have their secrecy is to have the iceberg above the water be available and visible and then to have under the water seven-eighths of the crypto subject to being hidden from the know-your-customer and anti-money-laundering laws.

So how can the crypto compete with the dollar, aspire to become a currency, and compete with the best currency in the world? By tapping into the markets that don't want to be surveilled by the U.S. Government. What are those? Obviously, the sanctions evaders, the drug dealers, and the human traffickers, but that is not a big enough market for crypto. They want the tax evasion market.

The IRS Commissioner under Donald Trump testified that we are losing a trillion dollars in revenue. That means that those who are cheating on taxes, almost all at the high end of the spectrum, have to hide $3 trillion of income each and every year. That is $30 trillion of hidden income every decade. They can't do it with U.S. dollars, so crypto is designed to fill that need.

Now, if you think it will be successful in doing that and you want to bet against America and facilitate the undermining of American laws while perhaps making a profit, you can buy crypto, but it is an asset whose very nature creates an additional risk. That risk needs to be shown in the financial statements of the custodian. This resolution would prevent the SEC from causing that to be disclosed either on the balance sheet or in the footnotes.

□ 1245

If you doubt what the purpose is of crypto, then look at their latest invention: the mixer.

What is the mixer?

It is designed to mix up law enforcement. It is a facility available to every crypto owner to disguise their transactions and to hide from American law enforcement.

Not only that, of course, crypto aspires and claims that they will partially displace the dollar as the reserve currency. If it does that, that will be a tremendous decline in America's power in the world and the American economy.

So I see no reason for us to have rules that hide this risk from the shareholders of the custodian.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. I see no reason for us to hide from those who are looking at bank balance sheets the unique risk that they take in order to facilitate a crypto ecosystem whose sole purpose and whose strategy is to defeat the American Government whether it tries to collect taxes or enforce our sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any doubt, look at what the proponents, the visionaries, behind crypto say. They say that they are innovative. They are trying to innovate a way to make sure that America cannot enforce its sanctions, cannot deal with drug dealers, cannot enforce its taxes, and, oh, by the way, particularly useful to Sam Bankman-Fried, cannot enforce its bankruptcy laws.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that if they want to fix the Sam Bankman-Fried FTX fraud and their ability to do that again, then you need to pass the bill that we produced out of committee that regulates crypto and provides regulatory agencies power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), who is the chairman of the Science Committee and a great leader on the Financial Services Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan CRA to overturn the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

SAB 121 has removed a bank's ability to offer custodial services for digital assets and has prevented banks from exploring the use of distributed ledger technologies.

The SEC issued SAB 121 unilaterally, outside the rulemaking process, and without the consultation of the banking regulators.

This policy is not for the SEC to decide, and certainly not for the SEC to

dictate through a broad interpretation of accounting practices.

The cost of and the availability of capital is dependent on the U.S. banking system's ability to adapt to new technologies and to compete in offering innovative products and services. SAB 121 has put up barriers to that essential responsibility.

This CRA is an important correction to the SEC's misstep. I thank Congressman FLOOD and Congressman NICKEL for leading this effort.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy from the White House.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 109—CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF ''STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121'' ISSUED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—REP. FLOOD, R–NE, AND FOUR COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.J. Res. 109, which would disrupt the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) work to protect investors in crypto-asset markets and to safeguard the broader financial system. H.J. Res. 109 would invalidate SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (SAB 121), which reflects considered SEC staff views regarding the accounting obligations of certain firms that safeguard crypto-assets. Moreover, as explained in staff's accompanying release, SAB 121 was issued in response to demonstrated technological, legal, and regulatory risks that have caused substantial losses to consumers. By virtue of invoking the Congressional Review Act, it could also inappropriately constrain the SEC's ability to ensure approriate guardrails and address future issues related to crypto-assets including financial stability. Limiting the SEC's ability to maintain a comprehensive and effective financial regulatory framework for crypto-assets would introduce substantial financial instability and market uncertainty.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 109, he would veto it.

Ms. WATERS. The President states that the resolution before us would ''disrupt the Securities and Exchange Commission's work to protect investors in crypto-asset markets and to safeguard the broader financial system.''

This statement not only explains how terrible this resolution is, but that the President of the United States of America will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) who is also the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology and Inclusion.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 109.

This misguided resolution would eliminate the Securities and Exchange Commission's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121. This nonbinding, interpretive guidance advises companies that are holding crypto assets in custody for customers to record those assets as liabilities on their balance sheets. It also recommends that companies disclose the nature and the amount of their crypto-asset holdings. Simply put, it advises caution and transparency regarding crypto because it is so volatile.

The disapproval of SAB 121 would have severe consequences in the U.S. financial services industry and be especially dangerous for banks, depositors, investors, and consumers. As underscored in the bulletin, the safeguarding of crypto assets presents unique technological, regulatory, and legal risks that could significantly impact a company's financial condition and its operations. For this same reason, the bulletin seeks to ensure that investors are informed about these risks in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.

The failure of Silicon Valley Bank, Signature Bank, First Republic Bank, and others have shown us that nervous depositors can cause a run on bank assets when crypto assets become unstable. They can also move money in the blink of an eye, which makes these banks less stable and subject to failure.

With the collapse of FTX, the violation of Federal anti-money laundering and sanctions laws by Binance, and legal issues facing several other crypto companies, Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 serves to protect investors.

Crypto is now in its 17th year, yet the primary use cases for crypto continue to be money laundering, tax avoidance, cybercriminal ransomware payments, and terrorist finance.

Regrettably, crypto has become a truly perfect example of a textbook case of an elegant idea that is being continually savaged by an ugly gang of facts.

Regrettably, the Republican leadership's efforts to curtail SEC regulation in the crypto sector are now even extending to staff bulletins that are simply advisory and designed to publicize staff views regarding accounting-related disclosure practices.

This resolution also undermines the practice of issuing Staff Accounting Bulletins for the benefit of small investors and firms that may not have the resources to engage directly with the SEC and obtain an individual opinion or advice.

As ranking member of the Digital Assets Subcommittee for the House Financial Services Committee, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Monetary Policy on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in front of you today to support my friend and colleague from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) and his CRA resolution to nullify the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin Number 121 which would eviscerate financial institutions' ability to provide custodial services for digital asset firms.

In theory, under SAB 121, a bank could custody digital assets. However, the conditions set forth by SAB 121 make it impractical for any bank. This very fact has been noted by Federal Reserve Board Chair Powell who acknowledged it shifts away from traditional custodial practices as custodial assets receive off-balance-sheet treatment.

SAB 121 overturns decades of precedent regarding the accounting assets for banks. If a bank decides to custody digital assets and adhere to SAB 121, then the on-balance-sheet requirement would have significant capital, liquidity, and other prudential consequences. This makes it difficult, at best, for regulated institutions to safeguard digital assets.

The fact is that technological, legal, and regulatory risks cited in SAB 121 are already addressed by the legal and regulatory framework that applies to banks' custodial activities. Yet, SAB 121 did not account for that.

Moreover, and disturbingly, the SEC did not consult with any of the prudential regulators before issuing this flawed guidance. Unfortunately, the failure to consult the regulators overseeing institutions that are largely impacted by an SEC proposal has become quite common under Chair Gensler.

The SEC does not have the expertise to assess the same risks as the prudential regulators, and it is not the role of Gary Gensler to propose misguided rulemakings and guidance that may have major adverse implications to the functioning of our financial institutions, and ultimately to the safety and soundness of our financial system.

Given the implications for financial institutions' ability to safeguard assets under this rule and the clear lack of understanding regarding their prudential standards and guidance from their primary regulators, this rule is fatally flawed.

The fact of the matter is to the extent there is concern about a lack of regulation, if there is concern about a lack of regulatory clarity or risk with crypto, then we should not make it impossible, as a practical matter, for well-regulated banks to protect Americans who own digital assets with custody services.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to protect customers and if you want to protect investors in digital assets, then we shouldn't be pushing crypto transactions into less transparent and more opaque, riskier offshore places, but that is exactly what SAB 121 would do.

I have to address this issue. Silicon Valley Bank's failure had to do with deposit concentration risk and interest rate mismanagement. It had nothing to do with the fact that many of its customers were technology firms or worked in the blockchain space. It had nothing to do with that. That is a red herring.

This is why I support Mr. FLOOD's measure, I support the bipartisan work, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated March 2, 2023, cosigned by Chairman MCHENRY and Senator LUMMIS sent to the Fed, OCC, FDIC, and NCUA asking them about SAB 121's impact on regulated entities, and also asking if they were consulted prior to SAB 121's issuance.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2023.

Re Prudential Impact of Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

Hon. MICHAEL BARR,
Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.
Mr. MICHAEL HSU,
Acting Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC.
Hon. MARTY GRUENBERG,
Chairman of the Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD HARPER,
Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, Alexandria, VA.

DEAR VICE CHAIR BARR, CHAIRMAN GRUENBERG, CHAIRMAN HARPER, AND MR. HSU: We write regarding Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (''SAB 121'') published on April 11, 2022. SAB 121 was intended to clarify the accounting treatment of digital assets safeguarded by custodians, exchanges, and other platforms engaged in digital asset activities. However, SAB 121 places customer assets at greater risk of loss if a custodian becomes insolvent or enters receivership, violating the SEC's fundamental mission to protect customers.

Our concern stems from SAB 121's directive that companies recognize a liability and a corresponding offset on their balance sheets, measured at the fair value of the customer custodial digital assets. A recent decision in the Celsius bankruptcy, which classified all Celsius' customers as unsecured creditors, and therefore at the back of the line to recover their assets, highlights the legal risk of effectively forcing customer custodial assets to be placed on balance sheet. Additionally, SAB 121 upends decades of precedent regarding the accounting treatment of custodial assets for banks, credit unions and other regulated financial institutions.

Federal Reserve Board Chair Powell noted this shift away from traditional custodial practices in testimony before the Senate Banking Committee on June 22, 2022. Typically, custodial assets receive off-balance sheet accounting treatment. This is largely because customers retain ownership of their custodial assets and financial institutions are not permitted to conduct proprietary trading with customer assets. As emphasized in comment letters, SAB 121 ''deviates from existing accounting treatment of safeguarded assets held in a custodial capacity, which does not result in assets or liabilities reported on the custodian's balance sheet.''

Furthermore, the breadth of the ''digital asset'' definition in SAB 121 covers any ''digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.'' The scope of assets covered by this broad definition, whether virtual currency, stablecoins, or even tokenized equities, is unclear. This is concerning because a more nuanced hierarchy for this asset class which considers the opportunities and risks of digital assets with different functions is necessary. For example, the Bank for International Settlements' Prudential Treatment of Crypto Assets framework differentiates between various types of digital assets for bank capital purposes.

Since SAB 121 purports to require banks, credit unions and other financial institutions to effectively place digital assets on their balance sheets, it would trigger a massive capital charge. This in turn is likely to prevent these prudentially regulated entities from engaging in digital asset custody. To the contrary, we should be encouraging prudentially regulated financial institutions, like banks and credit unions, to provide digital asset services precisely because they are subject to the highest standards of capital, liquidity, recovery and resolution, custody, cyber-security, and risk management.

In sum, the effect of SAB 121 is to deny millions of Americans access to safe and secure custodial arrangements for digital assets. For these reasons, please respond to the following questions regarding the impact of SAB 121 on banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions:

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? If not, do you plan to do so?

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency's input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of ''digital asset'' under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

We would appreciate a response no later than March 16, 2023. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

SEN. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,
Senate Banking Committee.
REP. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated April 6, 2023, sent by OCC Acting Comptroller Hsu to Chairman MCHENRY and Senator LUMMIS in response to their March 2, 2023, letter.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER
OF THE CURRENCY,
April 6, 2023.

Hon. CYNTHIA LUMMIS,
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LUMMIS AND CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2023, concerning the impact of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin Number 121 (SAB 121) on institutions regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC).

The OCC recognizes that the SEC plays an important role in developing financial reporting standards applicable to publicly listed companies in the United States. Federal law (12 U.S.C.1831n) requires all national banks and federal savings associations to follow reporting standards that are no less stringent than U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), regardless of public listing status. We understand that these institutions, in consultation with their auditors, are analyzing the intersection of SAB 121 and GAAP. The OCC is monitoring these discussions.

Please see responses below to your specific questions.

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

The SEC did not consult with the OCC prior to the issuance of SAB 121.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

The OCC has not participated in any communications with the SEC in which the SEC indicated it would modify or withdraw SAB 121.

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

Section 37(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 183n(a)) requires that the Federal banking agencies prescribe accounting principles for regulatory reporting purposes that are no less stringent than U.S. GAAP. Under U.S. GAAP, custodial assets are generally not reported on the bank's balance sheet provided that client assets held in custody are properly segregated and held separately from the bank's assets

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? If not, do you plan to do so?

The OCC worked with the other members of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council to provide regulatory reporting instructions to banks that provide for each bank to determine whether it is appropriate to apply SAB 121 for financial reporting purposes. If a bank determines that it is appropriate to follow SAB for financial reporting purposes, the bank should also prepare its Consolidated Reports of Condition and Income in the same manner.

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency's input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of ''digital asset'' under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) defines cryptoassets as ''private digital assets that depend on cryptography and distributed ledger technologies (DLT) or similar technologies. Digital assets are a digital representation of value, which can be used for payment or investment purposes or to access a good or service.''

While the final BCBS cryptoasset standard applies different capital treatments to Group 1 and Group 2 cryptoasset exposures, the standard states that custodial service activities are not considered ''exposures'' for the purposes of the standard.

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

The OCC expects banks to hold capital commensurate with the nature and extent of the risks of their activities) For national trust banks, OCC Bulletin 2007–21, ''Supervision of National Trust Banks: Revised Guidance: Capital and Liquidity,''provides that the minimum capital is informed by analysis of quantitative and qualitative factors including, but not limited to, financial projections, fixed and variable expenses, the nature of fiduciary products and services being proposed, and discussions with organizers.

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

The OCC will continue to monitor this issue and work to ensure that national banks and federal savings associations operate in a safe and sound manner, provide fair access to financial services, treat customers fairly, and comply with applicable laws and regulations, including consumer protection laws.

If you have any questions or need additional information. please do not hesitate to contact me or Carrie Moore, Director, Public Affairs and Congressional Relations.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HSU,
Acting Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter dated March 16, 2023, sent by NCUA Chairman Harper in response to Chairman MCHENRY's and Senator LUMMIS' March 2, 2023, letter.

NATIONAL CREDIT
UNION ADMINISTRATION,
Alexandria, VA, March 16, 2023.

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, U.S. House Committee on Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCHENRY: Thank you for contacting the National Credit Union Administration about the implementation of Staff Accounting Bulletin 121. The increase in consumers and businesses using digital assets, including cryptocurrency, has impacted the financial services industry, which includes both credit unions and banks. It is therefore important to develop a balanced policy approach to address emerging risks to the safety and soundness of federally insured credit unions.

Your letter requests responses to several questions, which reflect the NCUA's supervisory role over federally insured credit unions. Our responses follow.

(1) Was your agency contacted by the SEC prior to the issuance of SAB 121? If so, please identify the staff members consulted by the SEC and provide copies of written feedback, if any, provided to SEC staff.

The NCUA was not contacted.

(2) Has the SEC indicated that it will modify or withdraw SAB 121 in light of widespread comments that the Bulletin is flawed?

The NCUA is not aware of the SEC's intent to modify or withdraw SAB 121.

(3) What are the legal and supervisory reasons off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets has historically been the norm for banks and credit unions?

The off-balance sheet treatment of custodial assets is rooted in generally accepted accounting principles, or GAAP for short. The GAAP standard evolved from the concept of the principal agent relationship, where the reporting of an asset belonged to the entity that controlled the asset and ownership rights were not passed to the custodian. As the custodian did not have ownership rights—that is, the ability to buy, sell, or leverage the asset—the custodian did not report those types of assets in its financial statements. The concept is codified in the Accounting Standards Codification Topic 860 Transfers and Servicing, where ''transfers of the custody of financial assets for safekeeping'' is excluded from accounting for transfers and servicing of financial assets.

(4) Has your agency directed banks and other financial institutions within your jurisdiction to comply with the terms of SAB 121 for the purposes of capital adequacy, business plan change approvals, reporting and other supervisory matters? if not, do you plan to do so?

The NCUA has not directed credit unions to comply with SAB 121 for any purpose. SAB 121 is a requirement of public registrants and does not apply to credit unions, which are cooperatively owned by their members.

(5) Does SAB 121 conflict with your agency's input regarding the Basel Committee on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures, in so far as the definition of ''digital asset'' under SAB 121 also encompasses Group 1a, Group 1b, and Group 2 digital assets under the Prudential Treatment framework?

The NCUA is neither a member of the Basel Committee nor does it provide input on Bank Supervision's Prudential Treatment for Crypto Asset exposures.

(6) Do you agree that the capital charge for banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions under SAB 121 is prohibitive?

If SAB 121 is eventually applied to nonpublic entities, it will have implications for assessing the adequacy of an insured credit union's net worth. If a credit union functions as a digital asset custodian and is required to reflect the digital assets held in custody on its balance sheet, the credit union's net worth ratio would be negatively impacted as the institution's assets would increase without a commensurate increase in the net worth.

(7) Do you agree that SAB 121 potentially weakens consumer protection by preventing well-regulated banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions from providing custodial services for digital assets?

Prior to the release of SAB 121, the NCUA issued a Letter to Credit Unions on Relationships with Third Parties that Provide Services to Digital Assets. As stated in that letter, the NCUA would not take exception to credit unions partnering with third parties to make digital asset services available to members. That letter also outlines the NCUA's expectations that credit unions conduct adequate due diligence and ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations when engaging in any such activity. The NCUA is not able to determine the impact of adopting SAB 121 at publicly traded financial institutions that offer custody services of digital assets and cannot make a broad determination of the impact on consumer protection.

Thank you for raising this issue with the NCUA. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me or have your staff contact Elizabeth Eurgubian in our Office of External Affairs and Communications.

Sincerely,

TODD M. HARPER,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been opposed by the Biden administration. Further, this bill is opposed by the following organizations: Americans for Financial Reform, Better Markets, Public Citizen, Consumer Federation of America, United States Public Interest Research Group; New Jersey Citizen Action, Demand Progress, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Texas Appleseed, 20/20 Vision, and Bank of New York Mellon.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H.J. Res. 109 which would repeal the SEC's unnecessary regulations on cryptocurrency and the banking industry.

The SEC and its chairman, Gary Gensler, have repeatedly overstepped their authority and targeted cryptocurrencies.

The SEC's latest unnecessary regulation was implemented outside of the regular rulemaking process and bypassed established procedures, and it shows.

This rule will limit banks' ability to offer digital assets as part of their custodial services. This makes it more challenging for Americans to safely engage with digital assets under the advisement of their local banks who are able to accurately inform them of risks of investments.

Crypto is a legitimate market used by millions of Americans. Hundreds of thousands of those are in my district. Unfortunately, today they have been referred to as ''criminals and drug dealers,'' and I take offense to that.

We should be giving investors opportunities to take part in cryptocurrencies, not putting up artificial barriers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and repeal the regulation.

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

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have echoed calls from the crypto industry saying that legislation is needed to provide clarification on how securities laws apply to them, but their actions reveal their true motivation.

They don't want clarity; they want broad exemption from securities laws.

Let's look at their actions to date. The first crypto-related bill that Republicans marked up was the FIT 21 Act which they claimed was responsive to the need for clarity on crypto.

The only thing clear about this highly convoluted bill is that it would provide the crypto industry with broad exemptions from current securities.

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

□ 1300

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman

from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend and chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee and the vice-chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MCHENRY and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) for this excellent work in this Congressional Review Act resolution to roll back the SEC's failure in their Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.

It would reshape the business of custody in this country. This is not just about crypto. This is a sweeping rule that the SEC has implemented without following the Administrative Procedures Act. The GAO says it is a rule. Well, if it is a rule, it needs to go through the Administrative Procedures Act and have a comment period and get people involved because, as Ranking Member WATERS noted, they did not consult with the banking regulators, who have the primary role of supervising custody in this country.

A custodian is someone who holds your assets for you, whether it is shares of a stock or acres of forest land or a rental house or 10 bitcoin. Holding reserves against the assets in custody is not standard financial services practice.

This staff accounting bulletin is misguided. It requires that money be set aside for that category of assets of digital assets in custody. It is part of a broader attack by the Biden administration to treat digital assets differently from all other assets.

That doesn't make any sense to House Republicans. Under Mr. MCHENRY's leadership and Mr. THOMPSON's leadership of the Ag Committee, we have a fit-for-purpose approach that, in fact, directs the SEC and the CFTC how to handle digital assets.

Unfortunately, this accounting bulletin is in the wrong direction. That is why we have the Congressional Review Act. That is why we are using Article I authority under the Constitution to say this is the wrong direction and that we will all come to this House floor and say it should be repealed and sent back.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, senior Biden official Vice Chairman Barr of the fed, Acting Comptroller Hsu all testified before our committee that they were not consulted by the SEC about this staff accounting bulletin. It is a significant change. It is a rule. It should have gone through the Administrative Procedures Act and be out for public comment.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD) for leading the charge on this important resolution, and I urge adoption.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the industry, the custody industry, the big banks that hold these crypto assets simply asked for a little correction, a little clarity, a little information.

The Republicans are taking advantage of this, and this is the first crypto bill that Republicans are bringing to the floor today, and it would do what the majority always attempts to do, and this would actually reverse SEC guidance that provides clarity on accounting standards specifically for crypto assets. Not only that, but it would undermine the SEC's ability to provide clarity on crypto in the future.

That is why the administration sees this bill for what it is and has advised us that they would veto it.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), the chair of the Housing Subcommittee, the vice chair of the Digital Assets Subcommittee, and a longtime leader in digital innovation and digital assets.

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

Mr. Speaker, this accounting bulletin has proven to be a barrier to publicly traded banks having an ability to meaningfully engage in distributed ledger products due to their overly broad definition of a crypto asset. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types in use cases, but, instead, generally states that crypto assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks, requiring special on-balance-sheet treatment.

All other assets, if you want to make a deposit at a bank, they are glad to hold custody of the assets, but somehow these assets qualify for special treatment.

Normally, if there was on-balance-sheet treatment, it would also just be a clean entry. There wouldn't be a mark to mark it that would require not just a balance sheet treatment that would be appropriate for a custody of a certain kind of asset, but you would have income statement flow throughs and all kinds of other risks.

Why would a bank need to cover extra risk up to 100 percent of the deposit of an asset simply to take custody of the asset? This is a special treatment that applies just to these assets, so applying on-balance-sheet treatment for crypto assets wrongly subjects customer assets to creditors' claims in the event there was a failure of a custodial institution.

In a traditional bankruptcy, assets are accounted for on balance sheet and are subject to creditor claims. Conversely, assets held in custody for customers are accounted for off balance sheet and, thus, are protected from creditor claims in bankruptcy because they remain the assets of the company.

We would see this distinction in a company like Fidelity, where the assets are off balance sheet, versus a company like Silicon Valley Bank when they went bankrupt. The depositors were literally at risk. Why would we change the standard with this out-of-jurisdiction rulemaking by the SEC?

Requiring custody crypto assets to be accounted for on balance sheets risks losing the bankruptcy protections of custodial services. This is an important distinction from the treatment for a broker-dealer that would be subject to a different form of bankruptcy under the Securities Investor Protection Act. Distributor ledger technology does not change the underlying nature of risk of traditional assets, nor do they present risks that SAB 121 purports to address.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters: A letter dated August 23, 2023, cosigned by Chairman MCHENRY and Representative HILL, sent to the Comptroller General at the Government Accountability Office, urging GAO to complete its assessment on whether the Congressional Review Act applies to SAB 121; a letter dated February 14, 2024, cosigned by the Bank Policy Institute, the American Bankers Association, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, sent to the SEC requesting a meeting with the SEC Chairman, Gary Gensler, urging him to reconsider SAB 121; and, lastly, a bipartisan, bicameral letter dated November 15, 2023, cosigned by five Representatives and two Senators, sent to the Federal Reserve, the OCC, the FDIC, NCUA, urging the agencies to withhold enforcement of SAB 121 in light of GAO's decision.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, August 23, 2023.

Re SEC Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 and the Congressional Review Act

Hon. GENE DODARO,
Comptroller General of the United States Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR COMPTROLLER DODARO: We write to inquire about the status of the Government Accountability Office (GAO)'s decision regarding the applicability of the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 (SAB 121). We are concerned that SAB 121 is not guidance but rather should be considered a major action undertaken by the SEC. This letter underscores the request by Senator Lummis expressing her shared concern about the effect of SAB 121. To date, GAO has not rendered a decision.

To underscore Senator Lummis' position, SAB 121 should be construed as a rule for purposes of the CRA. SAB 121 is not an interpretive rule. It is not a general statement of policy. Rather SAB 121 is a major policy change that fundamentally impacts the way customer assets under custody are treated for balance sheet purposes. The Bulletin significantly impacts a number of entities within the SEC's purview but also state and nationally chartered banks and trust companies.

Separately, it is important to note that Congress continues to make progress on legislation establishing a regulatory framework to provide certainty for the digital asset ecosystem. The Committee's work to report out legislation governing both the issuance and use of payment stablecoins as well as the regulation of digital asset intermediaries is consistent with the recommendations made by GAO this past June. This legislative work should not be subverted by unelected bureaucrats through opaque and unaccountable processes such as SAB 121.

We encourage you to protect the prerogatives of the legislative branch by determining SAB 121 as a major rule and subject to the CRA. We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

FRENCH HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology, and Inclusion.

FEBRUARY 14, 2024.

Hon. GARY GENSLER,
Chair, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GENSLER: The Bank Policy Institute (''BPI''), the American Bankers Association (''ABA''), the Financial Services Forum (''the Forum''), and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (''SIFMA'') (collectively, the ''Associations'' write to request that the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') consider targeted modifications to Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121 (''SAB 121'') to address recent policy developments and the challenges that SAB 121 has posed for U.S. banking organizations since it was issued on March 31, 2022.

As the two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121 approaches, the Associations believe now would be an appropriate time to examine and discuss the implications of SAB 121 for regulated banking organizations. There have been several relevant developments during this two year period, including the GAO report issued in October, approval of certain Spot Bitcoin ETPs, and the SEC's proposed rule on Safeguarding Advisory Client Assets that would cover the custody of digital assets if finalized as proposed. The Associations believe that SAB 121 can be modified to mitigate the specific challenges identified herein without undermining the stated policy objectives of the Commission to enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements.

The Associations are happy to continue to serve as a resource and work collaboratively with the Commission to provide recommendations that would ensure that investors are provided the requisite disclosures while allowing responsible innovation to occur. The Associations and Commission share the common goals of ensuring the highest levels of investor protection and implementing policies that advance principles of market integrity and financial stability.

We believe the recommendations set forth in this letter are consistent with those principles and would remove unintended barriers for well-regulated U.S. banking organizations to engage in certain activities. Below we describe the drivers behind this request and suggest targeted modifications to SAB 121.

I. BACKGROUND

Since SAB 121 was issued in 2022, the Associations have articulated their concerns regarding the Bulletin to the Commission both in writing and in meetings with Commission staff. The foremost concern identified and discussed is how the on-balance sheet requirement of SAB 121 negatively impacts U.S. banking organizations and investors due to the associated prudential implications. The Associations have underscored that on-balance sheet treatment will preclude highly regulated banking organizations from providing a custodial solution for digital assets at scale. Moreover, the Associations have highlighted that the on-balance sheet requirement, coupled with the overly-broad definition of ''crypto-asset'' in SAB 121, will have a chilling effect on banking organizations' ability to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) more broadly.

U.S. banking organizations' experience over the past two years has confirmed that SAB 121 has curbed the ability of the Associations' members to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. In comparison, in-scope entities of SAB 121 other than U.S. banking organizations have not suffered the same effects. For example, digital asset custodial services are currently offered by various non-banking organizations, thereby keeping activity outside the prudential perimeter and avoiding the necessary oversight by regulators. Indeed, if regulated banking organizations are effectively precluded from providing digital asset safeguarding services at scale, investors and customers, and ultimately the financial system, will be worse off, with the market limited to custody providers that do not afford their customers the legal and supervisory protections provided by federally-regulated banking organizations. The Associations continue to urge the Commission to work with industry to adopt solutions that could mitigate the described challenges.

II. CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF THE IMPACT OF SAB 121 ON U.S. BANKING ORGANIZATIONS

The Associations highlight two specific examples of the negative impact of SAB 121 on banking organizations, investors, and the financial ecosystem:

(1) Spot Bitcoin ETPs: The Commission recently approved 11 Spot Bitcoin ETPs, allowing investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, notably absent from those approved products are banking organizations serving as the asset custodian, a role they regularly play for most other ETPs. These ETPs have already experienced billions of dollars in inflows, but it is practically impossible for banks to serve as custodian for those ETPs at scale due to the Tier 1 capital ratio and other reserve and capital requirements that result from SAB 121. This raises important questions about the safety and stability of this ecosystem. We believe that this result could raise concentration risk, as one nonbank entity now serves as the custodian for the majority of these ETPs. That risk can be mitigated if prudentially regulated banking organizations have the same ability to provide custodial services for Commission regulated ETPs as qualified nonbank asset custodians. SAB 121 does not appear to contemplate this type of concentration risk, in part perhaps because Spot Bitcoin ETPs or similar products were not an approved product at the time SAB 121 was issued.

(2) Use of DLT to record traditional financial assets: Banking organizations are increasingly exploring the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets, such as bonds. The use of DLT has the potential to expedite and automate payment, clearing, reconciliation and settlement services, and multiple central banks outside the United States are partnering with banks to explore the adoption of DLT. However, SAB 121 has proven to be a barrier to banking organizations' ability to meaningfully engage in DLT-based projects due to the breadth of the definition of ''crypto-asset'' in SAB 121: ''a digital asset that is issued and/or transferred using distributed ledger or blockchain technology using cryptographic techniques.'' Under this definition, a traditional financial asset issued or transferred using DLT could be considered a ''crypto asset'' and thus within scope of SAB 121, regardless of the applicable risks. SAB 121 makes no distinction between asset types and use cases, but instead generally states that crypto-assets pose certain technological, legal, and regulatory risks requiring on-balance sheet treatment. However, there are significant differences between a cryptocurrency like Bitcoin that exists on a public, permissionless network versus a traditional financial instrument that is recorded on a blockchain network where access is controlled and transactions can be cancelled, corrected, or amended. The past two years have underscored these differences, as the turmoil in the crypto market has been wholly unrelated to banks' use of permissioned DLT. DLT does not change the underlying nature or risks of traditional assets, nor do they present the risks SAB 121 purports to address, and thus SAB 121's application to those assets should be reconsidered. Clear indication from the Commission that the use of DLT to record or transfer traditional financial assets is consistently outside the scope of SAB 121 would alleviate associated challenges.

III. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The Associations request that the Commission consider the following targeted modifications to SAB 121 to address the above concerns:

Narrow the definition of ''crypto-assets'' to clarify and confirm the exclusion of certain asset types and use cases. SAB 121 is premised on the risks posed exclusively by cryptocurrencies, and traditional financial assets recorded or transferred using blockchain networks should be excluded because they do not present the same risks as cryptocurrencies; the use of DLT does not change the underlying nature or risk of traditional assets. Moreover, certain exclusions for products wherein the underlying activity relates to the offering of a Commission-approved product should be clarified.

Exempt banking organizations from on-balance sheet treatment but maintain the disclosure requirements: As described previously, SAB 121 answers three questions, and the Associations' and its members' are primarily concerned with the first question: how an entity should account for its obligations to safeguard crypto-assets (the on-balance sheet treatment). We do not object to the requirements imposed in the answer to the second question (disclosures in financial statements). Exempting banking organizations from the on-balance sheet treatment but requiring them to make certain disclosures about their digital activity would mitigate the concerns raised by banking organizations without undermining the goal of SAB 121 to promote disclosures to investors. Balance sheet disclosure may be appropriate where the controls are not adequate to protect investors from the risk of custodied assets, which is not the case for banking organizations that are subject to robust oversight from the federal banking agencies. The required disclosures in the answer to the second question are broad and may include disclosures in the description of business, risk factors, and management's discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operation, and such information will still ''enhance the information received by investors and other users of financial statements about these risks, thereby assisting them in making investment and other capital allocation decisions.''

IV. CONCLUSION

The Associations and their members appreciate your attention to the issues raised in this letter. Given the upcoming two-year anniversary of the issuance of SAB 121, certain

policy developments, the experience of U.S. banking organizations, and the evolution in technology since the guidance was first issued, we believe it is an appropriate time to reflect on the intended goals of SAB 121. We request a meeting with you and Commission staff to discuss the issues and proposed modifications set forth above.

We appreciate the Commission's attention to this important topic and look forward to engaging with you further. If you have any questions, please contact Paige Pidano Paridon.

Respectfully submitted,

Bank Policy Institute,
American Bankers Association,
Financial Services Forum,
Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, November 15, 2023.

Hon. MARTIN GRUENBERG,
Chairman of the Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Commission, Washington, DC.
Hon. MICHAEL BARR,
Vice Chair for Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, DC.
Hon. MICHAEL HSU,
Acting Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, DC.
Hon. TODD HARPER,
Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, Alexandria, VA.

DEAR VICE CHAIR BARR, CHAIRMAN GRUENBERG, CHAIRMAN HARPER, AND ACTING COMPTROLLER HSU: We write regarding Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 (''SAB 121'') published on April 11, 2022.

Last month, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a legal decision that SAB 121 is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act. SAB 121 was issued without consultation with any of your respective agencies and would require custodians to recognize a liability and a corresponding offset on their balance sheets, measured at the fair value of the customer custodial digital assets. This accounting approach, which deviates from established accounting standards, would not accurately reflect the underlying legal and economic obligations of the custodian, and places consumers at greater risk of loss.

In its decision, GAO stated that ''it is reasonable to believe that companies may change their behavior to comply with the staff interpretations found in the Bulletin'' due to the SEC's responsibility and authority in monitoring public disclosures and pursuing enforcement actions against noncompliant entities.

SAB 121 meets the definition of a rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), and was never submitted to Congress or the GAO, nor was it subsequently published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD consistent with the requirements of the Congressional Review Act. Given that the SEC failed to meet these obligations, SAB 121 should have no legal effect and the Federal banking agencies and National Credit Union Administration should not require banks, credit unions and other financial institutions that provide custody services for digital assets to comply. This means that such entities need not recognize a liability and a corresponding asset offset on their balance sheets.

Enforcing this noncompliant rule would set a concerning precedent that would facilitate regulatory gamesmanship to circumvent the APA, effectively allowing the SEC to have regulatory authority over institutions which Congress did not authorize.

We therefore ask you to clarify, through guidance or other action, that SAB 121 is not enforceable in light of the recent GAO determination. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY,
Member of Congress.
FRENCH HILL,
Member of Congress.
RITCHIE TORRES,
Member of Congress.
WILEY NICKEL,
Member of Congress.
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS,
United States Senator.
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND,
United States Senator.
MIKE FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of this bill, Mr. FLOOD, has asked what the alternative to this CRA resolution would be, and that answer is very simple: Draft a bill that narrowly addresses the current question about how this guidance applies to banks. The use of a CRA is dangerous and reckless.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, my friend says dangerous and reckless. Well, Democrats used the Congressional Review Act process just like Republicans have used the Congressional Review Act process. This is not reckless or dangerous. It is law, and we are trying to be a check and balance on overreach of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD), an esteemed member of the Financial Services Committee and Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 109. I don't want to be redundant on some of these points, but the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 is a radical departure from how custodians account for all other assets. By requiring custodians to treat digital assets as both an asset and a liability on their balance sheets, SAB 121 makes it nearly impossible for banks to provide custody services for digital assets due to the prudential requirements that it would trigger.

Innovations like the tokenization of assets have the potential to dramatically improve our financial infrastructure, and tokenization will allow new innovations and traditionally illiquid assets to become available to more people more efficiently, like commercial bank deposits, government corporate bonds, money market fund shares, real estate, gold, and other commodities.

However, for tokenization to take hold, it is important for regulated financial institutions to be custodians in order to identify the entitlement holder and to mitigate any single point of failure in the record of the ownership.

Mr. Speaker, this misguided action from the SEC should be struck down, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' for this resolution.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NICKEL), my good friend and colleague, and a great leader in digital assets.

Mr. NICKEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution I am leading with my colleague across the aisle, Congressman MIKE FLOOD.

Mr. Speaker, our Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove of the SEC's Staff Accounting Bulletin 121 protects consumers, reinforces Congress' role in the rulemaking process, and pushes back on the SEC's hostility toward digital assets.

Mr. Speaker, SAB 121 makes the digital assets industry less safe for consumers. It prevents well-regulated banks from safeguarding digital assets that are owned by their clients. SAB 121 requires banks to place custody of digital assets on their balance sheets, contrary to how traditional assets are treated. This makes it nearly impossible for a bank to provide custody of digital assets at scale, leaving investors to rely on riskier, unregulated options.

Mr. Speaker, whether you love crypto or you hate it, you should want the most heavily supervised financial institutions who are experts at custodial banking to safeguard digital assets. We are also seeing this issue with SAB 121 play out in real time, the SEC's recent approval of spot bitcoin ETPs, which I pushed for, allows retail investors access to this asset class through a regulated product. However, most bitcoin ETPs are held by the same nonbank custodian. Notably, banks aren't serving as custodians for any of these products as they would with a traditional ETP. This could pose a risk to the safety and soundness of the financial system, a concentration of risk issue, for sure.

To make matters worse, Gary Gensler and the SEC deliberately sidestepped the customary regulatory process, amounting to an obvious overstep of the agency's authority.

Last October, the Government Accountability Office concluded that the SEC breached statutory rulemaking requirements by issuing SAB 121 as guidance rather than a rule, avoiding the notice and comment period. SABs are meant to serve as tools to interpret existing policies, not create brand-new policy like SAB 121.

Additionally, the SEC issued the rule without conferring with banking regulators, which is unacceptable given the SEC's lack of prudential authority over banking institutions. It is time for Congress to take action and conduct oversight of the SEC's missteps. We shouldn't have to resort to using a CRA to fix this issue, and Gary Gensler could re-issue this accounting bulletin

and work with stakeholders to find a solution, but, unfortunately, this is the only tool that we have left.

As with previously successful CRAs, the SEC will be able to re-issue its rule as long as it has made changes responding to statements made by Members in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support our bipartisan CRA of SAB 121, which will protect investors and the financial system, encourage innovation, bolster American competitiveness, and restore Congress' role in administrative rulemaking.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. DAVIDSON entered a letter into the RECORD from several bank trades. What he did not mention was that the banks only asked for target modifications when they wrote about this legislation. In fact, in that letter, they supported the transparency requirements this resolution would repeal.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to see this bill for what it is. It is a giveaway to one powerful special interest group in an effort to weaken the SEC, a crucial agency that protects investors and the functioning of our capital markets. This is the agency that is working to protect the retirement savings of millions of Americans. This is the agency that is crucial to making our capital markets the envy of the world. This is the agency at the forefront of ensuring that innovation, like in crypto, is done responsibly and in accordance with existing security laws. We simply cannot afford to weaken the SEC.

□ 1315

Moreover, this resolution harms investors by eliminating much-needed transparency on volatile crypto assets, making it harder for them to make informed investment decisions. It also harms crypto users because transparency also deters fraud and other mismanagement of assets that can lead to devastating losses for consumers.

Additionally, the resolution increases the likelihood of market volatility because a lack of transparency can result in more unexpected failures of crypto-related companies.

Finally, this resolution harms all public companies who benefit from the SEC's practice of providing timely guidance through Staff Accounting Bulletins.

If the Republicans would like to address the issue raised by large custody banks, they should do that, but there is no need to cause broader harm to the SEC and all of the people and companies that rely on it to maintain safety and stability.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States would not be giving us this information this early about vetoing unless they saw this as a serious issue that must be dealt with right here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a May 7, 2024, letter from the American Bankers Association, Bank Policy Institute, the Financial Services Forum, and the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association supporting H.J. Res. 109.

MAY 7, 2024.

Re Providing for Congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to ''Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121'' (H.J. Res. 109)

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: The American Bankers Association, Bank Policy Institute, Financial Services Forum, and Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (Associations) write to express our support for H.J. Res. 109, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval for the Securities and Exchange Commission's ''Staff Accounting Bulletin 121.'' H.J. Res. 109 was introduced by Reps. Mike Flood (R–NE) and Wiley Nickel (D–NC) and favorably reported by a bipartisan vote from the Financial Services Committee on February 29. The measure is scheduled for consideration by the House this week.

In March 2022, the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Office of the Chief Accountant released Staff Accounting Bulletin (SAB) 121, without consulting the prudential regulators or soliciting public comment, to address perceived risks to publicly traded companies that safeguard digital assets for their customers. Under SAB 121, an entity responsible for safeguarding digital assets for platform users must measure safeguarding assets and obligations on its balance sheet at the fair value of the related assets, which is a departure from accounting standards and the historical practice of treating custodial assets as off-balance sheet. As this effectively treats the custodied assets as those owned by a bank, SAB 121 effectively precludes banks from offering digital asset custody at scale since placing the value of client assets on their balance sheets will impact certain capital, liquidity, and other prudential requirements. Furthermore, SAB 121 undercuts the ability of banks to develop responsible use cases for distributed ledger technology (DLT) and encumbers regulated broker-dealers from custody services as a result of the net capital rule (Rule 15c3–1), which treats the on-balance sheet items as non-allowable assets.

On February 14, 2024, the Associations sent a joint letter to the SEC noting that over the past two years SAB 121 has curbed the ability of our member banks to develop and bring to market at scale certain digital asset products and services. This includes spot bitcoin exchange traded products (recently approved by the Commission for investors) and the use of DLT to record traditional financial assets (i.e. tokenization).

SAB 121 represents a significant departure from longstanding accounting treatment for custodial assets and threatens the industry's ability to provide its customers with safe and sound custody of digital assets. Other, non-bank digital asset platforms subject to SAB 121 are not required to meet the same capital, liquidity, or other prudential standards as banks and therefore do not face the economically prohibitive implications of SAB 121. Limiting banks' ability to offer these services leaves customers with few well-regulated, trusted options for safeguarding their digital asset portfolios and ultimately exposes them to increased risk.

The Associations respectfully request that Members of the House vote in favor of H. J. Res. 109.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association,
Bank Policy Institutec,
Financial Services Forum,
Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

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

Mr. Speaker, the administration's approach to digital assets doesn't make a lot of sense.

The President has an executive order outlining work products that he wants from agencies. On one hand, they say we want to bring digital assets into regulated finance, and we need clear rules of the road.

On the other hand, the administration's appointees at the Securities and Exchange Commission have done everything they can to undermine that level of clarity, that is number one; number two, issuing guidance that undermines whatever the current clarity is and diminishing that; number three, thereby diminishing consumer protection.

It is a nonsensical approach. So the administration says they want to veto this resolution. Yet they have a whole workstream the President issued without any forcing mechanism and executive order asking for a regulated stable coin, which we have passed out of the House Financial Services Committee with bipartisan votes.

They have asked for a market regulation to give clarity of what is a digital asset, and a means of exchange so American consumers can participate in this innovation that is the basis of the new generation of internet technology that the globe is using and America is behind.

I think it is important that we engage, as best we can, whether it is with the stable coin bill that we passed out of committee—the market regulation bill we passed out of committee—that it brings that clarity the President's executive order asked for, and takes this first step to provide consumer protection so that their financial assets are protected.

If the firm goes bankrupt, they want to know they can get their asset back. Passing this repeal is the first step in that process.

This is very important for consumer protection. If you support consumer protection vote ''yes'' on this resolution. If you support safety and soundness for financial institutions vote ''yes.'' If you support reining in rogue regulators vote ''yes.'' This should be a wide bipartisan vote and a statement that the House supports digital assets, digital innovation, and thoughtful policymaking from our regulators and regulated finance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution. I also thank my colleagues on the Democrat side, Mr. NICKEL, and on the Republican side, Mr. FLOOD, for their thoughtful approach to policymaking, and digital assets generally, but on developing this Congressional Review Act proposal, in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 118–416 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2925

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 ''Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024''.

SEC. 2. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

''(1) CLAIMANT RIGHTS.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF OPERATIONS.—In this paragraph, the term 'operations' means—

''(i) with respect to a locatable mineral, any activity or work carried out in connection with—

''(I) prospecting;

''(II) exploration;

''(III) discovery and assessment;

''(IV) development;

''(V) extraction; or

''(VI) processing;

''(ii) the reclamation of an area disturbed by an activity described in clause (i); and

''(iii) any activity reasonably incident to an activity described in clause (i) or (ii), regardless of whether that incidental activity is carried out on a mining claim, including the construction and maintenance of any road, transmission line, pipeline, or any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for a support facility.

''(B) RIGHTS TO USE, OCCUPATION, AND OPERATIONS.—A claimant shall have the right to use and occupy to conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

''(i) the claimant makes a timely payment of—

''(I) the location fee required by section 10102; and

''(II) the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

''(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver of the claim maintenance fee under subsection (d)—

''(I) the claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102; and

''(II) the claimant complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

''(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy any requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for the payment of fair market value to the United States for the use of public land and resources pursuant to the general mining laws.

''(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection—

''(A) diminishes any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant;

''(B) creates or increases any right (including a right of exploration, entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant on lands that are not open to location under the general mining laws;

''(C) modifies any provision of law or any prior administrative action withdrawing lands from location or entry;

''(D) limits the right of the Federal Government to regulate mining and mining-related activities (including requiring claim validity examinations to establish the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit) in areas withdrawn from mining (including under—

''(i) the general mining laws;

''(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

''(iii) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

''(iv) sections 100731 through 100737 of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Mining in the Parks Act');

''(v) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

''(vi) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'National Historic Preservation Act')); or

''(E) restores any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy, or right to conduct operations) of a claimant that existed prior to the date that the lands were closed to or withdrawn from location under the general mining laws and that has been extinguished by such closure or withdrawal.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2925.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024.

In May 2022, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed a lower court's decision revoking an approved mine plan for the Rosemont Copper Mine project in Arizona.

This determination commonly called the Rosemont decision upended decades of regulatory precedent and specific U.S. Forest Service regulations that allow approvals of operation on or off a mining claim so long as these operations meet environmental and regulatory standards.

Essentially, this court's ruling puts the cart before the horse and fails to reflect the process of how a company actually develops a mine. I think there is some confusion about the mine approval process and what the term ''valid'' claim means.

First, when looking to develop a mine, an operator must submit something called a Mine Plan of Operations to the United States Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. This plan must include the intended uses of the surface of the mining claim, including those for waste rock placements, mills, offices, and roads.

The Mine Plan of Operations is key in determining the economic feasibility of a mining site, which, in turn, factors into the basis of determining which mineral deposits are commercially developable and, therefore, valid.

If allowed to stand, the Rosemont decision would require the discovery and determination of a valid mineral deposit, meaning that operators must prove the existence of a commercially developable deposit on a claim before a plan of operations can be approved.

Remember, a mine cannot move forward if the Federal Government does not approve any facet of the Mine Plan of Operations. Further, mineral validity cannot be determined until after the economic viability of a site—as is laid out in the Mine Plan of Operations—is verified by the Federal Government, as well.

H.R. 2925, Mr. Speaker, would reverse this backward determination of the court, allowing American mining to resume on Federal lands. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, and I will remind my friends across the aisle that mining is already happening on American lands and on our public lands.

However, this week, instead of working on meaningful legislation on behalf of the American people, our friends have opted instead to focus on a toxic free-for-all on our public lands and have opted to focus on legislation to rollback energy efficiency in home appliances.

In fact, they put forward a bill this week called Hands Off Our Home Appliances because they are so concerned about the American people that they want to regulate the efficiency of their toasters, their dishwashers, their refrigerators, and undermine the ability of our immigrant and our Hispano communities to have representation in the United States Census and, yes, to allow a free-for-all on our public lands.

Now, the American people are not asking us to do this. They are asking us to work on real problems: to work on the economy, inflation, helping families put food on the table and a roof over their head, protecting our reproductive rights and access to the ballot box, protecting our democracy, and dealing with the international crises that are happening on multiple continents.

My question is: Why the heck are we back on the House floor one week after we voted, on a bipartisan basis, to send this bad bill back to committee when it couldn't even be supported on the floor once?

Yet here we are, and our friends are trying to pass it once again, without revision, without changes because they think they found a few extra spare votes.

Let's talk about mining laws. The existing mining law of 1872 already gives our mining companies, including foreign-owned companies, the right to extract on our publicly-owned lands. They can also do so without having to pay even one cent in royalties. That includes companies that are controlled by governments of adversarial nations.

This is not only a shameful giveaway, but a huge national security vulnerability for the United States. This bill is not about clarifying a court decision, it is about giving more minerals away to those who would like unfettered access to our public lands. It would give opportunities for multinational corporations and adversarial nations to control even more of our resources without having to pay royalties to the U.S. Government, and to tie up claims on our public lands, whether or not there are minerals actually present there.

This would make it impossible to invalidate a mining claim, even if their real intent was other things, maybe to lock up development on other uses or buying them for other uses, including construction of transmission lines or other things that they would want to do.

This should be of deep concern to anyone who does not want adversarial nations or the companies that operate in them to control our public lands or minerals.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that it is either mine here or mine abroad and create a false equivalency, but it is not that simple. Some of the countries that are trying to expand their mining operations here in the United States, in fact, many of these multinational corporations are owned as subsidiaries under countries like China and other countries that we have adversarial relationships with.

□ 1330

They also engage in practices that we know cause human rights abuses, things like slave labor elsewhere in the world. While my friends across the aisle have tried to claim that this is really about mining on American lands, it is about granting unfettered access to these corporations.

In fact, these entities can ship the minerals that they take from American lands anywhere in the world and smelt those materials on the cheap, often relying on human rights abuses abroad to cut costs.

As I said, we already had this debate last week. The outcome was the entire House, right here on this floor, voted to send this toxic bill back to the Natural Resources Committee. In fact, that hasn't happened in years because this bill was so flawed and such a giveaway to foreign national owned companies and a threat to our national security that it was agreed that it wasn't ready for prime time and shouldn't be passed on the floor.

My colleague from New Mexico, Representative TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ, offered to send the bill back to committee so that we could discuss amending the bill to ban these adversarial corporations operating in adversarial nations from mining and locking up our public lands.

I have to say, I was heartened. We had six Republicans join the Democrats to do just that. They said they were not going to vote for that bill. Well, it was about time. We need some bipartisan support to double down on protecting U.S. interests.

In fact, as I said, it has been decades since the House sent a bill back to committee like that, but as we see today, here we are. Republican leadership is trying once again to get the bill passed through brute force without addressing serious concerns, without sending it back to committee, without going through due process. Here we are, debating it and about to take a vote again.

These concerns aren't new. Last year, the bill was included in H.R. 1. At that time, one of my Republican colleagues offered a very similar amendment banning mining on our public lands by foreign companies with records of human rights violations. We are literally talking about companies that have child slave labor records. That amendment passed through committee on a bipartisan basis, yet they stripped it out and are trying to pass the bill without it here today on the floor.

I find it absolutely jaw-dropping and extremely telling that this was the amendment that was stripped out of the bill and that we are back here a week later after this bill failed on the floor.

I think it is very clear what is going on here. This is really about advancing the interests of corporations, interests on our public lands, and opening them up for exploitation.

I think it is important that we talk about how outrageous this is. We have to ensure that our public lands are not open to our adversaries, to these multinational corporations that will exploit our minerals for free. We need some bipartisan action to make sure that that cannot happen.

We should be back in committee discussing the vulnerabilities, discussing the national security implications, discussing American competitiveness, discussing energy policy, not trying to jam through a bill that will violate human rights and international trade.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear: This bill will not allow mining companies to do whatever they want on public land. That is a fact.

Mining activity will not occur if any facet of a mine plan of operations has not passed our strict Federal guidelines and our strict environmental guidelines.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

H.R. 2925 would resolve harmful permitting uncertainty and litigation delays caused by a harmful 2019 rogue court decision known as the Rosemont decision. This decision revoked a previously approved mine plan in my great State of Arizona, ignoring 40 years of Federal permitting and land management regulations.

The uncertainty caused by Rosemont threatens to add years of delays to any proposed mining project on Federal lands in the United States.

Congress should act to remedy the fallout created by Rosemont and must work to expedite mine permitting and build up domestic mineral supply chains.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that will provide much-needed certainty for domestic mining projects.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, we have heard repeatedly from across the aisle that mining pollution is a thing of the past, that today's modern mining industry operates under the highest environmental standards, and that after the mining operations stop, the industry cleans up after itself. If that sounds too good to be true, it is because it is.

Our current regulations require companies to post financial assurances to cover the cost of cleanup after their mining operations stop, but it is not enough. Dangerous pollution still happens far too often. Depending on the mine type and location, between 74 and 82 percent of modern-day mines are polluting beyond what their permits allow.

The kicker? Taxpayers pay domestic and foreign mining companies for their subsidies and often the entire cost of cleanup. Given the $54 billion backlog to clean up mines abandoned before our current reclamation regulations, which continue to pollute our lands, waters, and communities, the American taxpayer literally cannot afford new mining pollution.

That is why I filed an amendment to this bill to improve bonding requirements and make mining companies keep up with the new mining rush that this bill would enable.

This is a commonsense amendment. If we are going to allow a toxic mining free-for-all, we should at least make sure that taxpayers are not footing the bill. After all, this bill opens up our lands to our foreign adversaries, and I don't expect them to clean up after themselves out of the goodness of their hearts.

My amendment would make sure operators post financial assurances to fully cover reclamation of all mining activities. It would correct for inconsistencies in both BLM and Forest Service regulations and codify those corrections into law. It would have made sure these financial assurances were real money, like surety bonds, irrevocable letters of credit, certificates of deposit, or cash, not insurance policies that lapse if the mining company goes bankrupt.

It is time we hold industry accountable and make sure they cannot pass on the costs of cleaning up after themselves, the costs of their earning profits, to the American people.

Guess what? The Republican majority refused to even consider my amendment. They blocked it from getting a debate on the House floor and even from getting a simple up-or-down vote.

It is outrageous, and it paints a dark picture of the House Republican's priorities: polluters over people, and China over the American taxpayer.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my good friend, for his words of support for this legislation.

Again, this legislation would correct a misguided court decision revoking an approved mine for the Rosemont Copper Mine Project in Arizona.

Arizona produced the second-most amount of minerals in the United States in 2023. It also has over 30 million acres of Federal lands. If the Rosemont decision stands, over 40 percent of Arizona's lands will be taken offline in the U.S. in the battle to produce enough minerals to meet our ever-growing needs.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, the Democrats brought an expert forward, Madam Speaker, an anti-mining expert. In fact, she said we have to stop hard-rock mining because the reclamation process doesn't work. I invited her to our great State of Minnesota to show her a reclaimed mine where we have deer hunting, bears, eagles, bees, birds, haymaking. We have drinking water that comes from mines that are not in operation. We have recreation in our mines in Minnesota and elsewhere in this country.

This hard-rock mining expert said it is too dry in Arizona and too wet in Minnesota to mine. I asked where she would like us to mine these minerals for our national security. She said the quiet part out loud. She said nowhere. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow mining to happen in this country.

The Communist country of China was just mentioned. This administration today, Madam Speaker, is in consultation with Congo, where 15 of the 19 industrial mines use child slave labor owned by the Chinese Communist country.

The Biden administration is entering into memorandums of understanding to have critical minerals mined by child slave labor in Congo, where there are zero environmental standards and zero labor standards, to meet their green agenda, Madam Speaker. They are okay with that but will not allow mining to happen in this country that follows our environmental and labor standards.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I live in the heart of mining country, and the best water in Minnesota is in the heart of mining country. We can drink it right out of the ground in Buhl, Minnesota.

I can tell you that this country better take part in mining domestically. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves, Madam Speaker, in deep, deep trouble.

The Department of Energy and the Department of Defense say we need more domestic mining. We cannot rely on China and other adversarial nations. This is a simple fix.

We believe the court erred, so it is our job to re-legislate this part of mining that is so important to the United States of America. It is so important to our communities where we are blessed to have these natural resources.

For my good friends and colleagues from California, let's go back many years. California started on a gold rush. It began because of mining. Safe to say, we don't want to follow California much longer, with what is happening in that great State.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I believe this is going to pass in a bipartisan fashion. It is a good piece of legislation. I look forward to passing it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, yes, California is a great State.

Madam Speaker, six Republicans joined Democrats in voting to stop this bill and send it back to committee, something that hasn't happened in 32 years. Of the Republicans who voted to send the bill back to committee, one had an amendment to say that if a company is guilty of human rights abuses, including slave labor in other countries, than they are not welcome to our land and minerals for free.

By the time the bill came to the House floor last week, Republican leaders had stripped the amendment right out. I guess Republicans want to take the win on supporting drug cartels and child sex traffickers, groups that benefit from human rights violations.

In addition, the Republican chair of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party also filed an amendment to close the loophole. That one was blocked twice by Republican leaders.

Republicans have voted to keep foreign adversaries from accessing our oil and gas. How are our minerals different? Insert side eye here because it doesn't add up.

Pardon my skepticism that there is not bipartisan concern here. This bill is a toxic national security giveaway to our foreign adversaries. It undercuts our competitiveness, and it is unconscionable on human rights. That is why we are seeing some Republicans buck their party on it, and I hope they will stand strong.

□ 1345

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert my side eye, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The disastrous results of the Rosemont decision will redirect the huge amounts of capital needed to mine domestically to countries like the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Indonesia.

When we choose this out-of-sight, out-of-mind mentality approach to

mining, development flows to other nations with significantly lower environmental and labor standards. Indonesia, for example, is currently the world's largest nickel producer and its dominance is only expected to grow in the coming years.

Indonesian mining is accomplished with sweeping deforestation and pollution, many of which are financed, again, by the Chinese Communist Party. These operations consistently ignore environmental impacts on local communities and leave the land far worse off than they found it.

On the other hand, American mines, like this mine project in Nevada, adhere to the best standards in the world and are committed to restoring the land after minerals are extracted.

In fact, again, mines are not even permitted until the Federal Government approves a full Mine Plan of Operations, which must include a robust plan and financial assurance for reclamation after the project is complete.

Madam Speaker, this is simple. Either we do it here or we let foreign adversarial nations take over. This is a strategic national security interest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, last week, House Republicans tried to pass H.R. 2925 to make it easier for the biggest mining corporations to take our public lands and mineral resources without giving the American people a dime.

I filed a motion to send the bill back to the committee to consider my amendment, which would have prevented companies owned or controlled by our adversaries from taking our gold, copper, and precious rare earth minerals to use against us in the market or in national security.

Fortunately, last week, a bipartisan majority, including six Republicans, passed my motion. We stood up together for our national security. However, the Republican leadership ignored last week's bipartisan vote, and here we are again.

What is worse, the Rules Committee Republicans rejected Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment to ban foreign entities of concern from conducting mining operations on our public lands.

Let me remind everybody, Chairman MOOLENAAR heads the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party. It is his job to know how dangerous China's mining of our precious minerals is to our economy and national security.

The Republicans blocked their own Republican chair's amendment. I believe in bipartisanship, so when I see an amendment I like and recognize is good, I support it.

Madam Speaker, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee once again. If House rules permitted, I would offer the motion with Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment, which would block foreign entities of concern from mining our public lands.

When Republicans block even consideration of an amendment which would ban China from taking away the precious metals that belong to the American people, Republicans are putting the interests of wealthy foreign corporations over the American people.

I hope the six Republicans who were courageous enough to stand up for American security interests last week stand for America today.

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 (Mrs. BICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I urge support for my motion so that the Natural Resources Committee can consider this amendment, this time in good faith.

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

Federal lands account for as much as 86 percent of the land area in certain Western States, and these same States account for 75 percent of our Nation's metals production.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act is needed to ensure that we have certainty of access to these essential mineral deposits.

If we want to encourage investment in safe, responsible, clean mining practices that provide billions in taxes that support our roads, bridges, schools, and other essential services, along with the essential materials to the American people, then we also need to support H.R. 2925.

Madam Speaker, really quick, you are hearing the other side of the aisle not necessarily debate the actual legislation. We have heard them talk about the process. When you can't debate the legislation, then you go after the process.

This is a very, very good piece of legislation, and I look forward to it passing in just the next hour or so.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, which rolls out the welcome mat to our foreign adversaries to exploit our minerals and violate human rights as well as national security.

We must defeat this bill. We did last week. We debated the merits. It is bad for America. It is bad for national security. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for American mining. It is bad for the environment, and that is why we must send it back.

Madam Speaker, I support the gentlewoman's motion to recommit. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let's be clear: There are no mines operating on Federal lands that are owned by the Chinese Communist Party. Zero. Zero. Anybody that mines in the United States will follow our environmental standards and our labor standards. It doesn't matter which company it is. They are going to follow our rules.

For this administration to turn a blind eye to the atrocities and the human rights violations to meet their green agenda, it is unconscionable. We can do it here in the United States with the best labor standards, the best environmental standards, with our technology, and be proud of these minerals that we produce. We can lead the rest of the world on how to do it. Nobody does it better than the United States of America and our workers, period.

Madam Speaker, let me address some of the misinformation we have heard about this bill. This bill does not allow mining companies to continue to operate under conditions that don't follow our labor and environmental standards.

If the outlandish circumstances that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been telling you will happen if this bill is enacted could have actually happened all along, including land lock-ups and subversion of environmental and governmental oversight, then why didn't it happen?

It is because the harm they claim this bill could inflict upon our Federal lands is actually not true. It is inaccurate.

This bill would, however, allow America to become a global leader in mineral production once again.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of Nevada in support of H.R. 2925.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
May 1, 2024.

Hon. DINA TITUS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. SUSIE LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TITUS, HORSFORD, AND LEE: I write in support of the Congressman Amodei's Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024 (H.R. 2925) and encourage you to vote in favor of this critical bill when it reaches the House floor. In doing so you will stand in solidarity with Senator Cortez Masto and Senator Rosen, sponsors of the Senate companion bill (S. 1281), and the State of Nevada to support a key pillar of our economy. Since the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals issued its decision in Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, also known as the Rosemont decision, the future of hardrock mining in Nevada and the West has been plagued by uncertainty. This matter must be favorably resolved for the Silver State and bipartisan, bicameral legislation must be signed by the

President to help ensure the economic viability of our robust mining industry.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act (MRCA) simply reinstates the contemporary mining policy and permitting practices that were upended by the Rosemont decision. Contrary to the scare tactics of critics, the MRCA does not open the door to unrestricted use of public lands, block renewable energy, recreation, or conservation, or allow mining in National Parks, wilderness areas, and other special areas. Rather, it provides much-needed business certainty and protects the 14,700 direct high-paying jobs and an additional 20,000 indirect jobs that are supported by the mining industry in the state. In addition to providing employment with high, family supporting salaries averaging over $100,000, the industry provides $4.9 billion of our state's gross domestic product and $12.7 billion in economic output.

Schools and local governments in each of your districts also benefit from the $389 million the industry paid in state and local taxes. More than half of the mining Net Proceeds of Minerals (NPOM) tax revenue goes to the Nevada State Education Fund. The other half goes to the county where the minerals were produced. Gold and silver operators further contribute to the State Education Fund through the Gold and Silver Excise Tax, or Mining Education Tax which was established during the 81st Nevada Legislative Session; and in fiscal year 2023, contributed approximately $68 million to the State. Beginning in fiscal year 2024, revenue from the Mining Education Tax will go directly into the State Education Fund. The Rosemont decision ends hardrock mining as we know it and threatens the livelihoods and institutions that rely on it.

Nevada is counting on you to unite and join Senators Cortez Masto and Rosen and Congressman Amodei to provide certainty to one of Nevada's critical industries. I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively to ensure Nevada remains well positioned as a leader in domestic mineral production, from lithium and other critical materials to precious metals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOE LOMBARDO,
Governor.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I support fair labor standards, high environmental standards, and increasing our national security. In short, I support domestic mining. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same and support H.R. 2925.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Leger Fernandez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A claimant shall be barred from the right described in subsection (e)(1)(B) if the claimant—

''(A) is a foreign entity of concern; or

''(B) is a subsidiary of a foreign entity of concern.

''(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN DEFINED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term 'foreign entity of concern' has the meaning given the term in section 40207(a)(5) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)).

''(B) CLARIFICATION.—In this subsection, a foreign entity of concern is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a government of a foreign country that is a covered nation (as that term is defined in section 2533c(d) of title 10, United States Code) within the meaning of section 40207(a)(5)(C) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)) if such entity is more than 10 percent owned, directed, controlled, financed, directly or indirectly, individually or in aggregate, by any individual that is the citizen, national or permanent resident or is an entity subject to the jurisdiction of the government of a covered nation.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–138)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2024.

The regime's brutality and repression of the Syrian people, who have called for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including with respect to chemical weapons and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 with respect to Syria.

In addition, the United States condemns the brutal violence and human rights violations and abuses of the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian enablers. The United States calls on the Assad regime, and its backers, to stop its violent war against its own people, enact a nationwide ceasefire, facilitate the unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians in need, and negotiate a political settlement in Syria in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254. The United States will consider changes in policies and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024.*

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–139)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides

for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2024.

The unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries augments the ability of these foreign adversaries to create and exploit vulnerabilities in information and communications technology or services, with potentially catastrophic effects. This threat continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024*.

□ 1400

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118–140)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2024.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic has been marked by a breakdown of law and order; intersectarian tension; the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers; and widespread violence and atrocities, including those committed by Kremlin-linked and Yevgeniy Prigozhin-affiliated entities such as the Wagner Group. These dynamics threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and neighboring states, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 with respect to the Central African Republic.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024*.

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 2 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1515

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2024, PART II

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8289) to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8289

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 ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024, Part II''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—FEDERAL AVIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM; DISCRETIONARY FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 48103(a)(7) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''$2,105,191,256 for the period beginning October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.'' for ''$2,041,120,218 for the period beginning October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.''.

(b) OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriations Acts, sums made available pursuant to subsection (a) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2024, and shall remain available until expended.

(c) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''May 17, 2024'' for ''May 10, 2024''.

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR APPORTIONMENTS.—Section 47114(c)(1)(J) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''May 17, 2024'' for ''May 10, 2024''.

(e) SUPPLEMENTAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.—Section 47115(j)(4)(A) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''$334,563,279 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.'' for ''$340,321,762 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.''.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES; MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) The following provisions of law shall be applied by substituting ''May 17, 2024'' for ''May 10, 2024'':

(1) Section 44310(b) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 44803(h) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) Section 44807(d) of title 49, United States Code.

(4) Section 44810(h) of title 49, United States Code.

(5) Section 47115(i) of title 49, United States Code.

(6) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code.

(7) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (Public Law 108–176).

(8) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note).

(9) Section 411(h) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 42301 note).

(10) Section 822(k) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (49 U.S.C. 47141 note).

(11) Section 161(a)(10) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 47104 note).

(12) Section 162 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 47102 note).

(13) Section 372(d) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 44810 note).

(14) Section 424(e) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 42302 note).

(15) Section 439(g) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 41705 note).

(16) Section 547(e) of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 40103 note).

(b) The following provisions of law shall be applied by substituting ''May 18, 2024'' for ''May 11, 2024'':

(1) Section 47107(r)(3) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) Section 47143(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) Section 50905(c)(9) of title 51, United States Code.

(4) Section 210G(i) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n(i)).

(5) Section 2306(b) of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–190; 130 Stat. 641).

(c) Section 48105 of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting ''$24,508,197 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 17, 2024.'' for ''$23,762,295 for the period beginning on October 1, 2023, and ending on May 10, 2024.''.

TITLE II—AIRPORT REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY FROM AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) Sections 9502(d)(1) and 9502(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied by substituting ''May 18, 2024'' for ''May 11, 2024''.

(b) Section 9502(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ''or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024, Part II;''.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) Sections 4043(d), 4081(d)(2)(B), 4261(j), 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii), and 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied by substituting ''May 17, 2024'' for ''May 10, 2024''.

(b) Section 4083(b) of such Code shall be applied by substituting ''May 18, 2024'' for ''May 11, 2024''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. 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 in the RECORD on H.R. 8289.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8289 extends the statutory authorities of the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA, through May 17, 2024. While this extension provides for key extensions of FAA authorities, such as the continued collection of aviation excise taxes that the safe operation of the national airspace is very dependent on, it is largely needed to accommodate the Senate's inability to successfully pass the conferenced FAA bill in time for the House to take a final vote before Friday.

The House did its part to provide for a long-term reauthorization of the FAA on time and well ahead of schedule when we passed H.R. 3935 last summer in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion with more than 350 votes. It is unfortunate that the Senate's process for considering its FAA bill continues to be plagued by delays necessitating this extension.

I know my colleagues in the House are ready to send the compromise bill to the President once and for all. The good news is that we are so close to doing that.

Setting aside the Senate's ability to act in a timely manner, the stark reality is that the FAA is set to expire on May 10, and we must act to pass another extension to maintain safety in the National Airspace System.

The Senate and House have worked tirelessly since the Senate Commerce Committee marked up its FAA bill in February. We have worked tirelessly to reconcile differences and produce a comprehensive FAA bill that provides certainty to the agency and the entire aviation community for the next 5 years.

The negotiated bill provides the long-term certainty to ensure the safety and prosperity of the American aviation industry for decades to come. Extensions don't provide any certainty, nor do they provide for the robust investments airports across the country need to ensure the continued transportation of goods and services to our communities.

For those reasons, both Chambers remain committed to passing a long-term bill.

In the meantime, this extension buys the Senate a little bit more time to do their job while keeping the national airspace safe and ensuring that airlines don't get a $50 million-a-day tax break.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this extension so that we can consider the conferenced bill next week.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8289, which extends the authorization to FAA and its related authorities for 1 week to give the Senate the time it needs to wrap up its consideration of this bicameral and bipartisan comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill.

This legislation reflects an agreement between the House and Senate. It will protect the safety of the flying public and ensure the future of the U.S. aviation industry.

Think back to last July, Mr. Speaker, when the House passed its version of this bill 351–69, a strong bipartisan bill.

Since then, I am actually pleased with the progress that we have made and that we were able to come to an agreement with our Senate counterparts last Sunday. We have been in close contact with the Senate as they have continued to consider this legislation.

This is, and will be next week, a bipartisan, bicameral product, and Members should not be surprised about what is included in it.

Unfortunately, the Senate is still working through its process and may not be able to send us the bill before the current authorization expires on Friday.

Nonetheless, I want to assure Members that Chairman GRAVES and I have fought hard for House Member priorities. I am very pleased to report that the vast majority of those priorities remain intact in the final package. Members' voices were heard as we worked hard to address the longstanding issues in our aviation system.

The Senate just needs a little bit more time. I fully expect the Senate to complete consideration and send the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024 to the House well before May 17, the time at which this extension expires.

Mr. Speaker, I support the short-term extension, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, new and persistent challenges facing the U.S. aviation system have made clear the status quo is unsustainable. We have to avoid a lapse in authorities of FAA. This current extension does that for 1 week and gives the Senate the short time it needs to deliberate and vote on the final bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support this extension, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge all Members to support this must-pass bill so we can keep our aviation system operating safely and focus on passing a long-term FAA bill next week.

H.R. 8289 provides for a clean extension of FAA authorities. It does not include policy riders.

Failure to extend FAA's authorities will cost the Federal Government more than $50 million a day in lost revenues. Enacting a long-term comprehensive FAA bill is the goal of both the House and Senate, and I look forward to presenting that critical piece of legislation to you next week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8289.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EQUAL REPRESENTATION ACT

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the bill (H.R. 7109) to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 7109

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 ''Equal Representation Act''.

SEC. 2. CITIZENSHIP STATUS ON DECENNIAL CENSUS.

Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g)(1) In conducting the 2030 decennial census and each decennial census thereafter, the Secretary shall include in any questionnaire distributed or otherwise used for the purpose of determining the total population by States a checkbox or other similar option for the respondent to indicate, for the respondent and for each of the members of the household of the respondent, whether that individual is a citizen of the United States.

''(2) Not later than 120 days after completion of a decennial census of the population under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make publicly available the number of individuals per State, disaggregated by citizens of the United States and noncitizens, as tabulated in accordance with this section.''.

SEC. 3. EXCLUSION OF NONCITIZENS FROM NUMBER OF PERSONS USED TO DETERMINE APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES AND NUMBER OF ELECTORAL VOTES.

(a) EXCLUSION.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by inserting after ''not taxed'' the following: ''and individuals who are not citizens of the United States''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the apportionment of Representatives carried out pursuant to the decennial census conducted during 2030 and any succeeding decennial census.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS. 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 measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7109 has three components.

Number one, it requires the Census Bureau to include a citizenship question on the decennial census questionnaire.

Number two, the bill directs that this information be used to ensure fair representation by requiring only citizens be included in the apportionment base.

Number three, it has a severability clause.

Currently, the Census Bureau estimates the noncitizen population using data collected annually in the American Community Survey. We are going to call that ACS as I go, just to help you out. That data is not necessarily accurate.

Further, there are no reports that asking a citizenship question on the ACS every year suppresses illegal, alien, or other noncitizen participation on the ACS questionnaire.

The constitutionally iterated rationale for a decennial census is to apportion electoral districts for Congress.

In Commerce v. New York, the Supreme Court noted that a host of various questions over the years that are tangential to apportionment had been included in the decennial censuses, ''race, sex, age, health, education, occupation, housing, and military service,'' and ''radio ownership, age at first marriage, and native tongue,'' et cetera.

The citizenship question is no stranger to the Census questionnaire. Commerce also noted: ''Every Census between 1820 and 2000 (with the exception of 1840) asked at least some of the population about their citizenship or place of birth. Between 1820 and 1950, the question was asked of all households. Between 1960 and 2000, it was asked of about one-fourth to one-sixth of the population.'' That is another quote from the Commerce case.

This isn't a uniquely American practice. Even the United Nations recommends collecting citizenship information via a census, as noted by, again, the Commerce Court. Australia, Canada, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Germany, Mexico, Spain, and the United Kingdom ask about citizenship in their respective censuses.

Is the United States to be the only North American country not to inquire about citizenship in its Census protocols?

The Commerce Court held, regarding the positing of a citizenship question on the Census, as follows: ''In light of the early understanding of and long practice under the Enumeration Clause, we conclude that it permits Congress, and by extension the Secretary [of Commerce], to inquire about citizenship on the Census questionnaire.''

Section 2 of H.R. 7109 simply asks whether a person is a citizen of the United States, yes or no. That is it, but everyone gets counted.

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

□ 1530

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

The last President tried to include a citizenship question on the decennial Census in 2020 and tried to count only U.S. citizens for the purpose of Census and reapportionment, and the effort failed miserably in court, for obvious reasons.

Section 2 of the 14th Amendment states that apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives is based on ''the whole number of persons in each State,'' persons being the all-encompassing category, much larger than that of citizens.

When the Framers wanted to impose a citizenship requirement in the text of the Constitution, they knew how to do it. Take the President of the United States, for example. It says that you have got to be a born U.S. citizen in order to run for President. Some of the historians tell us that was because Thomas Jefferson was trying to block Alexander Hamilton from running for President. He was foreign born. In any event, however, it was very clear that you needed to be a born U.S. citizen to run for President. For those of us in the House, it says we must have been a citizen for at least 7 years.

There are lots of citizenship requirements in the Constitution. There is no citizenship requirement for being counted in the Census and for purposes of reapportionment. On the contrary, the Census and reapportionment have included all persons, including noncitizens, like permanent resident green card holders, since 1790. That has been the unbroken practice since the beginning of the Republic.

This point was made even more clearly and emphatically by the Supreme Court in its unanimous 2016 decision in Evenwel v. Abbott, rejecting precisely the argument my distinguished friend is trying to make. Like this legislation itself, Evenwel involved a challenge to congressional apportionment based on a total count of the entire population

instead of a limited count of the total citizen or voter population. Justice Ginsburg held for a unanimous court that section 3 of the 14th Amendment ''retained total population as the congressional apportionment base.'' She cited the speech made on the floor of the Senate by Senator Jacob Howard upon introduction of section 2 of the 14th Amendment:

''The basis of representation is numbers . . . . The committee adopted numbers as the most just and satisfactory basis, and this is the principle upon which the Constitution itself was originally framed, that the basis of representation should depend upon numbers; and such, I think, after all, is the safest and most secure principle upon which the government can rest. Numbers, not voters; numbers, not property; this is the theory of the Constitution.''

My colleague needs to remember that when the Republic was founded, the vast majority of people were not citizens who could vote. Women could not vote, children could not vote, enslaved Americans, obviously, could not vote. So the Census and apportionment was for everybody who was here. That was the whole basis of the three-fifths compromise. Because enslaved Americans were being counted, too, what percentage should they count for purposes of reapportionment? Well, Congress arrived at 60 percent, three-fifths. It was the Southern States who were saying they should count completely for these purposes because they wanted the enslaved Americans to be enlarging and inflating the congressional delegations from the slave states. For these purposes, the Northern States said: No, they shouldn't count at all; they should count zero percent in the apportionment. They arrived at three-fifths. In any event, everybody agreed that everybody would be counted.

Justice Ginsburg included lots of decisive legislative authority like this, including the floor statement here in the House of Representative James Blaine, who stated: ''No one will deny that population is the true basis of representation; for women, children, and other nonvoting classes may have as vital an interest in the legislation of the country as those who actually deposit the ballot.''

For all of you constitutional textualists out there, the plain reading of the text is clear as day.

For all of you constitutional originalists out there, the original purposes of the passage of the 14th Amendment have been carefully articulated by the Supreme Court on a unanimous basis and never rebutted.

For all of you Members who like to follow precedent, every apportionment since 1790 has included every single person residing in the United States, not just those lucky enough to have been given the right to vote. As the Evenwel Court noted, the 14th Amendment contemplates that ''Representatives serve all residents, not just those eligible or registered to vote.''

The constitutional meaning is indisputable, a point which settles this for those who actually want to follow the Constitution in all cases, not just when it favors our own preferred policy outcome.

The House should be getting real work done instead of wasting more time on another MAGA bill that will never pass the Senate, let alone get signed by the President, much less approved by the courts. The bill is an insult, and it is an affront to the great radical Republicans who wrote the 14th Amendment. Their party was a profreedom, pro-union, proimmigrant, anticonspiracy theory, anti-Know Nothing Party that wanted to make sure everybody in the country was counted and made visible.

The Census is essential to democracy. Just as the Framers endorsed Thomas Paine's ''Common Sense,'' they endorsed a common Census, but this bill would destroy the accuracy of the Census, which may have something to do with its actual legislative motivation.

In the 2010 Census, the undercount of Hispanic citizens was 1.4 percent. In 2020, that number grew to 5 percent, with many observers crediting that jump to the Trump administration's simple attempt to add a citizenship question to the Census and all of the intense publicity and rumor surrounding it.

The addition of a question about citizenship will indeed deter many immigrants, including people who are permanent residents, including citizens, from completing the Census. Many noncitizen immigrants who are seeking asylum or are refugees will avoid responding because of uncertainty over their status and fear of arbitrary law enforcement action.

Extensive research over the last decade shows that many residents wrongly believe the Census Bureau will share their responses with other agencies. To be clear on this point, it does not. Federal law prohibits it. However, that pervasive worry has prevented some people from answering questions about immigration status or responding to the Census at all.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this legislation as unconstitutional and unwise. It dishonors our own history and the values of the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As my friend knows, the Commerce case held specifically you can ask the citizenship question on the Census. That is true. You can do that. That is what we are proposing.

Additionally, he misstated the rationale on why the Commerce case went the way it did. They said you can ask the question, but that the Secretary had contrived his rationale and was in violation of the APA, and that is why that happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for leading this debate, and I thank Mr. DAVIDSON for his co-leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what is an insult. The current situation is an insult to the American people, the citizens who live here whose voice and vote are being degraded because of the horrendous immigration problem that we have at our southern border through illegal aliens coming across the border, and that not being addressed here in Washington, D.C.

One of the lesser acknowledged, but equally alarming, side effects of this administration's failure to secure the southern border is the illegal immigration population's influence in America's electoral process.

Our democracy depends on accurate representation and electoral integrity. Voting is a coveted privilege held by American citizens, and elected Representatives are responsible for serving the interests of the voters in their district.

Even if not a single illegal alien casts a vote, the mere presence of illegal immigrants in the United States is having a profound impact on the outcomes of elections, skewing the representation of Americans.

Mr. BIGGS points out that the U.S. Constitution mandates that a Census be carried out every 10 years where everyone who is present in the United States, regardless of their citizenship and immigration status, is counted. The Constitution does not specify whether noncitizens or illegal aliens must be counted for the purpose of apportioning House seats.

You may recall that in 2016, President Trump through executive order added a citizenship question back to the 2020 Census, the same question that had been legally asked on nearly every Census since 1820 until it was removed in 1960, not because there was anything found wrong with that question, but because the effect of illegal immigration was negligible at that time. However, there is no doubt today, Mr. Speaker, the effect of illegal immigration is significant. I won't waste my time making that case here. We all know it. It is a top concern of about 70 percent of all Americans.

Though common sense dictates that only citizens should be counted for the apportionment process, illegal aliens have nonetheless recently been counted toward the final tallies that determine how many House seats that each State is allocated and the number of electoral votes that it will wield in Presidential elections.

Since the illegal alien population is not evenly distributed through the Nation, American citizens in some States are losing representation in Congress to illegal aliens in other States.

A 2019 study by the Center for Immigration Studies estimates illegal immigrants and noncitizens who have not naturalized and do not have the right to vote impact the distribution of 26

House seats. My bill, the Equal Representation Act, would finally address this alarming undermining of American democracy by requiring a citizenship question be added back to the 2030 Census, creating reporting requirements for data gathered from citizenship questions and requiring that only U.S. citizens be counted for the purpose of congressional apportionment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will no doubt and has no doubt drawn criticism from those who don't want to fix this problem and who seek to gain political influence by not fixing it. They will claim to have become experts on our Constitution. I don't see any black robes in this Chamber today. They will point to the word ''persons'' in section 2 of the 14th Amendment as a reason why this bill should not pass, but this word carries no definition in our Constitution, and it offers multiple meanings in current law.

Allow me to argue, in 1992, in Franklin v. Massachusetts, a Supreme Court case on apportionment of Representatives opined the term ''persons'' to mean an individual who not only has a physical presence but some element of allegiance to a particular place.

The Census Bureau does not include foreigners who visit the United States for a vacation or a business trip in the population count since they have no political or legal allegiance to any State or the Federal Government.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Similarly, illegal aliens who are deportable have no allegiance or enduring tie to the United States. Foreigners here on visas have an allegiance politically and legally to their home countries, not to the United States, so the same logic applies to them.

My bill is a commonsense solution to a chronic problem impacting the very governance and democracy of this country.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina observes that we don't have anybody wearing a black robe in the House of Representatives today, but you don't have to wear a black robe in order to read the Constitution, interpret the Constitution, and follow it.

If you need people with black robes, then I would urge the gentleman to read the Supreme Court's decision in Evenwel v. Abbott, where the Supreme Court unanimously found that the Census and reapportionment must include the entire population, all persons; not all citizens, not all voters, the alternative suggestions that are being made today.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, what do we have here? Since 1790, all persons have been included in the Census, in every Census on a decennial basis since the beginning of the Republic.

The Supreme Court rejected the theory that is being advanced by my friends in the majority today in Evenwel v. Abbott that the Constitution requires citizens rather than persons, and the gentleman from North Carolina invites us to think it has something to do with immigration.

We actually had an immigration deal coming out of the Senate for hundreds of new Border Patrol officers and asylum officers and asylum judges and fentanyl detection machinery, and it was vetoed by the fourth branch of government, Donald Trump, who said he didn't want a border solution, he wanted a border crisis to run on.

Despite the fact that Senator LANKFORD, perhaps one of the most conservative Senators that we have in the Republican Party, said that this was a great deal and the best that he had ever seen coming out of the Senate, and despite the fact that Senator MCCONNELL was for it, they blew it all up.

You judge for yourself the seriousness of the claims that they want to do something about immigration. This is another useless and needless distraction.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to oppose H.R. 7109. It is a bill that threatens equal and fair representation of immigrant communities.

This bill requires a citizenship question on the U.S. Census, which directly undermines the Constitution's mandate for a fair and accurate count of all residents.

This requirement would deprive tens of millions of immigrants their rightful access to representation and resources, even though they pay taxes and contribute to our economy.

A citizenship question would have a chilling effect on participation in the Census. Its accuracy would be destroyed.

The Census count affects where the Federal Government appropriates funds and resources to our communities.

Republicans are effectively saying: If you are not a citizen in this country, you don't count. Even legal permanent residents, you don't count. This is absurd.

Let me be clear. Immigrants are the backbone of this economy. They work the fields, they build our cities, and they contribute tirelessly to the fabric of our society.

They pay over half a trillion dollars in taxes, including taxes for Social Security and Medicare, even though undocumented immigrants can't receive benefits.

Despite their invaluable contributions, Republicans want to deny immigrant communities access to even more vital services and resources that they help fund through their hard-earned tax dollars.

As Representatives of the people, it is our duty to ensure that all members of our communities are treated with dignity and respect.

Every individual, regardless of their immigration status, should have the opportunity to thrive, but H.R. 7109 does the opposite.

A citizenship question on the Census threatens to further marginalize immigrant communities. An undercount of the immigrant population would not only result in an unfair distribution of resources, but it will also undermine the very foundation of our democracy—that is fair representation from our government.

I urge our colleagues to reject this extreme Republican bill and instead focus on policies that uplift and empower all members of our society.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, of course, every single Democrat voted against the great border security bill, H.R. 2. That is how serious they are not. Every person is counted under this bill. Why can't we ask them what their citizenship is?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland stated that this bill is perhaps unconstitutional. Under our Constitution, he has every right to lead an article III challenge to the constitutionality of this bill, which I expect that they will. My Democrat colleagues love to sue Americans and pursue legislation through the courts.

This is actual legislation presented by conservative Republicans to correct a horrible wrong. I rise in support of H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act.

While this bill will continue to count every person in the United States, it adds a simple question to the Census: Are you a United States citizen?

While the decennial Census must count every person in the United States, which I agree with, Mr. Speaker, the problem is the level of illegal persons that now live in our country because of President Biden's failures at the southern border.

It took 240 years to accumulate 30 million illegals living in the United States. In 4 short years, President Biden, under his policies, will have added 15 million. We are talking about 45 million illegal persons living in the United States. That is the equivalent to 60 congressional seats.

Now, most of those illegal aliens will be drawn to live primarily in sanctuary states and cities. This thwarts the fair representation of American citizens in the House of Representatives, foundationally altering our representative Republic.

This important piece of legislation enables us to fairly and accurately apportion congressional districts based upon equal representation of American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to seek the truth and to support this bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ).

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 7109. I mean, think about it. It is another Republican attempt to attack immigrant communities in this country.

So many of us, our children, and our grandchildren are immigrants, and we have the hypocrisy to stand in this room here and continue to attack immigrant communities.

Republicans are trying to amend the Constitution through unconstitutional means. The Census Bureau has constitutionally mandated responsibility to count the number of persons in the United States, to count every single person, because as the Member prior from this side said, they are here. They are contributing. They are paying taxes. They make it possible for us to be able to retire and then be able to have the benefits that we have worked so hard for because they are paying those taxes, and they serve our communities.

Republicans are adding Census questions to have a chilling effect, to keep people afraid, to make them nervous, to discourage their participation in the Census.

The ultimate effect that it is going to have on these communities, like mine, is undercounted and underrepresented. Our democracy grows weaker every single time these kind of actions are brought to this floor.

We must ensure that the Census remains as accurate as possible and free from the political interference that would rob whole communities of the resources and the representation they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage a ''no'' vote.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will make reference to a couple documents before I discuss the bill.

First of all, our Pledge of Allegiance, which we say every day, we pledge allegiance to the Republic for which we stand, right, the flag and the Republic for which we stand.

Benjamin Franklin, after our Constitution was ratified, he talked about giving us a Republic if we can keep it, and I think people should analyze those two little quotes and wonder why there were references to the Republic in both of them. In any event, it kind of bugs me when people around here don't understand that.

Now, back to the bill at hand. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for introducing this bill.

I think it is fairly obvious that when we take a Census, there are certain questions you expect to appear on the Census, right?

One thing they want to know is if you are a permanent citizen here or whether you are not a citizen. There is a difference between the two.

There is a reason why we swear certain people in as citizens. There is a reason why we treat citizens differently than other people.

I think it is absolutely bizarre that to this point, we have been sending out Census forms and not asking the first question that you would figure would pop into your head: Are you a citizen? It is kind of embarrassing it has not happened up to this point.

We have another problem in that there are some States declaring themselves sanctuary States or some sanctuary cities in which they seem to be encouraging people to come here who really shouldn't be in the country at all under current law.

In any event, I think this is a great bill. First of all, we should, in apportioning congressional seats, take into account people who are citizens, not people who are noncitizens, many of which I assume are going to return to the country they came from.

Secondly, we expect on the form—the first thing I look at, they put things on, their race. Sometimes in the surveys they put on, do you own a TV or that sort of thing.

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona again for giving me 2 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am about to yield to my friend from New York (Ms. MENG), but I am inspired by the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, especially about the word ''Republic'' which, of course, comes from res publica, the public thing.

He happened upon a subject that is of a lot of interest to me because I wrote a paper about it when I was in sixth grade.

The Pledge of Allegiance was written by a radical Baptist minister named Francis Bellamy—I am not sure if the gentleman is aware of that—on the 400th anniversary of Columbus' arrival in the new world.

Reverend Bellamy, who was an abolitionist in Vermont, was concerned about the continuing salute of the Confederate battle flag in the southern States.

He wanted to write a flag salute that would be unifying for the union, and he wrote: I pledge allegiance to my flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, with liberty and justice for all.

You notice what is not in there. He did not have ''under God.'' That was added in 1954 by Congress several weeks after the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education.

In any event, I am not quite sure what the relevance is of the gentleman's invocation of the Republic or of Ben Franklin and the famous vignette about him saying: If you can keep it.

Ben Franklin was, of course, a big supporter of immigration to the country, although he did display an anti-German bias in some of his writings.

I will tell you a little story about Ben Franklin that might be of relevance to what the gentleman is talking about because I just did a tour in Philadelphia with the Ben Franklin people up there, and we learned this wonderful story.

He made a loan to a friend of his for $100, and then he recorded in his diary that this gentleman he made the loan to for $100, Josiah, was always disappearing behind a tree or a building whenever Ben came along.

He finally caught up with him, and he said: Josiah, I loaned you a hundred bucks, and I am wondering, am I going to be able to get my principal back or at least the interest?

Josiah said: Well, Ben, look. The $100 is well invested somewhere else, so you don't have to worry about that.

Franklin said: Well, what about the interest?

Josiah said: Well, I forgot to tell you that it is against my religion to pay interest, so I can't pay you the interest.

Franklin said: You mean to tell me it is against your principle to pay me the interest, and it is against your interest to pay me the principal?

Josiah said: That's right.

Franklin said: Well, I can see I am not going to get either.

Well, here our principles and our interests converge very much. The principles are set forth in the Constitution, which is we count everybody, and everybody is part of the Census, and everybody is part of the reapportionment process.

It has been like that since 1790. We don't need to start finger painting on the Constitution with this silly election year proposal.

It is also in our interest because, as my colleagues have said, this is a land that is built on immigration. Except for the Native Americans who are already here and the people who were brought over as slaves, all of us are the descendants of immigrants to this country.

Tom Paine, when he got to America in 1774, 2 years before the Revolution, he said: This land, if it lives up to its principles, will become an asylum to humanity—not an insane asylum, mind you—an asylum to humanity, a place of refuge for people seeking freedom from religious, political, and economic oppression. That is who we are.

Every day I have in my office people from the hotel industry, people from the construction industry, and people from the restaurant industry saying: We have huge labor shortages. We need people in America.

I am for a whole lot more lawful immigration to America, less unlawful immigration to America like the deal that was worked out in the Senate that was rejected by the Republicans, and a lot less demagoguery about who we are as a country because the Census and reapportionment provisions in the 14th Amendment tell it all.

This is a country that is for everybody seeking opportunity and hope,

willing to follow the law and follow our Constitution.

□ 1600

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act.

The U.S. Constitution requires a count of the whole number of persons in each State. Counting has been the legal, historical, and constitutional practice ever since the first Census was conducted in 1790.

A citizens-only Census, as this legislation intends, is reckless, cynical, and, frankly, illegal. It is not the Census Bureau's job to keep track of immigration status. It is also not the Census Bureau's job to determine one's allegiance, just like the insurrectionists on January 6. We have agencies for both of those tasks.

The Census guides how more than $2.8 trillion a year in Federal funding is distributed to States, cities, and towns. This includes funding for Medicare, Medicaid, schools, roads, and other critical public services. Not counting every whole person may decrease Federal money, even in some of my colleagues' districts.

Noncitizens make up about 6.7 percent of our Nation's population of 333 million people. They are our loved ones, friends, neighbors, and those who have been actively contributing to and participating in our communities for many years.

Pretending that noncitizens do not live in our communities—that is exactly what this bill would do, pretend—will only instill fear, force people into the shadows, and take critical Federal funding away from the areas that need it most.

Throughout our Nation's history, there have been several attempts at adding a citizenship question to the Census, all of which have failed.

As a daughter of immigrants and as the Representative of a diverse community of constituents who have arrived from many corners of the world, I have adamantly fought against these attempts.

In 2018, the previous administration attempted to add a citizenship question to the Census, which Senator HIRONO and I and others fought against in Congress.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, this was subsequently blocked by the Supreme Court.

We cannot let this latest attempt succeed. Calling this legislation the Equal Representation Act is an oxymoron, and I am voting ''no'' and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish we were hearing not deflective statements but the actual truth here.

Here is the way it works. There is nothing in this bill that says you don't count everybody. You do count everybody. The thing they really don't want us to know is how many illegal aliens are in the country, so we are going to ask a citizenship question, which has been asked in 22 of 25 Censuses. They don't want that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to see Ranking Member RASKIN with a good, healthy head of hair. God does listen to our prayers. We are glad he is with us and healthy.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. BURCHETT's prayers go right to the top.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, my mama's prayers did. Mine don't get quite that close.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7109, the Equal Representation Act. This legislation will require U.S. citizens to include a question that asks if the person is a United States citizen. It is just a question.

This bill passed through the House Oversight Committee on a straight party-line vote, 22–20. Not a single Democrat supported it.

The Census informs how our government divides up congressional districts and electoral college votes. Mr. Speaker, it helps to ensure American voters have equal representation. That process should not factor in people who are not citizens or not eligible to vote.

You can see why my Democratic colleagues would have a problem with this bill. Factoring illegal aliens into the process skews things in their favor. In fact, it wasn't very long ago that a Member from the minority party was on the news claiming that they wish more illegals would come to their district for the Census.

If the Census does not include the citizenship question, States with more illegal aliens will get more congressional districts and more electoral college votes.

We have a history of saying that elections are sacred and that free, fair, and secure elections are the cornerstone of this great Republic, Mr. Speaker. It is time to act like it and prioritize the dadgum representation of our people.

Americans are sick and tired of this administration weaponizing different parts of our government, and they don't want to see something like the Census being used against them when it is so hard to get American citizens to even take the Census.

Leaders in States like California and New York are taking pride in harboring illegal aliens. In fact, the people of California have offered free healthcare to their illegals, and New York has kicked combat veterans out of housing to house illegals.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, States should not be rewarded with more congressional seats or electoral college votes, which would end up distorting the will of the American people.

I thank my colleagues, Congressman WARREN DAVIDSON and Congressman CHUCK EDWARDS, for introducing this legislation. I am proud to support it.

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

It is always great to be with my friend from Tennessee. Just two quick points on his always trenchant remarks.

One is that one should be clear that under this legislation, they are not roping out of the reapportionment just undocumented people. They are also roping out of the reapportionment permanent residents, people who are green card holders who are on the pathway to citizenship already. They are talking about disenfranchising from the Census reapportionment process millions of people who are lawfully within it. They should be aware of that.

Also, if we were being cynical politically, we would embrace this legislation because it is the red States like Texas and Florida whose congressional delegations are inflated by virtue of counting people who are not citizens. We are simply trying to follow what the Constitution says, which I know is kind of a radical proposition around here these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my cousin, Representative RASKIN, for yielding me time.

We have wasted another legislative week on ludicrous messaging bills to defend the liberty of laundry and freedom for the fridge. Today, they are pushing a bill to upend our Nation's process for collecting Census data.

Let's be clear. The so-called Equal Representation Act does nothing to live up to its name. In fact, their bill would result in the opposite. It will reduce participation in the Census, which our government relies on for a host of data to inform our decisionmaking.

What is more, this bill will violate our Constitution, which states that all persons be counted in the Census. Instead of wasting time on deeply unserious messaging bills, Congress should be focused on what really matters to the American people, particularly reproductive freedoms.

Right now, across the country, women are suffering from extreme abortion bans that are endangering their health and limiting their ability to make private medical decisions. Women in America are worried about

their reproductive freedoms and deeply concerned about what extremist politicians will attack next. We know that radical judges and politicians are not stopping with abortion bans. They are now attacking fertility treatments and attempting to restrict birth control methods like plan B and IUDs.

If far-right extremists really cared about women, they would want to make the full range of birth control readily available, not restrict access to it.

This Sunday is Mother's Day. How about giving moms and potential moms the gift they really want: the right to decide whether, when, and with whom to have children. Instead of flowers, let's guarantee the right to use the full range of FDA-approved birth control.

In honor of Mother's Day and for this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would strike the text of H.R. 7190 and replace it with my Right to Contraception Act, a bill to protect the right to access all forms of FDA-approved birth control and protect women's reproductive health from political interference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

For full text, please see H.R. 4121.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, right now, our Nation is grappling with a border crisis that has been manufactured by Democratic policies that brazenly reward those who break our laws to enter our country illegally. My home State of New York is drowning due to policies that transformed our State into a sanctuary for illegal immigration.

Democratic leaders in New York City, Albany, here in Congress, and the White House have turned their backs on lawful Americans, choosing instead to roll out the red carpet for illegal immigrants with housing, clothing, and financial incentives all paid for by the American taxpayers. The gravy train is alive and well.

Throughout this process, we are learning that it is a calculated effort to boost their own political power by inflating their population counts and skewing congressional representation. We are talking millions of people who are not American citizens having a major say in American elections.

They are not even hiding it anymore. One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who happens to represent New York City in this body, openly called for more illegal immigration to her district because she said she ''needs more people in her district for redistricting purposes.''

This absurd notion, pushed by my colleagues across the aisle, that these noncitizens should shape the future of our Nation is completely unconstitutional. They are corroding the essence of American citizenship, turning it into a political commodity.

The Equal Representation Act is our line in the sand. It is time to end the charade of rewarding States like New York and California for their reckless sanctuary antics that undermine our laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rise above partisan manipulation, protect the sanctity of our democracy, and support the Equal Representation Act. Let's send a clear message that the value of American citizenship is absolute and our elections are not for sale.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

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

If you strip away all the bombast and all the rhetoric, the gentleman just basically delivered a tirade about immigration but never addressed the fact that their legislation is totally unconstitutional.

If you want to deal with immigration, we had a bill, and the bill would have added hundreds of Border Patrol officers, asylum officers, and judges. The Republican leadership in the Senate said it was a great deal. They got most of what they wanted. It was a great compromise. Yet, who didn't want it? Donald Trump, still the putative leader of those who are left in the GOP, Lincoln's party. Donald Trump didn't want it because he didn't want a border solution. He wants a border crisis.

They are left with a bunch of completely superficial, empty bills like this one, which I doubt will even pass the House. If it does pass the House, it certainly won't pass the Senate. It will never be signed by the President, and it would be struck down immediately by the Supreme Court.

Why are we wasting our time on that instead of getting to the legislation that actually a majority of the Senate was behind? I wish one of my colleagues would address that.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Boebert).

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BIGGS for leading on this issue.

I rise in support of the Equal Representation Act, which will add a citizenship question to the Census and exclude illegal aliens from the apportionment base. It is past time we put America and Americans first.

Joe Biden and his regime are shelling out benefits to illegal immigrants like Oprah Winfrey on her show: Everyone gets a vote. Everyone gets recognized, even if you are here illegally.

In New York, aliens are receiving $53 million in free, prepaid debit cards. In Denver, Colorado, aliens get 6 free months of housing. Now, they want to hand them seats in Congress to buy their lifelong allegiance to the Democratic Party.

□ 1615

Since Biden took office, we have seen more than 9 million illegal aliens cross our borders and more than 1.8 million got-aways evade Border Patrol agents. That is larger than the population of 32 States, Mr. Speaker.

There are now at least 16.8 million illegal aliens living in the United States, enough to account for roughly 22 seats in the House of Representatives.

Including these aliens in the apportionment of congressional districts impacts representation in Congress and undermines the constitutional principle of one person, one vote. Americans deserve to have their voices fully represented, not diluted by illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is always delightful to hear my friend from Colorado speak. One thing that I do want to point out, however, because there might be some students in the gallery today, is that there can be no illegal aliens and there can be no green card holders in Congress because the Constitution very clearly specifies that you must have been a citizen for 7 years before you run for the House, you must have been a citizen for 9 years before you run for the Senate, and you must be a born U.S. citizen in order to run for President of the United States, which some historians, as I think I mentioned before, attribute to Thomas Jefferson trying to write Alexander Hamilton out of the Presidential sweepstakes.

In any event, I think that my colleagues should probably relax with some of the hyperbole and exaggeration here. After all, all we are saying is: Let's keep doing what we have done since 1790 in the country.

This is the way that the Census and the reapportionment have always been run in the United States of America, and what they are proposing is obviously a radical departure from what the Constitution ordains.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to simply explain what we are talking about here.

Mr. Speaker, you could have a citizen of Russia who illegally crosses our southern border, pays cartels, comes across our southern border, and decides to set up shop in California. That citizen of Russia, who can still vote for Vladimir Putin all day long, also is counted in the distribution of electoral votes in the United States, therefore having influence and therefore shaping who is President of the United States.

I don't know what else could possibly be foreign interference in elections than what we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the State of Louisiana. We have six Members of Congress. We have six. By some calculations, the State of California alone has six Members of Congress entirely attributable to citizens of other countries, therefore, just offsetting all of the votes of all of the citizens of Louisiana.

This is outrageous.

To listen to people across the aisle talk about how this is inappropriate, I say: No, this is exactly appropriate. This is exactly appropriate.

As a matter of fact, regarding the way that we count American citizens in our territories, you are giving a greater status to an illegal alien in the United States, a citizen of a foreign country, than you are giving to an American citizen.

It is absolutely outrageous to listen to people who try to argue and justify this. This is 100 percent about stacking the vote, about foreign interference in elections, and about allowing and incentivizing sanctuary cities. That is what this does.

It actually takes American taxpayer dollars through the formula funding influenced by the Census, and it gives it to States that have illegal aliens.

This is completely outrageous. I can't even believe we are standing here having this debate.

Mr. Speaker, vote ''yes'' if you want Americans to be represented, and vote ''no'' if you think Russians, Chinese, and others should be represented.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear someone on that side of the aisle denounce Vladimir Putin, and I thank him for his remarks. We should definitely avoid putting in a President of the United States who looks up to Vladimir Putin and calls him a genius.

In any event, I could be persuaded by the gentleman's policy arguments, but then we have got to amend the Constitution. This is the way it has been done since the beginning of the Republic. The language in the 14th Amendment is perfectly clear, that it is all of the persons of the State who have to be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I thought you guys were constitutional textualists. I thought you followed the language of the Constitution, the original intent of the Constitution, and the precedent that has been set. I could be persuaded by it. I don't like the fact that Texas and Florida, or any State for that matter, gets an inflated congressional delegation because of this reason or that. Let's have that discussion, but you have got to amend the Constitution. You can't just say: Well, I don't like what is in the Constitution, and therefore I am going to ignore it.

The point about the territories I am not sure I understood. That undercut the gentleman's argument because, of course, the people in the territories are not represented in the House of Representatives except by nonvoting delegates whose votes ultimately don't count and can't count according to a D.C. circuit court decision called Michel v. Anderson.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Those are a lot of words from the opposition to this bill to say that citizenship does not matter. That is basically their argument: We don't care if you are a citizen.

In fact, they encourage you to not be a citizen. Sanctuary cities and States invite everyone from the world to flood their cities, and they need it. They have said as much in interviews that their population is fleeing their horrible policies in States like California, Illinois, Maryland, New York, and elsewhere, and they are going to places that have more freedom and less government.

So what do they do?

They import new people who don't know better, and, yes, the conditions are better there than the places they are fleeing, but as my colleague, Mr. GRAVES, was pointing out, California has six to seven Members. That is more than many of our States. Yes, Texas has Representatives because they, too, have a large illegal population, and the Biden administration is doing everything possible to prevent them from stopping this invasion of our country.

It is willfully and purposefully, and I will add skillfully, undermining the value of U.S. citizenship to flood this country with noncitizens.

I want to tell some great news to my colleagues: Foreign nationals do have representation in the United States at embassies or consulates. Their representative is not here in the United States Congress. I represent United States citizens, and so do my colleagues.

Nonetheless, noncitizens do not vote, and they should not vote, but don't let that stop them. They are working to change that too so that they can vote. We found that noncitizens are voting, and they found loopholes to do that with the Motor Voter Act.

We have to defend the value and right of U.S. citizens. The only way to do that is to do the very purpose of the Census, which is to apportion Representatives.

Now, we get a lot of other ancillary benefits from the Census, but the constitutional purpose of it is to know who is here.

Now, they want to know everything else about you, Mr. Speaker, how many hyphens you have in your ethnicity, national origin, what you believe about your religion, how much you make, and every other way they can invade your privacy, but they don't give a rip whether or not you are a United States citizen.

The American people deserve to be fairly and equally represented, and the only way that is going to be done is if we know who is a citizen, and the apportionment is based on United States citizens.

This amendment needs to be passed.

For assurance, for the previous three Congresses, I have introduced a constitutional amendment. In this Congress that is H.J. Res. 37. I assume Mr. RASKIN will run down and cosponsor it immediately because he knows that he could amend the Constitution and defend the principle that is at stake here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to sponsor this bill and to vote ''yes'' on this bill and get it passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, why do you need to amend the Constitution if you can just go ahead and do it by statute here?

That is rather curious. I think the gentleman doth protest just a little bit too much. I admire the intellectual honesty in putting forth a constitutional amendment, because that is precisely what needs to be done. I am happy to look at that. I appreciate his candor in admitting that the Constitution needs to be amended in order to overturn more than 2 centuries of practice and everything the Supreme Court has ever said about the issue.

It also should be clear to everybody that only U.S. citizens of majority may vote in Federal elections, that is Federal law, but everybody, including children, who are U.S. citizens are counted even though they can't vote in Federal elections.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, if you went out on the street today and asked someone, almost anybody on the street, and said: Do you know that we do a Census every 10 years and we count up the number of people in the country, and do you think it is okay if we found out how many of these people are citizens?

That person would say: Well, yes, but aren't you already doing that.

That is what they would think.

All this bill says is: Let's count persons, like the Constitution says, but let's also find out how many are citizens because that is what should determine how congressional representation, how apportionment is done.

It is so darn simple.

By the way, to my good friend from Maryland on the other side, we ask all kinds of other questions on the Census anyway.

What is wrong with asking the fundamental question: Are you a citizen of this great country, the greatest country ever?

That is all this does, and that is an important number to get. It is important information to get when you are figuring out who is going to represent and how many congressional Members there will be from each of the respective States.

This couldn't be more simple. I don't know why they oppose it, but they always do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be in the position of lecturing my colleagues about something that they often like to say, but the Constitution is the Constitution, and nobody yet has laid a glove on the Constitution or explained how the Supreme Court erred in the unanimous Evenwel decision.

None of them has been able to explain away the very plain language of the 14th Amendment, that it is all the persons of the States who are counted, not the citizens, and that has been the basis for both the Census and the reapportionment since the country began.

So the rest of it just strikes me like election year political rhetoric. To the extent that we want to deal with immigration, we had a great bargain that came out of the Senate, which everybody in this body and that body seemed to be behind, until they heard from Donald Trump that no, he didn't want to see any legislative progress, he wanted to be able to demagogue the immigration issue out on the campaign trail, although he has been severely undermined by all of the exposure that went into that decision.

Again, I haven't heard anyone either explain why their legislation is constitutional, nor have I heard anybody explain what is wrong with the immigration package that we have for hundreds of new Border Patrol officers, hundreds of new Border Patrol and asylum judges and a crackdown of drugs at the border.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to debate here about this. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, by far, most Americans would agree with the proposition that those illegally in the United States and noncitizens should not be counted for purposes of creating or modifying congressional legislative districts. That is probably what they think, and that is exactly what section 3 of this bill leads to.

Foreign nationals here legally who have not naturalized and cannot vote in Federal elections, together with illegal aliens who cannot vote in Federal elections, comprise a substantial portion of our population, by some accounts in excess of 15 percent of our populations.

Noncitizens are not evenly distributed among the States, and some States end up with greater representation in Congress based on a higher concentration of noncitizens. Perhaps that is what one New York Congresswoman meant when, in response to a question regarding illegal aliens, she said: ''I need more people in my district just for redistricting purposes.''

The provision of this bill would ensure a fair apportionment based on equal representation of citizens.

Now, my colleague has relied on Evenwel v. Abbott, a case that they relied on wrongfully. Their reliance is totally misplaced.

First of all, they are dealing with State apportionment issues in Evenwel, not Federal, but State. Let's go ahead, and let's see what Justice Ginsburg did. She cited with approval the district court holding in Evenwel that the Supreme Court allows jurisdictions to use any neutral, nondiscriminatory baseline, including total population, when drawing State and local legislative districts.

That has never been overturned, nor did Justice Ginsburg overturn it in Evenwel. In Evenwel, the plaintiffs that came before the Court wanted apportionment based on the citizen voting age population. That is what they were asking for.

□ 1630

Although Evenwel deals with State and local apportionment, we can fairly extrapolate that rationale to Federal apportionment, as well. Justice Ginsburg's holding in Evenwel turns on the idea that voter equality in a district is not required. It is not required. However, she also lays out that neither is it the total population metric that is implied by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is not required either.

For instance, Justice Ginsburg referred to Burns v. Richardson. In that case, it held that districts may be apportioned on the basis of registered voters or voter-eligible populations, that that is permissible.

In the Burns case, they give the example of Hawaii, which could rationally justify its use of voter-eligible apportionment because of the large number of transients and military personnel it had. The Burns court noted that apportioning using registered voters was permissible because of the conditions in which Hawaii found itself.

Now, what has happened since then? What has happened since then is this administration will admit that 9.2 million illegal aliens have come in under their control. They will also admit that there is another 1.8 million known got-aways. That is 11 million people that the administration will admit to have come in, in 3½ years. It has distorted the population. It skewed the one-person, one-vote standard, which is the canon upon which the commerce case was founded. It is the one-person, one-vote rule.

Our colleagues on the other side don't want to acknowledge that there is a constitutional basis, as I have just cited, to allow section 3 to go forward, but Democrats are perfectly content with California, which is a sanctuary State, hauling in people. The minority is perfectly content with New York bringing in people through sanctuary policies, or Illinois. That skews exactly what the Founders intended to make straight and clear.

Let's go to the 14th Amendment for just one second to actually read the second part of the 14th Amendment, or get to that. I am not going to read it. The first clause, that is what my colleague across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, has relied on exclusively, but he didn't bother to tell you about the second clause.

In the second clause itself, it deals with every Federal election and every State election for State Governor, judicial body, and State legislatures. What they do there in the second clause of the 14th Amendment is provide a way to reduce apportionment when those individuals may be disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are saying here. That is why this bill needs to pass, and I urge a passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 7109 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 8289;

Passage of H.J. Res. 109;

The motion to recommit H.R. 2925;

Passage of H.R. 2925, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 7109, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 7109, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules with respect to:

S. 870; and
H.R. 4143.

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

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2024, PART II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8289) to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 24, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—385

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amo
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burlison
Bush
Calvert
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Lamborn
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—24

Beyer
Biggs
Boebert
Brecheen
Burchett
Cammack
Clyde
Connolly
Crane
Donalds
Gaetz
Good (VA)
Greene (GA)
McClellan
Mills
Moore (AL)
Norman
Ogles
Rosendale
Roy
Scott (VA)
Spartz
Steube
Wexton

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bergman

NOT VOTING—20

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

□ 1708

Mrs. CAMMACK changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ADAMS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I seek recognition to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 1209. Declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives to be vacant.

This is the uniparty, for the American people watching.

Whereas, the House Republican Conference elected MIKE JOHNSON on October 25, 2023, after 3½ weeks of trying to decide on a new Speaker of the House.

Whereas, MIKE JOHNSON sent the Republican Conference a letter making promises as to what type of Speaker he would be and outlining his plans going forward. MIKE JOHNSON put forth seven tenets that would guide the Conference under his Speakership:

1. Restore trust by ensuring total transparency, open processes, and regular order.

2. Advance a comprehensive policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.

3. Promote individual Members and thus the whole team by working to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths, district dynamics and challenges, and individual goals and objectives.

4. Engage Members in productive working groups to formulate solutions in key policy areas and enhance our internal communications and team building.

5. Effectively message to persuasively inform the Republican base and the American people of our policy agenda, why we are pursuing it, and how it will ensure liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

6. Build and utilize external coalitions in the Conservative ecosphere, including think tanks, policy groups, and other allied organizations that can contribute to our efforts.

7. Develop and grow our majority by building upon our resources and expanding the base to successfully advance our Conservative agenda.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON has not lived up to a single one of his self-imposed tenets.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON allowed the Conference only 1 day rather than

72 hours to review a 1,000-plus page bill, to which no amendments could be offered, rather than ensure ''total transparency, open processes, and regular order.''

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON worked with Democrats to produce appropriations text, NDAA text, and other legislative items rather than with Republicans ''to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths'' and engage with them.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON relied on majority Democrat support to pass a two-part omnibus spending bill rather than advancing a ''policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.''

Whereas, on December 1, 2023, Speaker JOHNSON failed to protect the Republican majority when he allowed multiple votes to remove another Republican from the House of Representatives.

It was unprecedented for a Member to be removed from Congress by a two-thirds vote prior to conviction of a crime. To this day, the Republican expelled from the House under Speaker JOHNSON has not been convicted of a crime. Meanwhile, a Democrat now holds that seat.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON supported fully funding abortion, the trans agenda, the climate agenda, foreign wars, and Biden's border crisis rather than ensuring ''liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.''

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON relied on Democrat votes on at least two occasions, with the first transgression occurring on March 22, 2024, with the House passage of H. Res. 1102—part 2 of the Johnson-Schumer omnibus—and the second transgression occurring on April 20, 2024, with House passage of H.R. 8035—the $61 billion Ukraine funding bill. On both occasions, the ''majority of the majority''—112 Republicans—voted against the measures, while only 101 voted in favor.

Whereas, before Kevin McCarthy was ousted as Speaker, our Conference had passed seven appropriations bills, which were some of the strongest Conservative bills passed in decades. Speaker JOHNSON refused to continue this important process. He, instead, led us to another CR on January 18, 2024, and got it passed with the support of 207 Democrats and only 107 Republicans, while 106 Republicans voted against it.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON passed a third CR, this time calling it a ''process CR,'' as if that made continuing NANCY PELOSI's budget, yet again, any different from the previous CRs.

Whereas, with little to no communication with our Conference, Speaker JOHNSON passed the first minibus appropriations bill on March 6 and passed the second minibus appropriation bill 2 weeks later on March 22.

Whereas, a two-part omnibus split into two minibuses was crammed down our throats and passed under suspension of the rules with only one day to review it.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON's omnibus did nothing to stop Biden's deadly border invasion—it fully funded it. Speaker JOHNSON did nothing to stop the energy-killing Green New Deal climate agenda—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop the weaponized Department of Justice and FBI—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the trans agenda on kids—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop full-term abortions—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the fueling of forever foreign wars—he fully funded them.

Whereas, on April 18, 2024, the Rules Committee passed H. Res. 1160—the rule providing for consideration of the $95 billion foreign funding package—by a vote of 9–3. Notably, all Democrat Members of the committee voted to advance the measure to the floor while three Republicans opposed it. It is unprecedented for Members of the minority party to advance a resolution out of the Rules Committee. Since 1995, there have been a few instances of rules advancing out of committee with minority support. However, H. Res. 1160 is the only instance where this was done to bypass opposition from the Members of the majority party.

Whereas, the last instance an appropriations measure which passed the House failed to include a ''majority of the majority'' was on final passage of the fiscal year 2015 Department of Homeland Security House Appropriations bill during the 114th Congress. In the months following this failure, Speaker Boehner announced his resignation.

Whereas, in a January 26, 2024, ''Dear Colleague,'' Speaker JOHNSON called the Senate supplemental and border security legislation ''dead on arrival in the House.'' Likewise, in January 2024, Speaker JOHNSON took a trip to the U.S.-Mexico border where he said, ''If President Biden wants a supplemental spending bill focused on national security, it better begin by defending America's national security.''

Whereas, in the months following his border trip, Speaker JOHNSON introduced a $95 billion foreign aid supplemental with no border security attached.

Whereas, excuses like ''this is just how you have to govern in divided government'' are pathetic, weak, and unacceptable. Even with our razor-thin Republican majority, we could have at least secured the border, with it being the number one issue in the country and the issue that is actually causing Biden to trail President Trump in poll after poll.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON's capitulation on his promise to secure the border came on the heels of Laken Riley being brutally murdered, women and children being raped by illegal alien monsters, and our own Border Patrol and Texas National Guard being run over by hordes of military-aged illegals.

Whereas, great legislation, like H.R. 2 and the Laken Riley Act, are only messaging bills unless we fight to enforce them in our government funding bills.

Whereas, while serving on the House Judiciary Committee, MIKE JOHNSON was a strong defender of individual liberties and was the chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government. Despite his history as a defender of civil liberties, on April 12, 2024, MIKE JOHNSON cast the deciding vote against requiring a warrant for U.S. person queries of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) section 702 data.

Whereas, our Conference could have also taken out funding for abortion and the trans agenda on kids, if our own Speaker would have allowed us to offer amendments. Instead, MIKE JOHNSON worked with CHUCK SCHUMER rather than the Conference and gave Joe Biden and the Democrats everything they wanted, no different from how a Speaker HAKEEM JEFFRIES would have done.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON fully funded Special Counsel Jack Smith's witch hunt and 91 indictments against President Trump, our Republican Presidential nominee. House Republicans could have used our power of the purse to stop this, but Speaker JOHNSON didn't even let us try.

Whereas, Joe Biden's weaponized DOJ is arresting a new January 6th election protestor every single day and putting nonviolent political enemies, including veterans, mothers and fathers, and grandparents in jail for years, and the fifth January 6th defendant has now committed suicide.

Whereas, our pro-life Christian Conservative Republican Speaker MIKE JOHNSON fully funded the Department of Justice as it is prosecuting and convicting peaceful pro-life activists who are facing 11 years in jail, again refusing to allow Republicans to offer amendments to stop these injustices.

Whereas, actions are the only thing that matter, and words are meaningless without following through on them. By passing the Democrats' agenda and handcuffing Republicans' ability to influence legislation, our elected Republican Speaker, MIKE JOHNSON, has aided and abetted the Democrats and the Biden administration in destroying our country.

Whereas, removing this uniparty Speaker will not give the Speaker's gavel to the Democrats, which would only happen if Republicans actually vote for HAKEEM JEFFRIES. In fact, Minority Leader JEFFRIES, NANCY PELOSI, and other high-ranking Democrats have publicly stated they will save MIKE JOHNSON from a vote to vacate him. In a recent interview, Minority Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES said: ''Even though we are in the minority . . . we effectively have been governing as if we were in the majority.''

Whereas, our country is nearly $35 trillion in debt and about $40 billion are added to the debt every day, our border is overrun by illegal invaders

and terrorists from over 160 countries, our people are being killed by the hundreds every single day by fentanyl, and MIKE JOHNSON refuses to do anything about it.

Whereas, MIKE JOHNSON is ill-equipped to handle the rigors of the job of Speaker of the House and has allowed a Uniparty—one that fuels foreign wars, tramples on civil liberties, and increases our disastrous national debt—to take complete control of the House of Representatives.

Whereas, Speaker JOHNSON's tenure is defined by one self-serving characteristic: When given a choice between advancing Republican priorities or allying with the Democrats to preserve his own personal power, JOHNSON regularly chooses to ally himself with Democrats.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared to be vacant.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). The Chair would now recognize the gentlewoman from Georgia to offer the resolution just noticed.

Does the gentlewoman offer the resolution?

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1209

Whereas, the House Republican Conference elected Mike Johnson on October 25, 2023, after three-and-a-half weeks of trying to decide on a new Speaker of the House.

Whereas, Mike Johnson sent the Republican Conference a letter making promises as to what type of Speaker he would be and outlining his plans going forward. Mike Johnson put forth seven tenets that would guide the Conference under his speakership:

1. Restore trust by ensuring total transparency, open processes, and regular order.

2. Advance a comprehensive policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.

3. Promote individual Members, and thus the whole team, by working to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths, district dynamics and challenges, and individual goals and objectives.

4. Engage Members in productive working groups to formulate solutions in key policy areas and enhance our internal communications and team building.

5. Effectively message to persuasively inform the Republican base and the American people of our policy agenda, why we are pursuing it, and how it will ensure liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

6. Build and utilize external coalitions in the conservative ecosphere, including think tanks, policy groups, and other allied organizations that can contribute to our efforts.

7. Develop and grow our majority by building upon our resources and expanding the base to successfully advance our conservative vision and agenda.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson has not lived up to a single one of his self-imposed tenets.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson allowed the Conference only one day, rather than 72 hours, to review a 1000-plus page bill to which no amendments could be offered, rather than ''ensure total transparency, open processes, and regular order.''

Whereas, Speaker Johnson worked with Democrats to produce appropriations texts, NDAA text, and other legislative items, rather than with Republicans ''to understand and emphasize each Member's unique strengths and [engage with] them.''

Whereas, Speaker Johnson relied on majority Democrat support to pass a two-part omnibus spending bill, rather than ''advancing a policy agenda supported by Conference consensus.''

Whereas, on December 1, 2023, Speaker Johnson failed to protect the Republican majority when he allowed multiple votes to remove another Republican from the House of Representatives. It was unprecedented for a Member to be removed from Congress by a two-thirds vote prior to conviction of a crime. To this day, the Republican expelled from the House under Speaker Johnson has not been convicted of a crime. Meanwhile, a Democrat now holds that seat.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson supported fully funding abortion, the trans agenda, the climate agenda, foreign wars, and Biden's border crisis, rather than ''ensuring liberty, opportunity, and security for all Americans.''

Whereas, Speaker Johnson relied on Democrat votes on at least two occasions, with the first transgression occurring on March 22, 2024, with House passage of H. Res. 1102—Part 2 of the Johnson/Schumer omnibus—and the second transgression occurring on April 20, 2024, with House passage of H.R. 8035—the 61-billion-dollar Ukraine funding bill. On both occasions, the ''majority of the majority''—112 Republicans—voted against the measures, while only 101 voted in favor.

Whereas, before Kevin McCarthy was ousted as Speaker, our Conference had passed seven appropriations bills, which were some of the strongest conservative bills passed in decades. Speaker Johnson refused to continue this important process. He instead led us to another CR on January 18, 2024, and got it passed with the support of 207 Democrats and only 107 Republicans, while I 06 Republicans voted against it.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson passed a third CR, this time calling it a ''process CR,'' as if that made continuing Nancy Pelosi's budget yet again any different from the previous CRs.

Whereas, with little to no communication with our conference, Speaker Johnson passed the first minibus appropriations bill on March 6, and passed the second minibus appropriations bill two weeks later, on March 22.

Whereas, a two-part omnibus, split into two minibuses, was crammed down our throats and passed under suspension of the rules, with only one day to review it.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's omnibus did nothing to stop Biden's deadly border invasion—it fully funded it. Mike Johnson did nothing to stop the energy-killing Green New Deal climate agenda—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop the weaponized DOJ and FBI—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the trans agenda on kids—he fully funded it. He did nothing to stop full term abortions—he fully funded them. He did nothing to stop the fueling of foreign forever wars—he fully funded them.

Whereas, on April 18, 2024, the Rules Committee passed H. Res. 1160—the rule providing for consideration of the 95-billion-dollar foreign funding package—by a vote of 9 to 3. Notably, all Democrat members of the Committee voted to advance the measure to the floor while three Republicans opposed it. It is unprecedented for members of the minority party to advance a resolution out of the Rules Committee. Since 1995, there have been a few instances of rules advancing out of Committee with minority support; however, H. Res. 1160 is the only instance where this was done to bypass opposition from members of the majority party.

Whereas, the last instance an appropriations measure which passed the House failed to include a ''majority of the majority'' was on final passage of the FY2015 Department of Homeland Security House appropriations bill during the 114th Congress. In the months following this failure, Speaker Boehner announced his resignation.

Whereas, in a January 26, 2024, ''Dear Colleague,'' Speaker Johnson called the Senate supplemental and border security legislation, ''dead on arrival in the House.'' Likewise, in January 2024, Speaker Johnson took a trip to the U.S.-Mexico border where he said, ''If President Biden wants a supplemental spending bill focused on national security, it better begin by defending America's national security.''

Whereas, in the months following his border trip, Speaker Johnson introduced a 95-billion-dollar foreign aid supplemental with no border security attached.

Whereas, excuses like, ''this is just how you have to govern in divided government,'' are pathetic, weak, and unacceptable. Even with our razor-thin Republican majority, we could have at least secured the border, with it being the number one issue in the country, and the issue that is causing Biden to trail President Trump in poll after poll.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's capitulation on his promise to secure the border came on the heels of Laken Riley being brutally murdered, women and children being raped by illegal alien monsters, and our own Border Patrol and Texas National Guard being run over by hordes of military-aged illegals.

Whereas, great legislation like H.R. 2 and the Laken Riley Act are only messaging bills unless we fight to enforce them in our government funding bills.

Whereas, while serving on the House Judiciary Committee, Mike Johnson was a strong defender of individual liberties and was the Chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government. Despite his history as a defender of civil liberties, on April 12, 2024, Mike Johnson cast the deciding vote against requiring a warrant for U.S. person queries of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Section 702 data.

Whereas, our Conference could have also taken out funding for abortion and the trans agenda on kids if our own Speaker would have allowed us to offer amendments. Instead, Mike Johnson worked with Chuck Schumer rather than with the Conference, and gave Joe Biden and the Democrats everything they wanted—no different from how a Speaker Hakeem Jeffries would have done.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson fully funded Special Counsel Jack Smith's witch hunt and 91 indictments against President Trump, our Republican Presidential nominee. House Republicans could have used our power of the purse to stop this, but Speaker Johnson didn't even let us try.

Whereas, Joe Biden's weaponized DOI is arresting a new January 6th election protestor every single day and putting nonviolent political enemies, including veterans, mothers and fathers, and grandparents in jail for years.

Whereas, our pro-life Christian conservative Republican Speaker Mike Johnson fully funded the DOJ as it is prosecuting and convicting peaceful pro-life activists who are facing eleven years in jail, again refusing to allow Republicans to offer amendments to stop these injustices.

Whereas, actions are the only thing that matter, and words are meaningless without following through on them. By passing the Democrats' agenda and handcuffing Republicans' ability to influence legislation, our elected Republican Speaker Mike Johnson has aided and abetted the Democrats and the Biden administration in destroying our country.

Whereas, removing this Uniparty Speaker will not give the Speaker's gavel to the Democrats, which would only happen if Republicans actually vote ,for Hakeem Jeffries. In fact, Minority Leader Jeffries, Nancy Pelosi, and other high-ranking Democrats have publicly stated they will save Mike Johnson from a vote to vacate him. In a recent interview, Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries said, ''Even though we're in the minority . . . We effectively have been governing as if we were in the majority.''

Whereas, our country is nearly 35 trillion dollars in debt, and about 40 billion dollars are added to the debt every day. Our border is overrun by illegal invaders and terrorists from over 160 countries. Our people are being killed by the hundreds every single day by fentanyl. And Mike Johnson refuses to do anything about it.

Whereas, Mike Johnson is ill-equipped to handle the rigors of the job of Speaker of the House and has allowed a Uniparty—one that fuels foreign wars, tramples on civil liberties, and increases our disastrous national debt—to take complete control of the House of Representatives.

Whereas, Speaker Johnson's tenure is defined by one self-serving characteristic: When given a choice between advancing Republican priorities or allying with Democrats to preserve his own personal power, Johnson regularly chooses to ally himself with Democrats.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby declared to be vacant.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (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 New York?

Mr. MASSIE. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Scalise of Louisiana moves to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 43, answered ''present'' 7, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—359

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amo
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budzinski
Burchett
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-McCormick
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Collins
Comer
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallego
Garbarino
Garcia, Mike
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
James
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Lamborn
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Posey
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—43

Barragán
Biggs
Bowman
Burlison
Bush
Casar
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Connolly
Crane
Davidson
DeGette
Doggett
Escobar
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Gomez
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Harder (CA)
Jackson (IL)
Jayapal
Kamlager-Dove
Lee (CA)
Lee (PA)
Massie
Menendez
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Ocasio-Cortez
Pressley
Ramirez
Roy
Ryan
Scanlon
Spartz
Tlaib
Velázquez
Waters
Watson Coleman
Williams (GA)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—7

Chu
García (IL)
Omar
Pocan
Schakowsky
Takano
Torres (CA)

NOT VOTING—21

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Cole
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
Mullin
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1743

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call Vote No. 188 on the motion to table H. Res. 1209, I mistakenly recorded my vote as YEA when I should have voted NAY.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION RELATING TO ''STAFF ACCOUNTING BULLETIN NO. 121''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to ''Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121'', on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 182, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—19

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1749

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 208, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—203

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

NAYS—208

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

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

NOT VOTING—19

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1755

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 195, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—19

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUAL REPRESENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7109) to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Manning of North Carolina moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7109 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

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

Ms. Manning moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7109 to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Right to Contraception Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONTRACEPTION.—The term ''contraception'' means an action taken to prevent pregnancy, including the use of contraceptives or fertility-awareness-based methods and sterilization procedures.

(2) CONTRACEPTIVE.—The term ''contraceptive'' means any drug, device, or biological product intended for use in the prevention of pregnancy, whether specifically intended to prevent pregnancy or for other health needs, that is approved, cleared, authorized, or licensed under section 505, 510(k), 513(f)(2), 515, or 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355, 360(k), 360c(f)(2), 360e, 360bbb–3) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

(3) GOVERNMENT.—The term ''government'' includes each branch, department, agency, instrumentality, and official of the United States or a State.

(4) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means any entity or individual (including any physician, certified nurse-midwife, nurse, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, and pharmacist) that is licensed or otherwise authorized by a State to provide health care services.

(5) STATE.—The term ''State'' includes each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each territory and possession of the United States, and any political subdivision of any of the foregoing, including any unit of local government, such as a county, city, town, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The right to contraception is a fundamental right, central to an individual's privacy, health, well-being, dignity, liberty, equality, and ability to participate in the social and economic life of the Nation.

(2) The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the constitutional right to contraception.

(3) In Griswold v. Connecticut (381 U.S. 479 (1965)), the Supreme Court first recognized the constitutional right for married people to use contraceptives.

(4) In Eisenstadt v. Baird (405 U.S. 438 (1972)), the Supreme Court confirmed the constitutional right of all people to legally access contraceptives regardless of marital status.

(5) In Carey v. Population Services International (431 U.S. 678 (1977)), the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutional right to contraceptives for minors.

(6) The right to contraception has been repeatedly recognized internationally as a human right. The United Nations Population Fund has published several reports outlining family planning as a basic human right that advances women's health, economic empowerment, and equality.

(7) Access to contraceptives is internationally recognized by the World Health Organization as advancing other human rights such as the right to life, liberty, expression, health, work, and education.

(8) Contraception is safe, essential health care, and access to contraceptive products and services is central to people's ability to participate equally in economic and social life in the United States and globally. Contraception allows people to make decisions about their families and their lives.

(9) Contraception is key to sexual and reproductive health. Contraception is critical to preventing unintended pregnancy, and many contraceptives are highly effective in preventing and treating a wide array of medical conditions and decrease the risk of certain cancers.

(10) Contraception has been associated with improved health outcomes for women, their families, and their communities and reduces rates of maternal and infant mortality and morbidity.

(11) The United States has a long history of reproductive coercion, including the childbearing forced upon enslaved women, as well as the forced sterilization of Black women, Puerto Rican women, indigenous women, immigrant women, and disabled women, and reproductive coercion continues to occur. This history also includes the coercive testing of contraceptive pills on women and girls in Puerto Rico.

(12) The right to make personal decisions about contraceptive use is important for all Americans, and is especially critical for historically marginalized groups, including Black, indigenous, and other people of color; immigrants; LGBTQ+ people; people with disabilities; people paid low wages; and people living in rural and underserved areas.

(13) Many people who are part of the marginalized groups described in paragraph (12) already face barriers, exacerbated by social, political, economic, and environmental inequities, to comprehensive health care, including reproductive health care, that reduce their ability to make decisions about their health, families, and lives.

(14) State and Federal policies governing pharmaceutical and insurance policies affect the accessibility of contraceptives and the settings in which contraception services are delivered.

(15) People engage in interstate commerce to access contraception services.

(16) To provide contraception services, health care providers employ and obtain commercial services from doctors, nurses, and other personnel who engage in interstate commerce and travel across State lines.

(17) Congress has the authority to enact this Act to protect access to contraception pursuant to—

(A) its powers under the Commerce Clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States;

(B) its powers under section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enforce the provisions of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment; and

(C) its powers under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(18) Congress has used its authority in the past to protect and expand access to contraception information, products, and services.

(19) In 1970, Congress established the family planning program under title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300 et seq.), the only Federal grant program dedicated to family planning and related services, providing access to information, products, and services for contraception.

(20) In 1972, Congress required the Medicaid program to cover family planning services and supplies and the Medicaid program currently accounts for 75 percent of Federal funds spent on family planning.

(21) In 2010, Congress enacted the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) (referred to in this section as the ''ACA''). Among other provisions, the ACA included provisions to expand the affordability and accessibility of contraception by requiring health insurance plans to provide coverage for preventive services with no patient cost-sharing.

(22) As of June 2023, at least 4 States tried to ban access to some or all contraceptives by restricting access to public funding for these products and services. Furthermore, Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas have infringed on people's ability to access their contraceptive care by violating the free choice of provider requirement under the Medicaid program.

(23) Providers' refusals to offer contraceptives and information related to contraception based on their own personal beliefs impede patients from obtaining their preferred method of contraception, with laws in 12 States as of the date of introduction of this Act specifically allowing health care providers to refuse to provide services related to contraception.

(24) States have attempted to define abortion expansively so as to include contraceptives in State bans on abortion and have also restricted access to emergency contraception.

(25) Justice Thomas, in his concurring opinion in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization (142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022)), stated that the Supreme Court ''should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including Griswold, Lawrence, and Obergefell'' and that the Court has ''a duty to correct the error established in those precedents'' by overruling them.

(26) In order to further public health and to combat efforts to restrict access to reproductive health care, congressional action is necessary to protect access to contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception for everyone, regardless of actual or perceived race, ethnicity, sex (including gender identity and sexual orientation), income, disability, national origin, immigration status, or geography.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide a clear and comprehensive right to contraception;

(2) to permit individuals to seek and obtain contraceptives and engage in contraception, and to permit health care providers to facilitate that care; and

(3) to protect an individual's ability to make decisions about their body, medical care, family, and life's course, and thereby protect the individual's ability to participate equally in the economic and social life of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 203, nays 207, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—203

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Casar
Allred	Bowman	Case
Amo	Boyle (PA)	Casten
Auchincloss	Brown	Castor (FL)
Balint	Brownley	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Budzinski	Cherfilus-McCormick
Beatty	Bush	Chu
Bera	Caraveo	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Blumenauer	Carter (LA)	

Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—207

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

NOT VOTING—20

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
McHenry
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1809

Ms. DE LA CRUZ changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 202, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—206

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

NAYS—202

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes

Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Banks
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Krishnamoorthi
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luna
Magaziner
McCaul
McHenry
Murphy
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1815

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 193.

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 870) to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 13, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—393

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Allred
Amo
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Bush
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson (TX)
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Lamborn
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Mast
McBath
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McHenry
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Nickel
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Pence
Perez
Perry
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Self
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—13

Biggs
Brecheen
Burlison
Cloud
Clyde
Collins
Doggett
Foxx
Greene (GA)
Harris
Massie
Norman
Roy

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tlaib

NOT VOTING—23

Banks
Budzinski
Burgess
Carson
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Foushee
Garcia (TX)
Granger
Grijalva
Hageman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
LaMalfa
Landsman
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Magaziner
Matsui
McCaul
Sessions
Thompson (MS)
Tokuda

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1822

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, to advance the benefits of nuclear energy, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY TEAM ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4143) to amend the National Construction Safety Team Act to enable the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate structures other than buildings to inform the development of engineering standards, best practices, and building codes related to such structures, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 41, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—358

Adams	Duarte	Kilmer
Aderholt	Duncan	Kim (CA)
Aguilar	Dunn (FL)	Kim (NJ)
Alford	Edwards	Krishnamoorthi
Allen	Ellzey	Kuster
Allred	Emmer	Kustoff
Amo	Escobar	LaHood
Amodei	Eshoo	LaLota
Arrington	Espaillat	Lamborn
Auchincloss	Estes	Langworthy
Babin	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Bacon	Ezell	Larson (CT)
Baird	Fallon	Latta
Balderson	Feenstra	LaTurner
Balint	Ferguson	Lawler
Barr	Fitzgerald	Lee (CA)
Barragán	Fitzpatrick	Lee (FL)
Bean (FL)	Fleischmann	Lee (NV)
Beatty	Fletcher	Lee (PA)
Bentz	Flood	Leger Fernandez
Bera	Foster	Letlow
Bergman	Foxx	Levin
Beyer	Frankel, Lois	Lieu
Bice	Franklin, Scott	Lofgren
Bilirakis	Frost	Loudermilk
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Lucas
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Luttrell
Blunt Rochester	Garbarino	Lynch
Bonamici	García (IL)	Mace
Bost	Garcia, Mike	Malliotakis
Bowman	Gimenez	Maloy
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)	Mann
Brown	Goldman (NY)	Manning
Brownley	Gomez	Massie
Buchanan	Gonzales, Tony	Mast
Bucshon	Gonzalez, Vicente	McBath
Bush	Gooden (TX)	McClain
Calvert	Gottheimer	McClellan
Caraveo	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Carbajal	Green (TN)	McCollum
Cárdenas	Green, Al (TX)	McCormick
Carey	Greene (GA)	McGarvey
Carl	Grothman	McGovern
Carter (GA)	Guest	McHenry
Carter (LA)	Guthrie	Meeks
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Menendez
Casar	Harshbarger	Meng
Case	Hayes	Meuser
Casten	Hern	Mfume
Castor (FL)	Higgins (LA)	Miller (OH)
Castro (TX)	Hill	Miller (WV)
Chavez-DeRemer	Himes	Miller-Meeks
Cherfilus-McCormick	Hinson	Molinaro
Chu	Horsford	Moolenaar
Ciscomani	Houchin	Moore (UT)
Clark (MA)	Houlahan	Moore (WI)
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Moran
Clyburn	Hoyle (OR)	Morelle
Cohen	Hudson	Moskowitz
Cole	Huffman	Moulton
Collins	Huizenga	Mrvan
Comer	Issa	Mullin
Connolly	Ivey	Nadler
Correa	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano
Costa	Jackson (NC)	Neal
Courtney	Jackson (TX)	Neguse
Craig	James	Newhouse
Crenshaw	Jayapal	Nickel
Crockett	Jeffries	Norcross
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Cuellar	Johnson (SD)	Obernolte
D'Esposito	Jordan	Ocasio-Cortez
Davids (KS)	Joyce (OH)	Omar
Davis (IL)	Joyce (PA)	Owens
Davis (NC)	Kamlager-Dove	Pallone
De La Cruz	Kaptur	Palmer
Dean (PA)	Kean (NJ)	Panetta
DeGette	Keating	Pappas
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Pascrell
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi
Deluzio	Kelly (PA)	Peltola
DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Pence
DesJarlais	Khanna	Perez
Diaz-Balart	Kiggans (VA)	Peters
Dingell	Kildee	Pettersen
Doggett	Kiley	Pfluger
Pingree	Slotkin	Trone
Pocan	Smith (MO)	Turner
Pressley	Smith (NE)	Underwood
Ramirez	Smith (NJ)	Valadao
Raskin	Smith (WA)	Van Drew
Reschenthaler	Smucker	Van Duyne
Rodgers (WA)	Sorensen	Van Orden
Rogers (AL)	Soto	Vargas
Rogers (KY)	Spanberger	Vasquez
Rose	Spartz	Veasey
Ross	Stansbury	Velázquez
Ruiz	Stanton	Wagner
Rutherford	Stauber	Walberg
Ryan	Steel	Waltz
Salazar	Stefanik	Wasserman Schultz
Salinas	Steil	Waters
Sánchez	Stevens	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Strickland	Weber (TX)
Scalise	Strong	Webster (FL)
Scanlon	Suozzi	Wenstrup
Schakowsky	Swalwell	Westerman
Schiff	Sykes	Wexton
Schneider	Takano	Wild
Scholten	Tenney	Williams (GA)
Schrier	Thanedar	Williams (NY)
Schweikert	Thompson (CA)	Williams (TX)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (FL)
Scott, Austin	Timmons	Wilson (SC)
Scott, David	Titus	Wittman
Self	Tlaib	Womack
Sewell	Tonko	Yakym
Sherman	Torres (CA)	
Sherrill	Torres (NY)	
Simpson	Trahan	

NAYS—41

Armstrong	Donalds	Mills
Biggs	Finstad	Mooney
Bishop (NC)	Fischbach	Moore (AL)
Boebert	Fry	Nehls
Brecheen	Fulcher	Norman
Burchett	Gaetz	Ogles
Burlison	Good (VA)	Perry
Cammack	Gosar	Posey
Cline	Graves (LA)	Rosendale
Cloud	Griffith	Rouzer
Clyde	Harris	Roy
Crane	Hunt	Steube
Crawford	Lesko	Tiffany
Davidson	Miller (IL)	

NOT VOTING—30

Banks	Granger	Matsui
Budzinski	Grijalva	McCaul
Burgess	Hageman	Murphy
Carson	Jackson Lee	Porter
Carter (TX)	Jacobs	Quigley
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Ruppersberger
Curtis	Landsman	Sessions
Foushee	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (TX)	Luna	Tokuda
Garcia, Robert	Magaziner	Zinke

□ 1828

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on Roll Call No. 195 today. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

YEA on Roll Call No. 187, YEA on Roll Call No. 188, NAY on Roll Call No. 189, YEA on Roll Call No. 190, NAY on Roll Call No. 191, YEA on Roll Call No. 192, NAY on Roll Call No. 193, YEA on Roll Call No. 194, and YEA on Roll Call No. 195.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, due to a medical procedure and at the advice of my doctor, I was unable to cast my votes today in the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 187, on suspending the Rules and passing H.R. 8289; YEA on Roll Call No. 188, on the motion to table H. Res. 1209; NAY on Roll Call No. 189, on passage of H.J. Res. 109; YEA on Roll Call No. 190, on the motion to recommit H.R. 2925; NAY on Roll Call No. 191, on passage of H.R. 2925; YEA on Roll Call No. 192, on the motion to recommit H.R. 7109; NAY on Roll Call No. 193, on passage of H.R. 7109; YEA on Roll Call No. 194, on suspending the Rules and passing the House Amendment to S. 870; and YEA on Roll Call No. 195, on suspending the Rules and passing H.R. 4143, as amended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO WILLIAM D. OWENS FOR ACTS OF VALOR AT LA FIERE BRIDGE

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8063) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to posthumously award the Distinguished Service Cross to William D. Owens for his valorous actions from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, during World War II at La Fiere Bridge in Normandy, France, while serving with the 505th Parachute Infantry and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8063

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO WILLIAM D. OWENS FOR ACTS OF VALOR AT LA FIERE BRIDGE.

(a) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 7274 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Army may award the Distinguished Service Cross under section 7272 of such title to William D. Owens for the acts of valor at La Fiere Bridge described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in subsection (a) are the actions of William D. Owens from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, at La Fiere Bridge for which he was previously awarded the Bronze Star Medal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024, TO FRIDAY, MAY 10, 2024; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 10, 2024 TO TUESDAY, MAY 14, 2024

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, May 10, 2024; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 14, 2024, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S EV MANDATE WILL HURT AMERICANS

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

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's latest effort to push electronic vehicle mandates for truck usage is completely nonsensical.

Thanks to current administrative policy, we do not have the capability to implement the massive grid expansion needed to support the electrification of heavy-duty trucks. These vehicles consume about the same amount of electricity in just one charge as a typical American home uses in a week. The industry would need to invest upwards of $620 billion in charging infrastructure alone.

Then there is the question of where would the electricity come from. The administration has famously prosecuted its war on fossil fuels, nuclear, and hydropower generation. It is even impossible for wind and solar facilities to produce domestically because restrictions the administration has placed on American mining means the needed raw materials have to come from foreign adversaries. It is China that dominates the supply chain.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to look at the facts and stop prioritizing irresponsible energy ideology over Americans.

CELEBRATING MARY EATON DEAN THIS MOTHER'S DAY

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with Mother's Day coming, I am thinking about the one-in-a-million woman who raised my six siblings and me.

I have never before spoken about my mother on the House floor, but today I celebrate our beautiful mom, Mary Eaton Dean, here in a photo taken many years ago by my grandfather, William Dean.

Mary Dean was an only child who went on to become the mother of seven—five boys, two girls, one for every day's grace, and grandmother to 16. She gave freely of her kindness, her wisdom, and her friendship throughout our Glenside community.

Mary Dean was a woman of love. She loved our dad. She loved her life. She was a woman of faith, of adventure, and of loyalty. When our father, Bob Dean, died at 58, my mom was our anchor, determined to live the best life for herself and for us.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to my siblings, Bob, Harry, Michael, Jim, Chris, Maryann, aren't we lucky?

This Mother's Day, may we celebrate the mothers in our lives and honor those no longer with us knowing their lessons of love are forever imprinted on our hearts.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF MAGISTRATE JUDGE JENNIFER 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 recognize Chief Magistrate Judge Jennifer Lewis.

Jennifer has recently been awarded the 2024 Magistrate of the Year award from the Georgia Council of Magistrate Judges.

The magistrate court functions as Georgia's small claims court, which allows residents to proceed with a case with or without an attorney.

Winning this award is a testament to Jennifer's character and it shows how seriously she takes her judicial service.

Like myself, Judge Lewis was a Georgia Bulldog. After school at Georgia, she later went to Florida Coastal School of Law. Following her education, Judge Lewis started working at the Camden County Magistrate Court in 1998.

In 2008, she was elected as chief magistrate and took office the following year. I look forward to witnessing Judge Lewis' future accomplishments and thank her for her service.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF W. CHARLES WELCH

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, northwest Ohio mourns the passing of W. Charles Welch, who passed on Sunday, April 21, 2024.

He became known far and wide simply as ''Charlie Chuck.''

Born in 1938 in Talladega, Alabama, he later moved to Detroit and joined Greater St. Peter AME Zion Church where he met his wife Marjorie Chester at choir rehearsal.

They became sweethearts at 13 and 14, eventually marrying and raising five children—Rosalind, Katrina, Debra, Charles Bernard, and Trina.

Charles played piano at Detroit nightclubs, but his true calling came when he started his radio career in the 1960s. He was working for free at WJLB when he was hired by Toledo's WKLR in 1969.

Charlie Chuck was off and running. He spent years in radio, later founding The Juice FM 107.3 WJUC, the first African-American radio station in Ohio in 1997. It became known as the People's Station.

He lived by the credo that if you have a good idea about a dream, think of the three P's: prayer, perseverance, and patience.

May his inspiration bring comfort to his dear family, friends, and listening audience for whom he created a beloved community.

NURSES MAKE THE DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Nurses Week.

This year's theme is Nurses Make the Difference. Nurses fulfill diverse roles as caregivers, advocates, educators, and leaders, leaving a profound impact on their patients and communities.

In Congress, I am dedicated to strengthening America's nursing workforce. I have supported increased funding to title VIII nursing workforce programs, which include crucial funding to Nurse Corps Loan Repayment and Scholarship programs.

These programs will make nursing schools more accessible and help bolster the nursing workforce, especially in rural areas. I have also cosponsored the National Nursing Workforce Center Act, which seeks to curb burnout and address nurse retention issues.

I am also fighting to close the pay gap between clinical nurses and nursing educators.

Mr. Speaker, this week, let's thank a nurse in Pennsylvania's Ninth from Sayre to Pottsville, to Sunbury to Williamsport. We are so very grateful for our great nurses.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week we recognize Yom HaShoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day, and the month of May as Jewish Heritage Month.

We honor the 6 million Jewish lives lost to anti-Semitism, hatred, and violence. The Holocaust is not a distant memory. It happened within the lifetime of many Jewish people.

We also must acknowledge that this year marks the first Holocaust Remembrance Day since the attacks on October 7. This remembrance day feels different and raw for many of our Jewish brothers and sisters.

Let us take the month of May to celebrate Jewish culture, history, and people. Let us also begin this month remembering the millions of souls lost to the Holocaust, acknowledging the many survivors of the horrific events

of October 7, and standing with the Jewish community and those who have experienced lasting trauma as a result of anti-Semitism.

Let us vow to fight together and say ''never again'' for anyone.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JOYCE BENNETT JUSTUS

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Joyce Bennett Justus, who was called home on April 12.

A beloved and gifted academic, as well as a dedicated educator and administrator, Joyce touched the lives of many people in San Diego and beyond.

Joyce was born in Jamaica and immigrated to the United States. She believed in excellence and pushed herself to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology from UCLA in 1971.

She devoted her life to teaching, especially higher education, from her time as an assistant professor of anthropology, to coordinator of urban and royal studies, to vice chancellor at UCSD.

She also served as Vice Provost of Academic Affairs with the University of California Office of the President, Peace Corps Advisor, and Assistant Director of Social and Behavioral Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Clinton White House.

Joyce loved her church, St. Peter's, especially the choir and the organ music. She also loved her Bible study and her friends there.

Joyce was loved by all her family and friends, and they look forward to reuniting with her in Heaven.

May she rest in peace.

□ 1845

ELIMINATING MEDICAL DEBT

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, today, Senator BERNIE SANDERS and I introduced a historic bill to eliminate medical debt for every American.

Over 100 million Americans have medical debt. That is criminal in a country as wealthy as ours. No American should go into debt because they go to the ER or because they go to a doctor.

Our bill eliminates all medical debt for families. It eliminates the credit card damaging reports on medical debt, and it stops hospitals from sticking debt collectors on vulnerable patients.

Can we not agree in America that no one should have to give up their dream of owning a home because they have medical debt? No one should have to create GoFundMe pages to get medical attention. No one should have to decide between curing their cancer and medical bankruptcy.

This bill stands up for every American's right to healthcare. I thank Senator MERKLEY and Representative RASHIDA TLAIB for co-leading this effort.

CELEBRATING BONITA SHELBY

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to celebrate the 60th birthday of Lady Bonita Shelby, a community leader in Michigan's 12th District.

Lady Shelby is a leader of the Burning Bush International Ministries, along with her husband, Bishop Don Shelby, Jr.

As the leader of Burning Bush's Flare Women's ministry, she has spearheaded the Good Days women's weekend of events to serve the incredible women in our district.

She is also a mother, author, public servant, and mentor figure to so many in our community. In addition to their ministry at home in Westland, she and her husband travel all around the country to provide services for underserved communities and pray with families in need.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Lady Bonita Shelby for her commitment to serving our communities. Please join me in wishing her a happy 60th birthday and a meaningful year ahead.

ADDRESSING IMPORTANT ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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, House Republicans are addressing important issues affecting Americans across the country.

This week, we passed legislation out of the Energy and Commerce Committee to stop the Biden administration from imposing further regulations on home appliances and pushing their rush to green energy agenda that squashes consumer choice.

I can't believe we have to even say that in the U.S. House of Representatives, that we have to even deal with this type of nonsensical policy, but it is an important thing to do, to be able to push back on this, again, rush to green energy agenda that makes no sense.

As Americans struggle with historic inflation and everyday goods and energy costs, it is important that we have the ability to purchase the appliances that best suit our needs rather than overregulated appliances that, per the Department of Energy's analysis, will increase upfront costs by nearly 30 percent.

I hope Americans can understand that. This type of nonsensical overregulation is just going to cost them more money in an inflationary period that has been persistent since Biden took office.

We continue to stand up to anti-Semitism on our college campuses and hold university leadership accountable. Speaker JOHNSON has convened a probe into the leadership failures at our colleges and universities and the ways that they have allowed dangerous and harmful protests to overrun their campuses, putting Jewish students and community members in danger. We will not stop until Jewish students feel safe on their campuses again. This is a basic, fundamental right.

Last week, the House Committee on Homeland Security released documents that identified over 45 airports throughout the Nation that have been used by the Biden administration to secretly fly over 400,000 illegal immigrants into the United States, from Miami to Los Angeles, from Washington to Chicago. As this crisis at our southern border continues to wreak havoc on our communities, this is unconscionable.

President Biden's failed border policies have only further jeopardized our national security and risked the safety of our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for my colleagues to be focused on these key important issues and for them to join me this evening briefly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, after the October 7 terrorist attack on our ally Israel, a wave of hate has washed across our Nation. Our Nation's college campuses have been the focal point of a wave of anti-Semitism that I never thought I would see in America.

I have heard directly from Jewish students at our elite universities who have seen anti-Semitic mobs up close, donned in their terrorist scarves while shouting in support of the terrorist group Hamas.

These scenes are straight out of the Jim Crow 1960s South during the days of segregation and the KKK. The difference is the KKK bigots of my era hid their faces under white hoods. The pro-Hamas bigots today hide their cowardly faces behind face masks.

It was my sincere hope that we had left this hate in the past, but the slow march of Marxism has spread like a virus. It has even affected our K–12 system, where our children as young as the second grade are spewing anti-Semitic chants of kill the Jews.

Students, activist teachers, and administrators up until now have had

zero accountability. Well, accountability is finally here.

The people's House has the moral clarity to call out anti-Semitic hate and bigotry. As a House Republican majority, with committee oversight and the power of the purse, we are going to do the people's will and put an end to this Marxist-indoctrinated bigotry. We are putting all options on the table as we demand our educational institutions step up, do the right thing, and protect our Jewish students.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah for his steadfast voice on these key matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am also grateful to welcome my colleague and the House Republican skipper to share his message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American campuses once respected and envied across the world have become breeding grounds for the radical left to promote their anti-America agenda.

For weeks, Joe Biden, far-left Democrats, and university leaders have stood by as woke mobs have stormed college campuses across this Nation.

These so-called leaders have allowed thousands of students to blatantly disregard the law and build encampments on campuses for the sole purpose of harassing and intimidating Jewish students, even physically barring them from attending class. Authorities have turned a blind eye as these hateful people continue to destroy property, deface statues, and burn the American flag.

There must be consequences. We must respect our Nation and protect our schools and our students. This is not free speech. There are not peaceful protesters in this group. These are terrorists hiding behind masks and using violence, threats, and intimidation to control Jewish and Israeli students.

Today, I am proud to introduce the No Student Loan Forgiveness for Antisemitic Criminals Act, which would bar any student who is arrested for engaging in anti-Semitic activities within the United States from receiving student loan forgiveness through Federal income-driven repayment programs.

Clearly, these out-of-control students have never faced meaningful consequences in their lives. If woke leadership will not hold these violent protesters accountable and keep our students safe, House Republicans will. I can guarantee that defunding violent gender studies majors will end this chaos immediately.

No one should feel unsafe on campus. Anti-Semitism is a virus that we cannot allow to spread. Let us not forget, on October 7, 2023, Israel was brutally attacked by Hamas. We must stand with Israel as they protect the future of Israel and the Jewish people.

On another note, what in the world is going on with the Boy Scouts? In God we trust.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will share a couple of thoughts about this. I actually think it is very important as we are going through this moment right now in our country, as we see protests continuing on at colleges, to emphasize the importance of peaceful protests, the things that are done lawfully. We don't probably spend as much time focusing on the good examples that come out of this.

We have to be a nation of the rule of law. We have seen excellent examples from universities across the country as well taking a very clear, simple stance about offering opportunities for peaceful protest, but when they cross the line, they are going to be punished. We saw it from the University of Florida and others throughout the country.

Those are things we need to highlight. Those are things that are important to celebrate, that we are navigating that tricky line of making sure that we have the ability to protest. That is fundamental to who we are as Americans, and I commend those leaders.

Instead of just always talking about all the negative that is coming from this lawlessness that we see in a lot of ways, I commend those leaders who are across our country at different universities making it very clear that they are not going to tolerate anything that crosses the line. If you don't do that, you will continually see people cross the line.

Now, commencement ceremonies are being canceled. These kids have families, parents. Kids and students have put countless hours into their education to get to this moment. The commencement ceremony is one of the most special things that you could do in your academic experience. To then give in to this overextending of their protest capabilities just ruins the experience.

I hadn't even thought about it until I was talking to one of my colleagues, but this is the same group of people who probably had their graduations canceled because of COVID 4 years ago. Now, they are going through a similar type of situation. We are seeing it happen, popping up across the country. It is flat wrong.

We need stronger leadership. We have shown that in the last few months from the House of Representatives with the House Republican hearings that we have had. I think what we saw with the inability to call out genocide for being against the code of conduct clearly is the wrong direction to go, and I think there was a nice recourse. People lost their jobs because of it, as they should have.

This is going to be one of those moments when they are not doing enough to protect the silent majority on these campuses that want to attend class, that want to put their money to use in something productive.

The more that this type of nonsense continues to happen, we are going to see a shift away from these types of universities that aren't focused on what they should be focusing on, which is preparing those young minds and those students for the next-generation workforce. That is somehow lost in all of this. We are seeing it.

I am proud to represent a State that does such a good job with higher education. We are not immune to protests and things like that, but we are doing the best we possibly can to make sure that the rule of law is followed.

My oldest son is 11. I can't imagine helping out with tuition one day and then not even being able to go to a commencement or my son not even being able to get to class because of a group of people who have no idea and don't understand centuries and centuries of turmoil in a particular region. Hamas was elected 15 or so years ago and has made it impossible for Palestinians and citizens of Gaza to remove them from power. It has inflicted so much evil will on those innocent Palestinians, but they want to be in a position of supporting them.

It is fascinating that they think that they have it all figured out, that they understand Middle East policy, that they understand centuries and centuries of turmoil. It flat doesn't make sense. As a parent, to have a university president not be able to move forward to continue on with commencement is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT).

□ 1900

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the consequences that come when we stay home on election day.

Since President Biden took the oath of office on January 20, 2021, this country has been unrecognizable. Unrecognizable, Mr. Speaker. We will lose it completely if we don't get out in November and vote for constitutionalists who will defend the oath they took. We are in a battle for our way of life, and we better start acting like it.

Since Biden took office, he has let over 10 million illegal aliens cross our border, the government has completely weaponized our Federal agencies against the beliefs and interests of the American people, and war has broken out around the globe.

If you don't want to keep paying hundreds of billions of dollars to clothe, house, and make sure illegals are getting quality medical care before the veterans who served our country, dadgummit, you better get out and vote.

If you don't want to see theft and assault in broad daylight, violent protests in our streets and on our kids' college campuses, and see our men and women in law enforcement demonized, dadgummit, you better get out and vote.

If you don't want public school systems to tell your children that changing their gender is okay, that praying in public is wrong, and that our flag is

a reason not to stand for the national anthem, you all better get out and vote.

If you want a secure border, a fair justice system, and law and order in our communities, you better get out and vote.

If you want a military that is focused on its mission and not about meeting diversity quotas and having male recruiters out in dresses, you all better get out and vote.

If you want cheap, clean energy that is made in America instead of relying on our enemies, we better get out and vote.

If you want to quit sending money overseas to pay for drag shows and climate initiatives, we better get out and vote.

If you don't like where we have been, don't like where we are now, and don't like where we are going, folks, we better get out and vote.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that great message.

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

CELEBRATING MOTHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, I would like to take a moment and truly celebrate Mother's Day and recognize the contributions of mothers across our country.

We must continue to center mamas in the policies we develop and champion here in the United States Congress. As the mother of two incredible boys, I stand here today as an advocate for the needs of all mothers. Mothers should not be struggling like they are today, and we can act.

As the founder of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, I want to ensure that mothers have a seat at the table every day in our policies and legislative work. I always say to folks, we can't keep enacting laws that impact mothers, that are about mothers, but not with mothers.

From the incredible mothers in Michigan's 12th District Strong to mothers in other movements for justice, I want to tell you, I love you deeply. You are literally anchors within our communities and neighborhoods. Many of you are community mothers. Your voices deserve to be heard in this House, the people's House.

Mothers, as we all know, embody strength. They nurture. They come into spaces with unconditional love. Today, we honor and celebrate mothers for their tireless dedication and unwavering commitment to their families.

Mr. Speaker, motherhood is a journey filled with joy but also challenges and sacrifices. It is a universal experience that transcends race, religion, and socioeconomic status, yet many mothers continue to face great, great disparities.

Mothers are often the primary caregivers, so this Mother's Day, I ask all my colleagues, please, don't just say ''Happy Mother's Day,'' show your love with action, action that uplifts moms.

The challenges they face can be overcome with actions here in Congress. From the daily struggles of balancing work and family responsibilities to the barriers that negatively impact our marginalized communities, mothers often bear the brunt of inequity and injustice.

One of the most pressing issues that I see continued over and over, no matter which townhalls, whether I am having it in the city of Detroit or in suburban communities, mothers and families today are facing high levels of poverty and really, truly struggling every single day with the economics of their family around healthcare and so much more.

Millions of children, Mr. Speaker, in the United States live in poverty, lacking access to basic necessities like food, shelter, and healthcare. In Michigan, close to 20 percent of children under the age of 18 live in poverty. In the richest country in the world, that is unacceptable.

Working families in our country should not worry about where their next meal should come from. If we have the money for endless wars, this body can find the resources to end child poverty.

Ending child poverty is a policy choice, and in Congress we can start by expanding programs like the child tax credit. I introduced the End Child Poverty Act, which would cut poverty by over 60 percent. This bill would implement a universal child benefit program. This bill would lift millions of people out of poverty by providing about $428 per child per month to every family in America so that nobody is left behind.

Universal school meals are critical in ensuring that no child goes hungry. Of course, we all know and have been taught by the incredible Shirley Chisholm, the first African American to serve in Congress, that children cannot learn when they are hungry, so let's feed them. Access to meals is essential for every child's development. By investing in universal school meals, we can ensure that every child has access to the resources they need to thrive at school. This is how we support mothers.

I am proud to cosponsor the Universal School Meals Program, which many of my colleagues are championing here, to provide free meals to every child in America.

Again, many of the programs I want to talk about tonight will continue.

Now I want to yield to one of my colleagues who I consider an incredible community mother and partner in this fight to, again, uplift mothers. She has championed so much work around reproductive health and been at the center of movement work, from the movement for Black lives, movement around Black maternal health, and so much more. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, AYANNA PRESSLEY.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman TLAIB for her leadership in founding the Mamas' Caucus. I appreciate the way in which wherever she sees a gap, she seeks to fill it. I also appreciate what an incredible role model she is and the righteous representation that she provides for her sons. I appreciate the way that she fights for every child as if they are her own.

This time of year, Mr. Speaker, we wax poetic about the contributions of mothers, call their work valued, their love endless, their role invaluable. Mr. Speaker, mothers across America don't want a Hallmark card, they want policy change.

I grew up in a small storefront church on the south side of Chicago, and my grandfather was the pastor there. Even as a pastor, he would often say that he would rather see a sermon than hear one.

Mr. Speaker, the mothers of this country are deserving of policies, policies that see them, center them, and serve them, and they would prefer those over bouquets, verbal or otherwise.

We tell mothers that caregiving is their greatest contribution and then undermine them at every turn. We tell women that motherhood is aspirational and the greatest contribution they will ever make, while for many a safe pregnancy is a privilege and not a right. Then we thrust them into a broken healthcare system that denies their bodily autonomy, criminalizes pregnancy outcomes, and jeopardizes their lives.

We tell mothers that the work of keeping that baby warm, safe, and fed is the highest calling, and then we allow negligence and policy gaps to create a baby formula shortage in the midst of a pandemic as mothers panic to meet a most basic need.

We tell mothers that they must work like they don't have children and parent like they don't work while we fail to pass universal paid leave policy, thrusting mamas and caregivers back into the workplace mere weeks after their babies are born.

We tell mothers that it takes a village, and we are so proud to be a part of theirs, and then we fail to invest in safe, affordable childcare.

We tell mothers that they are their children's first teachers, and they send their little ones out into the world with a hopeful heart, and then a stark reality keeps them up at night—policy gaps that fail to keep that child safe from a gun on the block or in the classroom.

We tell mothers that in the twilight of their lives after they poured into their babies that we will take care of them, and then we gut social programs that would help our elders age in community with dignity and the care that they need.

Mr. Speaker, mothers don't need empty praise. They need policy change. Now, by the grace of God and the sheer will and brilliance and sacrifice of my mother—my shero, Sandy Pressley, may she rest in peace and power—the woman who gave me my roots and wings, there are many lessons that I was afforded by her example. Chief among those lessons was that being a mother was, in her opinion, her greatest achievement and her superpower. However, it was also not her only identity, and because I had a front-row seat early on to her humanity, I saw the many struggles and hardships that she was confronted with on a daily basis. Not for lack of good character, not for a lack of strong work ethic, but because of an absence of policy or policy violence.

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we penalize and marginalize the very people who give us life, but yet and still mothers and caregivers persist, persist in doing the work of community and movement building, of mothering, of nurturing, when it has been 101 years too long, and we have yet to even enshrine gender equality in our Constitution. We still have not passed the equal rights amendment, and still we raise our voices, and we rise in the Halls of power, navigating systems not built for us to speak out.

Together we press, day in and day out, for a more just America because being a mom, being a mama, being a mommy is our superpower.

This is not a just nation which supports us as parents, as caregivers. If we want this to be a just nation and one that is more just and fair for the generations we are raising and for the generations to come, we fight for the rights of our children and grandchildren, we move with the clarity and conviction that only caretakers can. Leaving a better world behind is not an abstract concept, it is grounded in the children right in front of us.

Every society owes a debt of gratitude to those who mother, and in their name we press for a world that lives up to their aspirations, a world that keeps their babies safe, a world that keeps all our babies safe.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather see a sermon than hear one.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as a mother myself, I know that there are circumstances out of our control that require families, especially the mothers, to take time off from work, especially new mothers. Whether it is your sick child, a parent, or a personal illness yourself, taking unpaid leave is not a reality for millions of our American families, our mothers.

Too many mothers are forced to choose between taking care of their families or keeping their jobs. We need paid leave for all by providing mothers with the time off they need to care for themselves and their families. No one, Mr. Speaker, not a single person should have to fear losing the income they need to keep a roof over their families' heads in exchange for literally just being able to take care of their child.

□ 1915

The Healthy Families Act would guarantee employees the right to earn paid sick days each year—again, earn it.

Now, I don't want us to forget a big crisis that we have, and I think the pandemic exposed this crisis. We have a childcare crisis in our country.

Affordable childcare is also incredibly essential for working mothers and the well-being of our children. Access to quality, affordable childcare allows mothers to continue to pursue their careers while knowing that their child is safe and taken care of.

By investing in affordable childcare, we can support working mothers and help them achieve economic justice and be able to thrive, not just survive.

I am proud to support as, again, the cofounder of the Congressional Mamas' Caucus to be pushing for the Childcare for Working Families Act to be sure families can afford the childcare they need and expand access to high-quality options and help ensure that childcare workers are paid living wages.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. RAMIREZ), a wonderful colleague from Illinois who is not only championing tenants' rights, which is the center to many mothers, but also is a proud child of immigrants. I will tell you just how incredibly connected she is to her community on the ground and brings a lot of that lived experiences here in the Chamber that has been really missing for a long time.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker,

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

I rise today to honor the women in my community as we prepare to return home to our districts for Mother's Day.

I've said before that I'm the proud daughter of my courageous immigrant mother, Maria Elvira Ramirez.

A woman who almost drowned in the Rio Grande and sacrificed so much to give me a chance at a better life.

A woman who, to this day, never fails to lend a hand and offer support and guiding words to anyone in IL–03 who needs it.

She is a mother for the whole community.

And as I honor my mother, I can't forget women who have also served as mothers to community, including: Elvira Arellano, Juanita Barraza, Nancy Aardema, Leticia Barrera, Catherine Garcia, and Julieta Alcántar.

Each of these ''mujeres'' have nurtured, cared for, and supported whole communities, extending their love and compassion.

As ''madres de communidad,'' they have: taught us how to care for each other and keep each other safe; defended our causes and protected our dreams; created safe spaces and encouraged us to be our authentic selves.

These mothers have taught us that love is both gentle and fierce.

They taught us how to fight for each other and to stand firmly against that which seeks to destroy us: unaffordable housing, gun violence, a broken immigration system, and more.

These mothers taught us to stand up for each other—not only for their children, but for all children.

El día de hoy me levanto para honrar a las mujeres de mi comunidad mientras nos preparamos para regresar a nuestros distritos para celebrar el Día de la Madre.

Muchas veces he dicho que soy la orgullosa hija de mi valiente madre inmigrante, María Elvira Ramirez.

Una mujer que casi se ahoga en el Río Grande y sacrificó tanto para darme la oportunidad de una mejor vida.

Una mujer que, hasta el día de hoy, no deja de dar una mano y ofrecer apoyo y palabras de orientación a cualquiera en IL–03 que lo necesite.

Ella es madre de toda la comunidad.

Y al honrar a mi madre, no puedo olvidar a las mujeres que también han servido como madres en la comunidad, entre ellas: Elvira Arellano, Juanita Barraza, Nancy Aardema, Leticia Barrera, Catalina Garcia, y Julieta Alcántar.

Cada una de estas mujeres ha nutrido, cuidado y apoyado a comunidades enteras, extendiendo su amor y compasión.

Como madres de comunidad, ellas nos han tienen: enseñado cómo cuidarnos unos a otros y mantenernos seguros; Defendido nuestras causas y protegido nuestros sueños; Creado espacios seguros y animado a ser nosotros mismos.

Estas madres nos han enseñado que el amor es a la vez gentil y feroz.

Nos enseñaron cómo luchar unos por otros y a oponernos firmemente a aquello que busca destruirnos: viviendas inasequibles, violencia armada, un sistema de inmigración fallido y más.

Estas madres nos enseñaron a pararnos firmes, no sólo por sus hijos, sino por todos los niños.

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is why I rise today to honor mothers, my mother, and so many women in Illinois-3 who have shown love, who have shown compassion, who have shown love even when they have been given hate.

I also recognize that our mothers, as we pay respect to them, they also want

to make sure that we pay respect to the brave children that they have raised.

You see, on college campuses across the United States and the whole world, students, our children, they are fighting for our shared humanity.

They are putting their comfort and their bodies on the line to disrupt the status quo. They are sending a clear message that Palestinian, that Jewish, that Christian children must be protected and that we must uplift our shared humanity.

Inspired by the lessons we have learned from our own mothers in our communities, these brave and courageous students are defending children in Gaza who are being murdered with U.S. bombs.

They are taking a stand for children whose schools have been destroyed. Students of all faiths—Muslim, Jewish, Christian, and from diverse backgrounds—are uniting to care for each other and to keep each other safe, to defend their cause and protect their dreams and to create a space that is encouraging freedom for everyone.

These children are an inspiration to so many of us, and they remind us that the future is bright by putting the values and love into action that their courageous mothers instilled in them.

Thanks to the teachings of these women, today we have a generation who believes in our interconnectedness struggles and are saying enough. In one voice, they are telling us clearly: No more war.

I close by saying that I learned from my own mother, a woman with a third-grade education, a woman who struggled and has experienced all that is wrong with this world, that if you lead with compassion, that if you lead with courage, that you are willing to be uncomfortable in the times that you must be uncomfortable, then you are living your purpose and our collective responsibility for collective care.

It is why today as we are all getting ready to head back to our districts to celebrate Mother's Day, I call on us all to remember the lessons we learned from our own mothers, and I urge all of us to see our shared humanity, no matter where we were born, no matter our citizenship status.

Let's not forget the women who right now are mourning their children and the children looking for their mothers under the rubble in Gaza and in every conflict. May we remember those children. May we remember those mothers.

After all, President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first Mother's Day in 1914 to honor mothers who had lost their sons in the First World War.

May we come back to protecting our children, may we come back to protecting mothers and fathers, and may we be reminded in this day as we celebrate mothers across the world that we, here in Congress, have a responsibility to protect them and to uplift them.

I thank Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB for her work, particularly the work she is doing around paid family leave, affordable childcare, universal school meals, investments in WIC and SNAP, ending child poverty, and reproductive freedom.

It is the honor of my life to serve with her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois will provide a translation of her remarks to the Clerk.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as you heard from my colleague, again, incredible lived experience is so needed because mothers come from all different backgrounds, all in different income classes.

Again, we could be doing more as Mother's Day comes up, not just saying happy Mother's Day but uplifting policies that uplift all mothers.

In the Congressional Mamas' Caucus, we have been centering our work on Black maternal health. The crisis is real, it is here, and I know many of my residents continue to tell me: We don't want just task forces and commissions and to be studied.

We know that there is a crisis. We know that Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy complications.

We know it is not because Black women are less capable of bearing children or giving birth but because our healthcare system has consistently neglected and mistreated them. We must address the racial health disparity in our healthcare system and face that fact.

I am also incredibly proud to be a cosponsor of the Black Maternal Momnibus Act, a comprehensive bill, Mr. Speaker, that would ensure Black mothers are safe and supported in their decisions and journeys to have children.

Every person should have the right to make decisions about their own body, including whether and when and how to have children.

There is a clear attack on women's rights as we know across our Nation. Rather than prohibit safe and legal contraception, we need to provide support for women and families that lack the means to access such treatment.

The relentless attacks on reproductive freedom are making it more difficult for mothers to access the care they need.

Today, I say to my colleagues that it is time to do better for our mothers. This Mother's Day, let's celebrate the incredible strength and resilience of our mothers everywhere and thank them by continuing to fight for policies that will change their lives for the better.

I can't leave this House floor without talking about the fact that I grew up in the most beautiful Blackest city in the country.

When you grow up in Detroit, Mr. Speaker, you don't have one mother. There are all the Black mothers and the neighborhood mothers so that even when my mom's eyes were not on us, all the other mothers on the block had eyes on us.

I take this moment and acknowledge these community mothers throughout my district, and I know I am going to leave some out, and I love them all. There are particular ones that really, really, really have touched me and shaped the person that I am today.

From Mother Christina Guzman to Mother Monet Davis to Mother Angie Webb, Linda Campbell, Mother Dr. Leonard who is fighting, fighting for the right to breathe clean air, Mother Braxton who is embedded in the community.

These are mothers that after they take care of their family, they are trying to take care of the neighborhoods they live in.

I thank again Mother Nan Berry, Mother Laveta Browne, who is my former high school teacher who continues to check on me and make sure that I am okay and literally is always in the background saying that we have to do better as a country.

Again, as we come together, we honor and celebrate every single mother every day, and we can do it every single day, not wait until Mother's Day to say Happy Mother's Day but do it with action.

I would be remiss in not speaking about my mother. My Yama was born and raised in Palestine in the occupied territories in the West Bank, a little village, Mr. Speaker, Beit Ur al-Foka.

It is an olive farm that she grew up on, picking olives and harvesting in October, a family that literally struggled every single day, but they lived off their land.

My mother came to the United States after marrying my father with only an eighth-grade education. She was pregnant with me, 3 months.

She came to the city of Detroit, and she raised 14 children, and I am the eldest. When people call me mama bear, it is really real.

My mom, to this day, after we all left, now she is an empty nester, and I kid you not. I have people come up to me. Can you tell your mother to stop sending food because she cooks for the whole block, even folks that are, like, I am fine. I have children that take care of me.

She sees a person that is limping or maybe had an accident, one of her neighbors, she will bring them food, all kinds of Middle Eastern food, all kinds of food. You have to take it. If you don't take it, she gets very angry. She takes care of her block.

I think people don't realize just the incredible compassion that my mother has, was really filled with living again in Palestine with the most compassionate woman I have ever met, my grandmother.

These mothers—sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just lost my grandmother. These mothers deserve us to do more here, and the Congressional Mamas' Caucus centers this.

We can't keep talking about how we love our mothers, but they are struggling from food insecurity to housing.

When I am at a town hall, I do not ever want a mother to tell me she is struggling to feed her children. It should be easier for them.

Again, if they are doing everything they are supposed to do, why can't we help them? I feel very compelled that we need to move with the same urgency that many of my colleagues do when it is corporations.

When it seems to be the defense budget, it seems like we find the money. When it is somebody that literally comes to my office and says: Rashida, I found out I have MS. How am I supposed to take care of my family? I have MS. A young girl came to my office at 31 years old telling me she is on dialysis, spending 3 to 4 hours in treatment.

These mothers deserve us to do more in this Congress. We deserve to do it in action. We have to do more.

This is incredible to sit there and tell you all that these mothers come to us, and they are not even asking. They are saying: Tell us what we need to do, but it is hard out there. It is hard. I am working, but if my child gets sick, I am out. I can't make up those hours.

Again, our families right now are struggling with sick care in our country, not healthcare. Literally, people are making money off of the fact that folks continue to be sick.

I am asking our Congress this Mother's Day as the Congressional Mamas' Caucus member and many of us in this Chamber; we know that we love our mothers, but we can do more.

We can do more through policy and through action to really protect and to uplift them, to make sure that they are not only surviving in our country, but they are thriving. Because I will tell you, if we take care of our mothers, I know the children will be taken care of. Our neighborhoods and communities will be taken care of.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1042. An act to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber. Acting Clerk of the House, reported that on May 1, 2024, the following bills and joint resolution were presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 292. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the ''William L. Reynolds Post Office Building''.

H.R. 996. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901 MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the ''Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office''.

H.R. 2379. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the ''Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office''.

H.R. 2754. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2395 East Del Mar Boulevard in Laredo, Texas, as the ''Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza, Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez & Sergeant Roberto Arizola Jr. Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3865. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South 8th Street in Lebanon, Pennsylvania, as the ''Lieutenant William D. Lebo Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3944. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Church Street in Mount Vernon, Georgia, as the ''Second Lieutenant Patrick Palmer Calhoun Post Office''.

H.R. 3947. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 859 North State Road 21 in Melrose, Florida, as the ''Pamela Jane Rock Post Office Building''.

H.J. Res. 98. Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to ''Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status''.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, May 10, 2024, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–4090. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands; Minimum Property Standards for Flood Hazard Exposure; Building to the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard [Docket No.: FR-6272-F-02] (RIN: 2506-AC54) received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4091. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Investing Lenders and Investing Mortgagees Requirements and Expansion of Government-Sponsored Enterprises Definition [Docket No.: FR-6291-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ60) received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–4092. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's Fiscal Year 2025 Congressional Budget Justification; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC–4093. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, ''FY 2023 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress'', pursuant to Sec. 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4094. A letter from the Senior Policy and Regulatory Coordinator, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medical Devices; Laboratory Developed Tests [Docket No.: FDA-2023-N-2177] (RIN: 0910-AI85) received April 30, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4095. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Garrett Lee Smith Campus Suicide Prevention (GLS Campus) Grant Program Report to Congress, pursuant to Sec. 520E-2 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4096. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Dedication of Commercial-Grade Items for Use in Nuclear Power Plants [Regulatory Guide 1.164, Revision 1] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4097. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Installation, Inspection, and Testing for Class 1E Power, Instrumentation, and Control Equipment at Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulatory Guide 1.30, Revision 1] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4098. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Installation Design and Installation of Vented Lead-Acid Storage Batteries for Production and Utilization Facilities [Regulatory Guide 1.128, Revision 3] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4099. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Guidance for Evaluation of Defense in Depth and Diversity to Address Common-Cause Failure Due to Latent Design Defects in Digital Instrumentation and Control Systems [NUREG-0800 Revision] [Branch Technical Position 7-19] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–4100. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month period report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4101. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under Sec. 7034(k)(5) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, pursuant to Public Law 118-47, Sec. 7034(k)(5); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4102. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report titled ''Voting Practices of UN Members'', pursuant to Public Law 101-246; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–4103. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4104. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourteen (14) notifications of, a vacancy, a designation of acting officer, a nomination, an action on nomination, and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4105. A letter from the Deputy Staff Director for Management and Administration, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4106. A letter from the Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Service's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4107. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4108. A letter from the Deputy Controller, performing the delegated duties of the Controller, OFFM, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's notification of final guidance — Guidance for Federal Financial Assistance [Docket No.: OMB-2023-0017] received April 29, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4109. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the Corps' FY 2023 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4110. A letter from the Director, Public Affairs and Government Relations, Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report to the President and Congress for FY 2023, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 109-435, Sec. 701(a); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC–4111. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation and Landscape Health [BLM—HQ—FRN—MO450017935] (RIN: 1004-AE92) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4112. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska [BLM—HQ—FRN—MO4500177994] (RIN: 1004-AE95) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4113. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — West Coast, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Bottom Trawl and Midwater Trawl Gear in the Trawl Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 180207141-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-BH74) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4114. A letter from the Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, NOS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary Regulations [Docket No.: 230206-0037] (RIN: 0648-BL38) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4115. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 240410-0195] (RIN: 0648-BL68) received May 1, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–4116. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints received During Calendar Year 2022, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 41705(c)(3); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 41705(c)(3) (as added by Public Law 106-181, Sec. 707(a)(3)); (114 Stat. 158); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–4117. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''Value in Opioid Use Disorder Treatment Demonstration: Intermediate Report to Congress'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395cc-6(g)(2); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1866F(g)(2) (as amended by Public Law 115-271, Sec. 6042); (132 Stat. 3984); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC–4118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''Report on Unobligated Balances for Appropriations Relating to Quality Measurement'', pursuant to Public Law 116-260, Sec. 158(a)(2); (134 Stat. 2662); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7581. A bill to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118–494). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 7659. A bill to authorize and amend authorities, programs, and statutes administered by the Coast Guard; with an amendment (Rept. 118–495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BARR:

H.R. 8287. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue a rule relating to stress capital buffer requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8288. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a review of discount window operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 8289. A bill to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and 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. considered and passed.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the public disclosure of grants made by certain tax-exempt organizations to foreign entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8291. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit certain tax-exempt organizations from providing funding for election administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. CAREY):

H.R. 8292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase penalties for unauthorized disclosure of taxpayer information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of data on certain contributions received by tax-exempt organizations from foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently

determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 8294. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a waiver of certain criteria with respect to the designation of a critical access hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8295. A bill to require the President to deliver ammunition to Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 8296. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. JACOBS, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 8297. A bill to amend the HOME Investment Partnerships Act to establish a Project Turnkey Program to leverage vacant hotels and motels for housing and enhance shelter capacity nationally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 8298. A bill to amend section 1977A of the Revised Statutes of 1977 to equalize the remedies available under that section and to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to provide any legal or equitable relief available under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. SOTO, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 8299. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Council for Technology and Innovation of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to carry out a program to facilitate and coordinate efforts between the United States and Israel to expand and enhance collaboration on the development and delivery of health care products and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself and Ms. BUDZINSKI):

H.R. 8300. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to establish online and delivery standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 8301. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Accountability, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 8302. A bill to establish a commission to review the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make recommendations for legislative reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 8303. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to notify postal customers and relevant officials when operations are temporarily suspended at a post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

By Mr. FRY (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 8304. A bill to provide for a limitation on liability for certain institutions regarding limitations on compensation to student athletes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 8305. A bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. OGLES, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 8306. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as firearms accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8307. A bill to provide that the memorial to commemorate the sacrifice and service of the women who worked on the home front to support the efforts of the United States military during World War II may be located on the National Mall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 8308. A bill to reauthorize the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACOBS (for herself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8309. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the inclusion of additional information relating to internet freedom in Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES (for himself and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 8310. A bill to require strategies on United States policy towards the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CASAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 8311. A bill to cancel existing medical debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 8312. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to permit certain members of the Armed Forces to pre-enroll in the system of annual patient enrollment established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 8313. A bill to prioritize Federal permitting for certain national defense activities related to the authorities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and projects related to such activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose penalties with respect to contributions to political committees from certain tax exempt organizations that receive contributions from foreign nationals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 8315. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting United States artificial intelligence and other enabling technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio (for himself, Mr. VAN ORDEN, and Mr. D'ESPOSITO):

H.R. 8316. A bill to establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all, 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 Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8317. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas and midwives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COLE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 8318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian Tribal Governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 8319. A bill to create a grant program to support the development of innovative learning models, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEHLS (for himself and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 8320. A bill to allow taxpayers to indicate whether the Federal income taxes they pay should be used for domestic or international purposes, to rescind certain balances made available to the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 8321. A bill to require person convicted of unlawful activity on the campus of an institution of higher education beginning on and after October 7, 2023, to provide community service in Gaza; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. ROSENDALE):

H.R. 8322. A bill to revoke visas of certain aliens for rioting or unlawful protests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. TRONE, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASAR, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MFUME, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8323. A bill to provide emergency assistance to States, territories, Tribal nations, and local areas affected by substance use disorder, including the use of opioids and stimulants, and to make financial assistance available to States, territories, Tribal nations, local areas, public or private nonprofit entities, and certain health providers, to provide for the development, organization, coordination, and operation of more effective and cost efficient systems for the delivery of essential services to individuals with substance use disorder and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Accountability, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 8324. A bill to designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, as the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 8325. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue regulations to ensure due process rights for physicians before any termination, restriction, or reduction of the professional activity of such physicians or staff privileges of such physicians; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8326. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the treatment of dates for processing under certain marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SABLAN (for himself, Mr. MOYLAN, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 8327. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the redistribution of unused territorial cap amounts under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8328. A bill to establish grants to provide education on guardianship alternatives for older adults and people with disabilities to health care workers, educators, family members, and court workers and court-related personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 8329. A bill to reauthorize and modify the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 8330. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase access to accelerated nursing degree programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Ms. WILD, Mr. CAREY, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. BACON, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LANGWORTHY):

H.R. 8331. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to require skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities for the intellectually disabled, and inpatient rehabilitation facilities to permit essential caregivers access during any period in which regular visitation is restricted; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:

H.R. 8332. A bill to prohibit student loan forgiveness for certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OGLES, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.J. Res. 138. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to ''Clarifying the Eligibility of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Recipients and Certain Other Noncitizens for a Qualified Health Plan through an Exchange, Advance Payments of the Premium Tax Credit, Cost-Sharing Reductions, and a Basic Health Program''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GREENE of Georgia:

H. Res. 1209. A resolution declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives to be vacant.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H. Res. 1210. A resolution condemning the Biden border crisis and the tremendous burdens law enforcement officers face as a result; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. CLYDE):

H. Res. 1211. A resolution condemning the violent, anti-American and anti-Israel protests that are occurring on campuses of institutions of higher education nationwide; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILEY:

H. Res. 1212. A resolution ending campus encampments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H. Res. 1213. A resolution a resolution regarding violence against law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. MORELLE):

H. Res. 1214. A resolution honoring the resiliency of America's teachers during Teacher Appreciation Week of May 6, 2024, through May 13, 2024; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1215. A resolution calling on elected officials and civil society leaders to join in efforts to educate the public on the contributions of the Jewish American community; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-105. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 195, relative to funding for the federal Victims of Crime Act Victims Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-106. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 6, to urge the United States Congress to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue a rule relating to stress capital buffer requirements.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to carry out a review of discount window operations.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 8289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, clause 1, clause 3, and clause 18.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the U.S. Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require tax-exempt organizations to include in their annual filings certain information regarding any grants they provide to foreign entities.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Amends 501(c)(3)s to limit their donations to boards of elections.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 8292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The single subject of this bill is to increase penalties for unauthorized disclosure of taxpayer information.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 8293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution (Taxing and Spending Clause)

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of data on certain contributions received by tax-exempt organizations from foreign sources, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VAN ORDEN:

H.R. 8294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a waiver of certain criteria with respect to the designation of a critical access hospital.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8295.

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 President to deliver ammunition to Israel, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 8296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section *

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 8297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 8298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Labor & Employment

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 8299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Council for Technology and Innovation of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to carry out a program to facilitate and coordinate efforts between the United States and Israel to expand and enhance collaboration on the development and delivery of health care products and services.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 8300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Supporting America's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) workers.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 8301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section—Powers of Congress. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill enacts new laws with regard to to relocation of physical customer service facilities.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 8302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish a commission to review the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make recommendations for legislative reforms

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 8303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the United States Postal Service to notify postal customers and relevant officials when operations are temporarily suspended at a post office, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FRY:

H.R. 8304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Limited Liability

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishing a disaster assistance program for timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 8306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To deregulate suppressors.

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 8307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 and Article 4 Section 3 Clause 2

The single subject of this legislation is:
The creation of a monument to the Women who Worked on the Home Front on the National Mall.

By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 8308.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 1, Article 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To reauthorize the Nutria Eradication and Control Act of 2003.

By Ms. JACOBS:
H.R. 8309.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To include internet freedom in annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

By Mr. JAMES:
H.R. 8310.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Foreign Affairs

By Mr. KHANNA:
H.R. 8311.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Medical Debt

By Mrs. KIM of California:
H.R. 8312.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states ''[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''
The single subject of this legislation is:
To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to permit certain members of the Armed Forces to pre-enroll in the system of annual patient enrollment established and operated under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 8313.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
The single subject of this legislation is:
To prioritize Federal permitting for certain national defense activities related to authorities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and projects related to such activities, and for other purposes.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:
H.R. 8314.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose penalties with respect to contributions to political committees from certain tax exempt organizations that receive contributions from foreign nationals

By Mr. McCAUL:
H.R. 8315.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to prevent foreign adversaries from exploiting United States artificial intelligence and other enabling technologies

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:
H.R. 8316.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:
H.R. 8317.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Amends the Social Security Act to include reimbursement eligiblity for doulas and midwives

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:
H.R. 8318.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Federal taxation

By Mr. MORELLE:
H.R. 8319.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Education

By Mr. NEHLS:
H.R. 8320.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
The single subject of this legislation is:
To allow taxpayers to indicate whether the federal income taxes they pay should be used for domestic or international purposes.

By Mr. OGLES:
H.R. 8321.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is.
To send any person convicted of unlawful activity on a college campus on or since October 7, 2023 to Gaza for the purpose of providing community service.

By Mr. OGLES:
H.R. 8322.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To revoke visas of certain aliens for rioting or unlawful protests.

By Mr. RASKIN:
H.R. 8323.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Authorizing robust, sustained funding for communities on the frontlines of the substance use disorder crisis

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:
H.R. 8324.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
To designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky as the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''.

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 8325.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Due process rights for physicians

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 8326.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.
The single subject of this legislation is:
to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the treatment of dates for processing under certain marketing orders.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 8327.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Authorizing the redistribution of unused Medicaid block grant funding among the territories

By Ms. SCANLON:
H.R. 8328.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8, Article 1
The single subject of this legislation is:
To establish grants to provide education on guardianship alternatives for older adults and people with disabilities, to health care workers, educators, family members, and court workers and court-related personnel.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 8329.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Human Rights

By Ms. STEVENS:
H.R. 8330.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Nurses

By Ms. TENNEY:
H.R. 8331.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Provides visitation rights for Essential Caregivers at long-term care facilities accepting funds from Medicare.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas:
H.R. 8332.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.
The single subject of this legislation is:
Prohibits any individual arrested for participating in antisemitic activities from receiving federal student loan forgiveness programs under President Biden's Department of Education IDR plan.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.J. Res. 138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Blocking taxpayer subsidized health care for illegal immigrants

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 130: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 549: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 618: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 694: Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 789: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. NICKEL.

H.R. 830: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 920: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 1015: Ms. SALINAS and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1088: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1255: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 1359: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1425: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. MACE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1510: Mr. AMO.

H.R. 1572: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1582: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1787: Mr. TRONE and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1806: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1810: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1822: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1826: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1831: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2395: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2411: Mr. MEUSER and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2439: Mr. CARSON and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2451: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 2530: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2630: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2673: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2696: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2713: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 2784: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2800: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 2889: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2900: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2921: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 2923: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 3100: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 3170: Ms. LEE of Florida.

H.R. 3240: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 3418: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 3481: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 3519: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3599: Mrs. PELTOLA.

H.R. 3605: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 3606: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 3690: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3725: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3875: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 3882: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.

H.R. 4052: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4121: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 4148: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 4157: Ms. DELBENE and Ms. DE LA CRUZ.

H.R. 4184: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4189: Mr. BACON, Ms. TOKUDA, and Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 4335: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 4350: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4432: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4438: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 4519: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 4571: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 4646: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4800: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 4894: Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 4911: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 4942: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CROW, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. BUDZINSKI, and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 5041: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 5134: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 5141: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 5163: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 5266: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 5324: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 5414: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 5419: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 5509: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 5644: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 5646: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 5749: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5785: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 5834: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 5851: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H.R. 5987: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 5995: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 6020: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 6049: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 6173: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 6179: Mr. TRONE and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 6203: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 6205: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 6211: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 6371: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 6415: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.

H.R. 6515: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 6601: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 6664: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 6935: Mr. FROST and Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 6951: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 7101: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 7158: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 7174: Mr. YAKYM.

H.R. 7203: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 7218: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 7222: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 7227: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. PEREZ.

H.R. 7231: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 7232: Mr. VAN ORDEN.

H.R. 7252: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 7255: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 7315: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 7384: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7401: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7403: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 7450: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 7467: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 7479: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 7581: Mr. SCOTT Franklin of Florida.

H.R. 7624: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 7629: Mrs. SYKES and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 7634: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.

H.R. 7735: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 7763: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 7766: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 7770: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 7771: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 7825: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 7862: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7869: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

H.R. 7891: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 7914: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.

H.R. 8057: Mr. BERA, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 8061: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 8141: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 8164: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 8173: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 8174: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 8195: Mr. ELLZEY and Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 8212: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 8224: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 8238: Mr. GIMENEZ.

H.R. 8244: Mr. FEENSTRA, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 8253: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 8282: Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Ms. BOEBERT.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.J. Res. 82: Mr. NADLER.

H.J. Res. 135: Ms. TENNEY and Ms. LEE of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. OGLES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. GUEST.

H. Res. 86: Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 146: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 376: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H. Res. 837: Ms. PINGREE.

H. Res. 946: Mr. KUSTOFF.

H. Res. 1019: Mr. SELF.

H. Res. 1145: Mr. NORCROSS.

H. Res. 1148: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.

H. Res. 1180: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 1184: Mr. TRONE.

H. Res. 1186: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H. Res. 1188: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 1192: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 1197: Mr. DELUZIO.

H. Res. 1206: Ms. KUSTER.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2024 *No. 80*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we are reminded of Your mercies that have been of old. You have been our dwelling place in all generations. Because of Your mercies, we are not consumed. Great is Your faithfulness.

Today, guard and guide our Senators. Lord, provide them with a sense of purposeful direction as they strive to unite their best efforts for the health, strength, and safety of this Nation. May they also work for peace and justice in our world. Cleanse anything in our lawmakers that would block the flow of Your blessings and joy. May gratitude to You be the motive for everything they think, say, and do.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SECURING GROWTH AND ROBUST LEADERSHIP IN AMERICAN AVIATION ACT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3935, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3935) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer (for Cantwell) modified amendment No. 1911, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 2026 (to amendment No. 1911), to add an effective date.

Schumer motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 2027, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 2028 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2027), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 2029 (to amendment No. 2028), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me read a few quotes from the last 6 months, about securing our southern border, from some of my Republican Senate colleagues:

This crisis requires swift, serious, and substantive action.

It makes no sense to me for us to do nothing when we might be able to make things better.

This moment will pass. Do not let it pass.

Yes, indeed, these are words of our Republican Senate colleagues, uttered at press conferences and floor speeches and interviews from just the last few months. There are many, many, many more quotes like these, going back years, from Republican Senators, from Republican Congress Members, from the Republican Speaker, and from the former Republican President.

We kept hearing the same thing again and again and again: ''We need to do something about the border now,'' they shouted. ''The border is an emergency,'' they screamed. ''We cannot put this off until tomorrow''—and on and on and on.

So 3 months ago, here on the floor, Republicans got a chance to back up their angry words with real action by voting on the strongest bipartisan border bill Congress has seen in decades. And practically every Republican voted no, including my Republican colleague who said: ''It makes no sense to do nothing.'' Then he voted no. Including my Republican colleague who said: ''This crisis requires swift . . . action''—he voted no. And the Republican Speaker, JOHNSON, who said: ''The time to act'' on the border ''is yesterday,'' and then told the whole world that our bipartisan border bill would die in the House if we sent it over to them.

Donald Trump has spent years bellyaching and bemoaning the problems at

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

the border. But when Congress finally reached a breakthrough on a strong and bipartisan border bill, he told his MAGA acolytes to kill it so that he could exploit the chaos at the border for political gain. He was bold and open about that. He wanted to exploit the chaos at the border for his own political gain.

That is cynical even for Republicans—even, maybe, for Donald Trump, whose cynicism knows no bounds. For Democrats, the situation at the border is utterly unacceptable. That is why we worked with our Republican colleagues for months to write the strongest border security bill Congress has seen in generations—a bill that had the support of the Border Patrol union and the Chamber of Commerce and the extremely conservative Wall Street Journal editorial board.

But Donald Trump, desperate to exploit the border for the campaign trail, torpedoed this bill right in its tracks. He knew it would take real action to secure our border. That is why he didn't want it to happen.

Republicans will go on and on about the border this year, but their rhetoric, their political ads, everything else, will ring hollow because the border bill they killed in Congress will linger over them like stink on garbage.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, now, on AI, I just returned from the Special Competitive Studies Project's first ever expo on artificial intelligence, where I spoke about the Senate's ongoing efforts to tackle AI. As I have said before, tackling AI must be an all-hands-on-deck approach. AI is so complex, so rapidly evolving, so broad in its impact that it will take all of us working together to maximize its potential and minimize its harms.

That is why I was pleased to see President Biden will announce a $3.3 billion investment from Microsoft, later today, for a new AI center in Wisconsin. This investment from Microsoft will create thousands of new, good-paying jobs and help America keep a competitive edge on AI.

AI will remain a top priority for this U.S. Senate. We just finished our bipartisan AI Insight Forums, where we learned so much about AI's promises and challenges. Very soon, our bipartisan AI working group will release our policy roadmap highlighting the findings and the areas of consensus from our forums, which will help our committees fine-tune their work on AI legislation. We look forward to moving forward on AI.

H.R. 3935

Mr. President, now on FAA, last night, I filed cloture on the underlying bill and the Cantwell substitute amendment, with the next procedural vote scheduled for tomorrow. All of us need to work constructively and with urgency to finish the job on FAA.

Nobody—absolutely nobody—should want us to slip past the deadline. That would needlessly increase risks for so many travelers and so many Federal workers.

To get FAA done, we need three things: cooperation, haste, and a common desire to get to yes. Any single Member who insists on extraneous change will only increase the likelihood that we miss the deadline. God forbid something should happen when we do.

I hope that we will finish this job very soon so we can send a bill to the House in time for them to act. I thank Chair CANTWELL, the ranking member of the committee, CRUZ, and all my colleagues who have worked assiduously to get FAA done.

ABORTION

Mr. President, now, on abortion, just when we thought Republicans' anti-choice rhetoric couldn't get any more extreme, Republicans keep stooping to new lows. In an interview yesterday, Donald Trump, the presumptive Republican nominee for President, was asked about claims that he ''would support certain states with bans monitoring a woman's pregnancy.'' Donald Trump's response? ''Well, that would be up to the States.''

That would be up to the States?

Let me say that again so the American people hear how extreme this is. Donald Trump was asked yesterday if he would support States that want to monitor women's pregnancies—monitor women's pregnancies. Instead of condemning this grotesque invasion of women's privacy, Donald Trump thinks that if the States decide to do so, that is apparently A-OK with him. It is revolting.

In just the last few months, we have seen States like Florida enact some of the most extreme and cruel abortion bans in decades. So if Donald Trump and hard-right Republicans get back into power, should there be any surprise if some States pass laws allowing for women's pregnancies to be monitored?

I ask my Senate colleagues: Do you agree, Senate colleagues—Republican Senate colleagues—do you agree with Donald Trump's extreme, intrusive, crazy view that States should be able to monitor pregnant women if they want? Do my Senate Republican colleagues, who say they are the party of individual freedom, believe States should have the power to track movements of millions of women if they so choose?

Make no mistake, Senate Republicans created the mess we are in right now, where the presumptive Republican nominee is seemingly open to States monitoring pregnant women. Senate Republicans owe the American people an answer on where they stand on this absurd invasion to Americans' privacy.

CHIPS AND SCIENCE ACT

Mr. President, finally, on the Chips and Science bill. Yesterday, the New York Times reported a remarkable statistic from a recent study on the semiconductor industry. Thanks to funding provided by the Chips and Science Act, ''the United States will triple its domestic Chips manufacturing capacity by 2032, the largest increase in the world.''

The report goes on: Had Congress not passed Chips and Science, American share of global chip production would have kept slipping, but, instead, it is expected to triple—to triple—in less than a decade.

This report is great news for American jobs and America's economy and is precisely what we envisioned in the Senate as we worked on the bipartisan Chips and Science bill. With help from the Federal Government, communities in New York and Arizona and Ohio and Texas and Montana will become the next hubs of tech innovation.

We are seeing growth happen right now, in front of our eyes: Micron is expanding, Samsung is expanding, Intel is expanding, BAE Systems is expanding, and more. All of these companies are expanding in the United States thanks to the CHIPS Act.

When I began working on the Endless Frontier Act years ago, this was the hope: a new wave of tech jobs, a new wave of scientific research, and a revival of Federal investment in these areas. This report on the impact of Chips and Science shows America is on the right track, and our confidence in passing this legislation is vindicated.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

ISRAEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the attacks of October 7 brought the world face-to-face with the savage terrorists who have tried to destroy the Jewish State for decades. They forced us all to take a sober look at what our ally Israel has to defend against every single day.

In the months since, I have insisted repeatedly that America should provide Israel the time, the space, and the support it needs to defeat Iran-backed terrorists and restore its security, and I have made it clear that the consensus of Israel's national unity war cabinet—that lasting security can only come after Hamas is defeated—ought to be our position here in America as well.

Early on, there was reason to believe that President Biden shared this view. I was encouraged by his initial willingness to move quickly to transfer needed munitions to Israel, by his request for an emergency national security supplemental, including urgent security assistance to Israel, and by what he called his administration's ''ironclad'' commitment to Israel's security.

Unfortunately, we have since seen that iron bend under the heat of domestic political pressure from his party's anti-Israel base and the campus communists who decided to wrap themselves in the flags of Hamas and Hezbollah. We have seen his administration cave in to growing demands to

condition and limit assistance to our democratic ally. We have seen public attempts to micromanage Israel's self-defense, to constrain Israel's freedom of action. A few days ago, we saw reports that the President was delaying weapons shipments to Israel, creating daylight between America and a close ally.

As it turns out, these reports were true, and the decision to pause these shipments was withheld from Congress. We still don't know the key facts.

I speak with some experience in the difficulties of standing up to extreme elements in one's own political party, but the President's apparent inability to keep the most radical voices on his left flank out of the Situation Room isn't just a shameful abdication of leadership; it is actually dangerous.

Failing to pass the emergency national security supplemental would have been devastating to Ukraine's defense and America's credibility. For the administration to withhold assistance from Israel is devastating in its own right. At home, it will only whet the appetite of the anti-Israel left, and abroad, it will embolden Iran and its terrorist proxies.

There is no secret shortcut to restoring peace and security. A return to the status quo ante doesn't solve the challenge at hand. The status quo before October 7 was what allowed Iran the latitude to export terror across the Middle East and allowed Hamas to exploit a cease-fire to launch the attacks.

For those who care about the humanitarian situation in Gaza—and I would count myself among those who do—the most enduring way to help the Palestinian people is to help Israel defeat Hamas. A return to the status quo ante will only perpetuate the conditions that have long plagued the people of Gaza and threatened the people of Israel. In the last week, their terrorist oppressors have struck the main humanitarian entrance to Gaza twice with mortars.

It is time for the President to stop letting domestic political demands of the far left determine his foreign policy, and it is time to stop doubting the will of Israel's unity government and the overwhelming view of the Israeli people. A future of peace for Israelis and Palestinians is one in which Iran-backed terrorists play no part.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Now, Mr. President, on a related matter, Israel knows it cannot blink in the face of savages who seek to destroy it. The same cannot be said of the Biden administration—the disastrous retreat from Afghanistan; the delusion that over-the-horizon counterterrorism could fill in for on-the-ground operations; and, of course, an abiding fixation on releasing hardened killers from the terrorist detention facility at Guantanamo Bay so they can symbolically end the War on Terror.

Negotiations between Federal prosecutors and representatives of the masterminds of the September 11 massacre have been ongoing for years. The terrorists' defense has tried every trick in the book to dodge justice—from bids for transfer to U.S. soil for medical treatment to plea deals that would take a capital sentence off the table. Many of our colleagues have followed these proceedings with great interest. Many of us feel strongly that a terrorist mass murderer ought to get his just desserts.

The way this story is sometimes covered in the press, you might think there is something wrong about a U.S. Senator insisting on it. So let's clear up a couple of things.

First, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed deserves nothing less than the death penalty, and the fact that he hasn't yet received it is a disgrace.

Second, on President Biden's watch, the terrorist threat has grown significantly while our ability to combat it has actually shrunk. Law enforcement and intelligence officials confirm the urgency of the threat to our homeland. We have been kicked out of the Sahel, and we are blind in Afghanistan. The President's precipitous withdrawal from Bagram Air Base led to the emptying of the terrorist detention facility there and fueled ISIS-K terrorist plots against America.

Finally, if the President and his Attorney General let the perpetrators of the deadliest terrorist attack on American soil plead out or cut a secret deal for better healthcare and living conditions, the Biden administration will pay a steep political price.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. President, on one final matter, last week, the Biden administration rolled out the second wave of guidance in the price-fixing scheme he calls the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program, but, as I said the first time around, the word ''negotiation'' is doing a lot of work in that name. Calling administration bureaucrats' strong-arm tactic a negotiation is like calling jury duty a paid vacation.

What we are really talking about here is prescription drug socialism. The administration is dictating to America's world-leading medical innovators the maximum fair price for their products. In response, producers have three choices: Eat the fixed price, pay an exorbitant excise tax, or stop participating in Medicare and Medicaid drug programs altogether.

Of course, we know it is not that neat and tidy. The underlying problem with price-fixing is that it simply doesn't work. When the Federal Government predetermines outcomes, it kills the incentives that prompt innovators to bet big on cutting-edge research and development.

Artificially fixing the price for a life-saving cure doesn't make it cheaper; it makes it less likely to exist in the first place. By one estimate, over the next 10 years, the sort of prescription drug socialism the Biden administration is driving at could snuff out development on nearly 140—140—new treatments before they begin. Needless to say, the people who stand to lose the most from state meddling in the market for medical treatments are the people who rely on them—American patients, especially seniors.

There is a reason the United States leads the world in pharmaceutical development. It is precisely because we encourage innovation and welcome risk-taking, and it is because, until now, we have kept Washington from pouring cold water on the most prolific engine of lifesaving cures in our history.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 3935

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, the Senate is finally considering the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act, and I am glad we are here—even if belatedly.

Our Nation depends on a safe, efficient, and robust national aviation system. The bill before us today will help strengthen aviation safety, address the pilot shortage, and improve airport infrastructure—all of which will contribute to a better experience for the traveling public.

I am particularly pleased that my proposal to create an enhanced qualification program for prospective airline pilots was included in the bill. The United States is facing a serious pilot shortage, which has resulted in reduced air service at airports around the country. This has real impacts on the flying public, particularly for those in rural States like South Dakota since smaller, regional airports have tended to see the greatest reduction in flights.

To help address this shortage and improve the quality of pilot training, Senator SINEMA and I introduced a proposal to create an enhanced qualification proposal for prospective airline pilots. Our proposal was a direct response to a recommendation from the Air Carrier Training Aviation Rulemaking Committee—a body of industry, labor, and safety representatives who meet regularly under the auspices of the FAA's Office of Aviation Safety—which recommended the implementation of such a program to create a structured pathway for pilots to obtain intensive training.

While the United States has stringent requirements for the number of flight hours prospective airline pilots must complete before obtaining their pilot's license, the quality of that cockpit time is often less than optimal preparation for flying commercial jets. So, to better prepare pilots for airline jobs, our proposal will implement an

enhanced qualification program—designed and audited by the FAA and administered by air carriers—that will give aspiring airline pilots intensive training with experienced air carrier pilots and other experts.

Intensive training in the kind of air carrier environment where prospective airline pilots will be flying is something that is largely missing from current training, and getting the chance to work closely with seasoned pilots will help turn out highly qualified pilots who are better prepared for flying commercial jets.

In addition, our program's use of simulator training, whose proven value has resulted in its extensive use by the military, will give prospective airline pilots exposure to the cockpits of the jets they will be flying and, crucially, allow them to experience what it is like to handle challenging and dangerous situations in those cockpits.

For obvious reasons, standard flight training hours don't involve deliberately flying into perilous weather conditions or dealing with things like fires or engine failure, but simulator training offers prospective airline pilots the chance to deal with all those situations and more and deal with them again and again until their responses to these situations are finetuned.

Our proposal is a win-win. It will turn out better prepared pilots, and it will help address the pilot shortage by making training more accessible. I am very pleased it was included in the bill that is before us today.

I am also very pleased that Senator KLOBUCHAR's Aviation Workforce Development and Recruitment Act, which I cosponsored, was included in the bill. This measure will help address workforce challenges across the aviation industry by expanding resources to help recruit and train pilots, aviation manufacturing workers, and mechanics.

Finally, with rural air service once again in mind, I am very pleased that my provision to allow communities to receive multiple Small Community Air Service Development Program grants for the same project was included in the legislation before us today. This will help make it easier to expand sorely needed air service for rural communities.

The bill also includes language providing small airports with more flexibility to use AIP funding for terminal improvements, which will be crucial for enabling rural airports to expand access as construction costs continue to rise.

On another topic, the legislation before us today includes my bipartisan Increasing Competitiveness for American Drones Act with Senator WARNER, which will streamline the approval process for beyond visual line of sight drone flights and clear the way for drones to be used for commercial transport of goods across the country. The wider deployment of drones has potential to transform the economy with innovative opportunities for transportation and agriculture that would benefit rural States like South Dakota.

And my bill will help ensure that the United States remains competitive in a growing industry increasingly dominated by countries like China.

I am also pleased that legislation I cosponsored with Senator DUCKWORTH to help improve the flying experience for individuals who use mobility aids was included in the final legislation that we are considering.

No bill is perfect, but I believe that the legislation before us today will make real progress toward a safer and more reliable aviation system and an improved flying experience for the American public.

I am grateful to all those who contributed to getting this bill to the floor today. As a former chairman of the Commerce Committee, I know how much work goes into the process of drafting and moving an FAA reauthorization bill, and I want to thank the chair and ranking member and all of their staff.

I particularly want to thank Ranking Member TED CRUZ for his tireless efforts, both in getting this bill to the finish line and ensuring that we ended up with a strong piece of legislation. His work to ensure that we have strong staffing mandates for air traffic controllers, as well as his efforts to reduce backlogs and improve the FAA's efficiency, deserves particular recognition.

I also want to thank Senators MORAN and DUCKWORTH for their leadership at the Subcommittee on Aviation Safety, Operations, and Innovation.

As I said, final passage of the FAA Reauthorization Act has been a long time coming, but the day is finally here. I look forward to seeing this bill enacted into law in the very near future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I come to the Senate floor to talk about my ongoing Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives oversight regarding the intentional misclassification of law enforcement positions—all of this costing the taxpayers tens of millions and dollars.

As my colleagues know, I have done a lot of ATF oversight work, dating back more than a decade. The Obama-Biden administration coverup in ''Fast and Furious'' is just one example. But, today, we don't need to go back to 2011. Today, we will start in January 2018.

According to emails provided to me by ATF whistleblowers, ATF leadership was notified in January 2018 that some non-law enforcement positions were misclassified as law enforcement. That misclassification cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars because law enforcement gets paid more than non-law enforcement positions.

Specifically, in these ATF emails from January and June of 2018, whistleblowers alerted ATF officials that positions in the human resources division were misclassified. The positions were classified as law enforcement, but they performed no law enforcement duties. This is an example that I keep telling my colleagues we need to pay more attention to, information that comes from these patriotic people we call whistleblowers.

Accordingly, these positions were misclassified in violation of law. That is what oversight by Congress is all about: to make sure that the executive branch faithfully executes the laws according to the Constitution.

Emails from July 2019 show that whistleblowers contacted the Justice Management Division at the Department of Justice headquarters about these very problems. The whistleblowers informed the Justice Management Division that they notified ATF management of the misclassified positions and that ATF hadn't corrected this illegal conduct. Based on what whistleblowers have told my office, the Justice Department didn't even bother to get back to the whistleblowers.

Then, in July 2019, one whistleblower reported the matter to the Office of Special Counsel, and the other whistleblowers made their report to that same office April of 2020.

After the second whistleblower reported ATF's misconduct to the Office of Special Counsel, that office opened the claim for investigation in May of 2020.

On June 9, 2020, the Office of Special Counsel determined there was a substantial likelihood both whistleblowers' allegations disclosed violations of law, of rule, or regulation; a gross waste of funds; and gross mismanagement—once again, emphasizing tens of millions of dollars wasted here. The Office of Special Counsel referred the matter to the Attorney General for investigation.

Then, on November 2, 2020, the Office of Personnel Management partially suspended ATF's position classification authority. That office did so after preliminary findings from their investigation revealed that certain ATF non-law enforcement positions were misclassified in violation of statute and regulations.

On March 1, 2021, the Office of Personnel Management issued their final report substantiating the whistleblowers' claims and found that ''ATF leadership had acted outside of merit system principles and demonstrated disregard for the rule of law and regulations.''

This illegal scheme came to light because of brave whistleblowers. The

ATF whistleblowers, we now know, were right. All those government bureaucrats should have listened to the whistleblowers from the beginning. Instead, ATF rudely ignored their evidence and, obviously, ignored whistleblowers doing what they thought was right for our country.

I wrote Attorney General Garland and then-Acting ATF Director Richardson concerning these findings on October 6, 2021. I asked for copies of the final Office of Personnel Management report and an accounting of how much taxpayer dollars were wasted due to ATF's illegal misconduct. I also asked how long ATF unlawfully misclassified positions and the total number of misclassified positions within all of the ATF.

On December 15, 2021, the Justice Department responded that it couldn't provide answers because of various ongoing investigations. How tired I am of hearing from our law enforcement Agencies in the Federal Government that they can't comment to oversight investigations by Congress because of ''ongoing investigations.'' It is an excuse to avoid what they promise us every time they come before Congress: that they will answer our questions.

Going on now to April 7—6 months later—in 2022, the Justice Department provided me with a redacted copy of their investigative report, which they submitted to the Office of Special Counsel on March 29 of 2022. But they still failed to fully answer all of my questions.

Let me remind the executive branch yet again: The U.S. Congress maintains independent constitutional authority to investigate the Federal Government, irrespective of any ongoing investigation.

After the conclusion of the investigations, which was May 2, 2023, the Office of Special Counsel notified President Biden that ''whistleblowers' allegations were wholly substantiated.''

That investigation found ''substantial waste, mismanagement, unlawful employment practices at the ATF.'' It also found ''for years, the agency intentionally misclassified jobs as law enforcement and paid those employees benefits to which they were not entitled.'' The Office of Special Counsel also found that ATF's illegal scheme wasted at least 20 million taxpayer dollars.

When is the government going to learn that it needs to listen to whistleblowers instead of treating these patriotic whistleblowers like skunks at a picnic? ATF could have saved the taxpayers at least $20 million if they would have listened to these brave whistleblowers.

Then, on November 6, 2023, the Office of Personnel Management wrote to ATF and the Justice Department. Incredibly, if you can believe this, that letter restored ATF's position classification authority effective immediately even though ATF was unable to provide the necessary evidence to support that its updated position classifications were proper and within the law. This restoration doesn't bring this matter to a close.

On January 30 this year, my colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST, and I wrote to the Justice Department and to the ATF. In that letter, we noted that ATF Internal Affairs Division had been investigating the illegal scheme. We asked for answers and for findings relating to that investigation. Those government employees who were notified of the illegal misconduct and did nothing to investigate or stop it must be held accountable because in this town, if heads don't roll, nothing changes. And that applies the same, of course, to those who participated in that scheme of misclassification.

No one is above the law. But as of right now because of ATF's failure to give any update on the internal investigation, all Congress knows is that nobody has been held accountable.

It is very clearly hypocritical of the Biden administration's ATF to revoke the licenses of firearm sellers for innocent clerical errors but at the same time refuses to hold its own employees accountable for an illegal misclassification scheme.

Finally, in our January 2024 letter, we also noted that whistleblowers alleged to us that the ATF had been illegally misclassifying positions for more than the 5-year period reviewed by the Office of Personnel Management. The Office of Special Counsel noted in their letter to President Biden that the evidence suggests that ATF engaged in this illegal activity since at least 2003–2004.

The whistleblowers also alleged to us that hundreds of employees across all ATF field divisions and offices occupied positions that were identified as ''misclassified.'' Accordingly, if true, the cost to taxpayers for these misclassifications is likely significantly higher than $20 million. And if true, the review done by the Office of Personnel Management was really, really narrow.

Clearly, the Justice Department and the ATF have a lot of explaining to do. The taxpayers deserve to know how much of their money ATF wasted. The taxpayers deserve to know who was held accountable and how they were held accountable. And if nobody was held accountable, why not?

The entire matter is an example of the important role whistleblowers play in shining light on government waste, fraud, and abuse. Without the continued persistence of these brave whistleblowers to report wrongdoing that they know about and maybe the people in the head of the departments don't know about, ATF's illegal misclassification scheme, substantial waste of taxpayers' funds, and gross mismanagement would have likely continued.

I commend the grit of these whistleblowers. Senator ERNST's and my oversight on this issue will continue.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

TRANSGENDER ATHLETICS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today are two of my valuable colleagues from my office, Ms. Maddy Dibble and Mr. Christian Amy, and I am glad to have them today and thank them for their good work.

From afar, being an NFL football player looks like a lot of fun, but if you have ever been down on the field when those guys are playing, it is brutal. I mean, it is brutal.

Some NFL linemen weigh over 300 pounds, and it is all muscle. A lot of NFL quarterbacks, they are pretty big themselves, but they are not 300 pounds. They probably miss their high school days when they only had a chubby 16-year-old lineman trying to tackle them under those Friday night lights.

We have a player on the New Orleans Saints that we are all proud of in Louisiana, Mr. Cam Jordan. I will bet even Mr. Jordan, who is a starting defensive end for the Saints, one of the best in the NFL, has days when he wishes his competitors were only half as big as the ones he faces every Sunday and every day in practice.

But think about this, if Mr. Jordan were to announce tomorrow that he identifies as a 16-year-old and if Mr. Jordan then tried to join the football team at Zachary High School, my alma mater, no one in America would pretend that Mr. Jordan is actually a student athlete with the right to take the field along with teenage boys.

I mean, most Americans would think you are from outer space. They would be thinking, What planet did he just parachute in from?

I mean, every sane person in Louisiana and on planet Earth would understand that a 34-year-old NFL player has no place attacking kids who haven't even been to the prom yet, for God's sake.

Not only would it be unfair to allow Mr. Jordan on the Zachary High School football team, he would probably send a few kids to the hospital in the first quarter, in the first minute.

Men and women don't take the field against one another for the same reasons. It is fundamentally unfair, and women could get hurt.

Yet there are activists in our country today—I wish I didn't have to say this—and there is a President in our White House who think the laws of physics and biology don't apply to transgender athletes.

And these activists and President Biden are happy to destroy athletic opportunities for every woman in America to prove their point. These activists

and President Biden are working throughout the country—you have read about it in the media—to force biological women and girls to compete against biological men and boys.

The ACLU is one of those supporters. The ACLU, for example, says it is a ''fact'' that ''trans girls are girls.''

Now, these activists and President Biden say that it is ''a myth''—they call it a myth—that transgender female athletes have a physical advantage over biological girls.

As an aside, if that is the case, if this is a myth and not a fact, then you have to wonder why so few transgender men who are actually biological women are anxious to play on male sports teams, but I digress.

The fact is, you don't need a graduate degree in anatomy to know that these claims are specious. They just are. Both medical and the physical science and the data show that men have obvious and significant advantages over female athletes.

I mean, unless you are the reason that your parents drink, you know that. It is just a fact. That is how our Creator made us. Even before birth, baby boys begin developing different hormones and skeletal structures that help them outperform women athletically.

Testosterone exposure in the womb, before the baby is born, alters brain development in boys. This improves their motor skills, increases their aggression, two traits that benefit competitive athletes.

Boys also experience what doctors and scientists call a ''mini puberty.'' They call it a mini puberty in the womb, so that shortly after birth baby boys will gain weight faster than baby girls.

That is biology. That is not political ideology; that is biology. And that ultimately contributes to boys being taller than girls, on average, later in life.

The differences between boys and girls, as I think most of us know, explode during puberty. They explode during puberty. Girls develop hearts that are 14 percent smaller than boys. Girls develop lungs, smaller lungs, that are 12 percent smaller than men, on average.

That helps boys take in more oxygen—duh. It helps them pump blood more efficiently than girls can. That is biology, and that gives boys a clear edge in endurance sports, sports like running, cycling, swimming, rowing.

Girls, also during puberty—again, a biological fact—develop a wider pelvis, on average, and this decreases the amount of force their legs can exert when they are lifting or kicking or pedaling. That is another relative disadvantage when you compare female athletes to male athletes.

Boys develop broader shoulders. I think most of us know that. Common sense is illegal in Washington, DC, but it is not in the rest of America, and I think Americans know that. Boys develop broader shoulders to make space for more upper body muscle mass—again, a biological fact.

It is hard to think of a sport—I can't think of one—in which a higher muscle-to-fat ratio isn't helpful.

The average boy will also grow 5 inches taller than the average girl during this time. Even when women and men are the same height, men have higher levels of bone density, which helps them move more forcefully and escape more injuries in athletics—a biological fact.

Women are at a competitive physical disadvantage against men from birth, and this is especially clear at the very elite levels of athletics. Top-ranked high school boys, for example, regularly outsprint female Olympians. Many high school boys—now, we are talking the elites in high school, I wasn't one of those, but the really, fine male athletes in high school, they could run faster than female Olympians, and they are in high school.

In 2016, for example, American female sprinter Allyson Felix, Ms. Felix earned an Olympic Gold Medal in the women's 400-meter race. Ms. Felix is a wonderful athlete. A year later, after she won a gold medal, more than 285 American teenage boys logged a faster 400-meter time than Ms. Felix.

Don't take my word for it, it came from a study done at Duke University. More than 4,300 adult male athletes across America clocked faster 400-meter times than Ms. Felix, and she was an Olympian.

In many Olympic track or swimming events, the female world record holder wouldn't even qualify—wouldn't even qualify—to compete against men. In strength-based sports, such as weight lifting, men outperform elite women in the same weight class by as much as 30 percent.

Activists try to distract from biological reality by claiming that men lose their advantages over women when the men begin taking cross-sex hormones. That is not true. The differences between men and women begin in the womb, and no number, no amount of hormone treatments or surgeries can undo those.

Estrogen shots don't shrink a man's heart or his lungs, nor do they change the structure of the pelvis or the size of a skeleton, nor do they change your height.

One study revealed that men who have been taking cross-sex hormone treatments for 2 years can still run 12 percent faster and do 10 percent more pushups, on average, than women. That is just a biological fact. If you think that is misogynistic, curse our Creator, if you have the courage. It is just a biological fact.

Perhaps that is why the University of Pennsylvania swimmer—you have heard of her. When she first competed, her name was William Thomas. She was a male. She is now a transgender female, very prominent athlete. She now goes by Lia Thomas. She went from being the 554th ranked man in swimming to a top-ranked woman in the 200-yard freestyle when she was allowed to compete with biological women as a transgender female.

Now, at least in swimming, each athlete gets their own lane. A mediocre male athlete's transition into a top-tier female athlete kills the dreams, and it steals the scholarships of biological women. I will talk more about that later. But at least the female swimmers aren't usually in physical danger because everybody has got their lane. Contact sports are a whole different—a whole different—thing.

Transgender athletes have seriously injured female competitors on several occasions, as President Biden's and these activists' movement have been forced on many of our schools. In May 2023, for example, about a year ago, a high school volleyball player in North Carolina sued her State's high school athletics association after a transgender player—transgender female, born a biological male—spiked the ball in her face. Boom, hit her, right in the face. She got a concussion. She is suffering from long-term physical and mental injuries—not just physical injuries but mental injuries.

Last October, a high school senior in California suffered a season-ending concussion after a transgender—born biological male, now a transgender female—after a transgender volleyball player spiked the ball and hit this young woman in the face during a game. She couldn't play high school volleyball anymore.

This February, a girls' basketball team in Massachusetts forfeited a game. They said ''no mas''; we quit; we can't go on. They forfeited a game after a transgender athlete—biological male, transgender female—injured three female players. The other team was going to run out of players, so they had to quit, and the coaches were worried that more of their players were going to be hurt.

Now how many women and girls are going to be rushed to the hospital while activists and President Biden create safe places in which transgender athletes can hurt female athletes as a matter of course? Shouldn't we be asking that question?

Some activists say that a biological man—as I indicated, some activists may say that a biological man has the same physicality as a biological woman. Put down the ball if you believe that, but some—this is America. You are entitled to say what you want. And some say that a biological man doesn't have any advantage physically over a biological female, but that doesn't change the laws of nature. That doesn't change the laws of science. That doesn't change the laws of anatomy. The truth is that a woman's bone doesn't care that the person who snapped it identifies as a woman or a man or whatever. They just know their bone is broken.

American female athletes are not lab rats. They are not lab rats we can subject to a social experiment. They have

goals and dreams, too, and they have worked hard, too, to develop their skills, to earn scholarships, to win championships. No girl, no woman, no female in America should end up on the bench with her arm in a sling because the Biden administration wanted a biological man to feel included.

Broken bones will heal in most cases, but transgender athletes have also inflicted a different kind of pain on female athletes, a pain that is a lot harder to mend. I am thinking of the pain felt by athletes like the swimmer from the University of Florida who missed out on the chance to swim as an All American because Ms. Lia Thomas, formerly Mr. William Thomas, who ranked 554 as a man in swimming took her place and dominated the women's race. We should all worry about the swimmer from Virginia Tech who didn't get to compete in the final race of her collegiate career. That is a race she will never get back because Ms. Thomas stole her spot in the pool.

How discouraging. How discouraging it must be to dedicate your life to a goal, only to have these activists and President Biden rip them away because institutions are unwilling to accept the immutable facts of anatomy.

I reject the proposition. I do. I reject the proposition that it is OK that some young athlete is losing out—spends hours in the pool or in the gym each night—has to have her college championship taken away by a biological boy because the Biden administration says so. I reject that.

Transgender athletes are not just undermining the game for female athletes, they are also stealing opportunities for women athletes to earn scholarships to get an education. This isn't just about competitive competition; this is about getting an education. That is why we call them scholar athletes. The NCAA, for example—not exactly a model of courage, by the way. You ever seen a catfish once you catch it and bring it up on the bank? It flips and flops, and it flips and it flops. That is the NCAA. They just go with the political winds. Their attitude is: We have standards. If you don't like our standards, we have others.

The NCAA sets limits on the number of scholarships available for every sport, men and women. By definition, giving a transgender athlete a scholarship means a nontransgender girl will not get one. Duh. Yet the University of Washington recently offered the first Division I women's volleyball scholarship in the country to a biological male. It won't be the last. This is the first Division I scholarship taken away from a female athlete, but it won't be the last.

Now, that makes President Biden happy. I am happy he is happy. But that makes most fairminded Americans sad. It makes me sad.

Additionally, we have only just begun to see how much money is at stake for female athletes who could earn private sponsorships. Have you followed the career of Angel Reese, our star—former star at LSU now playing in professional basketball? Have you followed the career of Ms. Caitlin Clark? They make a lot more money from their sponsorships than they do from their salary playing their sport.

Now, regardless of how you feel about paying college athletes, it is here. Name, image, and likeness sponsorships—they are here, and they present an enormous financial opportunity to athletes. From July of 2021 to June of 2022, about a year, college athletes earned nearly $1 billion in sponsorship deals. We are talking a lot of money here.

We don't know yet how much sponsorship money female athletes can earn. We are sort of in the infancy of this. But we know for certain that they won't earn a penny if a biological male takes their spot on the team. I know that.

A lot of girls are already suffering the consequences of this reality. Chelsea Mitchell—Ms. Chelsea Mitchell—for example, she missed out on several track and field championships because the State of Connecticut forced her to compete against biological boys. She sued her State high school athletic association—good for her—because she believes she could have earned a better scholarship if she had finished first. This is what she told reporters.

> When colleges looked at me, they didn't see a winner. They saw a second or a third place. I wasn't a first place finisher, and I think that is what really hurt me.

The playing field—I have talked a lot about it—the playing field is not the only place where young women worry about facing transgender females. The locker room has become a nightmare. Ms. Riley Gaines, a female swimmer, she has been very outspoken to protect female athletics. You have probably seen her interview. She said: I felt and feel ''extreme discomfort''—her words, not mine—sharing a locker room with a nude biological man. She added:

> We were not forewarned. We were not asked for our consent. And we did not give our consent.

Ms. Gaines and more than a dozen other female athletes recently sued the NCAA—good for them—for forcing them to share a locker room with Ms. Lia Thomas, formerly Mr. William Thomas. The plaintiffs say that what the NCAA did violated their 14th Amendment right to bodily privacy, and it is hard not to believe them.

If Ms. Gaines—who is a tremendous athlete, and she is very well-educated—felt disturbed and violated by having a biological man in her locker room, think how horrifying it is for a teenage junior high school girl—a teenage junior high school girl—in her locker room after soccer or volleyball practice with a biological male.

Imagine how helpless parents feel when they can't shield their teenage daughter from naked men and boys without killing their daughter's chances to play and win the sports they love. It is the choice parents face. You can either play the sport—their daughter can either play the sport they love, or they can be forced to look at a young boy's penis in the locker room. Are you kidding me?

The discomfort that adults and President Biden are subjecting female athletes to should be enough for us to say that biological males should not be in the girl's locker room, let alone exposing their penises in front of those girls.

Only fools would ignore the reality that some—not all, now—but some men would abuse misguided gender policies for their own sexual advantage. We have already seen some horrific instances of this. You have probably read about the disturbing assault in Loudoun County, VA, sexual abuse in girls restrooms by biological males.

I will happily send you the media articles, President Biden, if your staff has not shown them to you.

Now, look, I have great empathy. I have genuine empathy for the small percentage of Americans who struggle with gender dysphoria. I do. And I hope they can somehow find peace in their lives. But I do not think that we need to sacrifice the physical safety of women. I do not think that we need to or should sacrifice women's athletic, educational, or professional opportunities just because some activists and President Biden claim that injecting biological men into women's sports is the only way to make transgender Americans feel included.

And don't let activists and President Biden try to tell you that protecting women is a controversial opinion. They are going to try. And 70 percent—70 percent—of Americans polled—you will see this every time—70 percent of Americans think only girls should compete in women's sports. In fact, many transgender Americans are part of that 70 percent. They don't believe biological men should compete in women's sports because it is going to destroy women's sports. Yet their stories by some members of the media have been co-opted by people determined to force boys onto girls teams and into their locker rooms.

Now, Louisiana has already put a stop to this. In 2022, the Louisiana State Legislature passed a bill—it is now an act—called the Fairness in Women's Sports Act. It prohibits biological boys from competing against girls in elementary or high school sports. It sailed through our State legislature. It was bipartisan. Republicans voted for it, and a whole bunch of Democrats voted for it.

It is just common sense that biological girls should take the field against biological girls and biological boys should compete only against biological boys. That is how we in Louisiana see it. We need a whole lot more of Louisiana's common sense in Washington, DC.

Congress has done a lot. I am proud of this body. Congress has done a lot to protect women's sports in the 50 years

since title IX became law. I am very proud of title IX.

I think President Biden is trying to turn it into something that we don't recognize, and I don't think he has the authority to do it. But I am very proud of the original title IX, and it would be a great disgrace to allow activists and President Biden to erase all the progress that we have made in elevating women and women athletes in order to conduct a social experiment, in order to demand inclusion.

Let me give you the bottom line. Activists and President Biden want to force young female athletes to change clothes in front of biological boys in their locker rooms. They accept the biological man's slide tackle on the football field with a smile. That is what they want women to do—just grin and bear it. And President Biden and activists want young women to hide their tears when a biological male walks away with a trophy that those women have spent their entire lives working for. And it is wrong.

Pass me the sick bucket. Pass me the sick bucket. That is what most fair-minded Americans are thinking.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITING RUSSIAN URANIUM IMPORTS ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a great win for the American people and for America's energy future. I want to start by saying something that I know Vladimir Putin is going hate to hear, and that is that Russia's choke hold on America's uranium supply is coming to an end. Putin's war machine has now lost one of its cash cows. America is finally starting to take back our nuclear energy security as well as our energy future.

Last week, this body unanimously passed legislation that I sponsored—bipartisan legislation—to ban the import of Russian uranium. It will soon become law. This victory is tremendous and transformative, and it is truly bipartisan.

I am very grateful for Senator MANCHIN, Senator RISCH, Senator LUMMIS, Senator HEINRICH, Senator COONS, and Senator MARSHALL for their critical work in helping get this bill into law. I also want to thank House Energy and Commerce Chairman CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS. Together, we all worked to make America safer as well as more prosperous.

I am especially pleased because my home State of Wyoming has world-class uranium resources.

For years, Russia has used its nuclear monopoly to flood the market with uranium. Russia's monopoly could do so only because it owned, ran, and manipulated the entire situation and had it done by the Russian Government. Putin tried to corner the global market. He used enriched uranium to enrich himself and to further his dangerous ambitions.

Russia has been undermining America's nuclear industry for decades. As a result, Putin now controls 50 percent of the world's enrichment capacity.

Today, he supplies 24 percent of America's enriched uranium. Putin's control is so vast that currently, today, the equivalent of 1 out of 20 homes in America is powered by uranium enriched by Russia. My legislation ensures that Americans will no longer count on Russia to turn on our lights.

Even worse, Putin uses the money from selling uranium to pay for his war efforts in Ukraine. For 2 years, America has unintentionally helped fund Russia's invasion of Ukraine. That is not how we stand up for democracy. America can't talk about stopping Vladimir Putin's march through Europe while also helping fund it.

When it comes to national security, actions matter more than words, and our allies want to see consistency. Banning the sale of Russian uranium in the United States shows Putin that the world is united against him.

With our legislation, Putin will lose $1 billion in revenue each and every year. By banning Russian uranium, we are striking a serious blow to Putin's war machine.

Perhaps what is most important about this legislation is what it does to boost America's energy. We are helping America become the global leader once again in nuclear energy.

I have spoken to leaders of many American nuclear utilities. What I hear constantly is that they are ready to transition away from Russian uranium. They point out that expanding our enrichment capacity here at home can be expensive. It takes time, it takes money, and it takes certainty. This legislation provides American uranium producers with the support they need. The bill also dedicates dollars for strategic investments to help jump-start America's nuclear supply chain.

Of course, we are not starting over from scratch. No, we are not. Wyoming is ready to power American reactors with Wyoming nuclear fuel. My home State of Wyoming is America's energy breadbasket. We are America's leading uranium producer. We have large uranium resources, and we will keep building upon them. We have Crook County, Campbell County, Converse County, and Sweetwater County. They are ground zero for making sure America has the uranium our Nation needs. Wyoming has the uranium to free America from dependence on Russia, and we are ready to deploy it.

I have great confidence in Wyoming's energy resources and, of course, in Wyoming's energy workers—remarkable individuals. Through their hard work, America will once again be a world leader in uranium production, conversion, and enrichment.

America's nuclear supply chain must begin with American-mined uranium and end with American-made fuel.

Russia's control of the world's nuclear fuel supply is coming to an end. It is good news for Wyoming, it is good news for America, and it is good news for the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 3935

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, every 5 years, Congress has the responsibility to fully fund the Federal Aviation Administration and National Transportation Safety Board to ensure airports across the country have the resources they need to bolster security measures and fulfill costs associated with meeting the demands of both national and global travel.

As the Cowboy State continues growing, making sure the people of Wyoming have reliable, safe, and affordable access to travel is critical to maintaining our State's economy. The FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024 stands to not only further boost our thriving tourism industry but eliminates burdensome regulations that challenge small airports across Wyoming and across the Nation.

For more than a year, I have fought to ensure that millions of Wyoming's tax dollars sent to Washington will be put to work to improve air travel across Wyoming. Wyoming is home to many small airports that serve what would otherwise be isolated parts of our State. This bill reauthorizes the Essential Air Service that supports flights for Cody and Laramie and increases funding for the program that multiple Wyoming airports use for capital projects.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Cody is the east entrance to Yellowstone National Park. It is home to the Buffalo Bill historical center, which is a world-class museum, and it is an important tourism and art destination. Laramie is the home of the University of Wyoming and many activities that improve our Nation, including efforts at carbon sequestration technologies. These are communities that need air transportation.

The bill counters Federal overreach that has threatened to burden airports by slapping them with multi-million-dollar expenses following arbitrary changes to Federal funding criteria for airport runways and taxiways or plunge essential renovations into sort of a regulatory purgatory. But thanks to critical improvements in this FAA reauthorization, not only will the Rock

Springs Airport be spared from arbitrary, new FAA requirements to pay for the upkeep of runways and taxiways, but Wyoming airports can now move forward with projects costing less than $6 million in Federal funds without being subject to unnecessary redtape.

These are the sizes of airports that we have in Wyoming, and to have these regulatory burdens and shackles taken off so these airports can improve runways and taxiways, which are essential to having an operational airport, is a true benefit of this bill.

I want to thank the full committee, and I want to thank the chair and the ranking member for understanding the importance of our small airports.

For too long, Congress has delivered FAA reauthorization bills that prioritize big aviation and overlook the needs of our rural airports, but this bill takes many of those rural airports into consideration. States like Wyoming rely on small airports to support entire regions of our State, and previous versions of this bill have reflected that misunderstanding. The bill we have in front of us fixes that misunderstanding. I am very, very pleased with how the treatment of small airports in this bill considers the needs of those small airports.

While we work to meet the needs of the Nation's largest airports, we cannot forget the smallest ones that work hard to serve rural America, and we have a responsibility to make sure this bill creates an environment where they can thrive and not just struggle to survive. My provisions included in this legislation help airports like Casper/Natrona County International address air traffic control staffing shortages and waive unrealistic rules that require EMTs to be on site at every airport when rural areas are already grappling with medical personnel shortages.

Unfortunately, these aren't the only challenges Wyoming airports face. My western colleagues and I know better than anyone how critical these small airports are, not only for serving our rural communities but also in fighting wildfires.

Wildfires continue to devastate our western habitats, and we need every tool readily available to mitigate the damage. Yet current regulatory hurdles dramatically slow response times. Every minute wasted trying to gain access to restricted airspace results in irreparable damage to wildlife, homes, and may even cost lives. My provision to this legislation eliminates costly hurdles to fighting wildfires, and establishes a reimbursement program for airport sponsors to replace firefighting agents and equipment that meet military specifications.

This legislation is a win for the State of Wyoming that will offer much needed support for our small airports and bolster our economy. Together, we have created a bipartisan and workable reauthorization that improves access to our Nation's Capital for all Americans, eliminates onerous regulations, and creates an environment where smaller airports can do more than just survive.

I want to thank the members of the Commerce Committee, including the Presiding Officer. I want to thank Chair CANTWELL and Ranking Member CRUZ, who worked together to create a bipartisan work product of which the committee can be proud, and they have prepared this FAA reauthorization for bipartisan passage.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. ROSEN).

SECURING GROWTH AND ROBUST LEADERSHIP IN AMERICAN AVIATION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I rise today to ask this body for unanimous consent to call up and make pending our amendment to add the Credit Card Competition Act to the substitute amendment for the FAA reauthorization bill.

Kansans elected me to fight for them in Washington, to give them a voice at the highest levels of government. I humbly took this job and that responsibility seriously. For that reason, I stand here today to say that I will not fall in line and cower to the standard operating procedures up here that puts U.S. Senators in the backseat and blocks us from bringing our priorities—the priorities of the people—to the floor.

Kansans want their voices to be heard and not sidelined by DC lobbyists and special interest groups who are blocking and tackling our priorities behind the scenes. Every Senator in this Chamber should have the right to hear and vote on their amendments. Many of my colleagues and I welcome this debate. It is healthy. Let's have the debates. Let's take the hard votes. What is the harm? I ask everybody: What is the harm of these discussions of these debates and then letting the cards fall as they may with each vote? Each Senator deserves the opportunity to bring their amendments to the floor and make their case.

Back home, I crisscross Kansas, meeting with small businesses and owners across the State. And at every meeting, they look me in the eyes and they say they need some type of relief. The price of business is simply too high and unfair. Outrageous swipe fees from Wall Street and the Visa-Mastercard duopoly are pulling the rug out from under them, making it unaffordable to do business. Americans pay seven times more than our friends in the European Union do for the same swipe fee, four times more than our friends in Canada.

So we took these concerns to Washington, and we got to work. But I never could have imagined the uphill battle we would face up here to do the right thing, for doing what is best for hard-working Americans who are living paycheck to paycheck.

As a physician, once we diagnose a problem, we think the treatment should be quick. Our patients demand that quick turnaround. Once we figure out what is wrong: ''Here is the solution. Let's do it.'' I don't want our patients to wait any more longer than they have to.

But in Washington, I have learned and realized that, too often, we see the problem, but we sit on the solutions if they are not popular with the people who cut the biggest checks up here. For too long, the Visa-Mastercard duopolies use money and influence in Washington to turn politicians' eyes away from predatory swipe fees. Right now the Visa-Mastercard duopoly and four mega banks are robbing our American small businesses at the highest rate in the world with credit card swipe fees totaling over 90 billion—that is 90 with a ''b,'' billion—dollars each year.

These swipe fees are inflation multipliers on businesses and the consumers. Often, credit card swipe fees are one of business's highest costs, often topping utilities, rent, or even the employees' healthcare costs.

Mom-and-pop shops across Kansas, hotels across Kansas, franchise owners across Kansas, consumers are all asking for relief to be able to sell their goods at a lower price and hire more employees, which I know this Chamber all agrees with is a good thing. If only they could get Wall Street out of the way of Main Street's success.

The National Federation of Independent Businesses, the voice of small businesses, said 92 percent of their members are asking for this—92 percent. So 92 percent of small businesses are telling Congress how we can help them, yet this body refuses to vote on it. It is not going to cost taxpayers a dime. And 92 percent of businesses want this.

It has been 2 long years since Senator DURBIN and I introduced this bill—2 years of fighting, asking, begging for a vote. For 2 years, we have gotten nothing but excuses and empty promises and assurances. We begged for committee hearings, with no results. Crickets. Why are they so afraid to have a committee hearing up here even on this? It is because they are afraid of the truth. We jumped through every hoop asked of us by leadership to try to advance this legislation for a vote. Enough posturing.

Kansan legend and Statesman Bob Dole once said.

Leaders stand ready to make the hard decisions and to live with the consequences. They don't pass it off to somebody else.

I know this won't be popular for beltway insiders and Wall Street lobbyists, but it is good for small businesses. It is good for hard-working Americans.

I made my decision. I am sticking with Main Street every single time. I am sticking with hard-working Americans who take their lunch pail to work.

Madam President, I will close today with a reminder to this Chamber: I will not stop fighting until we get this vote.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I will object—I thank my colleague from Kansas for his comments, but we are on the FAA bill.

The FAA and the National Transportation Safety Board need reauthorization by this Friday. So the leadership, both the House and Senate, have decided to best move forward to meet that deadline—the best thing we can do is to keep the subject of this debate to germane amendments. We have all four corners, not one person, not one individual, but all four leadership teams saying we need to get this bill done, and we will consider amendments that are germane to this subject.

I hope my colleagues will turn down my colleague from Kansas' request and move forward with an FAA bill so we can get this done to make sure that we are implementing the most important safety standards possible today—more air traffic controllers, more near-runway-miss technology, 25-hour cockpit recording—and make sure that we are giving consumers the refunds they deserve.

Madam President, therefore, I object to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I move to table the Motion to Commit, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 85, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Ernst	Lee	Sullivan
Hawley	Marshall	Vance

NAYS—85

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Barrasso	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hagerty	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Romney
Booker	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Budd	Kaine	Schatz
Butler	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Lankford	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Lummis	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Thune
Coons	Markey	Tillis
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Cruz	Mullin	Welch
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wicker
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Fetterman	Ossoff	Young
Fischer	Padilla	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Braun	Sinema	Tuberville

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Virginia.

H.R. 3935

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today, certain that, by now, some of the desk staff have memorized the speech I am about to give because it is the third time that I will have given it in the last few weeks on a topic that is really important to Virginia—the FAA reauthorization bill that is now pending before the body.

I want to thank Chairwoman CANTWELL, Ranking Member CRUZ, and the members of the Commerce Committee because, as a general matter, this is a necessary bill with a lot of good provisions in it—in particular, the work on air traffic control recruitment and training and pilot training hours.

I feel very, very good about that work that has been done. But the gist of this bill is to promote air safety, and there is one provision in the bill that is dramatically contrary to the thrust of this bill. It will not increase air safety. It will reduce air safety, and it will reduce air safety in the Capital of the United States—at Reagan National Airport, otherwise known as DCA.

I am going to summarize quickly the arguments I made in the last couple of weeks, but then I want to respond to at least three questions that folks who take a position opposite to me have raised and use some data to demonstrate that those questions, though honestly raised, have answers, and the answers actually verify and uphold the position that I and my Maryland and Virginia colleagues take: that we should not be jamming more flights onto the busiest runway in the United States.

Reagan National Airport, DCA, was built a long time ago. It is a postage stamp; it is 860 acres. By order of comparison, Dulles Airport is about 12,000 acres; Dallas-Fort Worth is about 19,000 acres; and Denver is 32,000 acres.

When Reagan National was built, it was a little bit the trend to build these smaller airports near downtowns because the airplanes were smaller, they were props with fewer passengers, they were lighter, and they didn't need as much runway space to take off or land.

When Reagan National was built on these 860 acres—and if you have been there, you know that it is 860 that can't be expanded because it is surrounded on three sides by water and on the other side by the George Washington Parkway; there is no way to expand this—it was built with three runways: a primary runway and two commuter runways.

The estimate was, in the 1960s, that Reagan National, with these three runways, could accommodate 15 million passengers a year—15 million passengers a year. Well, where are we today, circa 2024? Reagan National has now 25½ million passengers a year—25½ million passengers—an additional two-thirds over what it was built for on a landlocked footprint, with three runways.

There have been a couple other important changes at Reagan National. The idea was to spread the 15 million passengers over three runways, but that was when the planes were smaller and they were props. Now they are jets, and they can't land on the shorter runways. So today at Reagan National, 90 percent of the traffic into Reagan National has to use the main runway.

Think about this: If it was 15 million equally divided, then each runway would bring about 5 million passengers a year. Now the main runway doesn't have 5 million, it was 22½ million passengers a year, with only about 2½ to 3 million on the other two runways.

There has been another major change since this projection of 15 million a year was made, and that is 9/11. In the aftermath of 9/11, we imposed dramatically more stringent security requirements on the air patterns over Reagan National to make it much harder to get into a landing zone to land or to take off.

So what does that mean? Built for 15½ million on a landlocked spot, now at 25 million—what does it mean? Well, it means that the main runway at Reagan National is now the single busiest runway in the United States. Reagan National, because it is small, is not the busiest airport in the United States. It is only 19th in terms of total passengers in and out. But that main runway, with 90 percent of the traffic, is the busiest runway in the United States.

What does that mean? What does it mean to have one primary runway with 90 percent of the traffic that is the busiest in the United States? Well, it is pretty easy to predict. It means very

significant congestion. Let me give some stats about that.

Reagan, as the 19th busiest airport in the United States, has the 8th most daily delays. You calculate daily delay by the percentages of incoming and outgoing that are delayed and multiply it by the average delay. More than 20 percent of flights into and out of Reagan National are delayed. They are not delayed by a little. There are some airports that have worse on-time records, but the delay is a little bit of a delay. The average delay of flights in and out of Reagan National, once delayed, is 67 minutes already. That accounts to over 11,000 minutes of delay every day.

What does delay mean? Delay means, OK, you are late arrival or you are late taking off. But if you are taking off, you might be trying to make a connecting flight. It also means you take off late, and you are likely to miss your connecting flight. If you are coming in late and the plane is supposed to leave to take some people out and go somewhere else, the delay cascades down, and it affects the entire system.

Delay isn't the only measure of this airport's congestion; the second one is the number of canceled flights. Some airports have cancellations—I mean, maybe in Madison when the weather is not so great or Anchorage or the Windy City or Minneapolis. DCA has the third worst cancellation rate among these airports. And it is not because of weather. The weather here in DC may not be great, but it is not catastrophic either. The delay is a function of congestion.

Here is another measure: Planes that are landing, that upon landing have to get rerouted into a looping pattern—DCA is the third worst in that. Why does that matter? Well, first, it creates delay, but second, if you are looping planes through a constricted airspace as planes are taking off and landing every minute, you are increasing the risk of accident.

By all these measures—delay, average daily delay, cancellations, looping patterns—this airport, built for 15 million and now at 25 million, has serious problems already before you add any more flights to it.

The problems are more than just delay; the problems are also safety. I mean, we are all experienced folks, and we know that on roads, the more congested the road, the more likely an accident. Roads that are lightly traveled are less likely to have accidents. Roads that are more heavily traveled are more likely to have accidents.

I talked about this before I had a chance to play the air traffic control tape for colleagues of mine. I can't do that on the floor of the Senate. But about 2 weeks ago, there was a plane maneuvering on the main runway to take off and another plane trying to maneuver to one of the smaller runways to take off, and they almost collided. The frantic voice of the air traffic controller can be heard shouting ''Stop! Stop!'' These planes ended up stopping within 300 feet of each other, inside 100 yards of each other, at this super-busy airport.

Thank God a collision and a catastrophe were averted, but more and more planes on this busiest runway in the United States is just going to increase the chance of a significant incident. Don't take my word for it. Even though as Senators I know we like to think we are experts about everything, there are experts on this—the Federal Aviation Administration and the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. What does the FAA say about this? They point out—all the statistics I have just given you come from the FAA.

There is a Senate proposal before us that would add 10 flights into Reagan National. That is called five slots. Each slot is a flight in and a flight out—a total of 10 more flights a day.

What does the FAA say about it? They have given the committee and they have given the Senators from the region the same set of data, and what they say is that you can't even add one flight in without increasing delay, which is already significant, but if you add 10—5 slots—the delay will increase by 751 minutes a day.

There are already more than 11,000 minutes of delay a day. If you take the flights that are delayed and you multiply it by the minutes that they are delayed, adding 5 slots—10 flights—will add to that 751 additional minutes of delay; 751 minutes that make people late, that jeopardize their ability to get a connection, that cause cascading delays in the other airports, which are going to maybe be the recipients of planes taking off later from Reagan National.

That is what the FAA, charged with the safe and efficient operation of American airspace, is telling the U.S. Senate.

The Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority—Congress created it in the late 1980s. Congress appoints its Board and charges it with the operation not only of Reagan National but also Dulles Airport. What does the MWAA say? MWAA says: Stop. Stop. Don't add any more flights because the delay is already unacceptable, and if you jam more flights onto the busiest runway in the United States, you raise the safety risk.

Again, we Senators like to think we know a lot. We don't know as much about efficient and safe air traffic operations as the Federal Aviation Administration. We don't know as much as the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.

So when the delay statistics already point out that this is unacceptable, when the cancellation and looping into loop statistics are dangerous, when we have had a near collision that is a flashing red warning signal right in our face before this vote, when the FAA has said you can't even put one flight in without increasing what is already unacceptable delay, and when the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority that we created, and we appoint their Board, says don't do this, why would we do this? Why would we do this?

The Senators from the region who have the most at stake stand uniform—Senators CARDIN, VAN HOLLEN, WARNER, and I—opposed to the slot increase that is in the Senate bill that is pending before us. We have an amendment that would strip those 5 slots—10 flights—out so that we don't make this worse.

Since I last appeared on the floor to talk about this last week, colleagues have come up to me with some questions. They have raised three.

Here is one: DCA is under capacity because DCA was approved for more than 1,000 flights a day in the 1960s, and there are only 890 flights in and out today, so therefore there must be more capacity at DCA.

Those who ask that question are stating a truth. DCA was approved for over 1,000 flights a day in the 1960s when most of the flights had props, not jets; when most of the craft were smaller and had fewer passengers and could take off and land on shorter runways. So, yes, in the aviation world of the 1960s, DCA was approved for over 1,000 flights, but in the aviation world of 2024, where it is jets with more passengers that take more time to land and take off, that isn't that relevant. It is not that relevant.

In fact, another change that has happened that is important, that I alluded to earlier, is we were set up for more than 1,000 in and out in the 1960s—well, 9/11 happened since then. After 9/11, thank God, we have imposed much more stringent criteria on air traffic over the DC region—the Capitol, the Pentagon, the White House, Congress—to make sure there aren't challenges in the airspace that would lead to really serious harm and risk to people on planes and people who live in the area.

So the FAA has said: You are right, we did approve a higher capacity in the 1960s, but the changes in the number and size of planes have constricted them to the one runway, and changes in the airspace have made it harder. That is why even though we are not at the capacity that was established in the 1960s, you can't even put one more flight—one more flight—into DCA without expanding delay.

So that is the first argument. Yes, the 1960s was different, and 2024 is a completely different kettle of fish. You shouldn't be jamming flights onto this runway.

The second thing I have heard said is, well, DCA actually has pretty good on-time percentage—not bad delay, good on-time percentage.

It is true, if you just look at the percentage of planes that land or take off on time, DCA is better than some airports. Now, it is kind of sad to say that 20-plus percent of our flights are delayed in and out, and that is better

than some others. But here is what you have to know: Which airport would you feel more comfortable flying into—one with an 80-percent on-time record but where the average delay in that 20 percent was 67 percent or what if you flew into one with a worse on-time record but where the average delay was 10 minutes? Sixty-seven minutes is a hassle. Sixty-seven minutes means a missed connection. Sixty-seven minutes means cascading delay throughout the system. Three minutes or ten minutes doesn't.

So just looking at the on-time percentage doesn't give you the full picture of this airport, and that is why the FAA measures delay not in on-time percentage but in total daily delay. Based on that measure, DCA is not a high performer. It is already a poor performer, and we shouldn't add to it.

The last thing I will say, and then I will yield to other colleagues who wish to speak, is that some have said: Oh, this is just a fight between some airlines. You know, United likes it one way. Delta likes it another way. Maybe some other airlines aren't expressing their position.

Who cares about them? Who cares about the airlines? We ought to care about safety. We ought to care about passengers. We ought to care about the 25½ million people who are using this DCA airport on an annual basis, and we ought to weigh that 25½ million a lot heavier than a couple of dozen people in the Senate who would like to have more convenience on flights at DCA.

And this is ultimately about the Senate, because, as I have said to my colleagues, the House took up the same issue in the FAA reauthorization bill, and in the committee, they chose not to jam more flights into DCA. Then, when the bill was on the floor, someone tried to make the amendment that is the same amendment that is before us today: Hey, why not add 5 flights, 10 flights?

And the House rejected this. So this is not a battle with the House. The House has accepted the advocacy of the FAA and MWAA and the regional delegation. They paid heed to the potential impacts on delays and cancellations and even potential collisions, and they said: We are not going to run this risk. The last thing we want is for there to be something bad happen out at that airport, and people stick a mic in our face and say: You knew all this, and you were warned. But you voted for it anyway?

So the House rejected this, and what Senator WARNER and I and Senators VAN HOLLEN and CARDIN, the four Senators from the region affected by this bill—affected very dramatically by the bill—are asking is, we hope our Senate colleagues will too.

We want to support this FAA bill. It has a lot of good in it. But when it comes to jamming more flights on the busiest runway in the United States, we are saying exactly what this air traffic controller said, narrowly avoiding a collision: Stop! Stop! For God's sake, stop!

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I return from a weekend at home. And last week, on the floor, I spoke about the same topic, and I rise today to again discuss the legislation that is now pending before the U.S. Senate, a long-term, 5-year reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration.

I appreciated the opportunity to work with you and others on the Commerce Committee as we worked our way through this process. I think we have been at this about 14 months, and the time is for us to bring this to a conclusion.

A long-term reauthorization must be a priority. It should be a priority as it was in our subcommittee, and, certainly, it should be a priority of this Senate.

I am disappointed to learn, just a few moments ago, that it appears that the House of Representatives is set to vote on a 1-week extension. I hope that we do not utilize that development in the Senate to delay our consideration and passage of the legislation. Perhaps, that is the way for the House next week to finish the work, but as we often do here when there is extra time, we take every moment and much more than what is really available. After 14 months of negotiations, the most recent extension expires Friday of this week, May 10. It is time to come together and pass a long-term FAA reauthorization.

I am the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee, where I worked closely with Chairs CANTWELL and DUCKWORTH and Ranking Member CRUZ to balance the priorities of the FAA, the aviation community, its academia partners, and the flying public in a bill that demonstrates Congress's commitment to aviation safety and excellence.

This legislation strengthens the standards for air safety, bolsters the aviation workforce, modernizes American airports in urban and rural settings, promotes innovation in American aviation, and enhances consumers' air travel experience.

My home State of Kansas is steeped in aviation history and will continue to contribute to the greater industry as a result of the passage of this legislation.

The FAA reauthorization safeguards the Essential Air Service Program, ensuring that rural communities and small airports are connected to the national airspace system, increasing business and tourism and access to educational opportunities and employment throughout the country—invaluable to States like mine, States like Kansas.

This allows small airports in rural communities to continue to have regional air service. Previous FAA reauthorization bills created the Aviation Workforce Development Grant Program, aimed at strengthening the pool of pilots and aviation maintenance workers. The text of agreement expands this highly competitive grant program to grow the aviation workforce and is broadened to open eligibility for aircraft manufacturing workers. Whether you are an airline looking for a pilot or an airplane manufacturer looking for a worker, there is great demand in our country for those who have those technical capabilities, that engineering experience, and those who love the joy of flying.

Bolstering this grant program means increased competitiveness, which only drives innovation and will create more opportunities and economic development for our State and my colleagues' States. Every place you go, people are looking for workers. In America, we are known as the place in which aviation is king. Aerospace is a driving force in our country. A workforce is critical to its future.

Similarly, this bill encourages research on how best to introduce emerging aviation technologies in the airspace, including electric propulsion and hypersonic aircraft. As the ''Air Capital of the World,'' Kansas is the leader in new aviation research, development, and technologies. These are significant components of our educational system in our community colleges, technical colleges, and our universities. This legislation also provides a unique opportunity, not only to address current demands of the industry, current technical needs, but also to address the future ones.

The FAA oversees the world's busiest and most complex airspace system in the world, managing approximately 50,000 flights and 3 million passengers every day. In order to address shortcomings in air safety and modernization, Congress must do its job and pass a reauthorization bill that is tailored to the needs of the aviation community and the flying public. Recent incidents and near misses have made clear the urgency of this responsibility. No matter what else we do, we need to make certain that flying is as safe as it possibly can be.

This bill also makes considerable investment in modernization of the National Airspace System and FAA's systems for oversight.

As air traffic increases and new manned and unmanned aviation technologies are deployed, this bill provides essential updates to the FAA and to the NTSB's regulatory mandate. This bill addresses the need for additional numbers of air traffic controllers.

With an eye toward the future of aviation, this bill invests extensively in research and development around advanced materials, including at Wichita State University, innovative fuel research, and emergent aviation technologies.

The bill equips the FAA to meet its mission, to provide a safe and efficient operating environment for civil and commercial aviation in the United States.

Beyond innovative safety and workforce solutions, the bill provides the aviation industry, academia, and regulatory Agencies with the resources needed to maintain and extend America's leadership in aviation.

The path to a long-term FAA reauthorization has not been easy; nor has it been a short one. But this critical legislation can no longer take a backseat. Delaying this important legislation any further only exacerbates the challenges that the American civil and commercial aviation industries face and essentially condones bad behavior and lack of incentive by Congress.

Madam President, I hope that we do not use—if the House does pass a short-term extension, I hope we do not use it as an excuse to not proceed further today, tomorrow, and Friday to complete our work.

It is time we come together. It is time we get this bill done. It is past time for us to come together and get this bill done. The flying public and our aviation industry partners want it and our country and our citizens deserve it and need it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am back with my trusty battered ''Time to Wake Up'' chart here to talk about the climate warnings that now predict climate-related damage in the trillions of dollars—trillions of dollars.

A full third of our national debt already comes from economic shocks like COVID and the 2008 mortgage meltdown. I have been using the Budget Committee to spotlight warnings that the next big economic shock will be caused by climate change. Climate change is not just about polar bears or green jobs. It is about economic storm warnings to which we had better start paying attention. Today, I will talk about three.

The most recent comes from the Potsdam Institute.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report summary printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Nature, volume 628, pages 551–557 (2024)]

THE ECONOMIC COMMITMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE

(By Maximilian Kotz, Anders Levermann & Leonie Wenz)

ABSTRACT

Global projections of macroeconomic climate-change damages typically consider impacts from average annual and national temperatures over long time horizons. Here we use recent empirical findings from more than 1,600 regions worldwide over the past 40 years to project sub-national damages from temperature and precipitation, including daily variability and extremes. Using an empirical approach that provides a robust lower bound on the persistence of impacts on economic growth, we find that the world economy is committed to an income reduction of 19% within the next 26 years independent of future emission choices (relative to a baseline without climate impacts, likely range of 11–29% accounting for physical climate and empirical uncertainty). These damages already outweigh the mitigation costs required to limit global warming to 2°C by sixfold over this near-term time frame and thereafter diverge strongly dependent on emission choices. Committed damages arise predominantly through changes in average temperature, but accounting for further climatic components raises estimates by approximately 50% and leads to stronger regional heterogeneity. Committed losses are projected for all regions except those at very high latitudes, at which reductions in temperature variability bring benefits. The largest losses are committed at lower latitudes in regions with lower cumulative historical emissions and lower present-day income.

MAIN

Projections of the macroeconomic damage caused by future climate change are crucial to informing public and policy debates about adaptation, mitigation and climate justice. On the one hand, adaptation against climate impacts must be justified and planned on the basis of an understanding of their future magnitude and spatial distribution. This is also of importance in the context of climate justice, as well as to key societal actors, including governments, central banks and private businesses, which increasingly require the inclusion of climate risks in their macroeconomic forecasts to aid adaptive decision-making. On the other hand, climate mitigation policy such as the Paris Climate Agreement is often evaluated by balancing the costs of its implementation against the benefits of avoiding projected physical damages. This evaluation occurs both formally through cost-benefit analyses, as well as informally through public perception of mitigation and damage costs.

Projections of future damages meet challenges when informing these debates, in particular the human biases relating to uncertainty and remoteness that are raised by long-term perspectives. Here we aim to overcome such challenges by assessing the extent of economic damages from climate change to which the world is already committed by historical emissions and socio-economic inertia (the range of future emission scenarios that are considered socioeconomically plausible). Such a focus on the near term limits the large uncertainties about diverging future emission trajectories, the resulting long-term climate response and the validity of applying historically observed climate—economic relations over long timescales during which socio-technical conditions may change considerably. As such, this focus aims to simplify the communication and maximize the credibility of projected economic damages from future climate change.

In projecting the future economic damages from climate change, we make use of recent advances in climate econometrics that provide evidence for impacts on sub-national economic growth from numerous components of the distribution of daily temperature and precipitation. Using fixed-effects panel regression models to control for potential confounders, these studies exploit within-region variation in local temperature and precipitation in a panel of more than 1,600 regions worldwide, comprising climate and income data over the past 40 years, to identify the plausibly causal effects of changes in several climate variables on economic productivity. Specifically, macroeconomic impacts have been identified from changing daily temperature variability, total annual precipitation, the annual number of wet days and extreme daily rainfall that occur in addition to those already identified from changing average temperature. Moreover, regional heterogeneity in these effects based on the prevailing local climatic conditions has been found using interactions terms. The selection of these climate variables follows micro-level evidence for mechanisms related to the impacts of average temperatures on labour and agricultural productivity, of temperature variability on agricultural productivity and health, as well as of precipitation on agricultural productivity, labour outcomes and flood damages (see Extended Data Table 1 for an overview, including more detailed references). References contain a more detailed motivation for the use of these particular climate variables and provide extensive empirical tests about the robustness and nature of their effects on economic output, which are summarized in Methods. By accounting for these extra climatic variables at the sub-national level, we aim for a more comprehensive description of climate impacts with greater detail across both time and space.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The institute warns that ''global annual damages are estimated to be at 38 trillion dollars, with a likely range of 19–59 trillion dollars in 2050.'' Thirty-eight trillion dollars is the midpoint in a range that could go as high as $59 trillion. That is pretty bad.

But it gets worse. This is not a complete accounting of the expected damages. It does not fully account for damage from weather extremes, things like storm and wildfire damage.

To quote the Potsdam report about its damage predictions, ''accounting for other weather extremes such as storms or wildfires could further raise'' these predictions.

And even that is not the end of it. It gets worse still. The Potsdam economic estimates leave out damages that are hard to monetize but, nonetheless, can be very real to real people. Again, quoting from the report, ''that is without even considering non-economic impacts such as loss of life or biodiversity.''

If your grandfather taught you to fish in a certain place and you can't pass that on to your granddaughter because the fish aren't there or because the creek isn't there, that is a real and genuine harm, but they can't monetize it. So they don't even count it.

I am sorry to report that it gets even worse. The Potsdam global damage estimates are based on existing levels of fossil fuel pollution.

Back to the report:

These near-term damages are a result of our past emissions. We will need more adaptation efforts if we want to avoid at least some of them. And we have to cut down our emissions drastically and immediately—if not, economic losses will become even bigger in the second half of the century.

Well, with an entire industry and an entire political party, dedicated here in Congress to make sure that we do not cut down our emissions drastically or immediately, this damage estimate is virtually certain to be worse in the out years.

In sum, economic damages could be as high as $59 trillion annually in 2050,

plus whatever added damages come from storm and wildfire, plus whatever added damages come that are hard to monetize, plus whatever economic damages come from failing to reduce emissions drastically and immediately.

How do these damages hit us? Here is the report:

These damages mainly result from rising temperatures but also from changes in rainfall and temperature variability.

Those factors lead to ''income reductions . . . for the majority of regions, including North America . . . caused by the impact of climate change on . . . agricultural yields, labor productivity or infrastructure.''

The result:

Climate change will cause massive economic damages within the next 25 years in almost all countries around the world, [including] the United States.

That is report one: ''massive economic damages'' to the United States.

Let's move on to report two, the cover article from a recent issue of the Economist magazine, titled ''The Next Housing Disaster.''

From the Economist's opening paragraph:

About a tenth of the world's residential property by value is under threat from global warming—including many houses that are nowhere near the coast. From tornados battering Midwestern American suburbs to tennis-ball-size hailstones smashing the roofs of Italian villas, the severe weather brought about by greenhouse-gas emissions is shaking the foundations of the world's most important asset class.

Going on, the article says:

The potential costs . . . are enormous. By one estimate, climate change and the fight against it could wipe out 9 percent of the value of the world's housing by 2050—which amounts to $25 trillion.

We have had testimony in the Budget Committee about how this works. There is the potential direct cost of damage from wildfires or major storms. Hurricane Ian cost Florida more than $100 billion, and it was just a category 4 storm at landfall, below the maximum category 5 strength.

Some scientists believe we will actually need category 6 in the future for storms that are made even more powerful due to ever-warming seas.

There is the related risk of insurance coverage failing to pay claims after such a major disaster, leaving homeowners stranded economically in ruined homes. Then, there is the broader risk of insurance collapse, even without a single devastating storm.

How does that work? Again, from Budget Committee testimony: First, unprecedented, unpredictable wildfire or flooding risks drive up insurance costs. We are already seeing that happen.

Then, continued unpredictability and worsening risk make properties in certain areas uninsurable. We are beginning to see that. You can't get a policy for any amount of money.

Without insurance, then, it is near impossible to get a mortgage. And by the way, a 30-year mortgage doesn't look just at today's conditions; it looks out 30 years.

So a mortgage crisis follows the insurance problem. And when properties can't get a mortgage, the only buyers for the property are cash buyers. Buyer demand crashes, and your property values crash along with that.

This is how the chief economist of Freddie Mac predicted, years ago, a coastal property values crash that he said could hit the American economy as hard as the 2008 mortgage meltdown and subsequent global economic crisis: first, insurance crisis; second, mortgage crisis; third, coastal property value crisis.

And unlike the mortgage meltdown of 2008, when property values could recover and did recover from an economic shock, properties that are predictably going to be underwater physically or repeatedly burn down during the 30-year period of a mortgage, they won't recover their value. This is not a temporary market panic that crashes and then rebounds to something near normal.

In this kind of crash, the unpredictable conditions and the underlying risk that caused it just get worse—for decades, if we get serious, finally, about fossil fuel emissions, and for centuries or forever if we don't. We are playing near the edge of an economic precipice.

Back to The Economist:

The $25 trillion bill will pose problems around the world. But doing nothing today will only make tomorrow more painful.

This is what is called a systemic shock. It does not stay confined to the affected homeowners and industries.

To quote The Economist here:

The impending bill is so huge, in fact, that it will have grim implications not just for personal prosperity, but also for the financial system.

I continue here:

If the size of the risk suddenly sinks in, and borrowers and lenders alike realize the collateral underpinning so many transactions is not worth as much as they thought, a wave of repricing will reverberate through financial markets.

The punch line:

Climate change, in short, could prompt the next global property crash.

Now, The Economist article is a prediction just as to property markets.

For report three in this speech, let's go to Deloitte's research arm, which looks at broader economic trajectories: A, if we do respond effectively to climate change and, B, if we don't. The stakes are huge.

Deloitte is a corporate consulting firm; it is not a Green New Dealer. And Deloitte estimates that the global cost of doing nothing on climate will be around $180 trillion in economic damage by 2070—$178 trillion to be exact.

To quote the Deloitte report:

If we allow climate change to go unchecked, it will ravage our global economy.

Ravage our global economy.

But the Deloitte report goes on to say that if we act responsibly and enact policies that limit warming to 1.7 degrees Celsius, we can save ourselves from that ravaging and actually grow the global economy by over $40 trillion—$43 trillion to be exact.

So the swing in our economic future, based on what we do on climate, is over $220 trillion, the difference between a negative $178 trillion bad climate outcome if we keep shirking and dawdling, and a positive $43 trillion good climate outcome if we shape up. And to be clear, that $220 trillion, that is adjusted to present value.

Dialing down to the United States, the report predicts:

For the United States, the damages to 2070 are projected to reach $14.5 trillion, a lifetime loss of nearly $70,000 for each working American.

On the upside, a responsible climate path could add $885 billion in economic benefit for the United States for a swing of over $15.3 trillion, again, net present value, depending on which path we choose.

The Deloitte report warns:

[W]e have squandered the chance to decarbonize at our leisure. Given the costs associated with each tenth of a degree of temperature increase, every month of delay brings greater risks and forestalls the eventual economic gains.

They continue:

The global economy needs to execute a rapid, coordinated, and sequenced energy and industrial transition.

This is not the speech to lay out how we do that; that speech will come later, so stand by.

This speech is simply to highlight that there are now multiple damages assessments out there looking at the climate threat and assessing that threat into the tens of trillions of dollars.

There is much that we don't know, but the common level, moving into the tens of trillions ought to be a wake-up call for all of us.

There are some things that we do know. We do know that getting serious about these warnings will require breaking the filthy political hold of the fossil fuel industry on Congress.

It will require exposing and defeating fossil fuel's dark money influence and disinformation armada. And it will require learning to deal with the facts as they are, not as a deeply, ill-motivated industry would have us wrongly believe.

Wow, is it ever time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). The Senator from West Virginia.

EPA

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, well, here we go again. The Environmental Protection Agency is back with a barrage of rules and regulations to accomplish two main goals: kill coal and natural gas once and for all, and in doing so, appease the climate activists who the President feels he needs to keep happy in an election year.

So what just happened? Well, in the last 2 weeks, the Biden EPA finalized a slate of four policies as part of their

latest—and punishing—climate crusade.

The first is the Clean Power Plan 2.0 that will eliminate coal power generation and block new natural gas plants from coming online in the future.

The second is the updated Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule that is designed to put coal plants out West out of business by saddling them with unrealistic emissions requirements.

The third is the Coal Combustion Residuals Rule.

And the fourth is the Effluent Limitations Guidelines, sounds pretty technical, for coal plants which both impose unattainable requirements for disposing and discharging waste at these plants.

The ELGs will orphan millions in investments made just in the last 4 years. So our plants have readjusted to make sure they are following, and now they come back 4 years later and say, that $300 million? No good anymore; you have to spend another $340 million.

Again, this administration isn't being shy about what the desired end game is here.

These rules are meant to put coal and natural gas employees out of work. Now, let me tell you, the energy mix in this country now with coal and natural gas is 60 percent of our energy comes from the two of those combined. And the goal here is to shutter these baseload power plants once and for all.

But as I alluded to earlier, they have tried this before. We all remember when the Obama administration attempted to implement a similar, overreaching set of mandates, and the Supreme Court remembers that as well. They turned it down.

So why try again? Why get rejected by the highest Court in the land and then come back with the same playbook? Well, it, sadly, comes back to two of the overall—the same two overall goals: close down reliable American power plants, and try to prop up disappointing poll numbers.

The administration doesn't seem to care whether these regulations are struck down in the end. They are betting that by threatening the electricity sector with rule after rule, investment will be forced away from reliable, baseload power towards the energy sources of their choices, which, by the way, cannot produce the energy that is needed.

Beyond these four rules recently announced, the EPA has rolled out an electric vehicles mandate, an air rule meant to halt manufacturing projects, and a Federal plan that has already suffered legal blows in court because it dictates to States how to address their own unique environmental concerns.

Much of the regulations in the environment space—and we all want clean air and clean water—are left to the discretion of the States with oversight by the Federal.

But the EPA's broader strategy that costs hundreds of billions of dollars and purposefully violates legal constraints set by the Supreme Court is creating a massive problem that every member of the Biden administration just can't seem to see, or perhaps it is one that they choose to ignore.

All of President Biden's environmental regulations impacting everything from power plants to the kind of cars that we drive are working against each other and putting us on a path to an energy crisis.

They are driving up demand for electricity, so think electric vehicles, AI, higher manufacturing, more, more, more demand for energy, straining a grid that even the administration projects will see explosive demand in the coming years. We have seen instances where it has been too stressed, and it has had to pull back, while simultaneously cutting off the electricity supply from our baseload power needed to sustain that grid—more demand, less supply. It is kind of like a parent telling their child that they have to practice for hours and hours every day to make the high school baseball team, but in the same breath telling that same child: Well, you know what? I am going to take your bag, your bag of balls, your glove, and your bat, and I am going to put them in the garage. So good luck. So go get them.

The Biden administration and many on the left desperately need a reality check, and here it is: The inconvenient truth is that coal and natural gas are the backbone of America's current electric grid. I mentioned that earlier, 60 percent.

Many, many people know that I am a huge advocate for nuclear energy and hoping to get a bill passed to really spur the development of small modular nuclear and the advanced nuclear production because we want to see it grow to help with this baseload energy demand that we are going to see. I want energy sources of all kinds to continue playing an increased role, including renewables—wind and solar—in our energy mix, and I believe that with innovation and time, this absolutely will happen.

But, as I said, the reality is roughly 60 percent of electric generation in the United States comes from the two sources of power that the Biden administration is trying to close forever. Not only do these attacks on coal- and gas-fired powerplants make no sense, they pose serious threat to our grid reliability. That means: Is our grid going to be able to sustain the great energy appetite that we have?

And experts have sounded the alarm. Public utilities commissioners, nonpartisan grid operators from Blue States and Red States, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—better known as FERC—and the nonprofit North American Electric Reliability Corporation all shouted from the rooftops about the ways the Biden administration's proposed Clean Power Plan 2.0 and other rules would jeopardize the reliability of our electric grid. It would ''undermine reliability''; ''materially and adversely impact electric reliability''; ''potentially catastrophic reliability problems.''

These are just a few of the warning signs that we heard about when the EPA brought their plan forward.

The finalized rules announced by the EPA largely brushed aside these concerns. This is what gets me. They ask you for comments and concerns, and then they never listen to the comments or concerns. They brushed aside these concerns and pressed ahead to close down major sources of baseload power with no plan to replace it.

So let's take a step back and look at these rules and regulations from the outside. The results of the EPA's latest action means—what will happen? Americans will lose their jobs, and certainly in my State of West Virginia that will occur. American families and small businesses will pay more for their electricity at a time when Bidenomics is already causing inflation. Just go to the grocery store. Every time we go, we see it.

America's entire grid will be in jeopardy, our electric grid will be in jeopardy. And with an inexplicable ban on new natural gas exports still in place, America's allies will have to go to Russia and Iran and ask for extra help.

It is plain to see that the President's entire energy and environmental strategy actually hurts America and helps our adversaries. So as the Biden administration attempts to put the final nail in the coffin of America's baseload power sources, remember their objectives. To them, it is about accomplishing a decades-long goal of closing down coal and gas plants and hoping it is enough to get over the finish line in an election year. They have shown they have no regard for the opinions of our Supreme Court, no regard for the workers in West Virginia, and no regard for the truth about what happens when you undermine our Nation's electric grid.

The Biden administration has chosen whose side they are on: They are on the side of the climate activists over the well-being of Middle America, and they have chosen to shut the lights off for the rest of us without so much as a ''good luck.''

With that, I yield the floor to my friend from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, the Biden administration continues to fail the American people with its consistent attacks on our Nation's energy supply and production. These attacks are happening as Americans continue to suffer through the burden of record inflation caused by this administration.

Energy is the lifeblood of civilization: lighting our homes; fueling our transportation; powering innovation; and for those of us in rural America, heating our poultry houses—much like the area where you and I come from, Madam President.

Energy of all forms—from oil and gas to nuclear, to wind, to solar—not only powers our world, but it protects our world. To threaten any energy source is to threaten the vitality of our Nation and its communities. But from day one, President Biden did just that. It started with a barrage of excessive Executive orders aimed at American energy production, including the cancellation of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and only got worse from there.

Agencies under this administration have been emboldened to ram through harmful policies and rules that are driving us straight toward a cliff. The Department of the Interior continues to hold domestic energy production back by releasing a 5-year leasing plan for oil and gas production that contains the lowest amount of lease sales in history, with the option for the Secretary to cancel any one of them as she deems necessary.

The Bureau of Land Management has issued rules that weaken our domestic energy production and create additional more redtape. The Environmental Protection Agency has issued rules that weaken our domestic energy production and limit consumer choice for vehicles. The Department of Energy has issued rules that weaken our domestic energy production, limit consumer choice for natural gas appliances in our houses, and place a pause on liquefied natural gas export. It makes no sense.

Even the Securities and Exchange Commission has now decided it wants to get involved with climate policy, releasing a greenhouse gas disclosure rule that would lead to mountains of burdensome paperwork for companies and higher costs for consumers. The SCC is meant to protect investors, facilitate capital formation, and maintain markets. It has absolutely no authority to address political or social issues, much less serve as a climate change taskmaster.

If you threw a dart at a dartboard labeled with all the Biden Agencies that have a hand in targeting energy production, chances are that you will hit an Agency that has committed an overreach of its statutory authority.

The administration continues to slow-walk permitting, most recently attacking LNG facilities for climate considerations, whatever that is.

Well, is the administration aware that by continuing to ignore the law and not holding lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico, it hamstrings future GOMESA funds that would come back to the Gulf States to support critical coastal protection activities, including conservation, coastal restoration, and hurricane protection? That is right. The administration's Interior Department is jeopardizing actual climate and conservation goals for my State, and we aren't the only State sounding the alarm on these terrible policies. These policies are driving up energy costs and emboldening our enemies.

President Biden and his allies continue to paint the fossil fuel industry as the enemy, but both the Secretaries of Energy and Interior have stated that fossil fuels will be around for a long time because they are needed. Yet they continue to try and diminish its production without the necessary technology and grid capacity replacements.

Not only could we see higher energy costs under these policies, but we could see more blackouts during extreme weather events, something that has Mississippians very concerned.

The American people deserve better than failing energy policies from a tone-deaf administration and Agencies that are doing everything they can to circumvent Congress and force their radical energy agendas on this entire Nation.

Still, the hard-working people in our energy industry are not letting President Biden crush their spirits. My colleagues and I are battling back with everything we can to challenge these rulings on behalf of the American people.

With CRA resolutions of disapproval, appropriations, and committee hearings, we have the opportunities to try to hold these Agencies accountable for their continued overreach.

I will keep fighting alongside my colleagues until this ship is back on the correct course of independent energy production for the betterment of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the Biden administration's regulatory blizzard that is restricting energy development and making energy more expensive and less reliable for homes and businesses not only across my State but across the country.

According to data from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, electricity demand is expected to increase almost 5 percent over the next 5 years. At the same time, FERC Commissioners and grid operators are warning of more blackouts and brownouts because powerplants are retiring before new generation capacity can be brought online.

Simply put, energy prices are high because demand is outpacing supply, and Americans are being forced to pay higher prices at the pump and higher utility bills. Because the cost of energy is built into every good and service across the economy, higher energy prices are fueling persistent inflation.

Instead of bringing more supply online to reduce prices, the Biden administration is imposing a regulatory blizzard that seeks to curtail energy production. It starts with the EPA, which is imposing new, costly, unworkable mandates specifically designed to reduce traditional energy production.

Just 2 weeks ago, the EPA finalized four new regulations targeting the power sector, including an overly stringent, new mercury and air toxic standards, or MATS, rule, despite the EPA's own regulatory analysis stating that the existing rule is adequately protecting public health; also, the Clean Power Plan 2.0, requiring existing coal-fired and new gas-fired plants to reduce CO_2 emissions by 90 percent—90 percent—when carbon capture and storage is not yet commercially viable; and new burdensome requirements on water discharge at powerplants and costly new coal ash management requirements as well.

On top of all these burdensome regulations on the power sector, the EPA is placing onerous new methane regulations on oil and gas producers, and the EPA is implementing a new tax on natural gas.

Collectively, these EPA rules will require the power sector to spend billions of dollars to comply with these regulations or, worse, force the premature retirement of reliable coal-fired baseload plants.

Ultimately, these costs are passed along to electric ratepayers—families and businesses across the country.

To push back against this regulatory blizzard, I will be introducing a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval to overturn the MATS rule. Also, I am joining Senator CAPITO in her efforts to overturn the Clean Power Plan 2.0 rule.

All these things are driving inflation. Essentially, the Biden administration is putting handcuffs on our energy producers, and they are forcing up the price of energy. They are doing it not only with the regulatory burden that creates costs for the plants to continue to operate, but they are also putting baseload energy out of business. That puts us at risk of blackouts and brownouts across the country, and it undermines the stability of the grid. It also forces energy prices higher for every single consumer—every business and every individual. Who does that impact the most? Low-income people. So it goes right at low-income individuals.

If you live in a place like, I don't know, California, maybe Texas, it can get pretty warm, and you want those air-conditioners running. You don't want a brownout right at peak time when you need that power.

On top of the EPA's regulatory onslaught, this blizzard is continuing at the Interior Department, which manages 245 million acres of public land and 700 million acres of subsurface minerals.

Our vast taxpayer-owned energy reserves are a national strategic asset, ensuring that our Nation remains energy dominant. Why, then, is the Biden administration doing everything it can to seemingly lock away access to our taxpayer-owned energy reserves? It makes no sense.

Last month, the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management, or BLM, issued its public lands rule. This rule allows environmental groups to utilize a new conservation lease that will directly conflict with longstanding multiple-use stewardship of Federal lands, including energy development.

So the law says that on these Federal lands, they have to be for multiple use. That is energy development. That is agriculture. That is tourism. That is all of these different uses. But with these new environmental or conservation leases, that will restrict the use of that land to one use. One use is not multiple use. That absolutely violates the law.

Along with Senator BARRASSO, I will be introducing a CRA resolution of disapproval to block this rule as well.

The BLM has also finalized a new onshore oil and gas rule and a new venting and flaring rule. These are designed as well to and will drive up the cost of energy production on Federal lands. It affects small businesses. It affects consumers. It affects every single business that uses energy, which is just about all of them. It affects every consumer because we all use energy.

In North Dakota, the BLM is proposing a new—just my State alone—a draft resource management plan that would close off leasing to 45 percent of Federal oil and gas acreage. Texas produces the most oil, and then it is either North Dakota or New Mexico that produces the second most. We produce I think about 1.2 million barrels a day of oil, and we have a lot of Federal land. But this resource management plan that the BLM is putting forward would close off leasing to 45 percent of the Federal oil and gas acreage—45 percent. Half of it.

As far as coal, we provide electricity I think to as many as 12 different States with coal-fired electricity. Ninety-five percent of Federal coal acreage would be closed off under this new rule.

Furthermore, given the scattered nature of Federal minerals across North Dakota, this plan is particularly problematic because it also blocks access to State- and privately-owned energy reserves.

Think about this: The Bureau of Land Management owns the surface acres, but they don't own the minerals. So a private individual may own those minerals underneath, but because the BLM owns the surface acres, that individual can't develop his minerals for oil, gas, or coal because they are blocked by the BLM—patently unfair, absolutely unfair, and I just don't think it is going to pass legal muster.

The BLM's mismanagement of our vast energy reserves reaches to other States as well, including the blocking of new oil and gas production, for example, in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

The goal of the Biden administration's regulatory blizzard is clear. It is a ''keep it in the ground''—part of the Green New Deal—agenda no matter what the economic or geopolitical costs are.

There is a better approach, and it means taking the handcuffs off our energy producers and unleashing the full potential of our Nation's most valuable strategic asset: our abundant energy resources—oil, gas, coal, all types of energy.

Instead of this regulatory blizzard, the Biden administration needs to work with us to increase the supply of energy to bring down prices for hard-working American families.

So, at the end of the day, it is this simple: The Biden administration is handcuffing our energy producers with one onerous regulation after the next. We just put a few of them up here on these charts. It is just one after the next.

Simple terms: What does it do? It restricts and reduces the supply of domestic energy here at home. That means our cost of energy goes up. That fuels inflation. So every single consumer and every single business now pays more for energy. And who does it hit the hardest? The low-income individual. It goes right at the low-income individual.

So that is the first thing to think about. Second, we compete in a global economy, so if you use energy, that is one of the important costs for your business. If you have low-cost, dependable energy, we can compete more effectively, create higher paying jobs, more jobs, and grow our economy, but all of that is handcuffed as well by the Biden energy plan.

Then let's talk about national security. Energy security is national security. Look at what is going on in the world right now. How is Russia fueling its war machine? With sales of oil and gas. So when we don't produce here at home, that means more people have to buy from places like Russia, from OPEC, from Venezuela—including our allies in Western Europe. It makes them dependent on Russian energy instead of getting natural gas from the United States. That is a national security issue not only for us but for our allies.

It is the same thing with Iran. How does Iran fuel its war machine? With oil. How does it fund Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis? With revenues from oil and gas. When we produce oil and gas, that mitigates, reduces, hurts their ability to continue, particularly if we combine it with the right kinds of sanctions, which we should have, on Iran. It not only mitigates their ability to fuel terror, but it strengthens America, and it strengthens our allies.

The final point I want to make in this regard is, let's talk about good environmental stewardship, good conservation. Who has the best environmental standards in the world? Is it Iran? Is it Russia? Is it Venezuela? Of course not. So how could it possibly make any kind of common sense to produce less energy in America, where we have the best environmental standards, and instead forfeit it to our adversaries, like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, where they are not only our adversaries—not only our adversaries—but they have the worst environmental standards? That is an energy policy that makes absolutely no sense.

Instead of regulation after regulation after regulation and tax after tax, take the handcuffs off our energy producers. It is good for consumers, it is good for our economy, it is good for national security, and it is good for the environment to let us produce energy here in America. It is just common sense.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in opposing the Biden administration's anti-energy policies. From the EV mandate to the so-called Clean Power Plan 2.0, the Biden administration's war on American energy threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans and American families.

Let's start with the EPA's delusional and reckless electric vehicle mandate. It requires up to two-thirds of all cars and light trucks being sold in 2032 to be electric vehicles.

It is delusional because it will block low-income families from owning a car. Owning a car is a pathway out of poverty for many Americans, including many people in my State, and Biden's EV mandate will drive up the cost of those used vehicles.

It is delusional because the Biden administration has no plan for how we are going to generate the power needed to be able to charge these cars or the transmission lines needed to transmit the energy from where it is being produced to where it is going to be needed.

It is also delusional because this EV mandate will make us more dependent on the Chinese Communist Party, which controls about 60 to 80 percent of all the critical minerals that are necessary to be able to make the batteries for EVs, and they are leading us in this EV battery technology.

This is how crazy stupid this administration is: They want to mandate EVs on the one hand, but they also want to attack any project that may allow us to be able to mine the minerals that we need to be able to create the batteries for EVs.

For example, EVs can use up to four times the amount of copper that a regular car uses. At the same time, though, the Biden administration has blocked a road that would go to the Ambler Mining District in Alaska. The Ambler Mining District is one of the places where we have a lot of copper. It is a major copper deposit. We need this copper. Yet the Biden administration is blocking us from being able to get to it. It makes no sense.

Another thing that makes no sense is an EV mandate that requires dramatically increasing our energy production and transmission on the one hand, and then, on the other hand, we have the Clean Power Plan 2.0, which is going to attack our energy production. It is a classic example of ''bureaucrats gone wild.'' It forces coal- or gas-generating electric plants to reduce up to 90 percent of their carbon emissions by the year 2039.

First, the Clean Power Plan 2.0 is illegal, explicitly countering the Supreme Court's decision in West Virginia v. EPA.

Second, the rule will stifle our industry not only in Nebraska but nationwide. In Nebraska, 49 percent of our electricity comes from coal-fired plants. It is the baseload generation we have.

Nebraska, actually, ranks pretty high when it comes to renewable energy. We have over 31 percent of our electricity coming from renewable energy, but we still need that baseload.

Nebraska, in 2022, also ranked No. 3 nationwide for the most industrial electricity customers of any State. It just ranked behind Texas and California with regard to those industrial consumers of electricity.

Fossil fuel plants generate about 60 percent of U.S. electricity nationwide, and coal contributes about 16.2 percent of all the electricity in this country. Under this rule, more than 78 percent of coal-powered plants would have to retire between the years 2028 and 2040 while coal remains the primary source of electricity in 18 of our States. Currently, a quarter of the existing 200 plants are scheduled to retire within the next 5 years. We don't have enough new plants coming online to be able to replace the power that is going offline. This plan will close down the reliable and affordable fossil fuel plants, and American consumers will end up paying the price.

Again, for us in Nebraska, when you are driving up these costs, you are hurting our families and, of course, our businesses that create the jobs that allow families to be able to send their kids to school, to go on the family vacation, and so forth.

The EPA does not have the authority—the legal authority—to force a complete shift in energy production through bureaucratic fiat, but the Biden administration doesn't care, and they are going ahead with it anyway.

The Biden administration's anti-energy agenda doesn't just stop there. President Biden's imposed moratorium on new oil and gas leases is also an attack on our energy system. The administration has slow-walked these permits for new construction and has added new layers of bureaucracy that hinder job-creating energy projects.

Instead of supporting high-skilled, high-waged jobs, this administration has prioritized the interests of coastal elites and radical environmentalists. They would rather see fossil fuel plants closed and thousands of workers lose their jobs than stand up to these activists.

This appeasement of the far-left, radical, environmentalist wing of the Democratic Party is wrong. It must stop. We must reverse course. We must have some common sense. I am here today to join my colleagues in standing up for American energy, for American workers, and for our way of life.

Together, we are going to do all we can to overturn this anti-energy agenda through Congressional Review Act legislation and other means. We are going to support an ''all of the above'' energy strategy. We are going to continue to fight to make sure our workers remain employed, our communities remain prosperous, and our Nation remains energy independent.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

DISASTER RELIEF FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, disaster survivors are running out of time; disaster survivors are running out of money; and they are running out of patience. These people have been to hell and back, enduring the worst horrors of Mother Nature: wildfires, hurricanes, floods, tornadoes. They have lost loved ones. They have lost their homes. They have lost livelihoods. And after all that, after having their lives totally upended overnight, many have been stuck in limbo for months or even years waiting for help to arrive.

It hasn't always been this way. Over the years, Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has consistently stepped up to help hundreds of communities decimated by disasters, no matter the political color of the State or the size of the town or the pricetag of the cleanup. Why? Because we have recognized—correctly—that disasters do not discriminate and that helping communities recover is one of our most fundamental responsibilities in the Federal Government.

What is the Federal Government for if not to help our fellow Americans in their hour of need? What are we doing here if we can't agree that disaster relief is urgent and important and necessary for the well-being of our country?

It is not acceptable to keep survivors waiting. Congress must act. We need to pass disaster relief funding with the urgency that it demands and get survivors the assistance that they need to fully recover.

Nine months ago today, fires, fueled by 70-mile-an-hour winds, stormed the town of Lahaina on West Maui, incinerating everything in their path and leaving behind little more than ash, rubble, and smoke: 101 people died; 2,200 structures were leveled; and almost 12,000 people were immediately displaced. Just about everyone in that tight-knit community lost someone or something that day.

A few weeks after the fires, when President Biden came to Lahaina, he promised the survivors that his administration and the Federal Government would be there to help as they recovered—not just in those early weeks and months but throughout—for as long as it took; for as long as it took.

Nine months later, cleanup is still ongoing, not a single home has been rebuilt. And the infrastructure that was destroyed—the harbors, the roads, the water and sewer systems—all of it has yet to be restored.

The recovery was never going to be quick. The damage was so vast, the destruction so total and so toxic that bringing Lahaina back to anything close to normal was always going to be a multiyear endeavor. And that is the case for so many communities across the country that have been devastated by disasters.

When the President declares disaster in a community, it means a very specific thing. It not just like it is the President's whim or whether they like the place that has been hurt. It means that the community's recovery needs are so great that the State and local governments can't handle them alone. It means that the capacity of the local government has been exceeded, and the President is declaring that this place is a Federal disaster, so the Federal Government has to step in and help, which is why almost 7 months ago, the President of the United States submitted a supplemental funding request to Congress which included funding for disaster relief and specifically for the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery, or CDBG-DR, Program.

The CDBG-DR serves a simple but essential purpose. It provides survivors with the funding and flexibility to rebuild their homes, small businesses, and communities over the long term. For more than 30 years and in practically every State in the country, the program has been a lifeline for people trying to get back on their feet and economies trying to get back on their feet.

But it has been a year and a half since Congress last funded CDBG-DR, and in that time, disasters have piled up in every part of the country. Unfortunately, we know more are coming, especially with hurricane season around the corner. So for Lahaina and dozens of communities nationwide, this funding is urgent.

Rebuilding after a disaster—as a community but also as a family or an individual—is among the hardest things that anybody is ever going to go through. One moment you are going about your day—going to work, dropping off your kids at school, making dinner for your family—and the next thing you know, you are living out of a hotel, if you are lucky, not knowing where your next paycheck will come from or when or where you will have a permanent place to call home again.

The ordeal of recovery is hard; it is long; it is confusing; it is painful; and it is expensive. And, understandably, survivors look to their government for help. They have waited a long time. But time is running out, and money has run dry. Congress must act and pass disaster aid as soon as possible.

We have done full-year appropriations. We have done an international supplemental appropriations bill. We are about to finish the FAA. The next big bill that we pass has to be providing disaster relief across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Hawaii. First of all, I want to acknowledge my great appreciation for the work that the Senator and his committee have done on bringing attention to the ongoing challenge that communities that have been hammered, like your community of Lahaina and my State of Vermont, from natural disasters, and I am going to speak in support of the efforts you are making to get supplemental funding for the absolutely essential, flexible funding that goes with the block grant Disaster Relief Fund. Thank you very, very much.

You know, we are all in this together. What Senator SCHATZ said about the formality of a Federal disaster declaration—the formality is it is an acknowledgement that what happened, through no fault of anybody in Hawaii, through no fault of anybody in Vermont, is beyond the capacity of the communities in Vermont and Hawaii—beyond the capacity of Vermont and beyond the capacity of Hawaii—to handle the entire consequence of those events.

What is more important, more essential for the Senate than to acknowledge that all of us as Americans, that there but for the grace of God goes our community when a natural disaster occurs? So we have to respond.

There are two times that there is a response. One is in the immediate trauma of the event. It is all hands on deck. The community does everything it can. And there is one story after another in Lahaina; in Ludlow, VT; in Johnson, VT, of people coming together literally to save fellow citizens and neighbors and oftentimes people they don't even know. And the Federal Government comes in—President Biden was immediately responsive in Vermont, as he was in Lahaina—and our FEMA administration came in and was immediately responsive, and that really helps. It really, really makes a difference.

But do you know what? This is a photograph of the capital of Montpelier right after the flood. It is totally inundated in water. Every business on Main Street was basically destroyed, and the immediate relief efforts were about the water going down, getting the mud out, trying to find some temporary place to live, and see if you can save your business. But on that Main Street in Montpelier, our businesses are coming back, but they are not all back yet.

What I have seen is that the money that comes in right away and the help that comes in right away gives hope to folks. It gives all of the citizens in the State who are sad by what has happened to their neighbors but who, by the grace of God, avoided their own home and their own business from being flooded, it gives them and me hope that those folks are going to get some help from the Federal Government. And they did. Our roads and bridges, we are putting them back together. Some of the water treatment facilities that were destroyed, we are putting some of those back together. But the reality is, there is a long and lasting trauma and practical challenge of trying to get everybody back on their feet.

I get asked by my colleagues—and I really appreciate their concern—PETER, how is Vermont doing? I don't quite know how to answer that because on one level, Vermont is doing great. We have moved on. That flood in July, we have done the major things that have to be done. The help we got from the Federal Government was really essential in doing that. The good wishes from my colleagues, I am so grateful for.

But the other part of that is when I am asked: How is Vermont doing? The Vermonters, if it was your home, if it was your business, if it was your farm, you are not doing well. You know, it is a lot to try to put that business back together. It is a lot to look at that home and realize you may not be able to get back in.

So let me just give an example. You know, I was in Barre, VT. That is about 5 miles from Montpelier. You are seeing that here. They got flooded, much like Montpelier did. In Montpelier, most of the damage was to businesses; in Barre, most of it was the homes.

FEMA Administrator Criswell joined me and Senator SANDERS and Congresswoman BALINT on the tour of homes. I returned in March, and the folks who came to our meeting and took a tour of Barre with me were a lot of the folks whose homes had been damaged. They are still trying to find out whether they can get bought out. They are still trying to find out whether they can get back in their home.

One couple was at the home when I showed up. They weren't able to get back in. They are living in a mobile home about 50 miles from where their home is. And there is a lot of confusion about what you can do and how you can do it. Those thorny questions about what is available and how are you going to implement what is needed for that home or for that business, those really linger.

At this point, FEMA—I don't want to say they are gone because they have done what their job is. But the pain and recovery, the pain is still very present for those folks: your farm, your business, your home. And the challenges of getting through the bureaucracy are very complicated. That is what I learned with the folks in Barre who basically have a group of volunteers who have managed to stay together to try to address concerns and questions that various members of the community have.

But the thing that is absolutely vital—absolutely vital—is the flexible funding that comes from the Disaster Relief Fund.

You know, no matter how hard and how competent and how professional our FEMA folks are, the reality is they have to move on to the next disaster. That is what is happening in this country.

But the pain in that community is behind, and it is the folks in the community who really have to have the capacity and the tools and the resources to do what only can be done by folks in Barre, in Montpelier, in Johnson, in Ludlow, in Weston. And I am sure that is true in Lahaina. Of course, those are the best people to do the work. They live in that community. The most important thing to them is to restore the vitality of the community that they love.

So the disaster relief funding is the absolutely essential component to allow the full rebuilding and the recovery for the folks who lost their homes, for those farmers whose crops have been wiped out, and for those businesses that are so vital, not just to that individual business owner but to that downtown community that depends on retail downtown so neighbors can come in, shop, see one another, and have a sense of community.

If we are going to have an effective disaster relief program, yes, it starts with the Federal declaration. Our President and previous Presidents, in my experience, have been very responsive to communities that, through no fault of their own, suffered a devastating loss from a weather event or a fire, as was in the case of Lahaina. But what happens after the waters recede, after the FEMA emergency folks are gone? It is the hard work of actually rebuilding that house, repairing that business. That is left in the community, and if they don't have that disaster relief funding and the flexibility that is required to respond to the very particular challenges in that community, then we haven't completed the job. And it creates a sense of frustration and anguish and pain that we can alleviate by having a disaster relief response that starts when the event occurs—that is the disaster declaration—but continues until the job is done.

And that is where the funding for the disaster relief is so absolutely essential for us in order to maintain the commitment that I believe this Senate has to help folks who have been on the receiving end of a catastrophic loss.

I am fully in support of the supplemental appropriations request that the Senator from Hawaii is making because, in my view, he speaks for all of us. In my view, there but for the grace of God goes your community. We in Vermont, just as Senator SCHATZ in Hawaii, have always been there to support the funding for communities around this country that have suffered losses such as what happened in Hawaii and what happened in Vermont. I thank the Senator for organizing this, and I look forward to working with Senator SCHATZ and others in order to make sure we get that disaster relief funding in the supplemental appropriations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

REMEMBERING SHIREEN ABU AKLEH

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, May 11 will mark the second anniversary of the fatal shooting of a Palestinian American and accomplished Al Jazeera journalist, Shireen Abu Akleh. She was shot in the head while reporting on an Israeli raid in the Jenin refugee camp in the West Bank. At the time of her death, she was wearing a bulletproof vest with ''PRESS'' written in large letters on the front and on the back.

While there had been some earlier exchanges of gunfire between Israeli soldiers and Palestinian militants, there is no credible evidence that has been produced that the shooter acted in legitimate self-defense. No one in Shireen's immediate vicinity was armed, and no shots were fired from her location. Another journalist near her was also shot, but he survived.

Shortly after Shireen's death, Secretary of State Antony Blinken rightly called for a credible, thorough investigation and that the individuals responsible should be held accountable.

Israeli officials first denied responsibility. But when it became clear where the shots were fired from, they called Shireen's death an unintentional, tragic mistake. The shooter reportedly fired from an armored vehicle that was 190 meters away.

The inescapable conclusion is that she was intentionally targeted. The question is: Why?

My predecessor, Senator Patrick Leahy, asked detailed questions about her case, including why the Leahy law was not applied to stop U.S. assistance to the unit—the particular unit—responsible for Shireen's death. His questions were never answered. Since then, there has been no credible investigation.

I am disappointed that Israeli authorities have failed to fully cooperate with U.S. efforts to determine what happened, and nobody has been held accountable.

Shireen Abu Akleh's case has become one of many unresolved shootings in the West Bank and Gaza. Since the Hamas attack—the terrible attack on October 7—more than 140 journalists have reportedly been killed in Gaza. None of those cases have been investigated, and no one has been held accountable.

We have not and we will not forget Shireen Abu Akleh. She was an American citizen. More importantly, she was an innocent civilian doing her job, which she paid for with her life. She, her family, and her colleagues in the press deserve justice.

On May 3, World Press Freedom Day, Secretary Blinken said:

> In their pursuit of truth, journalists often face unprecedented danger worldwide. On World Press Freedom Day, we recognize their bravery, resilience, and vital role in ensuring the free flow of accurate information. Our support for journalists and an independent media is unwavering.

My hope is that Secretary Blinken uses his influence and insists on the credible, thorough investigation of the killing of Shireen Abu Akleh that he called for 2 years ago and that those responsible be brought to justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Oklahoma.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, October 7, 2023, was almost 5 years to the day after the attack on the Tree of Life synagogue—almost 5 years to the day. Anti-Semitism has been on the rise around the world and unfortunately here in America. We are seeing it on college campuses. We are seeing it in conversations online. It is not new, it is old, but it is on the rise in a way that we have not seen in a long time in the United States.

In 2019, Senator ROSEN and I launched the Senate Bipartisan Task Force for Combatting Anti-Semitism. We started that on the 1-year anniversary of the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue. Our mission was pretty simple: We wanted to create a task force to be able to collaborate with law enforcement, Federal Agencies, State and local governments, educators, advocates, clergy—any stakeholders who wanted to be able to combat anti-Semitism with education, empowerment, and bringing communities together in conversation.

Our goal was to speak out with one voice about hate, to support legislative efforts to combat anti-Semitism, to promote Holocaust education, and to bring the issue of combatting anti-Semitism to the forefront of our national conversation and, quite frankly, international.

She and I have worked together to be able to contact other nations and their Parliaments on what we have seen as anti-Semitism in other countries, to be able to reach out to Ambassadors, but to also speak out on what we see here in the United States. That has not changed.

The State Department has offered this warning:

> History has shown that wherever anti-Semitism has gone unchecked, the persecution of others has been present or not far behind. Defeating anti-Semitism must be a cause of great importance not only for Jews, but for all people who value humanity and justice.

That is our own State Department.

So now what are we going do about what we are seeing on college campuses? Interestingly enough, people see this as a new thing just in the last 7 months. This has been on the rise on college campuses for quite a while. Many of us have been ringing that bell to say that there is something happening in the national conversation on our college campuses.

So let's find ways to be able to engage on this. Senator ROSEN and I have a piece of legislation that is a compilation of multiple pieces that we have worked on for a very long time to be able to talk about anti-Semitism and to say there are specific ways that our Nation can get involved with this.

I have affirmed President Biden in areas where we agree, and there are some areas that he has brought up in the task force that he has created on the executive level to take on anti-Semitism nationally. Some of those things have been actually executed and carried out, and some of them have not.

So we have continued to be able to nudge in ways that we thought were appropriate to be able to nudge and to be able to poke to say things can be done. It has been leadership at our State Department that has risen up on that, and some, we have been actively involved in trying to be able to get into those positions, to be able to lead.

My friend TIM SCOTT came to the floor to be able to ask for unanimous consent to be able to pass his resolution to condemn anti-Semitism on college campuses. I want to thank my friend TIM SCOTT for his leadership on this issue and what he has also done to be able to raise awareness. But unfortunately his request to be able to pass that resolution was denied.

We should be able to find common ground on issues that condemn hate. His resolution was a simple statement: What are we going to do as a body to be able to condemn hatred in this area? We should not ignore this.

The House of Representatives last week brought up the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act. It was a bipartisan piece of legislation that they passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives that they have now sent to this body to be able to take up and to debate and to discuss.

What has been interesting to me is, when they picked up the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act as a nonpartisan piece of legislation, this is a continuance of actually what happened under the Trump administration. President Trump used the same definitions and the same process of putting it in the Department of Education, using what is called the IHRA definition for ''anti-Semitism'' and the examples attached to it in Executive order 13899.

But what has been fascinating to me is, when the House of Representatives passed it, there was a whole group of folks and some folks from my own party who stepped up and said: No, we can't actually do this, because this would inhibit free speech.

I have smiled at those same folks and said: Did you say that when President Trump was actually using it as an Executive order under his administration? Because now they are talking about making a statutory, long-term change.

The IHRA definition is not new, by the way. The United States has been a party to this definition since the 1990s. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition—that is IHRA—has been recognized all over the world as a basic definition with examples of what anti-Semitism is.

It is not new to the United States. There are many athletic teams that

have recognized the IHRA definition for their teams in their conversations to be able to recognize what anti-Semitism is. There are 34 States, including my own State of Oklahoma, that have recognized the IHRA definition within our own States to say: This is how we are going to define ''anti-Semitism'' in our States.

This is a very basic principle. It is difficult to discourage what you cannot even define, and when someone makes just a blanket statement for anti-Semitism, it is helpful to put some definition to what it actually means and what it does not mean. For instance, if someone were to say they disagree with the Netanyahu government, is that anti-Semitic? The IHRA definition would say, clearly, it is not. We can disagree on governmental action. That is a normal part of dialogue.

It also is not something that inhibits free speech. Even hateful speech in the United States—even foolish, even stupid speech—can be said in the United States. It is a protected right to be able to say whatever crazy thing you want to be able to say in the United States, but when it shifts from free speech to inciting violence and threats, that has shifted. That has moved from just speech to now criminal action.

The IHRA definition in what the House of Representatives passed last week in the Antisemitism Awareness Act doesn't limit speech in any way. In fact, it very specifically states it is not trying to take away any free speech rights of anyone. It specifically notes a protection for the First Amendment rights of Americans to be able to say what they choose to say.

What it does say is, if you are on a college campus and you are choosing to discriminate against Jewish students, that should fall into the same as any other title VI discrimination falls into. It is no different. So if they are doing discrimination on a college campus, you can't just say: Well, they are discriminating against Jewish students, so that doesn't fall under title VI.

That clearly does fall under title VI areas and makes what has been implied clear. What has been done by Executive action in the past under the Trump administration makes it clear for every administration. What has been done under the Department of State for three decades in the United States is clear policy not just for the State Department but also for the Department of Education. I think that is a pretty reasonable way to take on this issue and to be able to clarify what anti-Semitism is on a college campus or any campus that is out there.

Some of the responses that I have already mentioned have been fascinating to me on this, things like I have already said: This is going to limit free speech.

No. You still have the right to say something, even to say something dumb. That is still a protected right in the United States.

We can say things that we both disagree with—that is a protected right—but you can't move into criminal activity. That is not protected, and a university cannot protect discrimination on their own campus. That would not be allowed.

My favorite thing is that it does not outlaw the Bible. I have had folks who have said: If you put in the IHRA definition, it outlaws the Bible.

I have just smiled and said: That is absolutely ridiculous.

And it is not just me saying this. Christian leaders who I know all over the country say that is just a ridiculous statement.

There is a letter that just came out this week from Pastor John Hagee, who leads what is called CUFI, the national Christians United for Israel, and Ralph Reed, who is the leader of the Faith and Freedom Coalition. They have made this simple statement:

> To the Biblically literate, claims that the Antisemitism Awareness Act is anti-Christian are as insulting as they are injurious.

I have made it very clear on this as well when people have asked me about this, to say that somehow the Antisemitism Awareness Act outlaws the Bible or limits speech around the Bible.

There is a statement in the IHRA definition that talks about using symbols and images associated with classic anti-Semitism, and the examples are claims that ''Jews killing Jesus are blood libel'' to characterize Israel or Israelis. So they take that one statement and pull that out and say: See? You couldn't use the Bible.

I have laughed, and I have said: Well, I would just say not only have Pastor Hagee and others said this—and other faith leaders around—but let me add a voice to this as well. The Scripture is very clear from John 10 that Jesus laid his life down for others. He had the power to lay it down and the power to be able to take it up. That is Orthodox Christianity. Orthodox Christianity says: My sin is what put Jesus on the cross. That is what Scripture says.

What the IHRA definition says is, if someone is biased to say ''I hate all Jews because Jews killed Jesus,'' they are saying that that is an anti-Semitic statement to say that. I would also say it is not only inconsistent with the clear teachings of Scripture, but it is inconsistent with the faith practices of individuals.

Not only is the New Testament exceptionally clear about respect for Judaism, but the guy on the cross was Jewish. His mom at the foot of the cross was Jewish. The disciples were all Jewish. The people who wrote the New Testament were Jewish. So to somehow believe that Christianity would discount all Jews is to ignore the basic teachings of the New Testament, besides the basic fact that the Romans put Jesus on the cross.

So somehow to say that this discounts Scripture—that I have heard over and over again on social media over the past week—I think is absurd, No. 1, and as John Hagee and Ralph Reed have said, it actually is insulting and injurious.

There are folks who have said that there will be an international organization that is now going to police speech in the United States. I would encourage them to please read the legislation, not what is on social media, to be able to understand what this actually does. It does not give authority to an international organization to be able to step into the United States and be able to police speech. It is very clear.

It just says this is what discrimination looks like under title VI, just like we have discrimination laws in other areas wherein the Department of Education could not say: Well, it doesn't specifically outline religion in this area, and so if there is discrimination against Jewish students, we can look the other way. That would stop under this piece of legislation.

First things first: Let's actually have real dialogue as a country. Are we as a nation going to look the other way when students are discriminated against on a campus, or are we going to step in and say: ''No, we are not going to just look the other way when there is discrimination''? Because, as I go back to the statement from our State Department, history has shown that wherever anti-Semitism has gone unchecked, the persecution of others has been present or not far behind. So let's speak out and stop it.

For individuals who want to have anti-Semitic beliefs, that is still legal in America to have an anti-Semitic belief. It is still protected as a right. I would say it is hateful, and I would say it is bigoted, but it is still your protected right to be able to have that belief. But, when that speech moves to threats of violence and intimidation, when it moves from a voice to an action, that is criminal activity, and we should treat it as such. We should not let it fester as criminal activity and think it will not spread. It will.

My final statement: For the folks who track through social media, where you see voices of anti-Semitism on social media, why don't you be bold enough to speak out for the people who are being bullied online and say every person has the right to their faith and to be able to live that faith and have that protected? We as Americans have the right to have any faith of our choosing, to change our faith, or to have no faith at all, and that would be protected. That should not be any less for Jewish students anywhere online or on their own campuses.

So let's speak out on their behalf. And instead of allowing them to be bullied on their campuses or online, why don't we speak out for their right to be able to live their faith and practice their faith as every other American? That is what I think we should do on college campuses, and that is a simple way we can honor the dignity of every student.

We are going to disagree. There are people who have strong disagreements

with the war that is happening right now in Israel and in Gaza. So let's talk about it, but let's not discriminate while we do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

REMEMBERING KURT ENGLEHART

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I am here today to honor the life of Kurt Englehart, my senior adviser, a beloved Nevadan, friend, and family member who touched so many lives.

We lost Kurt very suddenly in April, and his loss is felt deeply by everyone in our office, some of whom are in the Galleries today, in the communities he impacted, and individuals he met throughout the State of Nevada, including—and I so appreciate my colleague Senator ROSEN being here and her staff as well. You could tell how beloved he was by the sheer volume of people who came to his funeral in Reno. Last month, there were Tribal leaders, law enforcement, farmers, ranchers, labor leaders, former coworkers, and Senate staffers, childhood friends and Nevadans from across the State who showed up to pay their respects.

Kurt touched so many lives, and he was able to make even strangers feel as though he was a close friend. Here is a picture of him, a photo of him, right here. There was always a smile on his face.

For the past 8 years, Kurt was an essential part of my team. He liked to call it Team CCM, not only because of his intimate knowledge of every community in northern Nevada, but because he had this contagious warmth that drew everyone in. You couldn't dislike Kurt if you tried. He had this way of attacking life that brought so much positivity and joy to both my campaign and my Senate offices.

I got to personally experience Kurt's zest for life on our many tours around rural Nevada. Every August, I travel through the rural counties in my State, and every August, Kurt was with me. That was when I got to know him the best. On the road, in the middle of the desert, I learned so much about Kurt's passions—about what inspired him to be so active in the community to the things that he enjoyed doing when he wasn't at the office.

One of the favorite things to talk about for Kurt was his deep enthusiasm for video games. Kurt loved his gaming community, and they all loved him. One of his friends who played World of Warcraft with him reminisced about how Kurt, in the game, played a healer, which meant he took care of the other players.

His friend said:

I would later learn that this was how he was in the real world.

And that is exactly true. That is exactly how Kurt was in the real world, always making people feel at ease and extending a helping hand to those who needed it.

In my Senate office, Kurt was a casework champion, addressing constituents' needs head on and working closely with Nevadans whose issues required special care and attention. Throughout his time in my office, Kurt worked on 638 cases. He was known by the Nevadans he worked with as a fierce advocate who knew how to get the job done for them.

One casework story Kurt was particularly proud of—and I was as well—happened in 2019. Kurt reached out to a veteran named John, who was considering ending his own life because he couldn't afford his medical bills. John had been kicked off his insurance the day he experienced a massive health issue, leaving him with hundreds of thousands of dollars to pay out-of-pocket. Kurt found out about this when he talked with John. He worked with John's insurance company to make sure that they retroactively paid every penny of John's bill. Kurt actually saved John's life, and he was lucky to have Kurt as an advocate for him.

That is just one example of Kurt's dedication to helping Nevadans in need. Whether he was working with the IRS to get people their tax refunds, advocating for the protection of sacred Tribal monuments, or resolving health benefit issues, Kurt gave each individual case his all. The Nevadans Kurt helped described him as going above and beyond to find solutions.

Kurt made people feel heard, taking on the issues of complete strangers as if they were his own. And after the fact, he followed up with them to make sure they had everything they needed because that is who Kurt was. Public service came so naturally to him. He believed in the power of good government; that our democracy is truly for the people; that our work here in the Senate can change people's lives for the better, even if it is one person at a time.

Kurt's determination to do the most good for the people of Nevada made him a giant all across the State and especially in our rural communities. Everyone from Reno to Elko, to our Tribal communities either knew Kurt personally or they knew of him. He drove from county to county talking with families, businessowners, farmers, ranchers, miners, Tribal leaders, and law enforcement about how our office could work with them and deliver for them. Democrats, Republicans, Independents—it did not matter—they all trusted Kurt to do the right thing by them, and he always did.

Kurt was originally from Ohio, but he advocated for Nevadans so well that he truly became a Nevadan. He was the type of down-to-earth guy who could win over even those who staunchly disagreed with him. He showed up to every meeting fully prepared and well-informed, no matter the topic, and he was ready to have a productive conversation with anyone.

And once Kurt made those connections, he maintained them. He got to know people on a deeper level and kept them in mind for future events he knew would interest them because he cared.

He was so loved by his colleagues in all of our offices. My staff have described him as someone who ''charted his own path'' and ''always found a way.'' He was known for being a straight shooter whom everyone could depend upon to tell them exactly what he was thinking, even if it meant—and sometimes it did from Kurt—hearing the hard truth.

When the work got intense—as it often does in Senate offices—Kurt would help his coworkers find the levity, even if he was just as frustrated as everyone else.

If you knew anything about Kurt, you knew he loved his family above all else. His pride and joy was his son Ender. They shared a special bond in so many ways, particularly one, because like his father, Ender is a master video gamer as well as being an outstanding young man.

Kurt cherished his family, and he talked about them endlessly: his mother Luann; his brother Matt; his girlfriend Siya; and Ender's mother Shaila. And he talked about Ender.

I got a chance to know Ender growing from a young boy to a young teen. And I will tell you, Kurt's proudest moments were with his son, always wanting him to have every opportunity to take chances but not to be afraid to lean in and take those risks. The good, the bad, all of the above, his main goal was to ensure that his son Ender had every opportunity in life.

Our office mourns this devastating loss, but we know Kurt will always be with us.

This is actually Kurt on one of our coal trains in Ely, NV. It is one of the many examples of how Kurt spent his time getting around Nevada and talking to everyone who lived there. He lives on in the stories of the countless Nevadans he helped, and he lives on in the actions of those he inspired with his unwavering passion. And he lives on in the hearts of those of us who knew him the best. He will be dearly missed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

REPORT ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this week, we are taking a big step forward in the fight to end online child exploitation. The bipartisan REPORT Act, which you and I led, has been signed into law, and now law enforcement and the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children—or NCMEC, as we call it—will have the resources that they need to better protect vulnerable children and track down these predators and pedophiles. This legislation has been urgently needed. And, Mr. President, I thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Here is a frightening statistic: In America, a child is bought or sold for sexual exploitation once every 2 minutes. In this country, in 2024, a child is

bought or sold for sex once every 2 minutes. This abuse increasingly happens in the virtual space, where predators distribute child sexual abuse material; they recruit minors into sex trafficking rings; and they extort children into sharing explicit images of themselves.

Just last year, NCMEC received 36.2 million reports of online child sexual exploitation, a 23-percent increase over 2021.

NCMEC, whose CyberTipline serves as our country's centralized reporting system for online child abuse, does incredible work to track down these crimes and report them to law enforcement. But, tragically, so many more acts of online sexual abuse against children are going unreported.

Although criminal law requires electronic service providers to report any child sex abuse material on their sites, online platforms—including Big Tech sites, such as Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram—have no obligation to report content involving the sex trafficking or grooming of children or enticement crimes.

Most online platforms choose not to report this abhorrent material to law enforcement. And even when they do report the content, electronic service providers often omit necessary information to identify victims and track down their abusers.

We have also heard from victims, their families, and law enforcement about the need to modernize laws around reporting online sexual abuse. For example, children and their parents risk legal liability for transferring evidence of online sexual abuse that they have experienced when submitting reports to the NCMEC CyberTipline.

The REPORT Act addresses these issues and more to ensure that they are defending children against some of the most heinous crimes imaginable. Now, electronic service providers will be legally required to report child trafficking and enticement.

To ensure compliance with the law, the REPORT Act raises the fine for first violations from $150,000 up to as much as $850,000, and subsequent violations, that fee is raised from $300,000 up to $1 million.

At the same time, the legislation enables victims to report evidence of online exploitation to the authorities and allows for the secure cloud storage and safe transfer of reports from NCMEC to law enforcement.

It also increases the retention period for CyberTipline reports from 90 days to 1 full year; meaning, law enforcement will have more time to track down and prosecute these criminals.

All together, these measures will do so much to protect the most vulnerable among us from online exploitation and help to put an end to this horrific abuse.

PROTESTS

Mr. President, across the country, we are witnessing one of the worst waves of anti-Semitism that we have ever seen in our Nation's history. I appreciate that my colleague from Oklahoma spoke previously to this.

One of the things that we have learned is a little bit about the leading perpetrators of these protests that are taking place. What we have found is that far-left activists, including college students at some of the most prestigious universities, are involved in these activities.

We have all seen the pro-Hamas demonstrators who are harassing and intimidating Jewish students. They are blocking them from attending class or even from accessing public spaces. They are doing this with these protests and with these illegal encampments.

Here are some examples of what we have had reported to us and what we have seen from individuals who are walking through these encampments with their cell phones. At Columbia University, activists chanted: ''We are Hamas'' and ''Long live Hamas.'' At George Washington University, one pro-Hamas demonstrator walked around campus with a sign calling for a ''Final Solution'' against the Jewish people.

We have seen activists hand out fliers calling for ''Death to America'' and ''Death to Israeli real estate.'' And at schools like Princeton, students have waved the flag of terror groups, including the flag of Hezbollah.

One thing should be obvious, the anti-Israel protests on campuses across this country are hotbeds for terrorist sympathizers and for anti-Jewish hatred. Never did I think I would see this in the United States of America.

In fact, some of these college groups who are out protesting, including at Columbia, have allegedly held events with the terrorist organization Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. These demonstrations have absolutely no place in America, and Tennesseans are telling me these demonstrations have no place in our great State of Tennessee.

But instead of cracking down on these activists and the students who are out there peddling anti-Semitism and are glorifying terrorism, many schools are beginning to bow to their demands. I find this abhorrent and disgusting.

In negotiations with pro-Hamas demonstrators, Northwestern University agreed to offer coveted faculty positions to Palestinian academics and set aside full-ride scholarships for Palestinian students.

To appease its pro-Hamas students, Brown University, last week, agreed to hold a vote on divesting from Israel.

After negotiating with pro-Hamas activists for weeks, Columbia University has canceled its commencement ceremony.

We can only bring an end to this disturbing illegal behavior when there are actual consequences.

College students who promote terrorism on behalf of Hamas should be added to the TSA No Fly List, and we should deport foreign students on visas who support Hamas—a U.S.-designated terror organization. And universities that allow anti-Semitism on their campuses should be defunded. The Stop Anti-Semitism on College Campuses Act, which I introduced alongside Senator TIM SCOTT, would ensure that happens.

Instead of standing up for Jewish students, President Biden has drawn, unfortunately, a moral equivalence between pro-Hamas activists and pro-Israel Americans. When asked about the anti-Semitic demonstrations last month, the President said he ''condemn[s] those who don't understand what is going on with the Palestinians.''

At the same time, the President has focused on pushing billions in new illegal student loan forgiveness—forgiveness that could very well benefit the students who are out leading these demonstrations. So that is why I have joined my Senate Republican colleagues in introducing the No Bailouts for Campus Criminals Act, which would make any person who is convicted of a State or Federal offense in connection with a campus protest ineligible for any Federal student loan forgiveness.

The President is also reportedly looking to welcome Gazans to America as refugees. According to a recent poll, 71 percent of Gazans said they supported Hamas's horrific October 7 attack on Israeli civilians. Seventy-one percent of Gazans said they supported Hamas's horrific attack on October 7. More than 300 individuals on the Terror Watchlist have entered our country under President Biden, but, for some reason, this administration thinks that they can vet Gazans, who elected Hamas as their government, who support the terrorist attack. They think they can properly vet them and bring them into this country? Have they not asked Egypt, Jordan, other countries in the region why they will not take these Palestinian refugees? I think it would be instructive.

Our country cannot afford more failed leadership and not knowing who is coming into this country who may wish us harm. We would like to see the President rescind this and review his priorities and make it his priority to protect the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 24–0F. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 21–55 of August 25, 2021.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24–0F

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia.

(ii) Sec. 36(B)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 21–55; Date: August 25, 2021; Implementing Agency: Navy.

(iii) Description: On August 25, 2021, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 21–55, of the possible sale, under Section 36(6)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of defense services related to the future purchase of Standard Missile 6 Block I (SM–6) and Standard Missile 2 Block IIIC (SM–2 IIIC) missiles. These services included development; engineering, integration, and testing (EI&T); obsolescence engineering activities required to ensure readiness; U.S. Government and contractor engineering/technical assistance, and related studies and analysis support; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of program and logistical support. The estimated total value was $350 million. There was no Major Defense Equipment (MDE) associated with this sale.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following MDE items: up to four hundred (400) SM–2 IIIC All Up Rounds (AUR); and up to five hundred (500) SM–6 AUR. Also included are non-MDE missile canisters; associated support; and test equipment. The estimated total value of the new items is $4.15 billion. The estimated non-MDE value will increase by $150 million to a revised $500 million. The estimated total case value will increase by $4.15 billion to a revised $4.5 billion. MDE constitutes $4.0 billion of this total.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided as the MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The inclusion of this MDE represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States. Australia is one of our most important allies in the Western Pacific. The strategic location of this political and economic power contributes significantly to ensuring peace and economic stability in the region.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

The Standard Missile–6 (SM–6) is a surface Navy Anti-Air Warfare missile that provides area and ship self-defense. The missile is intended to project power through its ability to destroy manned fixed and rotary wing aircraft, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), Land Attack Cruise Missiles, and Anti-Ship Cruise Missiles in flight. It was designed to fulfill the need for a vertically launched, extended range missile compatible with the AEGIS Weapon System to be used against extended range threats at sea, near land, and overland. The SM–6 combines the tested legacy of Standard Missile 2 (SM–2) propulsion and ordnance with an active Radio Frequency seeker allowing for over-the-horizon engagements, enhanced capability at extended ranges, and increased firepower.

The SM–2 Block IIIC Active Missile maximizes existing SM–6 Block I active and SM–2 semi-active missile technology to deliver a low cost, medium range dual mode active/semi-active missile.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 1, 2024.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 24–30, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Malaysia for defense articles and services estimated to cost $80 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24–30

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Malaysia.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * $26 million.
Other $54 million.
Total $80 million.
Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Ten (10) AN/AAQ–33 Sniper Advanced Targeting Pods.

Non-MDE: Also included are technical data and publications; personnel training; software and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (MF–P–LDA).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 6, 2024.

*as defined in Section 47 (6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24–30

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AN/AAQ–33 Sniper Advanced Targeting Pod is a single, lightweight targeting pod for military aircraft that provides positive target identification, autonomous tracking, global positioning system coordinate generation capabilities provided by Selected Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) or M–Code, and precise weapons guidance from extended standoff ranges. It incorporates a high-definition mid-wave Forward-Looking Infrared (FLIR), dual-mode laser, visible-light high-definition television, laser spot tracker, video, data link, and a digital data recorder.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Malaysia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Malaysia.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Malaysia—Sniper Advanced Targeting Pods

The Government of Malaysia has requested to buy ten (10) AN/AAQ–33 Sniper Advanced

Targeting Pods. Also included are technical data and publications; personnel training; software and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is $80 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a key partner that is a force for political stability and economic progress in the Indo-Pacific region,

The proposed sale will improve Malaysia's capability to meet current and future threats by modernizing its current F/A–18D platform with a common targeting pod. This proposed sale will also mitigate future obsolescence concerns and allow the Royal Malaysian Air Force to meet future operational requirements. Malaysia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region,

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Corporation, located in Orlando, FL, and The Boeing Company, located in St. Louis, MO. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Malaysia.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to give notice of my intent to object to any unanimous consent agreement regarding Executive Calendar No. 630, the promotion of Col. David M. Church to be Brigadier General in the U.S. Army.

While serving as the senior intelligence officer at the National Guard Bureau, Colonel Church was involved in retaliation against an Army officer who had turned information over to the Department of Defense Inspector General.

The Continental Congress, on July 30, 1778, unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation, stating: ''It is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge.''

Unfortunately, to this day, there are still people in government who retaliate against those brave individuals who are the fail-safe for our government. Such people have no place in public service.

CONFIRMATION OF DONNA ANN WELTON

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in strong support of the confirmation of Donna Ann Welton to be the United States Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste. This is a country that earned independence after centuries of colonial rule under the Dutch and, then, Indonesian Governments. Today, we still see senior figures coming to power in Indonesia that could drag up the Timor-Leste's painful past.

From helping our Peace Corps volunteers working in the country, to being a partner in Timor-Leste's energy transition, we need an Ambassador working in our Embassy that will support the democratic ambitions of Asia's youngest country.

Ms. Welton's experience and expertise means she is ready to hit the ground running. She recently served as Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Programs and Operations in the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. Ms. Welton began her career with the United States Information Agency in the Republic of Korea and has served in Afghanistan and Finland. She is a career member of the Senior Foreign Service and someone who will stand up for human rights and advance good governance efforts in this important part of the world.

I am pleased that my colleagues voted to confirm Ms. Welton to be Ambassador to Timor-Leste.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. CECIL ''CHIP'' MURRAY

● Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the life of the Reverend Doctor Cecil L. ''Chip'' Murray, who passed away on April 5 at the age of 94 after nearly five decades of commitment to his south Los Angeles community.

Rev. Murray was born on September 26, 1929, in Lakeland, FL, and moved with his family to West Palm Beach at a young age. From seventh grade until the end of high school, he served as a junior pastor and led services and sermons, showing an early interest in the ministry. But his path to the pulpit wasn't always so clear: after high school, he enrolled in Florida A&M University, an HBCU, and majored in history, before serving in the Air Force.

Rev. Murray would serve in uniform for a decade, training in fighter jets and working as a radar intercept officer in the Korean war, even earning the Soldier's Medal of Valor. After a life-threatening plane crash, Rev. Murray decided to pursue his doctorate in divinity from Claremont School of Theology in Southern California.

His early career in the ministry began at Primm AME Church in Pomona, CA, delivering sermons to just a seven-member congregation, a crowd that would one day be dwarfed by the community he would build in south Los Angeles. After stops in Kansas City and Seattle, Rev. Murray eventually landed at the historic First AME Church in Los Angeles, where a congregation of a few hundred soon became a congregation of thousands.

During his tenure at First AME, Rev. Murray would become host to leaders like President Bill Clinton and President George W. Bush and officiant of funerals for stars like Ray Charles and Eazy-E.

But to many, it was his leadership during crisis in Los Angeles that left the most memorable imprint on the city.

Throughout his life, he had a profound understanding of racial tensions in America. He was the descendant of slaves, had been beaten as a child in the Jim Crow South, and would later be threatened by racists plotting to bomb his church. But for all the violence he experienced, at the height of racial tensions during the Rodney King riots of 1992, he preached peace. As fires engulfed the city, he served as a calming presence for the community, even raising $1.5 million to rebuild from the ashes in the aftermath of the riots.

As countless Angelenos know, his service didn't end there. For decades, his church was at the center of the community: a lifeline providing food and clothing, affordable housing and home loans, economic and employment assistance, and even starting a private school and providing thousands of college scholarships to students.

Looking back, whether in 1994 or 2024, one wonders what south Los Angeles would look like without the faith and leadership of Rev. Dr. Cecil ''Chip'' Murray. As we celebrate him alongside his son Drew and all the loved ones and community members graced by his life, we remember the difference he made for Los Angeles and the legacy he now leaves behind.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. BOB ROSS

● Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, after nearly a quarter century of leadership, Dr. Bob Ross will step down this year from his position as president and CEO of the California Endowment. I rise today to honor the exemplary achievements of Dr. Ross in his role as a fierce health and safety advocate in California and for a lifetime of caring for communities across the country.

Whether in his role as director of San Diego County's Health and Human Services Agency, as commissioner for the Philadelphia Department of Public Health, or as an instructor of clinical medicine, Dr. Ross' extensive background in public health made him the perfect candidate to be appointed president and CEO of the California Endowment in September 2000.

In the time since his appointment, the California Endowment has helped change the culture of care in California for the better. Under Dr. Ross' leadership, the California Endowment has worked relentlessly in pursuit of ''Health for All,'' working to expand

coverage for undocumented immigrants, farmworkers, and Dreamers; to improve health outcomes for communities of color; and to increase diversity in the healthcare workforce.

Dr. Ross' leadership of the LA County Task Force on Alternatives to Incarceration helped reframe our approach to health in the justice system. His efforts have not only improved health outcomes but have also ensured that inclusion and equity are at the forefront of our health systems.

And of course, as a founding board member of Covered California, Dr. Ross' dedication to fostering an equitable healthcare delivery system was pivotal in bringing the Affordable Care Act to life in California.

While it is hard to believe there would ever come a day when the ''Yoda of Philanthropy'' would step down, we know the legacy he now leaves behind. It is a legacy of service, a commitment to equitable healthcare in California, and a roadmap for the California Endowment and all Californians to follow.

We are profoundly grateful for Dr. Ross' unyielding commitment to a healthier, more equitable California.●

TRIBUTE TO DONALD ''D.'' TAYLOR

● Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Donald ''D.'' Taylor for a lifetime of commitment to the labor movement and the empowerment of workers across the Nation.

In March, Taylor stepped down as president of the UNITE HERE labor union, after dedicating four decades to mobilizing support and relentlessly advocating for working families.

Born in Williamsburg, VA, D. Taylor started his journey in the food services industry at just 14, working at a Kentucky Fried Chicken, before eventually waiting tables part time while he attended Georgetown University. It was there that Taylor joined the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union—HERE—the start of what would become an extraordinary career fighting for dignity of workers.

Not long after graduation, Taylor began work in the Reno-Tahoe area of Nevada for the Culinary Workers' Union, before eventually arriving in Las Vegas to help organize during a strike against the hotel-casino industry at a time when the union's membership had fallen to 18,000.

Taylor quickly rose the ranks of leadership, serving as staff director and chief lieutenant to the head of the Culinary, before eventually being elected secretary-treasurer himself in 2002. By the time he was elected president of the international parent union UNITE HERE 10 years later, the local Culinary had tripled in size, becoming an essential resource for hospitality workers in the region, and a powerhouse in Nevada politics.

Under his tenure as president of UNITE HERE from 2012 to 2024, over 140,500 workers have joined the union, making UNITE HERE the fastest growing private sector affiliate of the AFL–CIO.

On a personal note, as the proud son of a UNITE HERE Local 11 retiree, looking back, I now know why families like mine could see a doctor when we were sick or could take time off of work each year for vacation—or could even afford to buy a home. It is because of a good union contract. And it is because of the leadership of people like D. Taylor.

For decades, he has fought to improve the quality of working standards for service employees across the country, defending that most basic belief that no matter who you are or where you come from, ''One Job Should Be Enough.''

While we know his work advocating for working people doesn't end today, we honor D. Taylor for his tireless dedication and the transformative impact he has had on the lives of hundreds of thousands of workers.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF TABLE ROCK LAKE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize 50 years of steady economic development, volunteerism, and stewardship from the Table Rock Lake Area Chamber of Commerce in Missouri.

Formed in 1974 as the Kimberling City Chamber of Commerce, the group has adapted and changed to accommodate the needs and interest of its community. In the 1990s, the chamber launched an initiative to protect the waters of Table Rock Lake, which spawned a part of the organization known today as H2Ozarks. Now, the chamber has embarked on a 5-year economic development initiative called Launch Stone County and has recently moved to a new location in Branson West to provide additional services to the business community.

The chamber has remained committed to promoting tourism of Stone County and the Ozarks, working to preserve the beauty of Table Rock Lake for future generations to enjoy. I am proud that such a vibrant community of small businesses exists and thrives in Missouri and hope Table Rock Lake continues to be a celebrated tourist destination for years to come.●

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13873 OF MAY 15, 2019, WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—PM 50

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2024.

The unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries augments the ability of these foreign adversaries to create and exploit vulnerabilities in information and communications technology or services, with potentially catastrophic effects. This threat continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024.*

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13338 OF MAY 11, 2004, WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—PM 51

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2024.

The regime's brutality and repression of the Syrian people, who have called for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including with respect to chemical weapons and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 with respect to Syria.

In addition, the United State condemns the brutal violence and human rights violations and abuses of the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian enablers. The United States calls on the Assad regime, and its backers, to stop its violent war against its own people, enact a nationwide ceasefire, facilitate the unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians in need, and negotiate a political settlement in Syria in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254. The United States will consider changes in policies and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024*.

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13667 OF MAY 12, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—PM 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2024.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic has been marked by a breakdown of law and order; intersectarian tension; the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers; and widespread violence and atrocities, including those committed by Kremlin-linked and Yevgeniy Prigozhin-affiliated entities such as the Wagner Group. These dynamics threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and neighboring states, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 with respect to the Central African Republic.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 8, 2024*.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3354. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 North Hatcher Avenue in Purcellville, Virginia, as the ''Secretary of State Madeleine Albright Post Office Building''.

H.R. 6192. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7423. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Benedette Street in Rayville, Louisiana, as the ''Luke Letlow Post Office Building''.

The message also announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the resolution (H.J. Res. 98) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to ''Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status'', returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was resolved that the said resolution do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

At 5:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8289. An act to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1042. An act to prohibit the importation into the United States of unirradiated low-enriched uranium that is produced in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3354. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 North Hatcher Avenue in Purcellville, Virginia, as the ''Secretary of State Madeleine Albright Post Office Building'' ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6192. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing any new or amended energy conservation standard for a product that is not technologically feasible and economically justified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 7423. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Benedette Street in Rayville, Louisiana, as the ''Luke Letlow Post Office Building'' ; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4405. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Chief Human Capital Officers Council's annual report to Congress for 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4406. A communication from the National Cyber Director, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2024 Report on the Cybersecurity Posture of the United States''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4407. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4408. A communication from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2023 annual report

relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4409. A communication from the Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4410. A communication from the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Surface Transportation Board, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Report to Congress'' received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4411. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–457, ''Black LGBTQIA+ History Preservation Establishment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4412. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–459, ''Lee Elder Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4413. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–460, ''Jesse Mitchell Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4414. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–461, ''Floodplain Review Authority Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4415. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–462, ''Robert L. Yeldell Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–463, ''Self Storage Lien Enforcement Modernization Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–464, ''St. Luke's Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4418. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–465, ''Annie's Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4419. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–466, ''Pastor John W. Davis Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4420. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–467, ''Sladen's Court Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4421. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–468, ''Blue and White Marching Machine Way Designation Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4422. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–458, ''Office of Administrative Hearings Jurisdiction Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4423. A communication from the Acting Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Appellate Jurisdiction Update''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4424. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4425. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of Defense's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4426. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4427. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2024–05, Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2024–05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4428. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2024–05, Technical Amendments'' (FAC 2024–05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4429. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2022–006, Sustainable Procurement'' (RIN9000–AO43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4430. A communication from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4431. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4432. A communication from the Executive Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Postal Service's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4433. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs and Public Relations, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4434. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4435. A communication from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Credit Union Administration's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4436. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Secretariat Division, Office of the General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Reformatting Clause for Direct 8(a) Contracting'' (RIN3090–AK56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 16, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4437. A communication from the Chair of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4438. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Board's compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4439. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal relative to authorizing protective services for former federal government officials or the reimbursement of pre-approved protective services to

such officials; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4440. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2024–04, Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2024–04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4441. A communication from the Acting Vice President of External Affairs, U.S. International Development Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4442. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4443. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4444. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive and Administrative Officer, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report for the period of October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024 received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4445. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority's fiscal year 2023 inventory that classifies that it performs as either inherently governmental or commerical, and includes the number of full-time equivalents needed to perform each activity and the place of performance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4446. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2024–04, Introduction'' (FAC 2024–04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4447. A communication from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunities and Diversity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4448. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2023 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4449. A communication from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4450. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting nine (9) legislative proposals relative to detect fentanyl suppliers or to defeat fentanyl traffickers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4451. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the decision not to seek Supreme Court review of the Valancourt Books, LLC v. Garland decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4452. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adoption of Updated WIPO Standard ST.26; Revision to Incorporation by Reference'' (RIN0651–AD80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4453. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4454. A communication from the Chief Regulatory Officer, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for 'T' Nonimmigrant Status'' (RIN1615–AA59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4455. A communication from the Acting Assistant Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Obsolete Procedures and Requirements Related to F, J, and M Nonimmigrants'' (RIN1653–AA87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4456. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Definition of 'Engaged in the Business as a Dealer in Firearms' '' (RIN1140–AA58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4457. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bipartisan Safer Communities Act Conforming Regulations'' (RIN1140–AA57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4458. A communication from the Chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines that were proposed by the Commission during the 2023–2024 amendment cycle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4459. A communication from the Chief Regulatory Officer, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Increase of the Automatic Extension Period of Employment Authorization and Documentation for Certain Employment Authorization Document Renewal Applicants'' (RIN1615–AC78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4460. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Department of Justice Freedom of Information Act 2023 Litigation and Compliance Report,'' and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for all federal agencies' Freedom of Information Act reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4461. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Commissioner, and the National Chair, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2023 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4462. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the decision not to appeal the United States v. Price decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4463. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Signature Requirements Related to Acceptance of Electronic Signatures for Patent Correspondence'' (RIN0651–AD73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 4, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4464. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations—Movie Theaters; Accessibility of Web Information and Services of State and Local Government Entities'' (RIN1190–AA79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2024; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–104. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the expansion of comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs and directing the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services to conduct a study concerning such programs and certain other matters relating to cardiovascular disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention of the United States Department of Health and Human Services has stated that cardiovascular disease is the leading cause of death in the United States; and

Whereas, According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, approximately 20.1 million people have been diagnosed with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease and are at risk of a cardiovascular event; and

Whereas, The Mayo Clinic has stated that atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease is linked to cholesterol accumulating in the arteries and the risk of associated cardiovascular events may be reduced by lowering low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; and

Whereas, According to a report from the American Heart Association, in 2016, nearly 68 million adults in the United States had a high level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; and

Whereas, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has reported that 47 million people in the United States are currently receiving medication to lower their level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and thereby manage their risk of a cardiovascular event; and

Whereas, Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey in 2011–2012 provides that only approximately 20 percent of people with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease who are taking statins, a leading therapy to lower low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, are successfully reducing their level of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol to a healthy level; and

Whereas, According to the American Heart Association, the total direct and indirect cost of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease in the United States was $555 billion in 2016 and is projected to reach $1.1 trillion by 2035; and

Whereas, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has stated that health care professionals in Nevada have diagnosed 8 percent of adults in this State with a symptom of atherosclerotic and cardiovascular disease, including, without limitation, an angina, stroke, heart attack or coronary heart disease; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada, the Assembly concurring, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature urge state agencies to expand comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs to allow for earlier identification of patients at risk of cardiovascular events; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature urge state agencies to explore ways to collaborate with federal agencies and national organizations to establish or expand comprehensive cardiovascular screening programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature urge state agencies to evaluate programs to improve cardiovascular health which are operating in this State for the purpose of accelerating improvements in the care rendered to patients at risk of cardiovascular events such that improvements in screening, treatment, monitoring and health outcomes are achieved; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature urge the development of policies to reduce the number of Americans who die as a result of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature direct the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services to conduct a study during the 2023–2024 interim concerning cardiovascular screening programs that are currently operating in this State, ways for state agencies to collaborate with federal agencies and private organizations in the evaluation and expansion of such programs and other matters relating to cardiovascular disease; and be it further

Resolved, That the study must include a review of the Get With The Guidelines program of the American Heart Association, the degree to which the program has been adopted by health facilities in this State and the success of the program where adopted by health facilities in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the study must consider the provision of reimbursement under the Medicaid program for the remote monitoring of cardiovascular health; and be it further

Resolved, That the study must include a review of the implementation of Complete Streets Programs pursuant to NRS 403.575 and the identification of gaps in reforms to zoning laws in order to promote zoning that is more conducive to good cardiovascular health; and be it further

Resolved, That, pursuant to subsection 4 of NRS 218E.330, the Committee shall submit a report of the study and any recommendations for legislation to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 83rd Session of the Nevada Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, members of the United States House of Representatives and United States Senate and other federal and state government officials and agencies as appropriate; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon adoption.

POM–105. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to refrain from reducing appropriations to the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund for fiscal year 2024 and instead restore full funding of VOCA to fiscal year 2021 levels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 195

Whereas, since 1984, millions of victims have been provided essential support resources through the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund; and

Whereas, the Fiscal Year 2024 funding proposal currently before the United States Congress proposes reducing appropriations for this fund by $700 million; and

Whereas, this reduction in federal funding could result in the elimination of direct services for more than 10,000 victims of crime throughout Tennessee; and

Whereas, Tennessee's District Attorneys General use federal VOCA grants to fund forty-five specially trained Victim Witness Coordinator (VWC) positions; and

Whereas, these VWCs support victims of crime who are navigating the court system by assisting with orders of protection and restraining orders, accompanying victims to court, providing service referrals, and helping victims apply for restitution and crime injuries compensation; and

Whereas, of the more than 10,000 victims served by VWCs in 2023, approximately seventy-five percent were encountering the court system for the first time; and

Whereas, in addition to their critical role as advocates for victims and survivors. VWCs are the link that connects victims to the successful prosecution of criminal cases; and

Whereas, it is essential that victims have the resources they need to navigate the court system in pursuit of justice, and thus, the VOCA Victims Fund is a critical resource that should be fully funded by Congress; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the One Hundred Thirteenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, that we urge the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to refrain from reducing appropriations to the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund for Fiscal Year 2024 and instead restore full funding of VOCA to Fiscal Year 2021 levels; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to Joe Biden, President of the United States; the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; the President and the Secretary of the U.S. Senate; and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the U.S. Congress.

POM–106. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to refrain from reducing appropriations to the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund for fiscal year 2024 and instead restore full funding of VOCA to fiscal year 2021 levels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 195

Whereas, since 1984, millions of victims have been provided essential support and resources through the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund; and

Whereas, the Fiscal Year 2024 funding proposal currently before the United States Congress proposes reducing appropriations for this fund by $700 million; and

Whereas, this reduction in federal funding could result in the elimination of direct services for more than 10,000 victims of crime throughout Tennessee; and

Whereas, Tennessee's District Attorneys General use federal VOCA grants to fund forty-five specially trained Victim Witness Coordinator (VWC) positions; and

Whereas, these VWCs support victims of crime who are navigating the court system by assisting with orders of protection and restraining orders, accompanying victims to court, providing service referrals, and helping victims apply for restitution and crime injuries compensation; and

Whereas, of the more than 10,000 victims served by VWCs in 2023, approximately seventy-five percent were encountering the court system for the first time; and

Whereas, in addition to their critical role as advocates for victims and survivors, VWCs are the link that connects victims to the successful prosecution of criminal cases; and

Whereas, it is essential that victims have the resources they need to navigate the court system in pursuit of justice, and thus, the VOCA Victims Fund is a critical resource that should be fully funded by Congress; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Thirteenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee,

That we urge the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to refrain from reducing appropriations to the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Victims Fund for Fiscal Year 2024 and instead restore full funding of VOCA to Fiscal Year 2021 levels; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to Joe Biden, President of the United States; the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives; the President and the Secretary of the U.S. Senate; and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the U.S. Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4278. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue regulations to ensure due process rights for physicians before any termination, restriction, or reduction of the professional activity of such physicians or staff privileges of such physicians; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 4279. A bill to require the Department of State and the Department of Defense to engage with the Government of Japan regarding areas of cooperation within the Pillar Two framework of the AUKUS partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4280. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to require skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities for the intellectually disabled, and inpatient rehabilitation facilities to permit essential caregivers access during any period in which regular visitation is restricted; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 4281. A bill to establish a student loan forgiveness plan for certain borrowers who are employed at a qualified farm or ranch; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 4282. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing any rule or regulation requiring the mandatory use of electronic identification eartags on cattle and bison; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4283. A bill to establish grants to provide education on guardianship alternatives for older adults and people with disabilities to health care workers, educators, family members, and court workers and court-related personnel; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4284. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of monthly housing stipend received by parents pursuing a program of education through distance learning using Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

S. 4285. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 to improve cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel defense capabilities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 4286. A bill to provide emergency assistance to States, territories, Tribal nations, and local areas affected by substance use disorder, including the use of opioids and stimulants, and to make financial assistance available to States, territories, Tribal nations, local areas, public or private nonprofit entities, and certain health providers, to provide for the development, organization, coordination, and operation of more effective and cost efficient systems for the delivery of essential services to individuals with substance use disorder and their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. VANCE):

S. 4287. A bill to establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 4288. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for more efficient hearings on nuclear facility construction applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4289. A bill to cancel existing medical debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4290. A bill to permit voluntary economic activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4291. A bill to repeal the limitations on multiple ownership of radio and television stations imposed by the Federal Communications Commission, to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from limiting common ownership of daily newspapers and full-power broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4292. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 4293. A bill to designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, as the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4294. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to negotiate with the Government of Canada regarding an agreement for integrated cross border aerial law enforcement operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 677. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of the teachers of the United States in building and enhancing the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 678. A resolution designating May 3, 2024, as ''United States Foreign Service Day'' in recognition of the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service of the United States, and honoring the members of the Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 679. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Con. Res. 36. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 76

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 76, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to furnish tailored information to expecting mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 138

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 138, a bill to amend the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to modify certain provisions of that Act.

S. 341

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 341, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain broadband grants from gross income.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2311, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, California.

S. 2340

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to establish the Increasing Land, Capital, and Market Access Program within the Farm Service Agency Office of Outreach and Education.

S. 2771

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2771, a bill to allow additional individuals to enroll in standalone dental plans offered through Federal Exchanges.

S. 3047

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3047, a bill to award payments to employees of Air America who provided support to the United States from 1950 to 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 3142

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3142, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand the prohibition related to child labor, and for other purposes.

S. 3580

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3580, a bill to require institutions of higher education participating in Federal student aid programs to share information about title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, including a link to the webpage of the Office for Civil Rights where an individual can submit a complaint regarding discrimination in violation of such title, and for other purposes.

S. 3629

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3629, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to revise recidivist penalty provisions for child sexual exploitation offenses to uniformly account for prior military convictions, thereby ensuring parity among Federal, State, and military convictions, and for other purposes.

S. 3733

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3733, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a national, evidence-based education campaign to increase public and health care provider awareness regarding the potential risks and benefits of human cell and tissue products transplants, and for other purposes.

S. 3832

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3832, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure appropriate access to non-opioid pain management drugs under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 4091

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4091, a bill to strengthen Federal efforts to counter antisemitism in the United States.

S. 4094

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4094, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of the Medicare Diabetes Prevention program, and for other purposes.

S. 4141

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 4141, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the FIFA World Cup 2026, and for other purposes.

S. 4240

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4240, a bill to establish that an individual who is convicted of any offense under any Federal or State law related to the individual's conduct at and during the course of a protest that occurs at an institution of higher education shall be ineligible for forgiveness, cancellation, waiver, or modification of certain Federal student loans.

S. 4249

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4249, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on access to operational energy by the Armed Forces in the Indo-Pacific region.

S. 4263

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4263, a bill to require agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rulemaking for major rules.

S. 4272

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4272, a bill to direct the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library to obtain a statue of Shirley Chisholm for placement in the United States Capitol.

S. 4275

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4275, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. RES. 676

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 676, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, to be observed from May 6 through May 12, 2024.

AMENDMENT NO. 1921

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1921 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1923

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1923 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1924

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1924 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1991

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1991 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2024

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2024 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2030

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2030 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3935, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 4293. A bill to designate the United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, as the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4293

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

SECTION 1. EUGENE E. SILER, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE ANNEX.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse annex located at 310 South Main Street in London, Kentucky, shall be known and designated as the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse annex referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Eugene E. Siler, Jr. United States Courthouse Annex''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 677—RECOGNIZING THE ROLES AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES IN BUILDING AND ENHANCING THE CIVIC, CULTURAL, AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. KAINE, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 677

Whereas education and knowledge are the foundation of the current and future strength of the United States;

Whereas teachers and other education staff have earned and deserve the respect of their students and communities for the selfless dedication of the teachers and staff to community service and the futures of the children of the United States;

Whereas teachers and other education staff have taken on many new challenges in recent years, including—

(1) helping to address pandemic learning loss;

(2) supporting the mental and behavioral health needs of students; and

(3) navigating a changing classroom environment;

Whereas the purposes of National Teacher Appreciation Week, celebrated from May 6, 2024, through May 10, 2024, are—

(1) to raise public awareness of the unquantifiable contributions of teachers; and

(2) to promote greater respect and understanding for the teaching profession; and

Whereas students, schools, communities, and a number of organizations representing educators are recognizing the importance of teachers during National Teacher Appreciation Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) thanks the teachers of the United States; and

(2) promotes the profession of teaching and the contributions of educators by encouraging students, parents, school administrators, and public officials to recognize National Teacher Appreciation Week.

SENATE RESOLUTION 678—DESIGNATING MAY 3, 2024, AS ''UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE DAY'' IN RECOGNITION OF THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE SERVED, OR ARE PRESENTLY SERVING, IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AND HONORING THE MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE WHO HAVE GIVEN THEIR LIVES IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 678

Whereas the Foreign Service of the United States (referred to in this preamble as the ''Foreign Service'') was established through the enactment of the Act entitled ''An Act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes.'', approved May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 140, chapter 182) (commonly known as the ''Rogers Act of 1924''), and is now celebrating its 100th anniversary;

Whereas the Rogers Act of 1924 established a career organization based on competitive examination and merit promotion;

Whereas, in 2024, nearly 16,000 men and women of the Foreign Service are serving at home and abroad;

Whereas Foreign Service personnel are supported by more than 60,000 locally engaged staff in nearly 300 embassies and consulates, who provide unique expertise and crucial links to host countries;

Whereas Foreign Service personnel comprise employees from the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Foreign Commercial Service, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, and the United States Agency for Global Media;

Whereas the diplomatic, consular, communications, trade, development, security, public diplomacy, and numerous other functions that Foreign Service personnel perform constitute the first and most cost-effective instrument of the United States to protect and promote United States interests abroad;

Whereas the men and women of the Foreign Service and their families are increasingly exposed to risks and danger, even in times of peace, and many have died in the service of the United States;

Whereas employees of the Foreign Service work daily—

(1) to ensure the national security of the United States;

(2) to provide assistance to United States citizens overseas;

(3) to preserve peace, freedom, and economic prosperity around the world;

(4) to promote the ideals and values of the United States, human rights, freedom, equal opportunities for women and girls, rule of law, and democracy;

(5) to promote transparency, provide accurate information, and combat disinformation;

(6) to cultivate new markets for United States products and services and develop new investment opportunities that create jobs in the United States and promote prosperity;

(7) to promote economic development, reduce poverty, end hunger and malnutrition, fight disease, combat international crime and illegal drugs, and address environmental degradation; and

(8) to provide emergency and humanitarian assistance to respond to crises around the world;

Whereas the foreign affairs agencies and the American Foreign Service Association have observed Foreign Service Day in May for many years; and

Whereas it is both appropriate and just for the United States as a whole to recognize the dedication of the men and women of the Foreign Service and to honor the members of the Foreign Service who have given their lives in the loyal pursuit of their duties and responsibilities representing the interests of the United States and of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service of the United States for their dedicated and important service to the United States;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service and sacrifice of past, present, and future employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, wherever they serve, with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

(3) designates May 3, 2024, as ''United States Foreign Service Day'' to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Foreign Service of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 679—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 679

Whereas children are fundamental to the success of the United States and will shape the future of the United States;

Whereas elected representatives and leaders in the communities of the United States must be ever vigilant and proactive in support of evidence-based means to prevent child abuse and neglect and support families;

Whereas adverse childhood experiences (referred to in this preamble as ''ACEs'') are

traumatic experiences that occur during childhood with lasting effects and include experiences of violence, abuse, or neglect;

Whereas at least 5 of the top 10 leading causes of death are associated with ACEs;

Whereas preventing ACEs could reduce many health conditions, including—

(1) up to 21,000,000 cases of depression;

(2) up to 1,900,000 cases of heart disease; and

(3) up to 2,500,000 cases of overweight and obesity;

Whereas every child is filled with tremendous promise, and we all have a collective responsibility to prevent ACEs, foster the potential of every child, and promote positive childhood experiences;

Whereas primary prevention of child abuse and neglect can reduce the lifetime economic burden associated with child maltreatment;

Whereas, in 2022, an estimated 7,530,000 children were referred to child protective services agencies, alleging maltreatment;

Whereas, in 2022, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's CyberTipline received nearly 32,000,000 reports of suspected online child sexual exploitation, which marked the highest number of reports ever received in 1 year;

Whereas reports indicate that 1 in 4 girls and 1 in 20 boys experience sexual abuse before their eighteenth birthday, with more than 42,000,000 estimated child sexual abuse survivors in the United States;

Whereas approximately 1 in 7 children in the United States experienced child abuse, neglect, or both between 2022 and 2023;

Whereas 43 percent of children exposed to inappropriate sexual content on social media are under 13 years old, and 1 in 5 are 9 years old or younger;

Whereas 91 percent of child sexual abuse victims are abused by a person they know and trust;

Whereas children who are sexually abused, especially when not provided appropriate treatment and support, often suffer lifelong consequences, such as physical and mental health challenges and higher risk of drug and alcohol misuse and suicide;

Whereas education and awareness of possible signs of child abuse and neglect should be prioritized for purposes of prevention;

Whereas by intervening to prevent adversity and build resilience during the most critical years of development of a child, voluntary, evidence-based, home-visiting programs have shown positive impact on—

(1) reducing the recurrence of child abuse and neglect;

(2) decreased low-birthweight babies;

(3) improved school readiness for children; and

(4) increased high school graduation rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month;

(2) recognizes child abuse and neglect and child sexual abuse are preventable and that a healthy and prosperous society depends on strong families and communities;

(3) supports efforts to increase the awareness of, and provide education for, the general public of the United States, with respect to preventing child abuse and neglect and building protective factors for families;

(4) supports the efforts to help survivors of childhood sexual abuse heal;

(5) supports justice for victims of childhood sexual abuse; and

(6) recognizes the need for prevention, healing, and justice efforts related to childhood abuse and neglect and sexual abuse.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 36—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on June 16, 2024, for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2033. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2034. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2035. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2036. Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. BUTLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2037. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2038. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2039. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2040. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2041. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2042. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2043. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2044. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2045. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2046. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2047. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2048. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2049. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2050. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2051. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2052. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2053. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2054. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2055. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2056. Mr. KELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2057. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2058. Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. WELCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2059. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2033. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS OF NEW MOTOR VEHICLE INVENTORY AS QUALIFIED LIQUIDATIONS OF LIFO INVENTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any dealer of new motor vehicles which inventories new motor vehicles under the LIFO method for any specified taxable year, the requirements of paragraphs (1)(B) and (2) of section 473(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as satisfied with respect to such inventory for such taxable year.

(b) ADDITIONAL RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, not later than the date which is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe regulations or other guidance under which dealers of new motor vehicles with a qualified liquidation (determined after application of subsection (a)) of new motor vehicles for any specified taxable year may elect—

(A) to not recognize any income in the specified taxable year which is solely attributable to such qualified liquidation, and

(B) to treat the replacement period with respect to such liquidation as being the period beginning with the first taxable year after such specified taxable year and ending with the earlier of—

(i) the first taxable year after such liquidation with respect to which such dealer does not inventory new motor vehicles under the LIFO method, or

(ii) the last taxable year ending before January 1, 2026.

(2) FAILURE TO FULLY REPLACE LIQUIDATED VEHICLES DURING REPLACEMENT PERIOD.—If, as of the close of the replacement period, the taxpayer has failed to replace all liquidated vehicles with respect to a qualified liquidation to which paragraph (1) applies, the taxpayer shall increase gross income for the last taxable year of the replacement period by the sum of—

(A) the aggregate amount of income that would have been required to be recognized in the liquidation year had the taxpayer elected to apply the provisions of section 473 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and not made the election in paragraph (1), plus

(B) interest thereon at the underpayment rate established under section 6621 of such Code.

(3) ELECTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent provided in subparagraph (B), an election under paragraph (1) with respect to any specified taxable year shall be made by the due date (including extensions) for filing the taxpayer's return of tax for such taxable year and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Once made, any such election shall be irrevocable.

(B) CERTAIN ELECTIONS TREATED AS CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of an election with respect to a specified taxable year for which the return of tax has already been filed before the date of the enactment of this Act, any election under paragraph (1) for such specified taxable year may be made on the return of tax for the first taxable year ending after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall be treated for purposes of section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as a change in method of accounting initiated by the taxpayer and made with the consent of the Secretary.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) SPECIFIED TAXABLE YEAR.—The term ''specified taxable year'' means any liquidation year ending after March 12, 2020, and before January 1, 2022.

(2) NEW MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term ''new motor vehicle'' means a motor vehicle—

(A) which is described in section 163(j)(9)(C)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

(B) the original use of which has not commenced.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(4) OTHER TERMS.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, terms used in this section which are also used in section 473 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall have the same meaning as when used in such section 473.

SA 2034. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. GUARANTEED BENEFIT CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) INCREASE TO FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining what benefits are guaranteed under section 4022 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1322) with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary under a covered plan specified in paragraph (4) in connection with the termination of such plan, the amount of monthly benefits shall be equal to the full vested plan benefit with respect to the participant.

(B) NO EFFECT ON PREVIOUS DETERMINATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to change the allocation of assets and recoveries under sections 4044(a) and 4022(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1344(a); 1322(c)) as previously determined by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (referred to in this section as the ''corporation'') for the covered plans specified in paragraph (4), and the corporation's applicable rules, practices, and policies on benefits payable in terminated single-employer plans shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, continue to apply with respect to such covered plans.

(2) RECALCULATION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the amount of monthly benefits with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary described in paragraph (1) was calculated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation shall recalculate such amount pursuant to paragraph (1), and shall adjust any subsequent payments of such monthly benefits accordingly, as soon as practicable after such date.

(B) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS OF PAST-DUE BENEFITS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a lump-sum payment to each eligible participant or beneficiary whose guaranteed benefits are recalculated under subparagraph (A) in an amount equal to—

(i) in the case of an eligible participant, the excess of—

(I) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the participant for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(II) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible participant; and

(ii) in the case of an eligible beneficiary, the sum of—

(I) the amount that would be determined under clause (i) with respect to the participant of which the eligible beneficiary is a beneficiary if such participant were still in pay status; plus

(II) the excess of—

(aa) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the eligible beneficiary for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

(bb) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible beneficiary.

Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the corporation shall increase each lump-sum payment made under this subparagraph to account for foregone interest in an amount determined by the corporation designed to reflect a 6 percent annual interest rate on each past-due amount attributable to the underpayment of guaranteed benefits for each month prior to such recalculation.

(C) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, an eligible participant or beneficiary is a participant or beneficiary who—

(I) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is in pay status under a covered plan or is eligible for future payments under such plan;

(II) has received or will receive applicable payments in connection with such plan (within the meaning of clause (ii)) that does not exceed the full vested plan benefits of such participant or beneficiary; and

(III) is not covered by the 1999 agreements between General Motors and various unions providing a top-up benefit to certain hourly employees who were transferred from the General Motors Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan to the Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(ii) APPLICABLE PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this paragraph, applicable payments to a participant or beneficiary in connection with a plan consist of the following:

(I) Payments under the plan equal to the normal benefit guarantee of the participant or beneficiary.

(II) Payments to the participant or beneficiary made pursuant to section 4022(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1322(c)) or otherwise received from the corporation in connection with the termination of the plan.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—The term ''full vested plan benefit'' means the amount of monthly benefits that would be guaranteed under section 4022 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1322) as of the date of plan termination with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary if such section were applied without regard to the phase-in limit under subsection (b)(1) of such section and the

maximum guaranteed benefit limitation under subsection (b)(3) of such section (including the accrued-at-normal limitation).

(B) NORMAL BENEFIT GUARANTEE.—The term ''normal benefit guarantee'' means the amount of monthly benefits guaranteed under section 4022 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1322) with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary without regard to this section.

(4) COVERED PLANS.—The covered plans specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

(B) The Delphi Retirement Program for Salaried Employees.

(C) The PHI Non-Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(D) The ASEC Manufacturing Retirement Program.

(E) The PHI Bargaining Retirement Plan.

(F) The Delphi Mechatronic Systems Retirement Program.

(5) TREATMENT OF PBGC DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination made by the corporation under this section concerning a recalculation of benefits or lump-sum payment of past-due benefits shall be subject to administrative review by the corporation. Any new determination made by the corporation under this section shall be governed by the same administrative review process as any other benefit determination by the corporation.

(b) TRUST FUND FOR PAYMENT OF INCREASED BENEFITS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a trust fund to be known as the ''Delphi Full Vested Plan Benefit Trust Fund'' (referred to in this subsection as the ''Fund''), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section.

(2) FUNDING.—There is appropriated, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as are necessary for the costs of payments of the portions of monthly benefits guaranteed to participants and beneficiaries pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payments. The Fund shall be credited with amounts from time to time as the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the corporation, determines appropriate, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may issue such regulations as necessary to carry out this section.

(d) TAX TREATMENT OF LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless the taxpayer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) to have this paragraph not apply with respect to any lump-sum payment under subsection (a)(2)(B), the amount of such payment shall be included in the taxpayer's gross income ratably over the 3-taxable-year period beginning with the taxable year in which such payment is received.

(2) SPECIAL RULES RELATED TO DEATH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the taxpayer dies before the end of the 3-taxable-year period described in paragraph (1), any amount to which paragraph (1) applies which has not been included in gross income for a taxable year ending before the taxable year in which such death occurs shall be included in gross income for such taxable year.

(B) SPECIAL ELECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OF ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—If—

(i) a taxpayer with respect to whom paragraph (1) applies dies,

(ii) such taxpayer is an eligible participant,

(iii) the surviving spouse of such eligible participant is entitled to a survivor benefit from the corporation with respect to such eligible participant, and

(iv) such surviving spouse elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the application of this subparagraph,

subparagraph (A) shall not apply and any amount which would have (but for such taxpayer's death) been included in the gross income of such taxpayer under paragraph (1) for any taxable year beginning after the date of such death shall be included in the gross income of such surviving spouse for the taxable year of such surviving spouse ending with or within such taxable year of the taxpayer.

(e) PENSION VARIABLE RATE PREMIUM PAYMENT ACCELERATION.—Notwithstanding section 4007(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1307(a)) and section 4007.11 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, any additional premium determined under subparagraph (E) of section 4006(a)(3) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1306(a)(3)) the due date for which is (but for this section) after September 15, 2033, and before November 1, 2033, shall be due not later than September 15, 2033.

SA 2035. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—FANS FIRST ACT

SEC. ___1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Fans First Act''.

SEC. ___2. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AFFIRMATIVE EXPRESS CONSENT.—The term ''affirmative express consent'' means an affirmative act by a person that clearly communicates that person's freely given, specific, and unambiguous authorization.

(2) ANCILLARY FEE.—The term ''ancillary fee'' means any additional charge added to the face value of an event ticket, excluding taxes.

(3) ARTIST.—The term ''artist'' means any performer, musician, comedian, producer, ensemble, or production entity of a theatrical production, sports team owner, or similar individual or entity that contracts with an event organizer to put on an event.

(4) CLEARLY AND CONSPICUOUSLY.—The term ''clearly and conspicuously'' means, with respect to a disclosure, that the disclosure is displayed in a manner that is difficult to miss and easily understandable, including in the following ways:

(A) In the case of a visual disclosure, its size, contrast, location, the length of time it appears, and other characteristics, stand out from any accompanying text or other visual elements so that it is easily noticed, read, and understood.

(B) The disclosure must be unavoidable.

(C) The disclosure must use diction and syntax understandable to ordinary consumers and must appear in each language in which the representation that requires the disclosure appears.

(D) The disclosure must not be contradicted or mitigated by, or inconsistent with, anything else in the communication.

(5) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Trade Commission.

(6) EVENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''event'' means a live activity described in subparagraph (B)—

(i) that is taking place in a venue;

(ii) that is open to the general public; and

(iii)(I) that is promoted, advertised, or marketed in interstate commerce; or

(II) for which event tickets are sold or distributed in interstate commerce.

(B) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities described in this subparagraph are any—

(i) live concert,

(ii) theatrical performance;

(iii) sporting event;

(iv) comedy show; or

(v) similarly scheduled activity taking place in a venue.

(C) EXEMPTED EVENTS.—Such term shall not include a live activity described in subparagraph (B) that is—

(i) put on by a religious organization for non-commercial purposes;

(ii) put on by a K-12 school; or

(iii) a non-sports-related event put on by a postsecondary school or not-for-profit entity in which the artists are primarily students.

(7) EVENT ORGANIZER.—The term ''event organizer'' means, with respect to an event, the person (such as the operator of a venue, the sponsor or promoter of an event, a sports team participating in an event or a league whose teams are participating in an event, a theater company, musical group, or similar participant in an event, or an agent for any such person) that—

(A) is primarily responsible for the financial risk associated with the event;

(B) makes event tickets initially available, including by contracting with a primary seller; and

(C)(i) is responsible for organizing, promoting, producing, or presenting an event; or

(ii) in the case of an event for which tickets are sold, holds the rights to present the event.

(8) EVENT TICKET.—The term ''event ticket'' means any manifested physical, electronic, or other form of a certificate, document, voucher, token, or other evidence indicating that a person has—

(A) a license to enter an event venue or occupy a particular seat or area in an event venue with respect to one or more events; or

(B) an entitlement to purchase such a license with respect to one or more future events.

(9) FACE VALUE.—The term ''face value'' means, with respect to an event ticket, the initial or acquisition price for the primary sale of the event ticket, exclusive of any taxes or ancillary fees.

(10) FAN CLUB PROGRAM.—The term ''fan club program'' means a membership-based program, primarily established by venues, artists, or performers to offer pre-sale opportunities offered before public on-sale of tickets.

(11) PRIMARY SALE.—The term ''primary sale'' means, with respect to a particular event ticket, the initial sale of that event ticket by or on behalf of the event organizer,

or the sale of an event ticket that was returned to the primary seller or event organizer after its initial sale and is sold by or on behalf of the event organizer under the same terms as such initial sale.

(12) PRIMARY SELLER.—The term ''primary seller'' means, with respect to an event ticket, any person who has the right to sell the event ticket prior to or at the primary sale of the ticket, including the event organizer, or any person that provides services to conduct or facilitate the primary sale of event tickets by or on behalf of the event organizer.

(13) RESELLER.—The term ''reseller'' means a person who sells or offers for sale, other than through a primary sale, an event ticket. That a reseller is also an event organizer or a primary seller does not exempt the reseller from this definition.

(14) SECONDARY SALE.—The term ''secondary sale'' means any sale of an event ticket other than the primary sale of the event ticket, and does not include the sale of a ticket returned to a primary seller.

(15) SECONDARY TICKETING EXCHANGE.— The term ''secondary ticketing exchange'' means any website, software application, or other digital platform that facilitates or executes the secondary sale of an event ticket. That a secondary ticketing exchange is also an event organizer or a primary seller does not exempt the secondary ticketing exchange from this definition.

(16) SELLER.—The term ''seller'' means any primary seller, secondary ticketing exchange, reseller, or any person that sells or makes available for sale an event ticket to the public.

(17) TOTAL EVENT TICKET PRICE.—The term ''total event ticket price'' means, with respect to an event ticket, the total cost of the event ticket, including the face value price and any ancillary fees but excluding taxes.

(18) URL.—The term ''URL'' means the Uniform Resource Locator associated with an internet website.

(19) VENUE.—The term ''venue'' means a physical space at which an event takes place.

SEC. ___3. ENSURING TICKETING MARKET INTEGRITY.

(a) BAN ON DECEPTIVE URLS AND IMPROPER USE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a secondary ticketing exchange or reseller, or the operator of any website purporting to sell or offer for sale event tickets that links or redirects to a secondary ticketing exchange or reseller, to—

(A) use any artist name, venue name, or event organizer name, graphic, marketing logo, image or other intellectual property of the artist, venue, or event organizer including any proprietary resemblance of the venue where an event shall occur in promotional materials, social media promotions, or URLs of the secondary ticketing exchange, reseller, or website without the prior authorization of the respective artist, venue, or event organizer under the terms of agreement between the artist, venue, or event organizer and the secondary ticketing exchange, reseller, or website; or

(B) state or imply that the secondary ticketing exchange, reseller, or website is affiliated with or endorsed by a venue, team, or artist, as applicable, including by using words like ''official'' in promotional materials, social media promotions, search engine optimization, paid advertising, URLs, or search engine monetization unless the secondary ticketing exchange, reseller, or website has the express written consent of the venue, team, or artist, as applicable.

(2) PERMITTED USE.—Paragraph (1) shall not prohibit a secondary ticketing exchange or reseller from using text containing the name of an artist, venue, or event organizers to describe an event and identify the location at which the event will occur, or provide information identifying the space within the venue that an event ticket would entitle the bearer to occupy for an event.

(b) SPECULATIVE TICKETING BAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a reseller to sell, offer for sale, or advertise for sale an event ticket unless the seller has actual or constructive possession of the event ticket.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit any person from offering a service to a consumer to obtain an event ticket on behalf of the consumer provided that the person—

(A) does not market or list such service as an event ticket;

(B) lists the price for such service separately from the total event ticket price paid by the service provider for the event ticket in any advertisement, marketing, price list, social media promotion, or other interface that displays a price for such service;

(C) maintains a clear, distinct, and easily discernible separation between such service and event tickets through unavoidable visual demarcation that persists throughout the entire service selection and purchasing process;

(D) clearly and conspicuously discloses prior to selection of the service that such service is not an event ticket and that the purchase of such service does not guarantee a ticket to such event;

(E) shall not obtain tickets through any fan club program;

(F) shall not obtain more tickets in each transaction than the numerical limitations for tickets set by the venue and artist for each respective event; and

(G) in the event the service is unable to obtain the specified event ticket purchased through the service for the consumer, provides the consumer that purchased the service, within a reasonable amount of time—

(i) a full refund for the total cost of the service to obtain an event ticket on behalf of the consumer; or

(ii) subject to availability, a replacement event ticket in the same or a comparable location with the approval of the consumer.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SALE OF EVENT TICKETS.—It shall be unlawful for any seller to sell or offer for sale an event ticket in or affecting commerce, unless the seller does the following:

(1) ALL-IN PRICING.—The seller clearly and conspicuously—

(A) displays the total event ticket price in any advertisement, marketing, price list, social media promotion, or other interface that displays a price for the event ticket; and

(B) discloses to any individual who seeks to purchase an event ticket the total event ticket price at the time the ticket is first displayed to the individual and anytime thereafter throughout the ticket purchasing process, including an itemized breakdown of the face value of the event ticket and all applicable taxes and ancillary fees.

(2) TICKET AND REFUND INFORMATION.—The seller discloses to any individual who seeks to purchase an event ticket—

(A) the space within the venue that the event ticket would entitle the bearer to occupy for the event, whether that is general admission or the specific seat or section, at the initial point of ticket selection by the purchaser;

(B) the seller's refund policies and how to obtain a refund from the seller if—

(i) the purchaser receives an event ticket that does not match the description of the ticket provided to the purchaser at the point of purchase;

(ii) the event is canceled or postponed;

(iii) the event ticket does not or would not grant the purchaser admission to the event;

(iv) the event ticket is counterfeit; or

(v) the event ticket was resold in violation of the terms and conditions established by the event organizer or its primary seller;

(C) the date and means of delivery by which the event ticket will be delivered to the purchaser;

(D) any restrictions on resale of the event ticket under the terms and conditions of the event ticket; and

(E) a link to the website created by the Commission under subsection (f)(4) through which individuals may report violations of this section to the Commission.

(3) DISCLOSURE OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The seller discloses or provides a link to the full terms and conditions of the event ticket to any individual who seeks to purchase an event ticket prior to the point of purchase.

(4) PROOF OF PURCHASE.—If the event ticket is an electronic ticket, the seller delivers written proof of purchase to the purchaser as soon as is practicable and no later than 24 hours following the purchase of the event ticket, which shall include—

(A) the date and time of the purchase of the event ticket;

(B) the face value and total purchase price of the event ticket, including all taxes and ancillary fees;

(C) the space within the venue that the event ticket would entitle the bearer to occupy for the event, whether that is general admission or the specific seat or section;

(D) the date on which and the means by which the event ticket will be delivered to the purchaser; and

(E) any restrictions on resale of the event ticket under the terms and conditions of the event ticket.

(5) REFUND REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the event of an event cancellation, a seller shall provide a purchaser of an event ticket from that seller, at the option of the purchaser, at a minimum a full refund of the total event ticket price plus any taxes paid by the purchaser.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply where an event is canceled due to a cause beyond the reasonable control of the event organizer, including a natural disaster, civil disturbance, or otherwise unforeseeable impediment.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SECONDARY SALES.—

(1) DISCLOSURES TO ARTIST AND VENUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A secondary ticketing exchange shall, in connection with each secondary sale of an event ticket facilitated or executed by the exchange, provide at a minimum the ticket purchaser the option to opt-in by affirmative express consent to provide the artist and venue the purchaser's name, email address, and phone number for the sole purposes of—

(i) ensuring the safety and security of the artist, venue staff or property, event attendees, or any other individual or property associated with the event; or

(ii) allowing the artist or venue to provide the purchaser with information about event postponements or cancellations.

(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—If a purchaser provides the affirmative express consent described in subparagraph (A) to a secondary ticketing exchange, the exchange shall provide the information described in such subparagraph to the artist and venue.

(C) PROHIBITION ON UNAUTHORIZED USES.—It shall be unlawful for an artist or venue to use information disclosed to the artist or venue in accordance with this paragraph from any purpose other than the purposes described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), including for promotional purposes.

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to conflict with or preempt existing data privacy laws.

(2) NOTICE OF SECONDARY SALE.—It shall be unlawful for a secondary ticketing exchange to—

(A) facilitate or execute the secondary sale of an event ticket unless the secondary ticketing exchange clearly and conspicuously discloses—

(i) that it is not the primary seller of the event ticket at the top of its website, or at a comparable appropriate place on its software application or other digital platform, and at the point of purchase; or

(ii) if the secondary ticketing exchange also operates as the primary seller with respect to the event ticket, a notice on any page or interface that facilitates the resale of event tickets, that event tickets available on the page or interface are being resold;

(B) receive the exclusive right to use the artist name, venue name, event organizer name, graphic, marketing logo, image or other intellectual property of the artist, venue, or event organizer in promotional materials, social media promotions, search engine optimization, or in any marketing agreement between the artist, venue, or event organizer and the secondary ticketing exchange, if the secondary ticketing exchange is owned by, controlled by, or under common ownership or control with a person that also operates as a primary seller or event organizer; or

(C) advertise or represent that it is the primary seller of an event for which it is not the primary seller.

(e) GAO STUDIES OF TICKETING MARKET PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—One year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall release a study on the event ticket market.

(2) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of how professional resellers obtain event tickets that are subsequently offered for resale, including whether those methods violate the BOTS Act (Public Law 114–274);

(B) an assessment of event ticket brokers obtaining tickets through fan club, venue pre sales, or credit card rewards programs;

(C) an assessment of the prevalence of counterfeit or fraudulently sold event tickets and whether incidents of counterfeit or fraudulently sold event tickets are reported to law enforcement agencies by consumers, venues, sellers, or other entities;

(D) an assessment of the incidence of consumers purchasing event tickets on secondary ticketing exchanges who are subsequently denied entry to the event for which they purchased event tickets;

(E) an assessment of the percentage of event tickets to events that are acquired by professional resellers for purposes of resale;

(F) an assessment of the average cost of event tickets in relation to their face value and total event ticket price;

(G) an assessment of the average cost of concert event tickets sold on the secondary market in relation to their face value and total event ticket price;

(H) an assessment of the average cost of event tickets in relation to their face value, ancillary fees and total event ticket price in both the primary and secondary markets;

(I) an assessment of primary and secondary exchange market share, including an estimate of how many tickets are purchased and resold on the same platform and average fees generated in closed-loop ticket resale;

(J) an assessment of the overall size of the resale market, including percentage of tickets resold and the total monetary volume of the resale market;

(K) an assessment of consumer use of the resale market, including how often ordinary consumers who intended to go to an event had to resell event tickets and what percentage of face value their event tickets sold for;

(L) an assessment of the prevalence of exclusive contracts between a primary seller and any venue or artist, including the effect of such exclusive contracts on the market for primary seller services, taking into account averages for events of various types (including but not limited to sports, concerts, fine arts performances) and venues (including but not limited to stadiums, amphitheaters, concert halls, clubs);

(M) an assessment of event ticket allocation by primary sellers, including the effect of event ticket allocation on event ticket prices, taking into account averages for events of various types (including but not limited to sports, concerts, fine arts performances) and venues (including but not limited to stadiums, amphitheaters, concert halls, clubs);

(N) an assessment of secondary ticketing exchanges and event ticket brokers offering services to a consumer to obtain an event ticket on behalf of the consumer, including but not limited to whether the platforms and brokers are deploying unfair, unethical, or illegal tactics to acquire such tickets and prevent fans from accessing them at face value;

(O) an assessment of market manipulation techniques employed by professional resellers, including but not limited to ''buy and hold'' strategies where event tickets purchased for resale are not listed for sale to affect secondary event ticket prices; and

(P) an assessment of the prevalence of exclusive national touring arrangements between promoters and artists and an assessment of artists represented by managers under shared ownership with promoters and ticketing companies, including how often those artists utilize the services of companies under shared ownership, including ticketing, event organizing, merchandising and venue rental.

(f) ENFORCEMENT BY THE COMMISSION.—

(1) FTC ACT VIOLATION.—Any person who violates this section shall be liable for engaging in an unfair or deceptive act or practice under section 5(a)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(1)).

(2) CIVIL ACTION.—If the Commission has reason to believe that any person has violated this section, the Commission may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) recover a civil penalty under paragraph (3); and

(B) seek other appropriate relief, including injunctive relief.

(3) CIVIL PENALTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates this section shall be liable for—

(i) a civil penalty of at least $15,000 for each day during which the violation occurs or continues to occur; and

(ii) an additional civil penalty equal to the greater of—

(I) $1,000 per event ticket advertised, listed, sold, or resold in violation of this section; or

(II) an amount equal to the sum of the total event ticket prices for each event ticket listed or sold in violation of this section, multiplied by 5.

(B) ENHANCED CIVIL PENALTY FOR INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS.—In addition to the civil penalty under subparagraph (A), a person that intentionally violates this section shall be liable for a civil penalty of at least $10,000 per event ticket sold or resold in violation of this section.

(4) COMPLAINT WEBSITE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall create a publicly available website where individuals may report violations of this section.

(B) COOPERATION WITH STATE AGS.—As appropriate, the Commission shall share reports received through the website created under subparagraph (A) with State attorneys general.

(5) FTC REPORT.—The Commission shall report annually to Congress on enforcement metrics, activity, and effectiveness under this section.

(g) ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person in a practice that violates this section, the attorney general of the State may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States—

(A) to enjoin further violation of such provision by such person;

(B) to compel compliance with such provision; and

(C) to obtain damages, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of such residents.

(2) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(3) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(A) VENUE.—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(i) is an inhabitant; or

(ii) may be found.

(4) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under paragraph (1), any other consumer protection officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

SEC. ___4. STRENGTHENING THE BOTS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Better Online Ticket Sales Act of 2016 (15 U.S.C. 45c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) to use or cause to be used an application that performs automated tasks to purchase event tickets from an Internet website or online service in circumvention of posted online ticket purchasing order rules of the Internet website or online service, including a software application that circumvents an

access control system, security measure, or other technological control or measure.'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) REQUIRING ONLINE TICKET ISSUERS TO PUT IN PLACE SITE POLICIES AND ESTABLISH SAFEGUARDS TO PROTECT SITE SECURITY.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT TO ENFORCE SITE POLICIES.—Each ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets shall ensure that such website or service has in place an access control system, security measure, or other technological control or measure to enforce posted event ticket purchasing limits.

''(2) REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH SITE SECURITY SAFEGUARDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets shall establish, implement, and maintain reasonable administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the security, confidentiality, integrity, or availability of the website or service.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the safeguards described in subparagraph (A), each ticket issuer described in such paragraph shall consider—

''(i) the administrative, technical, and physical safeguards that are appropriate to the size and complexity of the ticket issuer;

''(ii) the nature and scope of the activities of the ticket issuer;

''(iii) the sensitivity of any customer information at issue; and

''(iv) the range of security risks and vulnerabilities that are reasonably foreseeable or known to the ticket issuer.

''(C) THIRD PARTIES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Where applicable, a ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets shall implement and maintain procedures to require that any third party or service provider that performs services with respect to the sale of event tickets or has access to data regarding event ticket purchasing on the website or service maintains reasonable administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the security and integrity of the website or service and that data.

''(ii) OVERSIGHT PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS.—The procedures implemented and maintained by a ticket issuer in accordance with clause (i) shall include the following:

''(I) Taking reasonable steps to select and retain service providers that are capable of maintaining appropriate safeguards for the customer information at issue.

''(II) Requiring service providers by contract to implement and maintain adequate safeguards.

''(III) Periodically assessing service providers based on the risk they present and the continued adequacy of their safeguards.

''(D) UPDATES.—A ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets shall regularly evaluate and make adjustments to the safeguards described in subparagraph (A) in light of any material changes in technology, internal or external threats to system security, confidentiality, integrity, and availability, and the changing business arrangements or operations of the ticket issuer.

''(3) REQUIREMENT TO REPORT INCIDENTS OF CIRCUMVENTION; CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets shall report to the Commission any incidents of circumvention of which the ticket issuer has actual knowledge.

''(B) CONSUMER COMPLAINT WEBSITE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Fans First Act, the Commission shall create a publicly available website (or modify an existing publicly available website of the Commission) to allow individuals to report violations of this subsection to the Commission.

''(C) REPORTING TIMELINE AND PROCESS.—

''(i) TIMELINE.—A ticket issuer shall report known incidents of circumvention within a reasonable period of time after the incident of circumvention is discovered by the ticket issuer, and in no case later than 30 days after an incident of circumvention is discovered by the ticket issuer.

''(ii) AUTOMATED SUBMISSION.—The Commission may establish a reporting mechanism to provide for the automatic submission of reports required under this subsection.

''(iii) COORDINATION WITH STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

''(I) share reports received from ticket issuers under subparagraph (A) with State attorneys general as appropriate; and

''(II) share consumer complaints submitted through the website established under subparagraph (B) with State attorneys general as appropriate.

''(4) DUTY TO ADDRESS CAUSES OF CIRCUMVENTION.—A ticket issuer that owns or operates an Internet website or online service that facilitates or executes the sale of event tickets must take reasonable steps to improve its access control systems, security measures, and other technological controls or measures to address any incidents of circumvention of which the ticket issuer has actual knowledge.

''(5) FTC GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Fans First Act, the Commission shall publish guidance for ticket issuers on compliance with the requirements of this subsection.'';

(4) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b)'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''The Commission'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Commission''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Any person'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (3), any person''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) CIVIL ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission has reason to believe that any person has committed a violation of subsection (a) or (b), the Commission may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to—

''(i) recover a civil penalty under paragraph (4); and

''(ii) seek other appropriate relief, including injunctive relief and other equitable relief.

''(B) LITIGATION AUTHORITY.—Except as otherwise provided in section 16(a)(3) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 56(a)(3)), the Commission shall have exclusive authority to commence or defend, and supervise the litigation of, any civil action authorized under this paragraph and any appeal of such action in its own name by any of its attorneys designated by it for such purpose, unless the Commission authorizes the Attorney General to do so. The Commission shall inform the Attorney General of the exercise of such authority and such exercise shall not preclude the Attorney General from intervening on behalf of the United States in such action and any appeal of such action as may be otherwise provided by law.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Any civil penalty or relief sought through a civil action under this paragraph shall be in addition to other penalties and relief as may be prescribed by law.

''(4) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be liable for—

''(i) a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 for each day during which the violation occurs or continues to occur; and

''(ii) an additional civil penalty of not less than $1,000 per violation.

''(B) ENHANCED CIVIL PENALTY FOR INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS.—In addition to the civil penalties under subparagraph (A), a person that intentionally violates subsection (a) or (b) shall be liable for a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 per violation.'';

(5) in subsection (d), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, by striking ''subsection (a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a) or (b)''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(e) LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and other relevant State or local law enforcement officials shall coordinate as appropriate with the Commission to share information about known instances of cyberattacks on security measures, access control systems, or other technological controls or measures on an Internet website or online service that are used by ticket issuers to enforce posted event ticket purchasing limits or to maintain the integrity of posted online ticket purchasing order rules. Such coordination may include providing information about ongoing investigations but may exclude classified information or information that could compromise a law enforcement or national security effort, as appropriate.

''(2) CYBERATTACK DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term 'cyberattack' means an attack, via cyberspace, targeting an enterprise's use of cyberspace for the purpose of—

''(A) disrupting, disabling, destroying, or maliciously controlling a computing environment or computing infrastructure; or

''(B) destroying the integrity of data or stealing controlled information.

''(f) CONGRESSIONAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Commission shall report to Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives on the status of enforcement actions taken pursuant to this Act, as well as any identified limitations to the Commission's ability to pursue incidents of circumvention described in subsection (a)(1)(A).''.

(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITION.—Section 3 of the Better Online Ticket Sales Act of 2016 (15 U.S.C. 45c note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) CIRCUMVENTION.—The term 'circumvention' means the act of avoiding, bypassing, removing, deactivating, or otherwise impairing an access control system, security measure, safeguard, or other technological control or measure described in section 2(b)(1).''.

SEC. ____5. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and of the amendments made by this title, and the application of the remaining provisions of this title and

amendments to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SA 2036. Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. BUTLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. AVIATION EXCISE FUEL TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 47107(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking ''local taxes'' and inserting ''local excise taxes'';

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking ''State tax'' and inserting ''State excise tax''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) This subsection does not apply to State or local general sales taxes nor to State or local generally applicable sales taxes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 47133 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''Local taxes'' and inserting ''Local excise taxes'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''local taxes'' and inserting ''local excise taxes'';

(3) in subsection (c) by striking ''State tax'' and inserting ''State excise tax''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall not apply to—

''(1) State or local general sales taxes; or

''(2) State or local generally applicable sales taxes.''.

SA 2037. Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXTENSION OF CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 5 of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014 (6 U.S.C. 621 note) is amended by striking ''July 27, 2023'' and inserting ''October 1, 2026''.

SA 2038. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER FATIGUE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall promulgate and implement a rule to require an air traffic controller to have a break of not fewer than—

(1) 10 hours prior to the start of any shift; and

(2) 12 hours prior to the start of any midshift.

(b) MIDSHIFT DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ''midshift'' means a shift where the majority of hours of such shift fall between the hours of 10:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m.

SA 2039. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

SA 2040. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 7 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2041. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''7 days'' and insert ''8 days''.

SA 2042. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 9 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2043. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''9 days'' and insert ''10 days''.

SA 2044. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''10 days'' and insert ''11 days''.

SA 2045. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 12 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2046. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''12 days'' and insert ''13 days''.

SA 2047. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2048. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''14 days'' and insert ''15 days''.

SA 2049. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''15 days'' and insert ''16 days''.

SA 2050. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 17 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2051. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''17 days'' and insert ''18 days''.

SA 2052. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION B—TAX RELIEF

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Tax Relief for American Families and Workers Act of 2024''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this division an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this division is as follows:

TITLE I—TAX RELIEF FOR WORKING FAMILIES

SEC. 101. PER-CHILD CALCULATION OF REFUNDABLE PORTION OF CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 24(h)(5) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In applying subsection (d)—

''(i) the amount determined under paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection with respect to any qualifying child shall not exceed $1,400, and such paragraph shall be applied without regard to paragraph (4) of this subsection, and

''(ii) paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection shall be applied by multiplying each of—

''(I) the amount determined under clause (i) thereof, and

''(II) the excess determined under clause (ii) thereof,

by the number of qualifying children of the taxpayer.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of paragraph (5) of section 24(h) is amended by striking ''MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF'' and inserting ''SPECIAL RULES FOR''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 102. INCREASE IN REFUNDABLE PORTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (5) of section 24(h) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) AMOUNTS FOR 2023, 2024, AND 2025.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2022, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting for '$1,400'—

''(i) in the case of taxable year 2023, '$1,800',

''(ii) in the case of taxable year 2024, '$1,900', and

''(iii) in the case of taxable year 2025, '$2,000'.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (C) of section 24(h)(5), as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by inserting ''and before 2023'' after ''2018''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 103. INFLATION OF CREDIT AMOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 24(h) is amended—

(1) by striking ''AMOUNT.—Subsection'' and inserting ''AMOUNT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2023, the $2,000 amounts in subparagraph (A) and paragraph (5)(B)(iii) shall each be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting '2022' for '2016' in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any increase under this subparagraph is not a multiple of $100, such increase shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $100.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2023.

SEC. 104. RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF EARNED INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (6) of section 24(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''CREDIT.—Subsection'' and inserting ''CREDIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs

''(B) RULE FOR DETERMINATION OF EARNED INCOME.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2023, if the earned income of the taxpayer for such taxable year is less than the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, subsection (d)(1)(B)(i) may, at the election of the taxpayer, be applied by substituting—

''(I) the earned income for such preceding taxable year, for

''(II) the earned income for the current taxable year.

''(ii) APPLICATION TO JOINT RETURNS.—For purposes of clause (i), in the case of a joint return, the earned income of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year shall be the sum of the earned income of each spouse for such preceding taxable year.''.

(b) ERRORS TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL ERRORS.—Paragraph (2) of section 6213(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (U), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (V) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after subparagraph (V) the following new subparagraph:

''(W) in the case of a taxpayer electing the application of section 24(h)(6)(B) for any taxable year, an entry on a return of earned income pursuant to such section which is inconsistent with the amount of such earned income determined by the Secretary for the preceding taxable year.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2023.

SEC. 105. SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN EARLY-FILED 2023 RETURNS.

In the case of an individual who claims, on the taxpayer's return of tax for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2022, a credit under section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is determined without regard to the amendments made by sections 101 and 102 of this division, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) redetermine the amount of such credit (after taking into account such amendments) on the basis of the information provided by the taxpayer on such return, and

(2) to the extent that such redetermination results in an overpayment of tax, credit or refund such overpayment as expeditiously as possible.

TITLE II—AMERICAN INNOVATION AND GROWTH

SEC. 201. DEDUCTION FOR DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.

(a) DELAY OF AMORTIZATION OF DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—Section 174 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF SECTION TO DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—In the case of any domestic research or experimental expenditures (as defined in section 174A(b)), this section—

''(1) shall apply to such expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025, and

''(2) shall not apply to such expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning on or before such date.''.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPENSING FOR DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 174 the following new section:

''SEC. 174A. TEMPORARY RULES FOR DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.

''(a) TREATMENT AS EXPENSES.—Notwithstanding section 263, there shall be allowed as a deduction any domestic research or experimental expenditures which are paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

''(b) DOMESTIC RESEARCH OR EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'domestic research or experimental expenditures' means research or experimental expenditures paid or incurred by the taxpayer in connection with the taxpayer's trade or business other than such expenditures which are attributable to foreign research (within the meaning of section 41(d)(4)(F)).

''(c) AMORTIZATION OF CERTAIN DOMESTIC RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the election of the taxpayer, made in accordance with regulations or other guidance provided by the Secretary, in the case of domestic research or experimental expenditures which would (but for subsection (a)) be chargeable to capital account but not chargeable to property of a character which is subject to the allowance under section 167 (relating to allowance for depreciation, etc.) or section 611 (relating to allowance for depletion), subsection (a) shall not apply and the taxpayer shall—

''(A) charge such expenditures to capital account, and

''(B) be allowed an amortization deduction of such expenditures ratably over such period of not less than 60 months as may be selected by the taxpayer (beginning with the month in which the taxpayer first realizes benefits from such expenditures).

''(2) TIME FOR AND SCOPE OF ELECTION.—The election provided by paragraph (1) may be made for any taxable year, but only if made not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return for such taxable year (including extensions thereof). The method so elected, and the period selected by the taxpayer, shall be adhered to in computing taxable income for the taxable year for which the election is made and for all subsequent taxable years unless, with the approval of the Secretary, a change to a different method (or to a different period) is authorized with respect to part or all of such expenditures. The election shall not apply to any expenditure paid or incurred during any taxable year before the taxable year for which the taxpayer makes the election.

''(d) ELECTION TO CAPITALIZE EXPENSES.—In the case of a taxpayer which elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the application of this subsection, subsections (a) and (c) shall not apply and domestic research or experimental expenditures shall be chargeable to capital account. Such election shall not apply to any expenditure paid or incurred during any taxable year before the taxable year for which the taxpayer makes the election and may be made with respect to part of the expenditures paid or incurred during any taxable year only with the approval of the Secretary.

''(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY.—This section shall not apply to any expenditure for the acquisition or improvement of land, or for the acquisition or improvement of property to be used in connection with the research or experimentation and of a character which is subject to the allowance under section 167 (relating to allowance for depreciation, etc.) or section 611 (relating to allowance for depletion); but for purposes of this section allowances under section 167, and allowances under section 611, shall be considered as expenditures.

''(2) EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES.—This section shall not apply to any expenditure paid or incurred for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral (including oil and gas).

''(3) SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT.—For purposes of this section, any amount paid or incurred in connection with the development of any software shall be treated as a research or experimental expenditure.

''(f) TERMINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

''(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of a taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2025, paragraph (1) (and the corresponding application of section 174) shall be treated as a change in method of accounting for purposes of section 481 and—

''(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

''(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary, and

''(C) such change shall be applied only on a cut-off basis for any domestic research or experimental expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025, and no adjustment under section 481(a) shall be made.''.

(c) COORDINATION WITH CERTAIN OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(1) RESEARCH CREDIT.—

(A) Section 41(d)(1)(A) is amended by inserting ''or domestic research or experimental expenditures under section 174A'' after ''section 174''.

(B) Section 280C(c)(1) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The domestic research or experimental expenditures otherwise taken into account under section 174 or 174A (as the case may be) shall be reduced by the amount of the credit allowed under section 41(a).''.

(2) AMT ADJUSTMENT.—Section 56(b)(2) is amended by striking ''174(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''174A(a)''.

(3) OPTIONAL 10-YEAR WRITEOFF.—Section 59(e)(2)(B) is amended by striking ''section 174(a) (relating to research and experimental expenditures)'' and inserting ''section 174A(a) (relating to temporary rules for domestic research and experimental expenditures)''.

(4) QUALIFIED SMALL ISSUE BONDS.—Section 144(a)(4)(C)(iv) is amended by striking ''174(a)'' and inserting ''174A(a)''.

(5) START-UP EXPENDITURES.—Section 195(c)(1) is amended by striking ''or 174'' in the last sentence and inserting ''174, or 174A''.

(6) CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.—

(A) Section 263(a)(1)(B) is amended by inserting '' or 174A'' after ''174''.

(B) Section 263A(c)(2) is amended by inserting ''or 174A'' after ''174''.

(7) ACTIVE BUSINESS COMPUTER SOFTWARE ROYALTIES.—Section 543(d)(4)(A)(i) is amended by inserting ''174A,'' after ''174,''.

(8) SOURCE RULES.—Section 864(g)(2) is amended in the last sentence—

(A) by striking ''treated as deferred expenses under subsection (b) of section 174'' and inserting ''allowed as an amortization deduction under section 174(a) or section 174A(c),'', and

(B) by striking ''such subsection'' and inserting ''such section (as the case may be)''.

(9) BASIS ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1016(a)(14) is amended by striking ''deductions as deferred expenses under section 174(b)(1) (relating to research and experimental expenditures)'' and inserting ''deductions under section 174 or 174A''.

(10) SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.—Section 1202(e)(2)(B) is amended by striking ''research and experimental expenditures under section 174'' and inserting ''specified research or experimental expenditures under section 174 or domestic research or experimental expenditures under section 174A''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 13206 of Public Law 115–97 is amended by striking subsection (b) (relating to change in method of accounting).

(2) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 174 the following new item:

''Sec. 174A. Temporary rules for domestic research and experimental expenditures.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2021.

(2) COORDINATION WITH RESEARCH CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(1)(B) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2022.

(3) REPEAL OF SUPERCEDED CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING RULES.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(1) shall take effect as if included in Public Law 115–97.

(4) NO INFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO COORDINATION WITH RESEARCH CREDIT FOR PRIOR PERIODS.—The amendment made by subsection (c)(1)(B) shall not be construed to create any inference with respect to the proper application of section 280C(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to taxable years beginning before January 1, 2023.

(f) TRANSITION RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, an election made

under subsection (c) or (d) of section 174A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, shall not fail to be treated as timely made (or as made on the return) if made during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act on an amended return for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, or in such other manner as the Secretary may provide.

(2) ELECTION REGARDING TREATMENT AS CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer which (as of the date of the enactment of this Act) had adopted a method of accounting provided by section 174 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect prior to the amendments made by this section) for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, and elects the application of this paragraph—

(A) the amendments made by this section shall be treated as a change in method of accounting for purposes of section 481 of such Code,

(B) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer for the taxpayer's immediately succeeding taxable year,

(C) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary,

(D) such change shall be applied on a modified cut-off basis, taking into account for purposes of section 481(a) of such Code only the domestic research or experimental expenditures (as defined in section 174A(b) of such Code (as added by this section) and determined by applying the rules of section 174A(e) of such Code) paid or incurred in the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, and not allowed as a deduction in such taxable year, and

(E) in the case of a taxpayer which elects the application of this subparagraph, the amount of such change (as determined under subparagraph (D)) shall be taken into account ratably over the 2-taxable-year period beginning with the taxable year referred to in subparagraph (B).

(3) ELECTION REGARDING 10-YEAR WRITE-OFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, an eligible taxpayer which files, during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, an amended income tax return for the taxable year described in subparagraph (B)(ii) may elect the application of section 59(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to qualified expenditures described in section 59(e)(2)(B) of such Code (as amended by subsection (c)(3)) with respect to such taxable year. Such election shall be filed with such amended income tax return and shall be effective only to the extent that such election would have been effective if filed with the original income tax return for such taxable year (determined after taking into account the amendment made by subsection (c)(3)).

(B) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ''eligible taxpayer'' means any taxpayer which—

(i) does not elect the application of paragraph (2), and

(ii) filed an income tax return for such taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, before the earlier of—

(I) the due date for such return, and

(II) the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) ELECTION REGARDING COORDINATION WITH RESEARCH CREDIT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, an eligible taxpayer (as defined in paragraph (3)(B) without regard to clause (i) thereof) which files, during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, an amended income tax return for the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 2021, may, notwithstanding subparagraph (C) of section 280C(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 make, or revoke, on such amended return the election under such section for such taxable year.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF ALLOWANCE FOR DEPRECIATION, AMORTIZATION, OR DEPLETION IN DETERMINING THE LIMITATION ON BUSINESS INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 163(j)(8)(A)(v) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2022'' and inserting ''January 1, 2026''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2023.

(2) ELECTION TO APPLY EXTENSION RETROACTIVELY.—In the case of a taxpayer which elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may provide) the application of this paragraph, paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting ''December 31, 2021'' for ''December 31, 2023''.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF 100 PERCENT BONUS DEPRECIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 168(k)(6)(A) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026'', and

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end, and

(2) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), and redesignating clause (v) as clause (ii).

(b) PROPERTY WITH LONGER PRODUCTION PERIODS.—Section 168(k)(6)(B) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2024'' and inserting ''2027'', and

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end, and

(2) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), and redesignating clause (v) as clause (ii).

(c) PLANTS BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—Section 168(k)(6)(C) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026'', and

(B) by adding ''and'' at the end, and

(2) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), and redesignating clause (v) as clause (ii).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2022.

(2) PLANTS BEARING FRUITS AND NUTS.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to specified plants planted or grafted after December 31, 2022.

SEC. 204. INCREASE IN LIMITATIONS ON EXPENSING OF DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 179(b) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$1,000,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$1,290,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$2,500,000'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$3,220,000''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 179(b)(6) is amended—

(1) by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2024 (2018 in the case of the dollar amount in paragraph (5)(A))'', and

(2) by striking '' 'calendar year 2017'' and inserting '' 'calendar year 2024' ('calendar year 2017' in the case of the dollar amount in paragraph (5)(A))''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2023.

TITLE III—INCREASING GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

Subtitle A—United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act''.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULES FOR TAXATION OF CERTAIN RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 894 the following new section:

''SEC. 894A. SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

''(a) CERTAIN INCOME FROM UNITED STATES SOURCES.—

''(1) INTEREST, DIVIDENDS, AND ROYALTIES, ETC.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of interest (other than original issue discount), dividends, royalties, amounts described in section 871(a)(1)(C), and gains described in section 871(a)(1)(D) received by or paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan—

''(i) sections 871(a), 881(a), 1441(a), 1441(c)(5), and 1442(a) shall each be applied by substituting 'the applicable percentage (as defined in section 894A(a)(1)(C))' for '30 percent' each place it appears, and

''(ii) sections 871(a), 881(a), and 1441(c)(1) shall each be applied by substituting 'a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan' for 'a trade or business within the United States' each place it appears.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to—

''(I) any dividend received from or paid by a real estate investment trust which is not a qualified REIT dividend,

''(II) any amount subject to section 897,

''(III) any amount received from or paid by an expatriated entity (as defined in section 7874(a)(2)) to a foreign related person (as defined in section 7874(d)(3)), and

''(IV) any amount which is included in income under section 860C to the extent that such amount does not exceed an excess inclusion with respect to a REMIC.

''(ii) QUALIFIED REIT DIVIDEND.—For purposes of clause (i)(I), the term 'qualified REIT dividend' means any dividend received from or paid by a real estate investment trust if such dividend is paid with respect to a class of shares that is publicly traded and the recipient of the dividend is a person who holds an interest in any class of shares of the real estate investment trust of not more than 5 percent.

''(C) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (A)(i)—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term 'applicable percentage' means 10 percent.

''(ii) SPECIAL RULES FOR DIVIDENDS.— In the case of any dividend in respect of stock received by or paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan, the applicable percentage shall be 15 percent (10 percent in the case of a dividend which meets the requirements of subparagraph (D) and is received by or paid to an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan).

''(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR LOWER DIVIDEND RATE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met with respect to any dividend in respect of stock in a corporation if, at all times during the 12-month period ending on the date such stock becomes ex-dividend with respect to such dividend—

''(I) the dividend is derived by a qualified resident of Taiwan, and

''(II) such qualified resident of Taiwan has held directly at least 10 percent (by vote and

value) of the total outstanding shares of stock in such corporation.

For purposes of subclause (II), a person shall be treated as directly holding a share of stock during any period described in the preceding sentence if the share was held by a corporation from which such person later acquired that share and such corporation was, at the time the share was acquired, both a connected person to such person and a qualified resident of Taiwan.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR RICS AND REITS.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the requirements of this subparagraph shall not be treated as met with respect to any dividend paid by a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust.

''(2) QUALIFIED WAGES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed under this chapter (and no amount shall be withheld under section 1441(a) or chapter 24) with respect to qualified wages paid to a qualified resident of Taiwan who—

''(i) is not a resident of the United States (determined without regard to subsection (c)(3)(E)), or

''(ii) is employed as a member of the regular component of a ship or aircraft operated in international traffic.

''(B) QUALIFIED WAGES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified wages' means wages, salaries, or similar remunerations with respect to employment involving the performance of personal services within the United States which—

''(I) are paid by (or on behalf of) any employer other than a United States person, and

''(II) are not borne by a United States permanent establishment of any person other than a United States person.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include directors' fees, income derived as an entertainer or athlete, income derived as a student or trainee, pensions, amounts paid with respect to employment with the United States, any State (or political subdivision thereof), or any possession of the United States (or any political subdivision thereof), or other amounts specified in regulations or guidance under subsection (f)(1)(F).

''(3) INCOME DERIVED FROM ENTERTAINMENT OR ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed under this chapter (and no amount shall be withheld under section 1441(a) or chapter 24) with respect to income derived by an entertainer or athlete who is a qualified resident of Taiwan from personal activities as such performed in the United States if the aggregate amount of gross receipts from such activities for the taxable year do not exceed $30,000.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to—

''(i) income which is qualified wages (as defined in paragraph (2)(B), determined without regard to clause (ii) thereof), or

''(ii) income which is effectively connected with a United States permanent establishment.

''(b) INCOME CONNECTED WITH A UNITED STATES PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In lieu of applying sections 871(b) and 882, a qualified resident of Taiwan that carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be taxable as provided in section 1, 11, 55, or 59A, on its taxable income which is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

''(B) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—In determining taxable income for purposes of paragraph (1), gross income includes only gross income which is effectively connected with the permanent establishment.

''(2) TREATMENT OF DISPOSITIONS OF UNITED STATES REAL PROPERTY.—In the case of a qualified resident of Taiwan, section 897(a) shall be applied—

''(A) by substituting 'carried on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment' for 'were engaged in a trade or business within the United States', and

''(B) by substituting 'such United States permanent establishment' for 'such trade or business'.

''(3) TREATMENT OF BRANCH PROFITS TAXES.—In the case of any corporation which is a qualified resident of Taiwan, section 884 shall be applied—

''(A) by substituting '10 percent' for '30 percent ' in subsection (a) thereof, and

''(B) by substituting 'a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan' for 'the conduct of a trade or business within the United States' in subsection (d)(1) thereof.

''(4) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO INCOME DERIVED FROM CERTAIN ENTERTAINMENT OR ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent that the income is derived—

''(i) in respect of entertainment or athletic activities performed in the United States, and

''(ii) by a qualified resident of Taiwan who is not the entertainer or athlete performing such activities.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the person described in subparagraph (A)(ii) is contractually authorized to designate the individual who is to perform such activities.

''(5) SPECIAL RULE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AMOUNTS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any income which is wages, salaries, or similar remuneration with respect to employment or with respect to any amount which is described in subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii).

''(c) QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified resident of Taiwan' means any person who—

''(A) is liable to tax under the laws of Taiwan by reason of such person's domicile, residence, place of management, place of incorporation, or any similar criterion,

''(B) is not a United States person (determined without regard to paragraph (3)(E)), and

''(C) in the case of an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan, meets the requirements of paragraph (2).

''(2) LIMITATION ON BENEFITS FOR CORPORATE ENTITIES OF TAIWAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (E) and (F), an entity meets the requirements of this paragraph only if it—

''(i) meets the ownership and income requirements of subparagraph (B),

''(ii) meets the publicly traded requirements of subparagraph (C), or

''(iii) meets the qualified subsidiary requirements of subparagraph (D).

''(B) OWNERSHIP AND INCOME REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph are met for an entity if—

''(i) at least 50 percent (by vote and value) of the total outstanding shares of stock in such entity are owned directly or indirectly by qualified residents of Taiwan, and

''(ii) less than 50 percent of such entity's gross income (and in the case of an entity that is a member of a tested group, less than 50 percent of the tested group's gross income) is paid or accrued, directly or indirectly, in the form of payments that are deductible for purposes of the income taxes imposed by Taiwan, to persons who are not—

''(I) qualified residents of Taiwan, or

''(II) United States persons who meet such requirements with respect to the United States as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the requirements of this subsection (determined without regard to paragraph (1)(B)) with respect to residents of Taiwan.

''(C) PUBLICLY TRADED REQUIREMENTS.—An entity meets the requirements of this subparagraph if—

''(i) the principal class of its shares (and any disproportionate class of shares) of such entity are primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in Taiwan, or

''(ii) the primary place of management and control of the entity is in Taiwan and all classes of its outstanding shares described in clause (i) are regularly traded on an established securities market in Taiwan.

''(D) QUALIFIED SUBSIDIARY REQUIREMENTS.—An entity meets the requirement of this subparagraph if—

''(i) at least 50 percent (by vote and value) of the total outstanding shares of the stock of such entity are owned directly or indirectly by 5 or fewer entities—

''(I) which meet the requirements of subparagraph (C), or

''(II) which are United States persons the principal class of the shares (and any disproportionate class of shares) of which are primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in the United States, and

''(ii) the entity meets the requirements of clause (ii) of subparagraph (B).

''(E) ONLY INDIRECT OWNERSHIP THROUGH QUALIFYING INTERMEDIARIES COUNTED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Stock in an entity owned by a person indirectly through 1 or more other persons shall not be treated as owned by such person in determining whether the person meets the requirements of subparagraph (B)(i) or (D)(i) unless all such other persons are qualifying intermediate owners.

''(ii) QUALIFYING INTERMEDIATE OWNERS.—The term 'qualifying intermediate owner' means a person that is—

''(I) a qualified resident of Taiwan, or

''(II) a resident of any other foreign country (other than a foreign country that is a foreign country of concern) that has in effect a comprehensive convention with the United States for the avoidance of double taxation.

''(iii) SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED SUBSIDIARIES.—For purposes of applying subparagraph (D)(i), the term 'qualifying intermediate owner' shall include any person who is a United States person who meets such requirements with respect to the United States as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the requirements of this subsection (determined without regard to paragraph (1)(B)) with respect to residents of Taiwan.

''(F) CERTAIN PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED.—In determining whether the requirements of subparagraph (B)(ii) or (D)(ii) are met with respect to an entity, the following payments shall not be taken into account:

''(i) Arm's-length payments by the entity in the ordinary course of business for services or tangible property.

''(ii) In the case of a tested group, intragroup transactions.

''(3) DUAL RESIDENTS.—

''(A) RULES FOR DETERMINATION OF STATUS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is an applicable dual resident and who is described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) shall be treated as a qualified resident of Taiwan.

''(ii) APPLICABLE DUAL RESIDENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'applicable dual resident' means an individual who—

''(I) is not a United States citizen,

''(II) is a resident of the United States (determined without regard to subparagraph (E)), and

''(III) would be a qualified resident of Taiwan but for paragraph (1)(B).

''(B) PERMANENT HOME.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if such individual—

''(i) has a permanent home available to such individual in Taiwan, and

''(ii) does not have a permanent home available to such individual in the United States.

''(C) CENTER OF VITAL INTERESTS.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if—

''(i) such individual has a permanent home available to such individual in both Taiwan and the United States, and

''(ii) such individual's personal and economic relations (center of vital interests) are closer to Taiwan than to the United States.

''(D) HABITUAL ABODE.—An individual is described in this subparagraph if—

''(i) such individual—

''(I) does not have a permanent home available to such individual in either Taiwan or the United States, or

''(II) has a permanent home available to such individual in both Taiwan and the United States but such individual's center of vital interests under subparagraph (C)(ii) cannot be determined, and

''(ii) such individual has a habitual abode in Taiwan and not the United States.

''(E) UNITED STATES TAX TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED RESIDENT OF TAIWAN.—Notwithstanding section 7701, an individual who is treated as a qualified resident of Taiwan by reason of this paragraph for all or any portion of a taxable year shall not be treated as a resident of the United States for purposes of computing such individual's United States income tax liability for such taxable year or portion thereof.

''(4) RULES OF SPECIAL APPLICATION.—

''(A) DIVIDENDS.—For purposes of applying this section to any dividend, paragraph (2)(D) shall be applied without regard to clause (ii) thereof.

''(B) ITEMS OF INCOME EMANATING FROM AN ACTIVE TRADE OR BUSINESS IN TAIWAN.—For purposes of this section—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, if an entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan is not a qualified resident of Taiwan but meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), any qualified item of income such entity derived from the United States shall be treated as income of a qualified resident of Taiwan.

''(ii) QUALIFIED ITEMS OF INCOME.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified item of income' means any item of income which emanates from, or is incidental to, the conduct of an active trade or business in Taiwan (other than operating as a holding company, providing overall supervision or administration of a group of companies, providing group financing, or making or managing investments (unless such making or managing investments is carried on by a bank, insurance company, or registered securities dealer in the ordinary course of its business as such)).

''(II) SUBSTANTIAL ACTIVITY REQUIREMENT.—An item of income which is derived from a trade or business conducted in the United States or from a connected person shall be a qualified item of income only if the trade or business activity conducted in Taiwan to which the item is related is substantial in relation to the same or a complementary trade or business activity carried on in the United States. For purposes of applying this subclause, activities conducted by persons that are connected to the entity described in clause (i) shall be deemed to be conducted by such entity.

''(iii) EXCEPTION.—This subparagraph shall not apply to any item of income derived by an entity if at least 50 percent (by vote or value) of such entity is owned (directly or indirectly) or controlled by residents of a foreign country of concern.

''(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) UNITED STATES PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'United States permanent establishment' means, with respect to a qualified resident of Taiwan, a permanent establishment of such resident which is within the United States.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—The determination of whether there is a permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan within the United States shall be made without regard to whether an entity which is taxed as a corporation in Taiwan and which is a qualified resident of Taiwan controls or is controlled by—

''(i) a domestic corporation, or

''(ii) any other person that carries on business in the United States (whether through a permanent establishment or otherwise).

''(2) PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'permanent establishment' means a fixed place of business through which a trade or business is wholly or partly carried on. Such term shall include—

''(i) a place of management,

''(ii) a branch,

''(iii) an office,

''(iv) a factory,

''(v) a workshop, and

''(vi) a mine, an oil or gas well, a quarry, or any other place of extraction of natural resources.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN TEMPORARY PROJECTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A building site or construction or installation project, or an installation or drilling rig or ship used for the exploration or exploitation of the sea bed and its subsoil and their natural resources, constitutes a permanent establishment only if it lasts, or the activities of the rig or ship lasts, for more than 12 months.

''(ii) DETERMINATION OF 12-MONTH PERIOD.—For purposes of clause (i), the period over which a building site or construction or installation project of a person lasts shall include any period of more than 30 days during which such person does not carry on activities at such building site or construction or installation project but connected activities are carried on at such building site or construction or installation project by one or more connected persons.

''(C) HABITUAL EXERCISE OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY TREATED AS PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), where a person (other than an agent of an independent status to whom subparagraph (D)(ii) applies) is acting on behalf of a trade or business of a qualified resident of Taiwan and has and habitually exercises an authority to conclude contracts that are binding on the trade or business, that trade or business shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the country in which such authority is exercised in respect of any activities that the person undertakes for the trade or business, unless the activities of such person are limited to those described in subparagraph (D)(i) that, if exercised through a fixed place of business, would not make this fixed place of business a permanent establishment under the provisions of that subparagraph.

''(D) EXCLUSIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the term 'permanent establishment' shall not include—

''(I) the use of facilities solely for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business,

''(II) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business solely for the purpose of storage, display, or delivery,

''(III) the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the trade or business solely for the purpose of processing by another trade or business,

''(IV) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for the purpose of purchasing goods or merchandise, or of collecting information, for the trade or business,

''(V) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for the purpose of carrying on, for the trade or business, any other activity of a preparatory or auxiliary character, or

''(VI) the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for any combination of the activities mentioned in subclauses (I) through (V), provided that the overall activity of the fixed place of business resulting from this combination is of a preparatory or auxiliary character.

''(ii) BROKERS AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENTS.—A trade or business shall not be considered to have a permanent establishment in a country merely because it carries on business in such country through a broker, general commission agent, or any other agent of an independent status, provided that such persons are acting in the ordinary course of their business as independent agents.

''(3) TESTED GROUP.—The term 'tested group' includes, with respect to any entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan, such entity and any other entity taxed as a corporation in Taiwan that—

''(A) participates as a member with such entity in a tax consolidation, fiscal unity, or similar regime that requires members of the group to share profits or losses, or

''(B) shares losses with such entity pursuant to a group relief or other loss sharing regime.

''(4) CONNECTED PERSON.—Two persons shall be 'connected persons' if one owns, directly or indirectly, at least 50 percent of the interests in the other (or, in the case of a corporation, at least 50 percent of the aggregate vote and value of the corporation's shares) or another person owns, directly or indirectly, at least 50 percent of the interests (or, in the case of a corporation, at least 50 percent of the aggregate vote and value of the corporation's shares) in each person. In any case, a person shall be connected to another if, based on all the relevant facts and circumstances, one has control of the other or both are under the control of the same person or persons.

''(5) FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term 'foreign country of concern' has the meaning given such term under paragraph (7) of section 9901 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651(7)), as added by section 103(a)(4) of the CHIPS Act of 2022).

''(6) PARTNERSHIPS; BENEFICIARIES OF ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section—

''(A) a qualified resident of Taiwan which is a partner of a partnership which carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be treated as carrying on such trade or business through such permanent establishment, and

''(B) a qualified resident of Taiwan which is a beneficiary of an estate or trust which carries on a trade or business within the United States through a United States permanent establishment shall be treated as carrying on such trade or business through such permanent establishment.

''(7) DENIAL OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS THROUGH HYBRID ENTITIES.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 894(c) shall apply.

''(e) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any period unless the Secretary has determined that Taiwan has provided benefits to United States persons for such period that are reciprocal to the benefits provided to qualified residents of Taiwan under this section.

''(2) PROVISION OF RECIPROCITY.—The President or his designee is authorized to exchange letters, enter into an agreement, or take other necessary and appropriate steps relative to Taiwan for the reciprocal provision of the benefits described in this section.

''(f) REGULATIONS OR OTHER GUIDANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section, including such regulations or guidance for—

''(A) determining—

''(i) what constitutes a United States permanent establishment of a qualified resident of Taiwan, and

''(ii) income that is effectively connected with such a permanent establishment,

''(B) preventing the abuse of the provisions of this section by persons who are not (or who should not be treated as) qualified residents of Taiwan,

''(C) requirements for record keeping and reporting,

''(D) rules to assist withholding agents or employers in determining whether a foreign person is a qualified resident of Taiwan for purposes of determining whether withholding or reporting is required for a payment (and, if withholding is required, whether it should be applied at a reduced rate),

''(E) the application of subsection (a)(1)(D)(i) to stock held by predecessor owners,

''(F) determining what amounts are to be treated as qualified wages for purposes of subsection (a)(2),

''(G) determining the amounts to which subsection (a)(3) applies,

''(H) defining established securities market for purposes of subsection (c),

''(I) the application of the rules of subsection (c)(4)(B),

''(J) the application of subsection (d)(6) and section 1446,

''(K) determining ownership interests held by residents of a foreign country of concern, and

''(L) determining the starting and ending dates for periods with respect to the application of this section under subsection (e), which may be separate dates for taxes withheld at the source and other taxes.

''(2) REGULATIONS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH MODEL TREATY.—Any regulations or other guidance issued under this section shall, to the extent practical, be consistent with the provisions of the United States model income tax convention dated February 7, 2016.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO WITHHOLDING TAX.—Subchapter A of chapter 3 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1447. WITHHOLDING FOR QUALIFIED RESIDENTS OF TAIWAN.

''For reduced rates of withholding for certain residents of Taiwan, see section 894A.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subpart D of part II of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 894 the following new item:

''Sec. 894A. Special rules for qualified residents of Taiwan.''.

(2) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 3 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 1447. Withholding for qualified residents of Taiwan.''.

Subtitle B—United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act

SEC. 311. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act''.

SEC. 312. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means the tax agreement authorized by section 313(a).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) APPROVAL LEGISLATION.—The term ''approval legislation'' means legislation that approves the Agreement.

(4) IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.—The term ''implementing legislation'' means legislation that makes any changes to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 necessary to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 313. AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE AND ENTER INTO AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsequent to a determination under section 894A(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act), the President is authorized to negotiate and enter into a tax agreement relative to Taiwan.

(b) ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.—

(1) CONFORMITY WITH BILATERAL INCOME TAX CONVENTIONS.—The President shall ensure that—

(A) any provisions included in the Agreement conform with provisions customarily contained in United States bilateral income tax conventions, as exemplified by the 2016 United States Model Income Tax Convention; and

(B) the Agreement does not include elements outside the scope of the 2016 United States Model Income Tax Convention.

(2) INCORPORATION OF TAX AGREEMENTS AND LAWS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Agreement may incorporate and restate provisions of any agreement, or existing United States law, addressing double taxation for residents of the United States and Taiwan.

(3) AUTHORITY.—The Agreement shall include the following statement: ''The Agreement is entered into pursuant to the United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act.''

(4) ENTRY INTO FORCE.—The Agreement shall include a provision conditioning entry into force upon—

(A) enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 317; and

(B) confirmation by the Secretary of the Treasury that the relevant authority in Taiwan has approved and taken appropriate steps required to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 314. CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS.

(a) NOTIFICATION UPON COMMENCEMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS.—The President shall provide written notification to the appropriate congressional committees of the commencement of negotiations between the United States and Taiwan on the Agreement at least 15 calendar days before commencing such negotiations.

(b) CONSULTATIONS DURING NEGOTIATIONS.—

(1) BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 90 days after commencement of negotiations with respect to the Agreement, and every 180 days thereafter until the President enters into the Agreement, the President shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of the negotiations, including a description of elements under negotiation.

(2) MEETINGS AND OTHER CONSULTATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the course of negotiations with respect to the Agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall—

(i) meet, upon request, with the chairman or ranking member of any of the appropriate congressional committees regarding negotiating objectives and the status of negotiations in progress; and

(ii) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the appropriate congressional committees.

(B) ELEMENTS OF CONSULTATIONS.—The consultations described in subparagraph (A) shall include consultations with respect to—

(i) the nature of the contemplated Agreement;

(ii) how and to what extent the contemplated Agreement is consistent with the elements set forth in section 313(b); and

(iii) the implementation of the contemplated Agreement, including—

(I) the general effect of the contemplated Agreement on existing laws;

(II) proposed changes to any existing laws to implement the contemplated Agreement; and

(III) proposed administrative actions to implement the contemplated Agreement.

SEC. 315. APPROVAL AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Agreement may not enter into force unless—

(1) the President, at least 60 days before the day on which the President enters into the Agreement, publishes the text of the contemplated Agreement on a publicly available website of the Department of the Treasury; and

(2) there is enacted into law, with respect to the Agreement, approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 317.

(b) ENTRY INTO FORCE.—The President may provide for the Agreement to enter into force upon—

(1) enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 317; and

(2) confirmation by the Secretary of the Treasury that the relevant authority in Taiwan has approved and taken appropriate steps required to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 316. SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF AGREEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION POLICY.

(a) SUBMISSION OF AGREEMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the President enters into the Agreement, the President or the President's designee shall submit to Congress—

(1) the final text of the Agreement; and

(2) a technical explanation of the Agreement.

(b) SUBMISSION OF IMPLEMENTATION POLICY.—Not later than 270 days after the President enters into the Agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress—

(1) a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to ensure that the United States acts in a manner consistent with the Agreement; and

(2) a statement of anticipated administrative action proposed to implement the Agreement.

SEC. 317. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The approval legislation with respect to the Agreement shall include the following: ''Congress approves the Agreement submitted to Congress pursuant to section 316 of the United States-Taiwan Tax Agreement Authorization Act on _____.'', with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

(b) APPROVAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—The approval legislation shall—

(1) in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

(c) IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—The implementing legislation shall—

(1) in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SEC. 318. RELATIONSHIP OF AGREEMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO CONTROL.—No provision of the Agreement or approval legislation, nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, which is inconsistent with any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, shall have effect.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed—

(1) to amend or modify any law of the United States; or

(2) to limit any authority conferred under any law of the United States,

unless specifically provided for in this subtitle.

SEC. 319. AUTHORIZATION OF SUBSEQUENT TAX AGREEMENTS RELATIVE TO TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsequent to the enactment of approval legislation and implementing legislation pursuant to section 317—

(1) the term ''tax agreement'' in section 313(a) shall be treated as including any tax agreement relative to Taiwan which supplements or supersedes the Agreement to which such approval legislation and implementing legislation relates, and

(2) the term ''Agreement'' shall be treated as including such tax agreement.

(b) REQUIREMENTS, ETC., TO APPLY SEPARATELY.—The provisions of this subtitle (including section 314) shall be applied separately with respect to each tax agreement referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 320. UNITED STATES TREATMENT OF DOUBLE TAXATION MATTERS WITH RESPECT TO TAIWAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The United States addresses issues with respect to double taxation with foreign countries by entering into bilateral income tax conventions (known as tax treaties) with such countries, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification pursuant to article II of the Constitution.

(2) The United States has entered into more than sixty such tax treaties, which facilitate economic activity, strengthen bilateral cooperation, and benefit United States workers, businesses, and other United States taxpayers.

(3) Due to Taiwan's unique status, the United States is unable to enter into an article II tax treaty with Taiwan, necessitating an agreement to address issues with respect to double taxation.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) provide for additional bilateral tax relief with respect to Taiwan, beyond that provided for in section 894A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the United States-Taiwan Expedited Double-Tax Relief Act), only after entry into force of an Agreement, as provided for in section 315, and only in a manner consistent with such Agreement; and

(2) continue to provide for bilateral tax relief with sovereign states to address double taxation and other related matters through entering into bilateral income tax conventions, subject to the Senate's advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II of the Constitution.

TITLE IV—ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTER-IMPACTED COMMUNITIES

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2024''.

SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF RULES FOR TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISASTER-RELATED PERSONAL CASUALTY LOSSES.

For purposes of applying section 304(b) of the Taxpayer Certainty and Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2020, section 301 of such Act shall be applied by substituting ''the Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2024'' for ''this Act'' each place it appears.

SEC. 403. EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME FOR COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES OR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM CERTAIN WILDFIRES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, gross income shall not include any amount received by an individual as a qualified wildfire relief payment.

(b) QUALIFIED WILDFIRE RELIEF PAYMENT.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''qualified wildfire relief payment'' means any amount received by or on behalf of an individual as compensation for losses, expenses, or damages (including compensation for additional living expenses, lost wages (other than compensation for lost wages paid by the employer which would have otherwise paid such wages), personal injury, death, or emotional distress) incurred as a result of a qualified wildfire disaster, but only to the extent the losses, expenses, or damages compensated by such payment are not compensated for by insurance or otherwise.

(2) QUALIFIED WILDFIRE DISASTER.—The term ''qualified wildfire disaster'' means any federally declared disaster (as defined in section 165(i)(5)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) declared, after December 31, 2014, as a result of any forest or range fire.

(c) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) no deduction or credit shall be allowed (to the person for whose benefit a qualified wildfire relief payment is made) for, or by reason of, any expenditure to the extent of the amount excluded under this section with respect to such expenditure, and

(2) no increase in the basis or adjusted basis of any property shall result from any amount excluded under this subsection with respect to such property.

(d) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—This section shall only apply to qualified wildfire relief payments received by the individual during taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019, and before January 1, 2026.

SEC. 404. EAST PALESTINE DISASTER RELIEF PAYMENTS.

(a) DISASTER RELIEF PAYMENTS TO VICTIMS OF EAST PALESTINE TRAIN DERAILMENT.—East Palestine train derailment payments shall be treated as qualified disaster relief payments for purposes of section 139(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) EAST PALESTINE TRAIN DERAILMENT PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''East Palestine train derailment payment'' means any amount received by or on behalf of an individual as compensation for loss, damages, expenses, loss in real property value, closing costs with respect to real property (including realtor commissions), or inconvenience (including access to real property) resulting from the East Palestine train derailment if such amount was provided by—

(1) a Federal, State, or local government agency,

(2) Norfolk Southern Railway, or

(3) any subsidiary, insurer, or agent of Norfolk Southern Railway or any related person.

(c) TRAIN DERAILMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''East Palestine train derailment'' means the derailment of a train in East Palestine, Ohio, on February 3, 2023.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply to amounts received on or after February 3, 2023.

TITLE V—MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

SEC. 501. STATE HOUSING CREDIT CEILING INCREASE FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 42(h)(3)(I) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and 2021,'' and inserting ''2021, 2023, 2024, and 2025,'', and

(2) by striking ''2018, 2019, 2020, AND 2021'' in the heading and inserting ''CERTAIN CALENDAR YEARS''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years after 2022.

SEC. 502. TAX-EXEMPT BOND FINANCING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 42(h)(4) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) SPECIAL RULE WHERE MINIMUM PERCENT OF BUILDINGS IS FINANCED WITH TAX-EXEMPT BONDS SUBJECT TO VOLUME CAP.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), paragraph (1) shall not apply to any portion of the credit allowable under subsection (a) with respect to a building if—

''(i) 50 percent or more of the aggregate basis of such building and the land on which the building is located is financed by 1 or more obligations described in subparagraph (A), or

''(ii)(I) 30 percent or more of the aggregate basis of such building and the land on which the building is located is financed by 1 or more qualified obligations, and

''(II) 1 or more of such qualified obligations—

''(aa) are part of an issue the issue date of which is after December 31, 2023, and

''(bb) provide the financing for not less than 5 percent of the aggregate basis of such building and the land on which the building is located.

''(C) QUALIFIED OBLIGATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii), the term 'qualified obligation' means an obligation which is described in subparagraph (A) and which is part of an issue the issue date of which is before January 1, 2026.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to buildings placed in service in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2023.

(2) REHABILITATION EXPENDITURES TREATED AS SEPARATE NEW BUILDING.—In the case of any building with respect to which any expenditures are treated as a separate new building under section 42(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, for purposes of paragraph (1), both the existing building and the separate new building shall be treated as having been placed in service on the date such expenditures are treated as placed in service under section 42(e)(4) of such Code.

TITLE VI—TAX ADMINISTRATION AND ELIMINATING FRAUD

SEC. 601. INCREASE IN THRESHOLD FOR REQUIRING INFORMATION REPORTING WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PAYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 6041(a) is amended by striking ''$600'' and inserting ''$1,000''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 6041 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any calendar year after 2024, the dollar amount in subsection (a) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2023' for 'calendar year 2016' in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If any increase under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $100, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.''.

(c) APPLICATION TO REPORTING ON REMUNERATION FOR SERVICES AND DIRECT SALES.—Section 6041A is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''is $600 or more'' and inserting ''equals or exceeds the dollar amount in effect for such calendar year under section 6041(a)'', and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by striking ''is $5,000 or more'' and inserting ''equals or exceeds the dollar amount in effect for such calendar year under section 6041(a)''.

(d) APPLICATION TO BACKUP WITHHOLDING.—Section 3406(b)(6) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$600'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''the dollar amount in effect for such calendar year under section 6041(a)'', and

(2) by striking ''ONLY WHERE AGGREGATE FOR CALENDAR YEAR IS $600 OR MORE'' in the heading and inserting ''ONLY IF IN EXCESS OF THRESHOLD''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading of section 6041(a) is amended by striking ''OF $600 OR MORE'' and inserting ''EXCEEDING THRESHOLD''.

(2) Section 6041(a) is amended by striking ''taxable year'' and inserting ''calendar year''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to payments made after December 31, 2023.

SEC. 602. ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO COVID-RELATED EMPLOYEE RETENTION CREDITS.

(a) INCREASE IN ASSESSABLE PENALTY ON COVID–ERTC PROMOTERS FOR AIDING AND ABETTING UNDERSTATEMENTS OF TAX LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any COVID–ERTC promoter is subject to penalty under section 6701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any COVID–ERTC document, notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6701(b) of such Code, the amount of the penalty imposed under such section 6701(a) shall be the greater of—

(A) $200,000 ($10,000, in the case of a natural person), or

(B) 75 percent of the gross income derived (or to be derived) by such promoter with respect to the aid, assistance, or advice referred to in section 6701(a)(1) of such Code with respect to such document.

(2) NO INFERENCE.—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to create any inference with respect to the proper application of the knowledge requirement of section 6701(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS TREATED AS KNOWLEDGE FOR PURPOSES OF ASSESSABLE PENALTY FOR AIDING AND ABETTING UNDERSTATEMENT OF TAX LIABILITY.—In the case of any COVID–ERTC promoter, the knowledge requirement of section 6701(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as satisfied with respect to any COVID–ERTC document with respect to which such promoter provided aid, assistance, or advice, if such promoter fails to comply with the due diligence requirements referred to in subsection (c)(1).

(c) ASSESSABLE PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any COVID–ERTC promoter which provides aid, assistance, or advice with respect to any COVID–ERTC document and which fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, any COVID-related employee retention tax credit, shall pay a penalty of $1,000 for each such failure.

(2) DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the due diligence requirements referred to in paragraph (1) shall be similar to the due diligence requirements imposed under section 6695(g).

(3) RESTRICTION TO DOCUMENTS USED IN CONNECTION WITH RETURNS OR CLAIMS FOR REFUND.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any COVID–ERTC document unless such document constitutes, or relates to, a return or claim for refund.

(4) TREATMENT AS ASSESSABLE PENALTY, ETC.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the penalty imposed under paragraph (1) shall be treated in the same manner as a penalty imposed under section 6695(g).

(5) SECRETARY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(d) ASSESSABLE PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION, MAINTAIN CLIENT LISTS, ETC.—For purposes of sections 6111, 6112, 6707 and 6708 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) any COVID-related employee retention tax credit (whether or not the taxpayer claims such COVID-related employee retention tax credit) shall be treated as a listed transaction (and as a reportable transaction) with respect to any COVID–ERTC promoter if such promoter provides any aid, assistance, or advice with respect to any COVID–ERTC document relating to such COVID-related employee retention tax credit, and

(2) such COVID–ERTC promoter shall be treated as a material advisor with respect to such transaction.

(e) COVID–ERTC PROMOTER.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''COVID–ERTC promoter'' means, with respect to any COVID–ERTC document, any person which provides aid, assistance, or advice with respect to such document if—

(A) such person charges or receives a fee for such aid, assistance, or advice which is based on the amount of the refund or credit with respect to such document and, with respect to such person's taxable year in which such person provided such assistance or the preceding taxable year, the aggregate gross receipts of such person for aid, assistance, and advice with respect to all COVID-ERTC documents exceeds 20 percent of the gross receipts of such person for such taxable year, or

(B) with respect to such person's taxable year in which such person provided such assistance or the preceding taxable year—

(i) the aggregate gross receipts of such person for aid, assistance, and advice with respect to all COVID–ERTC documents exceeds 50 percent of the gross receipts of such person for such taxable year, or

(ii) both—

(I) such aggregate gross receipts exceeds 20 percent of the gross receipts of such person for such taxable year, and

(II) the aggregate gross receipts of such person for aid, assistance, and advice with respect to all COVID–ERTC documents (determined after application of paragraph (3)) exceeds $500,000.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.—The term ''COVID–ERTC promoter'' shall not include a certified professional employer organization (as defined in section 7705).

(3) AGGREGATION RULE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii)(II), all persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 of such Code, shall be treated as 1 person.

(4) SHORT TAXABLE YEARS.—In the case of any taxable year of less than 12 months, paragraph (1) shall be applied with respect to the calendar year in which such taxable year begins (in addition to applying to such taxable year).

(f) COVID–ERTC DOCUMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''COVID–ERTC document'' means any return, affidavit, claim, or other document related to any COVID-related employee retention tax credit, including any document related to eligibility for, or the calculation or determination of any amount directly related to any COVID-related employee retention tax credit.

(g) COVID-RELATED EMPLOYEE RETENTION TAX CREDIT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''COVID-related employee retention tax credit'' means—

(1) any credit, or advance payment, under section 3134 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and

(2) any credit, or advance payment, under section 2301 of the CARES Act.

(h) LIMITATION ON CREDIT AND REFUND OF COVID-RELATED EMPLOYEE RETENTION TAX CREDITS.—Notwithstanding section 6511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or any other provision of law, no credit or refund of any COVID-related employee retention tax credit shall be allowed or made after January 31, 2024, unless a claim for such credit or refund is filed by the taxpayer on or before such date.

(i) AMENDMENTS TO EXTEND LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3134(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(l) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 6501, the limitation on the time period for the assessment of any amount attributable to a credit claimed under this section shall not expire before the date that is 6 years after the latest of—

''(A) the date on which the original return which includes the calendar quarter with respect to which such credit is determined is filed,

''(B) the date on which such return is treated as filed under section 6501(b)(2), or

''(C) the date on which the claim for credit or refund with respect to such credit is made.

''(2) DEDUCTION FOR WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING IMPROPERLY CLAIMED CREDIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 6511, in the case of an assessment attributable to a credit claimed under this section, the limitation on the time period for credit or refund of any amount attributable to a deduction for improperly claimed ERTC wages shall not expire before the time period for such assessment expires under paragraph (1).

''(B) IMPROPERLY CLAIMED ERTC WAGES.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'improperly claimed ERTC wages' means, with

respect to an assessment attributable to a credit claimed under this section, the wages with respect to which a deduction would not have been allowed if the portion of the credit to which such assessment relates had been properly claimed.''.

(2) APPLICATION TO CARES ACT CREDIT.—Section 2301 of the CARES Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the limitation on the time period for the assessment of any amount attributable to a credit claimed under this section shall not expire before the date that is 6 years after the latest of—

''(A) the date on which the original return which includes the calendar quarter with respect to which such credit is determined is filed,

''(B) the date on which such return is treated as filed under section 6501(b)(2) of such Code, or

''(C) the date on which the claim for credit or refund with respect to such credit is made.

''(2) DEDUCTION FOR WAGES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING IMPROPERLY CLAIMED CREDIT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 6511 of such Code, in the case of an assessment attributable to a credit claimed under this section, the limitation on the time period for credit or refund of any amount attributable to a deduction for improperly claimed ERTC wages shall not expire before the time period for such assessment expires under paragraph (1).

''(B) IMPROPERLY CLAIMED ERTC WAGES.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'improperly claimed ERTC wages' means, with respect to an assessment attributable to a credit claimed under this section, the wages with respect to which a deduction would not have been allowed if the portion of the credit to which such assessment relates had been properly claimed.''.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions of this section shall apply to aid, assistance, and advice provided after March 12, 2020.

(2) DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS.—Subsections (b) and (c) shall apply to aid, assistance, and advice provided after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) LIMITATION ON CREDIT AND REFUND OF COVID-RELATED EMPLOYEE RETENTION TAX CREDITS.—Subsection (h) shall apply to credits and refunds allowed or made after January 31, 2024.

(4) AMENDMENTS TO EXTEND LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT.—The amendments made by subsection (i) shall apply to assessments made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(k) TRANSITION RULE WITH RESPECT TO REQUIREMENTS TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION, MAINTAIN CLIENT LISTS, ETC.—Any return under section 6111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or list under section 6112 of such Code, required by reason of subsection (d) of this section to be filed or maintained, respectively, with respect to any aid, assistance, or advice provided by a COVID–ERTC promoter with respect to a COVID–ERTC document before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall not be required to be so filed or maintained (with respect to such aid, assistance or advice) before the date which is 90 days after such date.

(l) PROVISIONS NOT TO BE CONSTRUED TO CREATE NEGATIVE INFERENCES.—

(1) NO INFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE REQUIREMENT TO PRE-ENACTMENT CONDUCT OF COVID-ERTC PROMOTERS, ETC.—Subsection (b) shall not be construed to create any inference with respect to the proper application of section 6701(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any aid, assistance, or advice provided by any COVID-ERTC promoter on or before the date of the enactment of this Act (or with respect to any other aid, assistance, or advice to which such subsection does not apply).

(2) REQUIREMENTS TO DISCLOSE INFORMATION, MAINTAIN CLIENT LISTS, ETC.—Subsections (d) and (k) shall not be construed to create any inference with respect to whether any COVID-related employee retention tax credit is (without regard to subsection (d)) a listed transaction (or reportable transaction) with respect to any COVID–ERTC promoter; and, for purposes of subsection (j), a return or list shall not be treated as required (with respect to such aid, assistance, or advice) by reason of subsection (d) if such return or list would be so required without regard to subsection (d).

(m) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary (as defined in subsection (c)(5)) shall issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section (and the amendments made by this section).

SA 2053. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE _____—ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. ___01. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AUGMENTED CRITICAL DECISION PROCESS.—The term ''augmented critical decision process'' means a process, procedure, or other activity that employs an automated decision system to make a critical decision.

(2) AUTOMATED DECISION SYSTEM.—The term ''automated decision system'' means any system, software, or process (including one derived from machine learning, statistics, or other data processing or artificial intelligence techniques and excluding passive computing infrastructure) that uses computation, the result of which serves as a basis for a decision or judgment.

(3) BIOMETRICS.—The term ''biometrics'' means any information that represents a biological, physiological, or behavioral attribute or feature of a consumer.

(4) CHAIR.—The term ''Chair'' means the Chair of the Commission.

(5) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Trade Commission.

(6) CONSUMER.—The term ''consumer'' means an individual.

(7) COVERED ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered entity'' means any person, partnership, or corporation over which the Commission has jurisdiction under section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2))—

(i) that deploys any augmented critical decision process; and

(I) had greater than $50,000,000 in average annual gross receipts or is deemed to have greater than $250,000,000 in equity value for the 3-taxable-year period (or for the period during which the person, partnership, or corporation has been in existence, if such period is less than 3 years) preceding the most recent fiscal year, as determined in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 448(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(II) possesses, manages, modifies, handles, analyzes, controls, or otherwise uses identifying information about more than 1,000,000 consumers, households, or consumer devices for the purpose of developing or deploying any automated decision system or augmented critical decision process; or

(III) is substantially owned, operated, or controlled by a person, partnership, or corporation that meets the requirements under subclause (I) or (II);

(ii) that—

(I) had greater than $5,000,000 in average annual gross receipts or is deemed to have greater than $25,000,000 in equity value for the 3-taxable-year period (or for the period during which the person, partnership, or corporation has been in existence, if such period is less than 3 years) preceding the most recent fiscal year, as determined in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 448(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(II) deploys any automated decision system that is developed for implementation or use, or that the person, partnership, or corporation reasonably expects to be implemented or used, in an augmented critical decision process by any person, partnership, or corporation if such person, partnership, or corporation meets the requirements described in clause (i); or

(iii) that met the criteria described in clause (i) or (ii) within the previous 3 years.

(B) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of applying this paragraph in any fiscal year after the first fiscal year that begins on or after the date of enactment of this title, each of the dollar amounts specified in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by the percentage increase (if any) in the consumer price index for all urban consumers (U.S. city average) from such first fiscal year that begins after such date of enactment to the fiscal year involved.

(8) CRITICAL DECISION.—The term ''critical decision'' means a decision or judgment that has any legal, material, or similarly significant effect on a consumer's life relating to access to or the cost, terms, or availability of—

(A) education and vocational training, including assessment, accreditation, or certification;

(B) employment, workers management, or self-employment;

(C) essential utilities, such as electricity, heat, water, internet or telecommunications access, or transportation;

(D) family planning, including adoption services or reproductive services;

(E) financial services, including any financial service provided by a mortgage company, mortgage broker, or creditor;

(F) healthcare, including mental healthcare, dental, or vision;

(G) housing or lodging, including any rental or short-term housing or lodging;

(H) legal services, including private arbitration or mediation; or

(I) any other service, program, or opportunity decisions about which have a comparably legal, material, or similarly significant effect on a consumer's life as determined by the Commission through rulemaking.

(9) DEPLOY.—The term ''deploy'' means to implement, use, or make available for sale, license, or other commercial relationship.

(10) DEVELOP.—The term ''develop'' means to design, code, produce, customize, or otherwise create or modify.

(11) IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.—The term ''identifying information'' means any information, regardless of how the information is collected, inferred, predicted, or obtained that identifies or represents a consumer, household, or consumer device through data elements or attributes, such as name, postal address, telephone number, biometrics, email address, internet protocol address, social security number, or any other identifying number, identifier, or code.

(12) IMPACT ASSESSMENT.—The term ''impact assessment'' means the ongoing study and evaluation of an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process and its impact on consumers.

(13) PASSIVE COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''passive computing infrastructure'' means any intermediary technology that does not influence or determine the outcome of a decision, including—

(A) web hosting;

(B) domain registration;

(C) networking;

(D) caching;

(E) data storage; or

(F) cybersecurity.

(14) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(15) SUMMARY REPORT.—The term ''summary report'' means documentation of a subset of information required to be addressed by the impact assessment as described in this title or determined appropriate by the Commission.

(16) THIRD-PARTY DECISION RECIPIENT.—The term ''third-party decision recipient'' means any person, partnership, or corporation (beyond the consumer and the covered entity) that receives a copy of or has access to the results of any decision or judgment that results from a covered entity's deployment of an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process.

SEC. ___02. ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF AUTOMATED DECISION SYSTEMS AND AUGMENTED CRITICAL DECISION PROCESSES.

(a) ACTS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is unlawful for—

(A) any covered entity to violate a regulation promulgated under subsection (b); or

(B) any person to knowingly provide substantial assistance to any covered entity in violating subsection (b).

(2) PREEMPTION OF PRIVATE CONTRACTS.—It shall be unlawful for any covered entity to commit the acts prohibited in paragraph (1), regardless of specific agreements between entities or consumers.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this title, the Commission shall, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and other relevant stakeholders, including standards bodies, private industry, academia, technology experts, and advocates for civil rights, consumers, and impacted communities, promulgate regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, that—

(A) require each covered entity to perform impact assessment of any—

(i) deployed automated decision system that was developed for implementation or use, or that the covered entity reasonably expects to be implemented or used, in an augmented critical decision process by any person, partnership, or corporation that meets the requirements described in section ___01(7)(A)(i); and

(ii) augmented critical decision process, both prior to and after deployment by the covered entity;

(B) require each covered entity to maintain documentation of any impact assessment performed under subparagraph (A), including the applicable information described in section ___03(a) for 3 years longer than the duration of time for which the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process is deployed;

(C) require each person, partnership, or corporation that meets the requirements described in section ___01(7)(A)(i) to disclose their status as a covered entity to any person, partnership, or corporation that sells, licenses, or otherwise provides through a commercial relationship any automated decision system deployed by the covered entity in an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process;

(D) require each covered entity to submit to the Commission, on an annual basis, a summary report for ongoing impact assessment of any deployed automated decision system or augmented critical decision process;

(E) require each covered entity to submit an initial summary report to the Commission for any new automated decision system or augmented critical decision process prior to its deployment by the covered entity;

(F) allow any person, partnership, or corporation over which the Commission has jurisdiction under section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)) that deploys any automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, but is not a covered entity, to submit to the Commission a summary report for any impact assessment performed with respect to such system or process;

(G) require each covered entity, in performing the impact assessment described in subparagraph (A), to the extent possible, to meaningfully consult (including through participatory design, independent auditing, or soliciting or incorporating feedback) with relevant internal stakeholders (such as employees, ethics teams, and responsible technology teams) and independent external stakeholders (such as representatives of and advocates for impacted groups, civil society and advocates, and technology experts) as frequently as necessary;

(H) require each covered entity to attempt to eliminate or mitigate, in a timely manner, any impact made by an augmented critical decision process that demonstrates a likely material negative impact that has legal or similarly significant effects on a consumer's life;

(I) establish definitions for—

(i) what constitutes ''access to or the cost, terms, or availability of'' with respect to a critical decision;

(ii) what constitutes ''possession'', ''management'', ''modification'', and ''control'' with respect to identifying information;

(iii) the different categories of third-party decision recipients that a covered entity must document under section ___04(1)(H); and

(iv) any of the services, programs, or opportunities described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of section ___01(8) for the purpose of informing consumers, covered entities, and regulators, as the Commission deems necessary;

(J) establish guidelines for any person, partnership, or corporation to calculate the number of consumers, households, or consumer devices for which the person, partnership, or corporation possesses, manages, modifies, or controls identifying information for the purpose of determining covered entity status;

(K) establish guidelines for a covered entity to prioritize different automated decision systems and augmented critical decision processes deployed by the covered entity for performing impact assessment; and

(L) establish a required format for any summary report, as described in subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), to ensure that such reports are submitted in an accessible and machine-readable format.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In promulgating the regulations under paragraph (1), the Commission—

(A) shall take into consideration—

(i) that certain assessment or documentation of an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process may only be possible at particular stages of the development and deployment of such system or process or may be limited or not possible based on the availability of certain types of information or data or the nature of the relationship between the covered entity and consumers;

(ii) the duration of time between summary report submissions and the timeliness of the reported information;

(iii) the administrative burden placed on the Commission and the covered entity;

(iv) the benefits of standardizing and structuring summary reports for comparative analysis compared with the benefits of less-structured narrative reports to provide detail and flexibility in reporting;

(v) that summary reports submitted by different covered entities may contain different fields according to the requirements established by the Commission, and the Commission may allow or require submission of incomplete reports;

(vi) that existing data privacy and other regulations may inhibit a covered entity from storing or sharing certain information; and

(vii) that a covered entity may require information from other persons, partnerships, or corporations that develop any automated decision system deployed in an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process by the covered entity for the purpose of performing impact assessment; and

(B) may develop specific requirements for impact assessments and summary reports for particular—

(i) categories of critical decisions, as described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of section ___01(8) or any subcategory developed by the Commission; and

(ii) stages of development and deployment of an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The regulations described in paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after such regulations are promulgated.

SEC. ___03. REQUIREMENTS FOR COVERED ENTITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR IMPACT ASSESSMENT.—In performing any impact assessment required under section ___02(b)(1) for an automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, a covered entity shall do the following, to the extent possible, as applicable to such covered entity as determined by the Commission:

(1) In the case of a new augmented critical decision process, evaluate any previously existing critical decision-making process used for the same critical decision prior to the deployment of the new augmented critical decision process, along with any related documentation or information, such as—

(A) a description of the baseline process being enhanced or replaced by the augmented critical decision process;

(B) any known harm, shortcoming, failure case, or material negative impact on consumers of the previously existing process used to make the critical decision;

(C) the intended benefits of and need for the augmented critical decision process; and

(D) the intended purpose of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process.

(2) Identify and describe any consultation with relevant stakeholders as required by section ____02(b)(1)(G), including by documenting—

(A) the points of contact for the stakeholders who were consulted;

(B) the date of any such consultation; and

(C) information about the terms and process of the consultation, such as—

(i) the existence and nature of any legal or financial agreement between the stakeholders and the covered entity;

(ii) any data, system, design, scenario, or other document or material the stakeholder interacted with; and

(iii) any recommendations made by the stakeholders that were used to modify the development or deployment of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, as well as any recommendations not used and the rationale for such nonuse.

(3) In accordance with any relevant National Institute of Standards and Technology or other Federal Government best practices and standards, perform ongoing testing and evaluation of the privacy risks and privacy-enhancing measures of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, such as—

(A) assessing and documenting the data minimization practices of such system or process and the duration for which the relevant identifying information and any resulting critical decision is stored;

(B) assessing the information security measures in place with respect to such system or process, including any use of privacy-enhancing technology such as federated learning, differential privacy, secure multi-party computation, de-identification, or secure data enclaves based on the level of risk; and

(C) assessing and documenting the current and potential future or downstream positive and negative impacts of such system or process on the privacy, safety, or security of consumers and their identifying information.

(4) Perform ongoing testing and evaluation of the current and historical performance of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process using measures such as benchmarking datasets, representative examples from the covered entity's historical data, and other standards, including by documenting—

(A) a description of what is deemed successful performance and the methods and technical and business metrics used by the covered entity to assess performance;

(B) a review of the performance of such system or process under test conditions or an explanation of why such performance testing was not conducted;

(C) a review of the performance of such system or process under deployed conditions or an explanation of why performance was not reviewed under deployed conditions;

(D) a comparison of the performance of such system or process under deployed conditions to test conditions or an explanation of why such a comparison was not possible;

(E) an evaluation of any differential performance associated with consumers' race, color, sex, gender, age, disability, religion, family status, socioeconomic status, or veteran status, and any other characteristics the Commission deems appropriate (including any combination of such characteristics) for which the covered entity has information, including a description of the methodology for such evaluation and information about and documentation of the methods used to identify such characteristics in the data (such as through the use of proxy data, including ZIP Codes); and

(F) if any subpopulations were used for testing and evaluation, a description of which subpopulations were used and how and why such subpopulations were determined to be of relevance for the testing and evaluation.

(5) Support and perform ongoing training and education for all relevant employees, contractors, or other agents regarding any documented material negative impacts on consumers from similar automated decision systems or augmented critical decision processes and any improved methods of developing or performing an impact assessment for such system or process based on industry best practices and relevant proposals and publications from experts, such as advocates, journalists, and academics.

(6) Assess the need for and possible development of any guard rail for or limitation on certain uses or applications of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including whether such uses or applications ought to be prohibited or otherwise limited through any terms of use, licensing agreement, or other legal agreement between entities.

(7) Maintain and keep updated documentation of any data or other input information used to develop, test, maintain, or update the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including—

(A) how and when such data or other input information was sourced and, if applicable, licensed, including information such as—

(i) metadata and information about the structure and type of data or other input information, such as the file type, the date of the file creation or modification, and a description of data fields;

(ii) an explanation of the methodology by which the covered entity collected, inferred, or obtained the data or other input information and, if applicable, labeled, categorized, sorted, or clustered such data or other input information, including whether such data or other input information was labeled, categorized, sorted, or clustered prior to being collected, inferred, or obtained by the covered entity; and

(iii) whether and how consumers provided informed consent for the inclusion and further use of data or other input information about themselves and any limitations stipulated on such inclusion or further use;

(B) why such data or other input information was used and what alternatives were explored; and

(C) other information about the data or other input information, such as—

(i) the representativeness of the dataset and how this factor was measured, including any assumption about the distribution of the population on which the augmented critical decision process is deployed; and

(ii) the quality of the data, how the quality was evaluated, and any measure taken to normalize, correct, or clean the data.

(8) Evaluate the rights of consumers, such as—

(A) by assessing the extent to which the covered entity provides consumers with—

(i) clear notice that such system or process will be used; and

(ii) a mechanism for opting out of such use;

(B) by assessing the transparency and explainability of such system or process and the degree to which a consumer may contest, correct, or appeal a decision or opt out of such system or process, including—

(i) the information available to consumers or representatives or agents of consumers about the system or process, such as any relevant factors that contribute to a particular decision, including an explanation of which contributing factors, if changed, would cause the system or process to reach a different decision, and how such consumer, representative, or agent can access such information;

(ii) documentation of any complaint, dispute, correction, appeal, or opt-out request submitted to the covered entity by a consumer with respect to such system or process; and

(iii) the process and outcome of any remediation measure taken by the covered entity to address the concerns of or harms to consumers; and

(C) by describing the extent to which any third-party decision recipient receives a copy of or has access to the results of such system or process and the category of such third-party decision recipient, as defined by the Commission in section ____02(b)(1)(I)(iii).

(9) Identify any likely material negative impact of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process on consumers and assess any applicable mitigation strategy, such as by—

(A) identifying and measuring any likely material negative impact of the system or process on consumers, including documentation of the steps taken to identify and measure such impact;

(B) documenting any steps taken to eliminate or reasonably mitigate any likely material negative impact identified, including steps such as removing the system or process from the market or terminating its development;

(C) with respect to the likely material negative impacts identified, documenting which such impacts were left unmitigated and the rationale for the inaction, including details about the justifying non-discriminatory, compelling interest and why such interest cannot be satisfied by other means (such as where there is an equal, zero-sum trade-off between impacts on 2 or more consumers or where the required mitigating action would violate civil rights or other laws); and

(D) documenting standard protocols or practices used to identify, measure, mitigate, or eliminate any likely material negative impact on consumers and how relevant teams or staff are informed of and trained about such protocols or practices.

(10) Describe any ongoing documentation of the development and deployment process with respect to the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including information such as—

(A) the date of any testing, deployment, licensure, or other significant milestones; and

(B) points of contact for any team, business unit, or similar internal stakeholder that was involved.

(11) Identify any capabilities, tools, standards, datasets, security protocols, improvements to stakeholder engagement, or other resources that may be necessary or beneficial to improving the automated decision system, augmented critical decision process, or the impact assessment of such system or process, in areas such as—

(A) performance, including accuracy, robustness, and reliability;

(B) fairness, including bias and non-discrimination;

(C) transparency, explainability, contestability, and opportunity for recourse;

(D) privacy and security;

(E) personal and public safety;

(F) efficiency and timeliness;

(G) cost; or

(H) any other area determined appropriate by the Commission.

(12) Document any of the impact assessment requirements described in paragraphs (1) through (11) that were attempted but were not possible to comply with because they were infeasible, as well as the corresponding rationale for not being able to comply with such requirements, which may include—

(A) the absence of certain information about an automated decision system developed by other persons, partnerships, and corporations;

(B) the absence of certain information about how clients, customers, licensees, partners, and other persons, partnerships, or corporations are deploying an automated decision system in their augmented critical decision processes;

(C) a lack of demographic or other data required to assess differential performance because such data is too sensitive to collect, infer, or store; or

(D) a lack of certain capabilities, including technological innovations, that would be necessary to conduct such requirements.

(13) Perform and document any other ongoing study or evaluation determined appropriate by the Commission.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title should be construed to limit any covered entity from adding other criteria, procedures, or technologies to improve the performance of an impact assessment of their automated decision system or augmented critical decision process.

(c) NONDISCLOSURE OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT.—Nothing in this title should be construed to require a covered entity to share with or otherwise disclose to the Commission or the public any information contained in an impact assessment performed in accordance with this title, except for any information contained in the summary report required under subparagraph (D) or (E) of section ____02(b)(1).

SEC. ____04. REQUIREMENTS FOR SUMMARY REPORTS TO THE COMMISSION.

The summary report that a covered entity is required to submit under subparagraph (D) or (E) of section ____02(b)(1) for any automated decision system or augmented critical decision process shall, to the extent possible—

(1) contain information from the impact assessment of such system or process, as applicable, including—

(A) the name, website, and point of contact for the covered entity;

(B) a detailed description of the specific critical decision that the augmented critical decision process is intended to make, including the category of critical decision as described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) of section ____01(8);

(C) the covered entity's intended purpose for the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process;

(D) an identification of any stakeholders consulted by the covered entity as required by section ____02(b)(1)(G) and documentation of the existence and nature of any legal agreements between the stakeholders and the covered entity;

(E) documentation of the testing and evaluation of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including—

(i) the methods and technical and business metrics used to assess the performance of such system or process and a description of what metrics are deemed successful performance;

(ii) the results of any assessment of the performance of such system or process and a comparison of the results of any assessment under test and deployed conditions; and

(iii) an evaluation of any differential performance of such system or process assessed during the impact assessment;

(F) any publicly stated guard rail for or limitation on certain uses or applications of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including whether such uses or applications ought to be prohibited or otherwise limited through any terms of use, licensing agreement, or other legal agreement between entities;

(G) documentation about the data or other input information used to develop, test, maintain, or update the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process including—

(i) how and when the covered entity sourced such data or other input information; and

(ii) why such data or other input information was used and what alternatives were explored;

(H) documentation of whether and how the covered entity implements any transparency or explainability measures, including—

(i) which categories of third-party decision recipients receive a copy of or have access to the results of any decision or judgment that results from such system or process; and

(ii) any mechanism by which a consumer may contest, correct, or appeal a decision or opt out of such system or process, including the corresponding website for such mechanism, where applicable;

(I) any likely material negative impact on consumers identified by the covered entity and a description of the steps taken to remediate or mitigate such impact;

(J) a list of any impact assessment requirements that were attempted but were not possible to comply with because they were infeasible, as well as the corresponding rationale for not being able to comply with such requirements; and

(K) any additional capabilities, tools, standards, datasets, security protocols, improvements to stakeholder engagement, or other resources identified by an impact assessment as necessary or beneficial to improve the performance of impact assessment or the development and deployment of any automated decision system or augmented critical decision process that the covered entity determines appropriate to share with the Commission;

(2) include, in addition to the information required under paragraph (1), any relevant additional information from section ____03(a) the covered entity wishes to share with the Commission;

(3) follow any format or structure requirements specified by the Commission; and

(4) include additional criteria that are essential for the purpose of consumer protection, as determined by the Commission.

SEC. ____05. REPORTING; PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE REPOSITORY.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date described in section ____02(b)(3), and annually thereafter, the Commission shall publish publicly on the website of the Commission a report describing and summarizing the information from the summary reports submitted under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) that—

(1) is accessible and machine readable in accordance with the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 note); and

(2) describes broad trends, aggregated statistics, and anonymized lessons learned about performing impact assessments of automated decision systems or augmented critical decision processes, for the purposes of updating guidance related to impact assessments and summary reporting, oversight, and making recommendations to other regulatory agencies.

(b) PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE REPOSITORY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(i) DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the Commission promulgates the regulations required under section ____02(b)(1), the Commission shall develop a publicly accessible repository designed to publish a limited subset of the information about each automated decision system and augmented critical decision process for which the Commission received a summary report under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) in order to facilitate consumer protection.

(ii) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date described in section ____02(b)(3), the Commission shall make the repository publicly accessible.

(iii) UPDATES.—The Commission shall update the repository on a quarterly basis.

(B) PURPOSE.—The purposes of the repository established under subparagraph (A) are—

(i) to inform consumers about the use of automated decision systems and augmented critical decision processes;

(ii) to allow researchers and advocates to study the use of automated decision systems and augmented critical decision processes; and

(iii) to ensure compliance with the requirements of this title.

(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the repository under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) how to provide consumers with pertinent information regarding augmented critical decision processes while minimizing any potential commercial risk to any covered entity of providing such information;

(ii) what information, if any, to include regarding the specific automated decision systems deployed in the augmented critical decision processes;

(iii) how to document information, when applicable, about how to contest or seek recourse for a critical decision in a manner that is readily accessible by the consumer; and

(iv) how to streamline the submission of summary reports under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) to allow the Commission to efficiently populate information into the repository to minimize or eliminate any burden on the Commission.

(D) REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission shall design the repository established under subparagraph (A) to—

(i) be publicly available and easily discoverable on the website of the Commission;

(ii) allow users to sort and search the repository by multiple characteristics (such as by covered entity, date reported, or category of critical decision) simultaneously;

(iii) allow users to make a copy of or download the information obtained from the repository, including any subsets of information obtained by sorting or searching as described in clause (ii), in accordance with current guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, such as the Open, Public, Electronic, and Necessary Government Data Act (44 U.S.C. 101 note);

(iv) be in accordance with user experience and accessibility best practices such as those described in the 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 note);

(v) include a limited subset of information from the summary reports, as applicable, under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) that includes—

(I) the identity of the covered entity that submitted such summary report, including any link to the website of the covered entity;

(II) the specific critical decision that the augmented critical decision process makes, along with the category of the critical decision;

(III) any publicly stated prohibited applications of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process, including whether such prohibition is enforced through any terms of use, licensing agreement, or other legal agreement between entities;

(IV) to the extent possible, the sources of any data used to develop, test, maintain, or update the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process;

(V) to the extent possible, the type of technical and business metrics used to assess the performance of the augmented critical decision process when deployed; and

(VI) the link to any web page with instructions or other information related to a mechanism by which a consumer may contest, correct, or appeal a decision or opt out of the automated decision system or augmented critical decision process; and

(vi) include information about design, use, and maintenance of the repository, including—

(I) how frequently the repository is updated;

(II) the date of the most recent such update;

(III) the types of information from the summary reports submitted under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) that are and are not included in the repository; and

(IV) any other information about the design, use, and maintenance the Commission determines is—

(aa) relevant to consumers and researchers; or

(bb) essential for consumer education and recourse.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

SEC. ____06. GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE; OTHER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) GUIDANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall publish guidance on how to meet the requirements of sections ____03 and ____04, including resources such as documentation templates and guides for meaningful consultation, that is developed by the Commission after consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and other relevant stakeholders, including standards bodies, private industry, academia, technology experts, and advocates for civil rights, consumers, and impacted communities.

(2) ASSISTANCE IN DETERMINING COVERED ENTITY STATUS.—In addition to the guidance required under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

(A) issue guidance and training materials to assist persons, partnerships, and corporations in evaluating whether they are a covered entity; and

(B) regularly update such guidance and training materials in accordance with any feedback or questions from covered entities, experts, or other relevant stakeholders.

(b) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PUBLICATION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit a covered entity from publicizing any documentation of the impact assessment maintained under section ____02(b)(1)(B), including information beyond what is required to be submitted in a summary report under subparagraph (D) or (E) of section ____02(b)(1), unless such publication would violate the privacy of any consumer.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall review the regulations promulgated under section ____02(b) not less than once every 5 years and update such regulations as appropriate.

(3) REVIEW BY NIST AND OSTP.—The Commission shall make available, in a private and secure manner, to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the head of any Federal agency with relevant regulatory jurisdiction over an augmented critical decision process any summary report submitted under subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of section ____02(b)(1) for review in order to develop future standards or regulations.

SEC. ____07. RESOURCES AND AUTHORITIES.

(a) BUREAU OF TECHNOLOGY.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established within the Commission the Bureau of Technology (in this subsection referred to as the ''Bureau'').

(B) DUTIES.—The Bureau shall engage in activities that include:

(i) Aiding or advising the Commission with respect to the technological aspects of the functions of the Commission, including—

(I) preparing, conducting, facilitating, managing, or otherwise enabling studies, workshops, audits, community participation opportunities, or other similar activities; and

(II) any other assistance deemed appropriate by the Commission or Chair.

(ii) Aiding or advising the Commission with respect to the enforcement of this title.

(iii) Providing technical assistance to any enforcement bureau within the Commission with respect to the investigation and trial of cases.

(2) CHIEF TECHNOLOGIST.—The Bureau shall be headed by a Chief Technologist.

(3) STAFF.—

(A) APPOINTMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chair may, without regard to the civil service laws (including regulations), appoint personnel with experience in fields such as management, technology, digital and product design, user experience, information security, civil rights, technology policy, privacy policy, humanities and social sciences, product management, software engineering, machine learning, statistics, or other related fields to enable the Bureau to perform its duties.

(ii) MINIMUM APPOINTMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this title, the Chair shall appoint not less than 50 personnel.

(B) EXCEPTED SERVICE.—The personnel appointed in accordance with subparagraph (A) may be appointed to positions described in section 213.3102(r) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(b) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL IN THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER PROTECTION.—

(1) ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chair may, without regard to the civil service laws (including regulations), appoint 25 additional personnel to the Division of Enforcement of the Bureau of Consumer Protection.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF AGREEMENTS OF COOPERATION.—The Commission shall negotiate agreements of cooperation, as needed, with any relevant Federal agency with respect to information sharing and enforcement actions taken regarding the development or deployment of an automated decision system to make a critical decision or of an augmented critical decision process. Such agreements shall include procedures for determining which agency shall file an action and providing notice to the non-filing agency, where feasible, prior to initiating a civil action to enforce any Federal law within such agencies' jurisdictions regarding the development or deployment of an automated decision system to make a critical decision or of an augmented critical decision process by a covered entity.

SEC. ____08. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ENFORCEMENT BY THE COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A violation of this title or a regulation promulgated thereunder shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(2) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall enforce this title and the regulations promulgated under this title in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Any person who violates this title or a regulation promulgated thereunder shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(C) AUTHORITY PRESERVED.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(D) RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall promulgate in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, such additional rules as may be necessary to carry out this title.

(b) ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of the State has been or is being threatened or adversely affected by a practice that violates this title or a regulation promulgated thereunder, the attorney general of the State may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate relief.

(2) RIGHTS OF COMMISSION.—

(A) NOTICE TO COMMISSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the attorney general of a State, before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), shall provide written notification to the Commission that the attorney general intends to bring such civil action.

(ii) CONTENTS.—The notification required under clause (i) shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate the civil action.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notification required under clause (i) before initiating a civil action under paragraph (1), the attorney general shall notify the Commission immediately upon instituting the civil action.

(B) INTERVENTION BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may—

(i) intervene in any civil action brought by the attorney general of a State under paragraph (1); and

(ii) upon intervening—

(I) be heard on all matters arising in the civil action; and

(II) file petitions for appeal of a decision in the civil action.

(3) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of the State to conduct investigations, to administer oaths or affirmations, or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary or other evidence.

(4) VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(A) VENUE.—Any action brought under paragraph (1) may be brought in—

(i) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(ii) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—In an action brought under paragraph (1), process may be served in any district in which—

(i) the defendant is an inhabitant, may be found, or transacts business; or

(ii) venue is proper under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code.

(5) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to a civil action brought by an attorney general under paragraph (1), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under paragraph (1), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this subsection to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(B) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

SEC. ___09. COORDINATION.

In carrying out this title, the Commission shall coordinate with any appropriate Federal agency or State regulator to promote consistent regulatory treatment of automated decision systems and augmented critical decision processes.

SEC. ___10. NO PREEMPTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed to preempt any State, tribal, city, or local law, regulation, or ordinance.

SA 2054. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE XIV—PROTECTING AMERICANS' DATA FROM FOREIGN SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 2023

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023''.

SEC. 1402. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) accelerating technological trends have made sensitive personal data an especially valuable input to activities that foreign adversaries of the United States undertake to threaten both the national security of the United States and the privacy that the people of the United States cherish;

(2) it is therefore essential to the safety of the United States and the people of the United States to ensure that the United States Government makes every effort to prevent sensitive personal data from falling into the hands of malign foreign actors; and

(3) because allies of the United States face similar challenges, in implementing this title, the United States Government should explore the establishment of a shared zone of mutual trust with respect to sensitive personal data.

SEC. 1403. REQUIREMENT TO CONTROL THE EXPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONAL DATA OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS AND INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4811 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1758 the following:

''SEC. 1758A. REQUIREMENT TO CONTROL THE EXPORT OF CERTAIN PERSONAL DATA OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS AND INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL DATA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, identify categories of personal data of covered individuals that could—

''(A) be exploited by foreign governments or foreign adversaries; and

''(B) if exported, reexported, or in-country transferred in a quantity that exceeds the threshold established under paragraph (3), harm the national security of the United States.

''(2) LIST REQUIRED.—In identifying categories of personal data of covered individuals under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

''(A) identify an initial list of such categories not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023; and

''(B) as appropriate thereafter and not less frequently than every 5 years, add categories to, remove categories from, or modify categories on, that list.

''(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF THRESHOLD.—

''(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall establish a threshold for determining when the export, reexport, or in-country transfer (in the aggregate) of the personal data of covered individuals by one person to or in a restricted country could harm the national security of the United States.

''(B) NUMBER OF COVERED INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by clause (ii), the Secretary shall establish the threshold under subparagraph (A) so that the threshold is—

''(I) not lower than the export, reexport, or in-country transfer (in the aggregate) by one person to or in a restricted country during a calendar year of the personal data of 10,000 covered individuals; and

''(II) not higher than the export, reexport, or in-country transfer (in the aggregate) by one person to or in a restricted country during a calendar year of the personal data of 1,000,000 covered individuals.

''(ii) EXPORTS BY CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS.—In the case of a person that possesses the data of more than 1,000,000 covered individuals, the threshold established under subparagraph (A) shall be one export, reexport, or in-country transfer of personal data to or in a restricted country by that person during a calendar year if the export, reexport, or in-country transfer is to—

''(I) the government of a restricted country;

''(II) a foreign person that owns or controls the person conducting the export, reexport, or in-country transfer and that person knows, or should know, that the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of the personal data was requested by the foreign person to comply with a request from the government of a restricted country; or

''(III) an entity on the Entity List maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce and set forth in Supplement No. 4 to part 744 of the Export Administration Regulations.

''(C) CATEGORY THRESHOLDS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, may establish a threshold under subparagraph (A) for each category (or combination of categories) of personal data identified under paragraph (1).

''(D) UPDATES.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies—

''(i) may update a threshold established under subparagraph (A) as appropriate; and

''(ii) shall reevaluate the threshold not less frequently than every 5 years.

''(E) TREATMENT OF PERSONS UNDER COMMON OWNERSHIP AS ONE PERSON.—For purposes of determining whether a threshold established under subparagraph (A) has been met—

''(i) all exports, reexports, or in-country transfers involving personal data conducted by persons under the ownership or control of the same person shall be aggregated to that person; and

''(ii) that person shall be liable for any export, reexport, or in-country transfer in violation of this section.

''(F) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing a threshold under subparagraph (A), the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall seek to balance the need to protect personal data from exploitation by foreign governments and foreign adversaries against the likelihood of—

''(i) impacting legitimate business activities, research activities, and other activities that do not harm the national security of the United States; or

''(ii) chilling speech protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

''(4) DETERMINATION OF PERIOD FOR PROTECTION.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall determine, for each category (or combination of categories) of personal data identified under paragraph (1), the period of time for which encryption technology described in subsection (b)(4)(A)(iii) is required to be able to protect that category (or combination of categories) of data from decryption to prevent the exploitation of the data by a foreign government or foreign adversary from harming the national security of the United States.

''(5) USE OF INFORMATION; CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this subsection (including with respect to the list required under paragraph (2)), the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall—

''(A) use multiple sources of information, including—

''(i) publicly available information;

''(ii) classified information, including relevant information provided by the Director of National Intelligence;

''(iii) information relating to reviews and investigations of transactions by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United

States under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565);

''(iv) the categories of sensitive personal data described in paragraphs (1)(ii) and (2) of section 800.241(a) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, and any categories of sensitive personal data added to such section after such date of enactment;

''(v) information provided by the advisory committee established pursuant to paragraph (7); and

''(vi) the recommendations (which the Secretary shall request) of—

''(I) experts in privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties, identified by the National Academy of Sciences; and

''(II) experts on the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States identified by the American Bar Association; and

''(B) take into account—

''(i) the significant quantity of personal data of covered individuals that is publicly available by law or has already been stolen or acquired by foreign governments or foreign adversaries;

''(ii) the harm to United States national security caused by the theft or acquisition of that personal data;

''(iii) the potential for further harm to United States national security if that personal data were combined with additional sources of personal data;

''(iv) the fact that non-sensitive personal data, when analyzed in the aggregate, can reveal sensitive personal data;

''(v) the commercial availability of inferred and derived data; and

''(vi) the potential for especially significant harm from data and inferences related to sensitive domains, such as health, work, education, criminal justice, and finance.

''(6) NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD.—The Secretary shall provide for a public notice and comment period after the publication in the Federal Register of a proposed rule, and before the publication of a final rule—

''(A) identifying the initial list of categories of personal data under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2);

''(B) adding categories to, removing categories from, or modifying categories on, that list under subparagraph (B) of that paragraph;

''(C) establishing or updating the threshold under paragraph (3); or

''(D) setting forth the period of time for which encryption technology described in subsection (b)(4)(A)(iii) is required under paragraph (4) to be able to protect such a category of data from decryption.

''(7) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to advise the Secretary with respect to privacy and sensitive personal data.

''(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The committee established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include the following members selected by the Secretary:

''(i) Experts on privacy and cybersecurity.

''(ii) Representatives of United States private sector companies, industry associations, and scholarly societies.

''(iii) Representatives of civil society groups, including such groups focused on protecting civil rights and civil liberties.

''(C) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Subsections (a)(1), (a)(3), and (b) of section 10 and sections 11, 13, and 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory committee established pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(8) TREATMENT OF ANONYMIZED PERSONAL DATA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may not treat anonymized personal data differently than identifiable personal data unless the Secretary is confident, based on the method of anonymization used and the period of time determined under paragraph (4) for protection of the category of personal data involved, it will not be possible for well-resourced adversaries, including foreign governments, to re-identify the individuals to which the anonymized personal data relates, such as by using other sources of data, including non-public data obtained through hacking and espionage, and reasonably anticipated advances in technology.

''(B) GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology shall issue guidance to the public with respect to methods for anonymizing data and how to determine if individuals to which the anonymized personal data relates can be, or are likely in the future to be, reasonably identified, such as by using other sources of data.

''(9) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IDENTIFICATION OF CATEGORIES OF PERSONAL DATA.—It is the sense of Congress that, in identifying categories of personal data of covered individuals under paragraph (1), the Secretary should, to the extent reasonably possible and in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, harmonize those categories with the categories of sensitive personal data described in paragraph (5)(A)(iv).

''(b) COMMERCE CONTROLS.—

''(1) CONTROLS REQUIRED.—Beginning 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, the Secretary shall impose appropriate controls under the Export Administration Regulations on the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, all countries (other than countries on the list required by paragraph (2)(D)) of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3), including through interim controls (such as by informing a person that a license is required for export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data), as appropriate, or by publishing additional regulations.

''(2) LEVELS OF CONTROL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) or (D), the Secretary shall—

''(i) require a license or other authorization for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3);

''(ii) determine whether that export, reexport, or in-country transfer is likely to harm the national security of the United States—

''(I) after consideration of the matters described in subparagraph (B); and

''(II) in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies; and

''(iii) if the Secretary determines under clause (ii) that the export, reexport, or in-country transfer is likely to harm the national security of the United States, deny the application for the license or other authorization for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer.

''(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining under clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) whether an export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data described in clause (i) of that subparagraph is likely to harm the national security of the United States, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall take into account—

''(i) the adequacy and enforcement of data protection, surveillance, and export control laws in the foreign country to which the covered personal data would be exported or reexported, or in which the covered personal data would be transferred, in order to determine whether such laws, and the enforcement of such laws, are sufficient to—

''(I) protect the covered personal data from accidental loss, theft, and unauthorized or unlawful processing;

''(II) ensure that the covered personal data is not exploited for intelligence purposes by foreign governments to the detriment of the national security of the United States; and

''(III) prevent the reexport of the covered personal data to a third country for which a license would be required for such data to be exported directly from the United States;

''(ii) the circumstances under which the government of the foreign country can compel, coerce, or pay a person in or national of that country to disclose the covered personal data; and

''(iii) whether that government has conducted hostile foreign intelligence operations, including information operations, against the United States.

''(C) LICENSE REQUIREMENT AND PRESUMPTION OF DENIAL FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

''(I) require a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a country on the list required by clause (ii) of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the threshold established under subsection (a)(3); and

''(II) deny an application for such a license or other authorization unless the person seeking the license or authorization demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the export, reexport, or in-country transfer will not harm the national security of the United States.

''(ii) LIST REQUIRED.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, the Secretary shall (subject to subclause (III)) establish a list of each country with respect to which the Secretary determines that the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, the country of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3) will be likely to harm the national security of the United States.

''(II) MODIFICATIONS TO LIST.—The Secretary (subject to subclause (III))—

''(aa) may add a country to or remove a country from the list required by subclause (I) at any time; and

''(bb) shall review that list not less frequently than every 5 years.

''(III) CONCURRENCE; CONSULTATIONS; CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish the list required by subclause (I) and add a country to or remove a country from that list under subclause (II)—

''(aa) with the concurrence of the Secretary of State;

''(bb) in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies; and

''(cc) based on the considerations described in subparagraph (B).

''(D) NO LICENSE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not require a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a country on the list required by clause (ii) of covered personal data, without regard to the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3).

''(ii) LIST REQUIRED.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, the Secretary shall (subject to clause (iii) and subclause (III)), establish a list of each country with respect to which the Secretary determines that the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, the country of covered personal data (without regard to any threshold established under subsection (a)(3)) will not harm the national security of the United States.

''(II) MODIFICATIONS TO LIST.—The Secretary (subject to clause (iii) and subclause (III))—

''(aa) may add a country to or remove a country from the list required by subclause (I) at any time; and

''(bb) shall review that list not less frequently than every 5 years.

''(III) CONCURRENCE; CONSULTATIONS; CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish the list required by subclause (I) and add a country to or remove a country from that list under subclause (II)—

''(aa) with the concurrence of the Secretary of State;

''(bb) in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies; and

''(cc) based on the considerations described in subparagraph (B).

''(iii) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The list required by clause (ii) and any updates to that list adding or removing countries shall take effect, for purposes of clause (i), on the date that is 180 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate congressional committees a proposal for the list or update unless there is enacted into law, before that date, a joint resolution of disapproval pursuant to subclause (II).

''(II) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

''(aa) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL DEFINED.—In this clause, the term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means a joint resolution the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress does not approve of the proposal of the Secretary with respect to the list required by section 1758A(b)(2)(D)(ii) submitted to Congress on _____.', with the blank space being filled with the appropriate date.

''(bb) PROCEDURES.—The procedures set forth in paragraphs (4)(C), (5), (6), and (7) of section 2523(d) of title 18, United States Code, apply with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval under this clause to the same extent and in the same manner as such procedures apply to a joint resolution of disapproval under such section 2523(d), except that paragraph (6) of such section shall be applied and administered by substituting 'the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs' for 'the Committee on the Judiciary' each place it appears.

''(III) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This clause is enacted by Congress—

''(aa) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

''(bb) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''(3) REVIEW OF LICENSE APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, consistent with the provisions of section 1756 and in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies—

''(i) review applications for a license or other authorization for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a restricted country of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3); and

''(ii) establish procedures for conducting the review of such applications.

''(B) DISCLOSURES RELATING TO COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—In the case of an application for a license or other authorization for an export, reexport, or in-country transfer described in subparagraph (A)(i) submitted by or on behalf of a joint venture, joint development agreement, or similar collaborative arrangement, the Secretary may require the applicant to identify, in addition to any foreign person participating in the arrangement, any foreign person with significant ownership interest in a foreign person participating in the arrangement.

''(4) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not impose under paragraph (1) a requirement for a license or other authorization with respect to the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data pursuant to any of the following transactions:

''(i) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer by an individual of covered personal data that specifically pertains to that individual.

''(ii) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of the personal data of one or more individuals by a person performing a service for those individuals if the service could not possibly be performed (as defined by the Secretary in regulations) without the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of that personal data.

''(iii) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of personal data that is encrypted if—

''(I) the encryption key or other information necessary to decrypt the data is not, at the time of the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of the personal data or any other time, exported, reexported, or transferred to a restricted country or (except as provided in subparagraph (B)) a national of a restricted country; and

''(II) the encryption technology used to protect the data against decryption is certified by the National Institute of Standards and Technology as capable of protecting data for the period of time determined under subsection (a)(4) to be sufficient to prevent the exploitation of the data by a foreign government or foreign adversary from harming the national security of the United States.

''(iv) The export, reexport, or in-country transfer of personal data that is ordered by an appropriate court of the United States.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN NATIONALS OF RESTRICTED COUNTRIES.—Subparagraph (A)(iii)(I) does not apply with respect to an individual who is a national of a restricted country if the individual is also a citizen of the United States or a noncitizen described in subsection (l)(5)(C).

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF CATEGORIES AND DETERMINATION OF APPROPRIATE CONTROLS.—In identifying categories of personal data under subsection (a)(1) and imposing appropriate controls under subsection (b), the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, as appropriate—

''(1) may not regulate or restrict the publication or sharing of—

''(A) personal data that is a matter of public record, such as a court record or other government record that is generally available to the public, including information about an individual made public by that individual or by the news media;

''(B) information about a matter of public interest; or

''(C) any other information the publication or sharing of which is protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and

''(2) shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees.

''(d) PENALTIES.—

''(1) LIABLE PERSONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of section 1760, an officer or employee of an organization has committed an unlawful act subject to penalties under that section if the officer or employee knew or should have known that another employee of the organization who reports, directly or indirectly, to the officer or employee was directed to export, reexport, or in-country transfer covered personal data in violation of this section and subsequently did export, reexport, or in-country transfer such data.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS.—

''(i) INTERMEDIARIES NOT LIABLE.—An intermediate consignee (as defined in section 772.1 of the Export Administration Regulations (or any successor regulation)) or other intermediary is not liable for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data in violation of this section when acting as an intermediate consignee or other intermediary for another person.

''(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—In a case in which an application installed on an electronic device transmits or causes the transmission of covered personal data without being directed to do so by the owner or user of the device who installed the application, the developer of the application, and not the owner or user of the device, is liable for any violation of this section.

''(2) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—In determining an appropriate term of imprisonment under section 1760(b)(2) with respect to a person for a violation of this section, the court shall consider—

''(A) how many covered individuals had their covered personal data exported, reexported, or in-country transferred in violation of this section;

''(B) any harm that resulted from the violation; and

''(C) the intent of the person in committing the violation.

''(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of actions taken pursuant to this section.

''(2) INCLUSIONS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of the determinations made under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii) during the preceding year.

''(3) FORM.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

''(f) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN LICENSE INFORMATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than every 90 days, the Secretary shall publish on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Commerce, including in a machine-readable format, the information specified in paragraph (2), with respect to each application—

''(A) for a license for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, a restricted country of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3); and

''(B) with respect to which the Secretary made a decision in the preceding 90-day period.

''(2) INFORMATION SPECIFIED.—The information specified in this paragraph with respect

to an application described in paragraph (1) is the following:

''(A) The name of the applicant.

''(B) The date of the application.

''(C) The name of the foreign party to which the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer the data.

''(D) The categories of covered personal data the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer.

''(E) The number of covered individuals whose information the applicant sought to export, reexport, or transfer.

''(F) Whether the application was approved or denied.

''(g) NEWS MEDIA PROTECTIONS.—A person that is engaged in journalism is not subject to restrictions imposed under this section to the extent that those restrictions directly infringe on the journalism practices of that person.

''(h) CITIZENSHIP DETERMINATIONS BY PERSONS PROVIDING SERVICES TO END-USERS NOT REQUIRED.—This section does not require a person that provides products or services to an individual to determine the citizenship or immigration status of the individual, but once the person becomes aware that the individual is a covered individual, the person shall treat covered personal data of that individual as is required by this section.

''(i) FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1756(c), the Secretary may, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, assess and collect a fee, in an amount determined by the Secretary in regulations, with respect to each application for a license submitted under subsection (b).

''(2) DEPOSIT AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, fees collected under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) be credited as offsetting collections to the account providing appropriations for activities carried out under this section;

''(B) be available, to the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, to the Secretary solely for use in carrying out activities under this section; and

''(C) remain available until expended.

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section.

''(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and to the head of each of the appropriate Federal agencies participating in carrying out this section such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section, including to hire additional employees with expertise in privacy.

''(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(2) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The term 'appropriate Federal agencies' means the following:

''(A) The Department of Defense.

''(B) The Department of State.

''(C) The Department of Justice.

''(D) The Department of the Treasury.

''(E) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

''(F) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.

''(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

''(H) The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

''(I) The Federal Trade Commission.

''(J) The Federal Communications Commission.

''(K) The Department of Health and Human Services.

''(L) Such other Federal agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual', with respect to personal data, means an individual who, at the time the data is acquired—

''(A) is located in the United States; or

''(B) is—

''(i) located outside the United States or whose location cannot be determined; and

''(ii) a citizen of the United States or a noncitizen lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

''(4) COVERED PERSONAL DATA.—The term 'covered personal data' means the categories of personal data of covered individuals identified pursuant to subsection (a).

''(5) EXPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'export', with respect to covered personal data, includes—

''(i) subject to subparagraph (D), the shipment or transmission of the data out of the United States, including the sending or taking of the data out of the United States, in any manner, if the shipment or transmission is intentional, without regard to whether the shipment or transmission was intended to go out of the United States; or

''(ii) the release or transfer of the data to any noncitizen (other than a noncitizen described in subparagraph (C)), if the release or transfer is intentional, without regard to whether the release or transfer was intended to be to a noncitizen.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'export' does not include—

''(i) the publication of covered personal data on the internet in a manner that makes the data discoverable by and accessible to any member of the general public; or

''(ii) any activity protected by the speech or debate clause of the Constitution of the United States.

''(C) NONCITIZENS DESCRIBED.—A noncitizen described in this subparagraph is a noncitizen who is authorized to be employed in the United States.

''(D) TRANSMISSIONS THROUGH RESTRICTED COUNTRIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Protecting Americans' Data From Foreign Surveillance Act of 2023, and except as provided in clause (iii), the term 'export' includes the transmission of data through a restricted country, without regard to whether the person originating the transmission had knowledge of or control over the path of the transmission.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) does not apply with respect to a transmission of data through a restricted country if—

''(I) the data is encrypted as described in subsection (b)(4)(A)(iii); or

''(II) the person that originated the transmission received a representation from the party delivering the data for the person stating that the data will not transit through a restricted country.

''(iii) FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.—If a party delivering covered personal data as described in clause (ii)(II) transmits the data directly or indirectly through a restricted country despite making the representation described in clause (ii)(II), that party shall be liable for violating this section.

''(6) FOREIGN ADVERSARY.—The term 'foreign adversary' has the meaning given that term in section 8(c)(2) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(c)(2)).

''(7) IN-COUNTRY TRANSFER; REEXPORT.—The terms 'in-country transfer' and 'reexport', with respect to personal data, shall have the meanings given those terms in regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(8) LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE; NATIONAL.—The terms 'lawfully admitted for permanent residence' and 'national' have the meanings given those terms in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

''(9) NONCITIZEN.—The term 'noncitizen' means an individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States.

''(10) RESTRICTED COUNTRY.—The term 'restricted country' means a country for which a license or other authorization is required under subsection (b) for the export or reexport to, or in-country transfer in, that country of covered personal data in a manner that exceeds the applicable threshold established under subsection (a)(3).''.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 1752 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4811) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) to restrict, notwithstanding section 203(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)), the export of personal data of United States citizens and other covered individuals (as defined in section 1758A(l)) in a quantity and a manner that could harm the national security of the United States.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(H) To prevent the exploitation of personal data of United States citizens and other covered individuals (as defined in section 1758A(l)) in a quantity and a manner that could harm the national security of the United States.''.

(c) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO MAKE EXCEPTIONS TO LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1754 of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4813) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(14), by inserting ''and subject to subsection (g)'' after ''as warranted''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO MAKE EXCEPTIONS TO LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may create under subsection (a)(14) exceptions to licensing requirements under section 1758A only for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of covered personal data (as defined in subsection (l) of that section) by or for a Federal department or agency.''.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.—Section 1754(b) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4813(b)) is amended by inserting ''(other than section 1758A)'' after ''this part''.

SEC. 1404. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of or any amendment made by this title, or the application of any such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of and amendments made by this title, and the application of such provisions and amendments to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SA 2055. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation

programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____—ANTISEMITISM

SEC. ___1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Antisemitism Awareness Act of 2024''.

SEC. ___2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance;

(2) while such title does not cover discrimination based solely on religion, individuals who face discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics do not lose protection under such title for also being members of a group that share a common religion;

(3) discrimination against Jews may give rise to a violation of such title when the discrimination is based on race, color, or national origin, which can include discrimination based on actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics;

(4) it is the policy of the United States to enforce such title against prohibited forms of discrimination rooted in antisemitism as vigorously as against all other forms of discrimination prohibited by such title; and

(5) as noted in the U.S. National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism issued by the White House on May 25, 2023, it is critical to—

(A) increase awareness and understanding of antisemitism, including its threat to America;

(B) improve safety and security for Jewish communities;

(C) reverse the normalization of antisemitism and counter antisemitic discrimination; and

(D) expand communication and collaboration between communities.

SEC. ___3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Antisemitism is on the rise in the United States and is impacting Jewish students in K–12 schools, colleges, and universities.

(2) The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (referred to in this title as the ''IHRA'') Working Definition of Antisemitism is a vital tool which helps individuals understand and identify the various manifestations of antisemitism.

(3) On December 11, 2019, Executive Order 13899 extended protections against discrimination under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to individuals subjected to antisemitism on college and university campuses and tasked Federal agencies to consider the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when enforcing title VI of such Act.

(4) Since 2018, the Department of Education has used the IHRA Working Definition of Antisemitism when investigating violations of that title VI.

(5) The use of alternative definitions of antisemitism impairs enforcement efforts by adding multiple standards and may fail to identify many of the modern manifestations of antisemitism.

(6) The White House released the first-ever United States National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism on May 25, 2023, making clear that the fight against this hate is a national, bipartisan priority that must be successfully conducted through a whole-of-government-and-society approach.

SEC. ___4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title, the term ''definition of antisemitism''—

(1) means the definition of antisemitism adopted on May 26, 2016, by the IHRA, of which the United States is a member, which definition has been adopted by the Department of State; and

(2) includes the ''[c]ontemporary examples of antisemitism'' identified in the IHRA definition.

SEC. ___5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

In reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) on the basis of race, color, or national origin, based on an individual's actual or perceived shared Jewish ancestry or Jewish ethnic characteristics, the Department of Education shall take into consideration the definition of antisemitism as part of the Department's assessment of whether the practice was motivated by antisemitic intent.

SEC. ___6. OTHER RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) GENERAL RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed—

(1) to expand the authority of the Secretary of Education;

(2) to alter the standards pursuant to which the Department of Education makes a determination that harassing conduct amounts to actionable discrimination; or

(3) to diminish or infringe upon the rights protected under any other provision of law that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SA 2056. Mr. KELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SAFETY ENHANCEMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION OF TRANSPORT CATEGORY PURPOSE BUILT CARGO AIRCRAFT.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are the following:

(1) To evaluate the function and reliability aspects of unique commercial cargo aircraft operations prior to any commercial operation of such aircraft under part 135 or part 121 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) To ensure compliance with the airworthiness requirements for unique commercial cargo aircraft.

(3) To support of the development of safe, new, and useful air cargo systems such that the highest level of safety mitigation, oversight, and inspections can support the advancement of aviation in the United States.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF FLIGHT OPERATIONS FOR CERTAIN TESTING.—Notwithstanding section 44711(a) of title 49, United States Code, and any regulation prohibiting such operations, the Secretary shall have the sole discretion to permit, as part of function and reliability flight testing and prior to type design approval, the operation of aircraft carrying unique commercial cargo if such aircraft is—

(1) a cargo-only aircraft with a maximum take-off weight of not less than 600,000 pounds;

(2) an aircraft for which testing and evaluation is to be performed with representative or actual cargo in cargo operation; and

(3) designed to use a novel cargo loading, cargo unloading, or cargo retention method.

(c) USE OF DESIGNATED ENGINEERING REPRESENTATIVE FLIGHT TEST PILOTS.—The Secretary may authorize Designated Engineering Representative Flight Test Pilots to perform the function and reliability flight testing described in subsection (b).

(d) SAFETY PROCESSES.—The Secretary shall use FAA safety processes and procedures for performing certification flight tests under this section to ensure an adequate level of safety.

(e) DEFINITION OF UNIQUE COMMERCIAL CARGO.—For purposes of this section, the term ''unique commercial cargo'' means cargo—

(1) that cannot be carried or otherwise transported in a certified cargo airplane; and

(2) for which a person seeking certification under this section may receive financial benefit to carry or otherwise transport.

(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority described in section shall expire on October 1, 2033.

SA 2057. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 502, add the following:

(d) REQUIREMENT TO CONSIDER IMPACT ON FLIGHT DELAYS, CANCELLATIONS, AND PASSENGER SAFETY.—Subsection (i) of section 41718 of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) REQUIRED DETERMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may only grant any of the slot exemptions authorized under this subsection if the Secretary determines for each of the slot exemptions that the granting of the slot exemption will not increase flight delays, cancellations, or compromise passenger safety for existing flight service at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. In making this determination, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

''(A) current operational performance at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, as of the date on which the Secretary makes the determinations required under this paragraph prior to granting the slot exemption under paragraph (1);

''(B) the most recent projections based on the Annual Service Volume Delay Model , as of the date applicable under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) current landside and airside constraints, such as gate capacity, as of the date applicable under subparagraph (A).''.

SA 2058. Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. WELCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1911 proposed by Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr.

MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DISASTER RESPONSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For an additional amount for ''Agricultural Programs—Processing, Research, and Marketing—Office of the Secretary'', there is appropriated, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $12,200,000,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses related to losses of revenue, and quality or production losses of crops (including milk, peaches, apples, and crops prevented from being planted during calendar year 2023), trees, bushes, and vines, as a consequence of droughts, wildfires, hurricanes, floods, derechos, excessive heat, tornadoes, winter storms, frost, freeze, including a polar vortex, smoke exposure, and excessive moisture occurring during calendar year 2023, under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The amount provided under this section shall be subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the first, second, and fourth through twelfth provisos under the heading ''Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Programs—Processing, Research, and Marketing—Office of the Secretary'' in title I of the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022 (division B of Public Law 117–43), except that each reference to 2020 or 2021 in those provisos shall be deemed to be a reference to calendar year 2023.

(c) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—

(1) STATUTORY PAYGO.—This section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) SENATE DESIGNATION.—In the Senate, this section is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

SA 2059. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SECURE PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''2023'' each place it appears and inserting ''2026''.

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026''.

(c) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205(a)(4) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''December 20, 2023'' each place it appears and inserting ''December 20, 2026''.

(d) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2028''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2029''.

(e) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPEND COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 305 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2028''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2029''.

(f) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE PILOT PROGRAM EXTENSION.—Section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

''(g) PILOT PROGRAM FOR RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS BY REGIONAL FORESTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall establish and carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary concerned shall allow the regional forester with jurisdiction over a unit of Federal land to appoint members of the resource advisory committee for that unit, in accordance with the applicable requirements of this section.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL FORESTER.—Before appointing a member of a resource advisory committee under the pilot program under this subsection, a regional forester shall conduct the review and analysis that would otherwise be conducted for an appointment to a resource advisory committee if the pilot program was not in effect, including any review and analysis with respect to civil rights and budgetary requirements.

''(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection relieves a regional forester or the Secretary concerned from an obligation to comply with any requirement relating to an appointment to a resource advisory committee, including any requirement with respect to civil rights or advertising a vacancy.

''(4) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided under this subsection terminates on October 1, 2028.''.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Col. David M. Church for appointment in the United States Army to the grade of brigadier general, dated May 8, 2024.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 4:00 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 4:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. LUMMIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until May 9, 2024. They are: Georgina Ringley, Jessica Yang, and Elizabeth Michael.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 677, S. Res. 678, S. Res. 679.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

DIESEL EMISSIONS REDUCTION ACT OF 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 178, S. 2195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2195) to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2195) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2195

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 ''Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2023''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF DIESEL EMISSIONS REDUCTION ACT.

Section 797(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16137(a)) is amended by striking ''2024'' and inserting ''2029''.

AMERICA'S CONSERVATION ENHANCEMENT REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 343, S. 3791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3791) to reauthorize the America's Conservation Enhancement Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''America's Conservation Enhancement Reauthorization Act of 2024''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT, DISEASE, AND PREDATION

SEC. 101. LOSSES OF LIVESTOCK DUE TO DEPREDATION BY FEDERALLY PROTECTED SPECIES.

Section 102(d) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (7 U.S.C. 8355(d)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''.

SEC. 102. BLACK VULTURE LIVESTOCK PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 103 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (7 U.S.C. 8356) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''; black vulture livestock protection program'' after ''common ravens'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (c) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in each of paragraphs (2) and (3) (as so redesignated), by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)'';

(4) by inserting before paragraph (1) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(a) DEPREDATION PERMITS FOR BLACK VULTURES AND COMMON RAVENS.—''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) BLACK VULTURE LIVESTOCK PROTECTION PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with States, shall carry out, through fiscal year 2030, a black vulture livestock protection program (referred to in this subsection as the 'program') that allows 1 public entity or Farm Bureau organization per State to hold a statewide depredation permit to protect commercial agriculture livestock from black vulture predation.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each public entity or Farm Bureau organization that holds a depredation permit under the program—

''(A) shall—

''(i) demonstrate sufficient experience and capacity to provide government regulated services to the public, as determined by the Secretary;

''(ii) submit a complete depredation permit application, as determined by the Secretary, for review and approval according to procedures of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

''(iii) be responsible for complying with, and ensuring subpermittee compliance with, as applicable, all permit conditions; and

''(iv) be responsible for collecting, managing, and reporting required information under the permit; and

''(B) may subpermit to livestock producers to take black vultures for the purposes of livestock protection.

''(3) STUDY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, shall carry out a study on whether prescribed take levels of black vultures may be increased for subpermittees within a biologically sustainable take level for the population.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the America's Conservation Enhancement Reauthorization Act of 2024, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, shall submit to the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the status of the program, including the results of the study required under paragraph (3).''.

SEC. 103. CHRONIC WASTING DISEASE TASK FORCE.

Section 104(d)(1) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 667h(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''.

SEC. 104. PROTECTION OF WATER, OCEANS, COASTS, AND WILDLIFE FROM INVASIVE SPECIES.

Section 10(p) of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 666c–1(p)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''.

SEC. 105. NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT.

Section 7(c) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4406(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''not to exceed $60,000,000'' and inserting the following: ''not to exceed—

''(1) $60,000,000'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) $65,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030.''.

SEC. 106. NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION ESTABLISHMENT ACT.

Section 10 of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3709) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and cooperative agreements,'' and inserting '', cooperative agreements, participating agreements, and similar instruments used for providing partnership funds,'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities may enter into a Federal funding agreement with the Foundation for a period of not less than 5 years and not more than 10 years.''; and

(D) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by inserting '', and should when possible,'' after ''may''.

SEC. 107. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF SPORT FISHING EQUIPMENT UNDER TSCA.

Section 108(a) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 note; Public Law 116–188) is amended by striking ''During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''During the period beginning on the date of enactment of the America's Conservation Enhancement Reauthorization Act of 2024 and ending on September 30, 2030''.

SEC. 108. CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

Section 117(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030, $100,000,000.''.

SEC. 109. CHESAPEAKE BAY INITIATIVE ACT OF 1998.

Section 502(c) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–312; 112 Stat. 2963; 134 Stat. 920) is amended by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''.

SEC. 110. CHESAPEAKE WATERSHED INVESTMENTS FOR LANDSCAPE DEFENSE.

Section 111(e)(1) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (33 U.S.C. 1267 note; Public Law 116–188) is amended by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''.

TITLE II—NATIONAL FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION THROUGH PARTNERSHIPS

SEC. 201. NATIONAL FISH HABITAT BOARD.

Section 203 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8203) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''26 members'' and inserting ''28 members'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) 2 shall be representatives of the Department of the Interior, including the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management;''; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (G) and (H) and inserting the following:

''(G) 2 shall be representatives of Indian Tribes, of whom—

''(i) 1 shall be a representative of Indian Tribes in the State of Alaska; and

''(ii) 1 shall be a representative of Indian Tribes in States other than the State of Alaska;

''(H) 2 shall be representatives of—

''(i) the Regional Fishery Management Councils established by section 302(a)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(1)); or

''(ii) the Marine Fisheries Commissions;''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(B), by striking ''all members'' and inserting ''the members present''.

SEC. 202. FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIPS.

Section 204(e) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8204(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', subject to paragraph (3),'' after ''Act and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LIMITATION.—The Board shall only submit a report required under paragraph (1) in the fiscal years in which the Board is proposing modifications to, or new designations of, 1 or more Partnerships.''.

SEC. 203. FISH HABITAT CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8205) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''for the following fiscal year''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the total cost of all fish habitat conservation projects carried out by a Partnership each year shall be at least 50 percent.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Such non-Federal share of the cost of a fish habitat conservation project'' and inserting ''The non-Federal share described in paragraph (1)''.

SEC. 204. TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC ASSISTANCE.

Section 206(a) of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8206(a)) is amended by inserting '', the Bureau of Land Management,'' after ''the Forest Service''.

SEC. 205. ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTING.

Section 209 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8209) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b);

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking the subsection designation and heading and all that follows through ''Not later than'' in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as subsection (b) and indenting appropriately; and

(3) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(C) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(4) a description of the status of fish habitats in the United States as identified by Partnerships; and''; and

(E) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (i) through (v) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting appropriately; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by redesignating subclauses (I) and (II) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting appropriately.

SEC. 206. FUNDING.

Section 212 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8212) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''PARTNERSHIPS AND'' after ''HABITAT'';

(ii) by inserting ''and $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030'' after ''through 2025''; and

(iii) by inserting ''Partnership operations under section 204 and'' after ''to provide funds for'';

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2030'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (E) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) $400,000 to the Secretary for use by the Bureau of Land Management;''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) NATIONAL FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT.—There is authorized to be appropriated for completion of the National Fish Habitat Assessment described in section 201(4), including the associated database of the National Fish Habitat Assessment described in that section, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 207. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 211 of the America's Conservation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 8211) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.)'' and inserting ''Chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Federal Advisory Committee Act')''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that the bill be considered read a third time.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3791), as amended, was passed.

BILLIE JEAN KING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2861) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, an American icon, in recognition of a remarkable life devoted to championing equal rights for all, in sports and in society.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2861) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2861

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 ''Billie Jean King Congressional Gold Medal Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Billie Jean King, born Billie Jean Moffitt on November 22, 1943, in Long Beach, California, demonstrated athletic prowess from a young age. She was introduced to tennis at the age of 11, and soon after, Billie Jean purchased her first tennis racket using money she earned working various jobs in her neighborhood.

(2) Billie Jean broke numerous barriers to become a number one professional tennis player. She dominated women's tennis with 39 Grand Slam singles, doubles, and mixed doubles titles, including a record 20 championships at Wimbledon. She also was a member of 3 World TeamTennis championship teams.

(3) After growing in prominence, Billie Jean used her platform as a celebrity to fight for equal rights and opportunities for equality for all in sports, and society, in the United States.

(4) Billie Jean played an instrumental role in the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), a law that mandates equal funding for women's and men's sports programs in schools and colleges. This legislation has unlocked a world of opportunities for girls and women in education and sports.

(5) During Billie Jean's career, the pay difference between prize money for men and women in tennis continued to expand. By the early 1970s, the pay gap in prize money reached ratios of as much as 12 to 1. Fewer and fewer tournaments were hosting women's events. Billie Jean harnessed the energy of the women's rights movement to create a women's tennis tour that would elevate women's tennis and establish pay equity within the sport. Along with 8 other women tennis players, she formed an independent women's professional tennis circuit, the Virginia Slims Series.

(6) In 1973, Billie Jean founded the Women's Tennis Association, today's principal governing body for women's professional tennis.

(7) Billie Jean helped found womenSports magazine and founded the Women's Sports Foundation. Both have been at the forefront of advancing women's voice in sports.

(8) Billie Jean successfully lobbied for equal prize money for men and women at the 1973 US Open Tennis Championships. It would take another 34 years for the other 3 major tournaments to all offer equal prize money.

(9) In 1973, Billie Jean played a tennis match against Bobby Riggs, a former World Number 1 player who sought to undermine the credibility and prominence of women in sports. Billie Jean defeated Riggs in what became a firm declaration of women's role in sports and society.

(10) Billie Jean King was the first tennis player and woman to be named Sports Illustrated's Sportsperson of the Year, one of the ''100 Most Important Americans of the 20th Century'' by LIFE magazine, was the recipient of the 1999 Arthur Ashe Award for Courage, and has been admitted to the International Women's Sports Hall of Fame, the International Tennis Hall of Fame, and the National Women's Hall of Fame.

(11) In 2006, the United States Tennis Association recognized Billie Jean's immeasurable impact on the sport of tennis by renaming the site of the US Open in her honor as the USTA Billie Jean King National Tennis Center, which is located in Flushing Meadows Corona Park in Queens, New York. This was the first time a major sporting complex was named after a woman.

(12) In 2009, Billie Jean was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the United States, by President Barack Obama for her impactful work advocating for the rights of women. She was the first female athlete to receive this honor.

(13) In 2014, Billie Jean King founded the Billie Jean King Leadership Initiative to empower companies and individuals to create inclusive work environments that celebrate and promote diversity and equality in the workplace.

(14) In 2020, Fed Cup, the world cup of women's tennis, was renamed the Billie Jean King Cup, making it the first global team competition to be named after a woman.

(15) Billie Jean King's extraordinary courage, leadership, and activism helped propel the women's movement forward, and open doors for countless people in the United States. On and off the court, Billie Jean has served as an inspiration to millions of people the world over. Few women and men have had a greater impact on their sport and on our society than Billie Jean King.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to Billie Jean King, in recognition of her contribution to the United States and her courageous and groundbreaking leadership advancing equal rights for women in athletics, education, and our society.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. The design shall bear an image of, and inscription of the name of, Billie Jean King.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 3 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 and section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 6. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck under this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 4 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission: Member of the Senate: The Honorable ALEX PADILLA of California.

APPOINTMENT CORRECTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction to an appointment made on April 30, 2024, be printed in the RECORD.

For the information of the Senate, the correction is clerical and does not change membership of the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission made by the appointment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106–398, as amended by Public Law 108–7, and in consultation with the Chairs of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States—China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Honorable Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2024 and expiring December 31, 2025.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Thursday, May 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 211, H.R. 3935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of the Senate, Senators should expect a rollcall vote on cloture on the substitute amendment to the FAA bill at approximately 1 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:58 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 9, 2024, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING DAISY BRANCH FOR HER 82ND BIRTHDAY

HON. JERRY L. CARL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Daisy Branch for her 82nd birthday. As a devout member of the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd, one of Alabama's oldest historically black Episcopal churches, Daisy embodies the highest ideals of faith and community.

She is also a member of the Cheerio Club, where she ministers to the sick and shut-in, exemplifying her dedication to caring for others. Daisy's acts of kindness extend far beyond her church community. She prepares meals for bereaved families, providing solace and support during their time of need. Her care has touched the lives of many and enriched our community immeasurably.

In representing the First District of Alabama, I take great pride in acknowledging individuals like Daisy Branch, whose grace and generosity elevate our community.

RECOGNIZING HAPPY TRAILS RIDING ACADEMY

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Happy Trails Riding Academy as they celebrate their 40-year anniversary. Established in 1983 by T.J. Barreiro, Happy Trails Riding Academy is dedicated to serving individuals with physical, cognitive, and emotional disabilities. For four decades, their devoted staff and volunteers have provided equine-assisted services to children, adults, and military veterans, offering a unique alternative to conventional therapies. Happy Trails Riding Academy is the only full accredited therapeutic riding center in the San Joaquin Valley. Participants from across the San Joaquin Valley, including those living with autism spectrum disorder, brain injuries, cerebral palsy, sight and hearing impairments, and posttraumatic stress disorder, have benefited immensely from Happy Trails' programs. Equine-assisted therapy provides numerous physical, psychological, and social benefits to riders. Happy Trails collaborates with several national and regional non-profit organizations, such as the Wounded Warrior Program, VA Direct Services, United Ways of Tulare and Kings Counties, Quail Park Memory Care Unit, Central Valley Regional Center, and Tulare County Health & Human Services. Through these partnerships, they provide a nurturing environment for individuals with disabilities to improve their overall well-being and gain independence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in celebrating Happy Trails Riding Academy on their 40-year anniversary. Their unwavering commitment to supporting individuals with disabilities in the Central Valley will have a lasting impact for years to come.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF BRIAN HILL'S RETIREMENT

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Gerrish Township Chief of Police, Brian A. Hill, for his forty-two years of service in law enforcement and wish him the best in his much-deserved retirement.

Chief Brian Hill attended Kirtland Community College from 1980 to 1982 where he earned an Associate's Degree in the Applied Science of Police Administration. Upon graduation from college in May of 1982, Chief Hill was hired by the Gerrish Township Police Department as a Road Patrol Officer.

His contribution to the Gerrish Township Police Department has led him to receive 7 Departmental Commendations/Citations for excellent investigative work as well as a Life-Saving Award for the use of a Department Automated External Defibrillator (AED) to save a heart attack victim. For his unwavering courage and work ethic, Chief Hill received a promotion to Sergeant in 1994.

As a Sergeant in 2004, he was appointed to serve as Co-Chair of the Roscommon County COOR Coalition against Domestic and Sexual Violence. Chief Hill was then promoted from Sergeant to the office of Chief of Police on September 9, 2006.

For his exemplary leadership and service, Chief Hill was awarded the "Crime Fighter Award" in 2013 by the Fight Crime, Invest in Kids, Michigan organization for his role in fighting for Early Child Education appropriations from both Washington D.C. and our State Capital.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Gerrish Township Police Chief, Brian A. Hill, for his four-plus decades of service and wish him well in his retirement.

HONORING THE 275TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF DUMFRIES, VA

HON. ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Town of Dumfries on its 275th anniversary.

This year we celebrate the 275th Anniversary of the Charter Day of the Town of Dumfries, Virginia. Virgina's oldest continuously chartered town, the Town of Dumfries has a vast and storied past dating back to as early as 1690 when Mr. Richard Gibson erected a gristmill on Quantico Creek. The Virginia General Assembly established Dumfries as the first of seven townships in Prince William County and officially awarded the town its charter on May 11, 1749. The Town of Dumfries was founded on 60 acres of land provided by Mr. John Graham, who named the town after his birthplace, Dumfriesshire, Scotland.

In Colonial America, Dumfries received tobacco and served as the second leading port—rivaling New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. For more than 15 years, Dumfries maintained its operations as a leading port. In June 1774, a resolution protesting taxation without representation was authored in the town at the Dumfries Courthouse. During the Revolutionary War, local men in Dumfries served as part of the Prince William County militia under Colonel Henry Lee, and the Town itself served as a holding place for Hessian officers held as prisoners and where Continental troops were inoculated for smallpox.

Today, the Town of Dumfries is growing rapidly. This growth can be traced back to the dedicated town staff, local elected officials, and the many residents who call Dumfries home and who work hard to make Dumfries a destination. Filled with charm, history, and many thriving small businesses, Dumfries, Virginia continues to add to the story that started 275 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating the Town of Dumfries, Virginia on its 275th anniversary. I am honored to represent the many families who call Dumfries home and am excited to see all they will accomplish in the next chapter of their story.

RECOGNIZING SOPHYA SOLE

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sophya Sole for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Sophya has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Sophya, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Sophya's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Sophya Sole on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

CONGRATULATING AINSLEY EARHARDT

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ainsley Earhardt, co-host of Fox Television's ''FOX & Friends,'' on receiving an honorary doctorate degree from the University of South Carolina on May 4, 2024.

Ainsley was born in Spartanburg, South Carolina, to Lewie and Dale Earhardt, and grew up in Columbia. After graduating from Spring Valley High School, she initially attended Florida State University, before transferring to the University of South Carolina (USC) and graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Journalism.

USC holds a special place in Ainsley's heart as her family has a long history of attending the University, including her grandparents.

Prior to Ainsley's successful career at Fox News, she got her start as a reporter for WLTX, the local CBS station in Columbia, while attending USC. She was soon promoted to the morning and noon anchor. After the 9/11 Attack, she went to New York City to cover South Carolina middle school students raising money for a new fire truck for the firefighters who had lost theirs at the World Trade Center site.

Since joining Fox in 2007, Ainsley has had her own segment on Hannity, ''Ainsley Across America,'' and has co-hosted ''Fox and Friends Weekend,'' ''All-American New Year's Eve,'' and ''America's News Headquarters.'' In 2016, she became a co-host of ''FOX & Friends,'' where she continues to bring us real news and honest opinions as a leading, distinguished media personality and broadcast journalist.

As a fellow South Carolinian and USC alum, I am grateful to join Ainsley's family and friends in congratulating her on her honorary doctorate degree and to thank her for representing South Carolina so well.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENSURING MEDICAID CONTINUITY FOR THE INSULAR AREAS ACT OF 2024

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Ensuring Medicaid Continuity for the Insular Areas Act of 2014, which would protect access to health insurance for our most vulnerable Americans in the territories. Specifically, my legislation would authorize the redistribution of unused Medicaid block grant funding to address shortfalls in the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Medicaid programs in the U.S. territories are subject to a statutory cap, denying them the open-ended federal funding enjoyed by Medicaid programs in the states. Block grant programs, however, are inherently ill-equipped to respond to emergencies due to their fixed funding structure. This disparity most recently became pronounced during the COVID–19 public health emergency.

Congress knows well the challenges associated with block grant programs. That's why we designed contingency measures for other block grant programs, such as the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). In the event of a funding shortfall, states and territory CHIP programs have access to multiple contingency measures to protect and sustain access to healthcare services. Territory Medicaid programs face similar funding challenges as CHIP due to their shared block grant structure yet lack equivalent contingency measures.

My bill, the Ensuring Medicaid Continuity for the Insular Areas Act of 2024, fixes this critical gap in our Nation's health safety net for Americans in the territories. Under terms set out by my legislation, territory Medicaid programs—like CHIP programs—would be better equipped to address emergencies through the redistribution of unused territory Medicaid allotment funds to shortfall territories.

This bipartisan legislation presents a common-sense, budget-neutral solution, establishing a long overdue fail-safe for Medicaid in the territories. The well-being of our citizens and the care to which they have access to, regardless of their geographic location, must be our top priority.

The gentleman from Guam, Mr. MOYLAN, and the gentlelady from American Samoa, Ms. RADEWAGEN, are original cosponsors of the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation and uphold our commitment to providing equitable health insurance coverage for all Americans.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF SARA CUNNINGHAM

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Director of Cheboygan County Veterans Services, Sara Cunningham. Sara's role in assisting Veterans and their families in obtaining county, state, and federal benefits to which they are entitled has been monumental for our servicemembers and their loved ones.

Sara served the country in the United States Coast Guard from 1999 to 2004. She was stationed in Texas and New Jersey during her five years of military service. She came to the Cheboygan area when her husband was transferred to the United States Coast Guard Cutter *Mackinaw* in 2014. She has worked in the Cheboygan County Veterans Services Office since December 2015 and also serves as the treasurer and secretary for the Veterans Memorial Park Committee.

In April 2022, Sara was recognized as the Hometown Hero of the Year by the Cheboygan County Veterans Subcommittee for everything she has done for local veterans. She was the first person to receive this honor for her exemplary work and humble service. Sara has also been the recipient of numerous statements of support and heartfelt appreciation from multiple Veterans and their families for the sacrifices she makes every day to serve those heroes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Director of Cheboygan County Veterans Services, Sara Cunningham for all her hard work and efforts on behalf of Veterans. Sara is an outstanding example of the ripple effect of positivity that one individual can start for a community and a grateful Nation and I wish her the best in all of her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING FREMONT OEM AND DOT

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fremont County Office of Emergency Management (OEM) and Department of Transportation (DOT) for their life-saving work to keep roads clear and restore power during a record-breaking winter storm in March of 2024. This harsh winter storm brought over thirteen inches of snow and caused major power outages throughout the county.

Staff from the Fremont County Office of Emergency Management, led by Emergency Manager Mykel Kroll, and the Fremont County Department of Transportation, led by Director Mike Whitt, worked overtime and over weekends throughout inclement weather conditions to clear roadways and restore traffic to over 700 miles of mountainous roadways in the county. Together, they freed an elderly woman who had been trapped in her car by the snow, secured housing for a family who were victims of a fire, restored power to a residential care facility in Florence, rescued a man caught in his vehicle after an avalanche, and helped maintain power for a family with a young child who relies on a supplemental oxygen supply.

Under some of the most extreme conditions possible, Fremont County OEM and DOT did an exemplary job of saving lives and serving our community during this storm.

On behalf of the people of Colorado's Seventh Congressional District, it is my honor to recognize Fremont County Office of Emergency Management and Department of Transportation for their outstanding work and service to our communities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I was present for the vote on the House floor and thought I had voted ''AYE'' for the bill using my member card but it did not properly count my vote. Had it been counted, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 186.

NATIONAL LIPID DAY

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, as co-Chair of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition,

I want to recognize May 10th as National Lipid Day. More than 71 million adults have high levels of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL–C), which increases their risk of developing heart disease—one of the leading causes of death in the United States. LDL–C accumulation in the arteries decreases the flow of blood and can deprive the heart or brain from an adequate supply of oxygen-rich blood.

Atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD), which can lead to a heart attack or stroke, is responsible for nearly 85 percent of cardiovascular deaths. More than 200 studies with over 2,000,000 patients have broadly established that elevated LDL–C levels unequivocally cause ASCVD.

Any comprehensive effort to reduce the number of adverse heart and stroke events across the country must be centered on cardiovascular disease prevention. We must also ensure that those who have already suffered a cardiac event do not suffer another. New data shows that there is a gap in care for Medicare beneficiaries who have had a heart attack. Less than 30 percent of Medicare Fee-for-Service beneficiaries' LDL–C levels were tested in the 90 days after being hospitalized due to a heart attack, despite clinical guidelines recommending earlier and more frequent LDL–C testing to monitor and manage one's cholesterol levels. In fact, a third of those survivors did not receive an LDL–C test in the full year following their heart attack. The importance of timely LDL–C testing cannot be understated. Patients who fail to reach their LDL–C level goals are at a 44 percent higher risk of experiencing an adverse cardiac event. The lack of guideline-directed care represents a missed opportunity to prevent further adverse events.

According to an article published by the American Heart Association, Black Americans and other people of color suffered a disproportionately higher increase in cardiovascular disease-related deaths during the pandemic than their white counterparts. Black Americans experienced a 20 percent increase in cardiovascular disease-related deaths during the pandemic, compared to just a 2 percent increase among white Americans in the same timeframe. A person's race or ethnicity should not put them at a higher risk of incurring a cardiac event, yet this data shows striking disparities exist among racial and ethnic groups. All Americans deserve quality cardiovascular care with a focus on prevention and getting access to innovative treatments when needed. Special attention should be focused on the disparities in outcomes that occur among racial and ethnic groups.

On National Lipid Day, we must recognize the importance of routine lipid screening and management as a critical piece of the puzzle while we work to significantly reduce the frequency of cardiac events.

RECOGNIZING BOSMA ENTERPRISES

HON. GREG PENCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exceptional work of Indiana's very own Bosma Enterprises.

Bosma is the largest employer of people with vision loss in the state. Over half of its employees are blind and employed at all company levels, from production to executive leadership. Each year, nearly 900 clients benefit from their services, learning the skills necessary to live independently.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support Bosma Enterprises and their work through the AbilityOne Program. They are truly making a difference in people's lives by creating opportunities for people who are blind or visually impaired, allowing Americans to be independent and pursue their own version of the American Dream.

RECOGNIZING MARGARITA TIKHANOVA

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Margarita Tikhanova for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Margarita has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Margarita, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Margarita's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Margarita Tikhanova on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

IN MEMORY OF NEW MEXICO STATE REPRESENTATIVE JIM TRUJILLO

HON. TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the loss of one of New Mexico's most accomplished and best-loved public servants, former New Mexico State Representative Jim Trujillo. He demonstrated what it means to answer the call to public service and that public service is an act of love. I am grateful for the love Rep. Trujillo gave to the people of his district and our state. He also truly embodied what it means to be a loving husband, father, and grandfather.

His legacy now lives on in countless lives he touched in our beautiful state through both his important career as a financial professional and his broad public service in the New Mexico Human Services Department, six years in the New Mexico National Guard, and his outstanding 17 years in the New Mexico Legislature. I met with Rep. Trujillo numerous times when I was working on voting rights and tribal intergovernmental matters. He always listened with deep attention and gave clear directions and support. He was a man of his word. His tireless dedication to the people of New Mexico proves to all of us how much we can accomplish together for our beloved communities.

I offer my deepest condolences to his wife Virginia, their children, and the entire extended Trujillo family. I carry his inspiration with me as I continue my own service in the beautifully diverse Third District of New Mexico.

RECOGNIZING THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD FOR THEIR 170TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERRY L. CARL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd for their 170th Church Anniversary. Formed in 1854, the Episcopal Church of the Good Shepherd has triumphed through wars, economic turmoil, and the Civil Rights Movement. Their motto. ''Guiding and supporting one another, to love and to serve, giving thanks to God for our rich heritage,'' embodies who they are and how they live their lives as a congregation. The Church truly has a profound legacy of being Alabama's oldest historically black Episcopal church. We are so grateful for the impact that this Church has on our great state and Alabama's First Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING THE WESTCARE FOUNDATION

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the WestCare Foundation on their 50-year anniversary and thank them for their significant contributions to the Central Valley. For decades, WestCare has played a vital role in delivering essential health programs and services to communities across the nation. Since their founding, WestCare has remained steadfast in its commitment to providing individuals and families with the care they need to lead healthy and fulfilling lives. In the Central Valley, WestCare California provides essential services to youth, veterans, the homeless, and other vulnerable populations. WestCare California is passionate about supporting individuals that struggle with substance abuse. Through its adult residential and outpatient services in both Fresno and Bakersfield, as well as their Adolescent Services outpatient programs in Hanford and Corcoran, WestCare California delivers comprehensive counseling, education classes, relapse prevention, job assistance and family support services. The organization is also dedicated to serving Central Valley veterans through its San Joaquin Valley Veterans (SJVV) program. The SJVV program provides transitional living facilities for all veterans, as well as drop-in locations throughout the Central Valley that offer housing services, job assistance, supportive care, and referrals. WestCare California also addresses homelessness through its Veteran's Plaza and

HomeFront programs, providing home and case management services for individuals for up to two years. These initiatives are crucial in ensuring that Central Valley veterans receive the care and support they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the WestCare Foundation on their 50-year anniversary. Their work to improve access to healthcare in the Central Valley will be felt for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING ANDRES SANCHEZ-RUBIO

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Andres Sanchez-Rubio for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Andres has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Andres, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Andres's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Andres Sanchez-Rubio on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF WEST BRANCH HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1964

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 60th reunion of the West Branch High School Class of 1964 and honor the 134th anniversary of the West Branch High School Alumni Association.

Sixty years ago, the West Branch High School Class of 1964 graduated with 88 students who went on to lead by example through their knowledge, skills, sacrifices, and perseverance. Our community takes immense pride in the West branch class of '64, as we salute and pay tribute to the military Veterans for their brave and honorable service to our Nation. During the Vietnam era and beyond, 50 percent of the male graduates from the class of '64 went on to serve in the United States military.

Accomplishments shared by the West Branch High School Class of 1964 attest to the lasting, positive impact that educators made on their lives and to the strength of friendships that have endured for decades, leaving a legacy that Michiganders across the 1st District can be proud of. I also recognize the West Branch High School Alumni Association on the occasion of its 134th anniversary, underscoring the dedicated leadership and significant efforts that have been made to keep the Alumni Association active and vital, long after the school closed 55 years ago.

I'm confident that the legacy of the school will continue to live on through ''The Orioles Forever West Branch High School Alumni Endowment Fund,'' established in 2006 to perpetually provide scholarships to graduating seniors from the West Branch—Rose City Schools who are continuing their education.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and celebrate the 60th reunion of the West Branch High School Class of 1964, as well as the 134th anniversary of the West Branch High School Alumni Association. I wish everyone the best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING SUNNY GURPREET SINGH FOR ALL HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Sunny Gurpreet Singh for his lifetime of work focused on wellbeing and holistic health.

Mr. Singh grew up in Punjab, India where he developed a passion for the environment and its relationship with human wellbeing. His upbringing emphasized the importance of nature, which eventually inspired him to pursue a master's degree at Montana State University. During his studies, he took advantage of Montana's natural beauty and made the connection between environment and personal well-being. This led him to a career focused on healthcare and creating pathways for people to reconnect with nature.

The link between the environment and health inspired Mr. Singh to start a company and develop programs that would make his philosophy accessible to anyone who was interested. He worked to improve healthcare delivery for patients, caregivers, and professionals and implement a proactive wellness approach. He also created a tool to assist people in making positive, long-term changes to enhance their lives.

Mr. Singh continues to give back to his community through various initiatives focused on increasing access for underserved communities to athletics, education, women's empowerment, and environmental protection. This philanthropic work has helped shape the way people view the environment and take care of themselves.

Roundglass Sustain, Mr. Singh's environmental philanthropic arm, has worked to document biodiversity in India and has campaigned to promote environmental conservation and showcase the planet's wildlife diversity through thousands of photos and videos that have reached millions of people.

Additionally, Mr. Singh developed the Roundglass India Center initiative based in Seattle University. The Center serves as a bridge between Seattle and India through their events and collaborations. He has helped students from Punjab pursue a legal education at Seattle University's School of Law through the Center's Punjab Scholarship. The Center also funds research that is aimed at gaining insights into the major challenges confronting societies today and promotes conversations on regional and national social and economic transformations for India.

Sunny Singh's life is the embodiment of the American Dream. As a fellow immigrant from India, I am deeply honored to commemorate Sunny Singh's significant contributions and accomplishments. Mr. Sunny Gurpreet Singh has empowered and uplifted countless individuals across the United States and India, and it is for that impact, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to extend my gratitude and appreciation to Sunny Gurpreet Singh.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ELK RUN BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 150th anniversary of Elk Run Baptist Church.

Today, I am honored to celebrate the Elk Run Baptist Church community, which since 1874 has built a legacy of service. The community first met under a chestnut tree located near the home of the late Deacon Henry Spotswood, Sr. in Madison County, Virginia. Soon after, Reverend Frank Tibbs became the church's first pastor.

Through the decades, Elk Run Baptist Church has faced trying times, such as a fire in 1954 that destroyed the church and displaced congregants for two years. However, in the face of adversity, this resilient community responded with tenacity and devotion. Today, Elk Run Baptist Church is known for having a welcoming and service-minded congregation that continues to provide support to its members through its worship and programming.

Elk Run Baptist Church has been a steadfast pillar of hope for Madison County and its residents. Under the current leadership of Reverend Maurice Evans, Elk Run Baptist Church has continued to have a positive impact on the Madison County community—from partnering with Virginia Food Ministry to feed the community to making sure their church is a safe haven for all who need it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating Elk Run Baptist Church on their 150th anniversary. I am honored to represent the families and individuals who make up the Elk Run Baptist Church community and look forward to celebrating their continued success for years to come.

RECOGNIZING CAITLEN RULIFFSON

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Caitlen Ruliffson for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Caitlen has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Caitlen, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives.

This award is a testament to Caitlen's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Caitlen Ruliffson on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

HONORING COLONEL JAMES COLLINS

HON. NANCY MACE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Colonel James Collins' service as the Chief, House Liaison Division, Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison, where he was responsible for the liaison between the Army and the United States House of Representatives. A truly outstanding leader of impeccable character, Colonel Collins skillfully managed an office that played a vital role in advancing the Army's interests while maintaining effective relationships with the 117th and 118th Congress during a critical time in our Nation's history.

Under Colonel Collins' leadership, the House Liaison Division conducted numerous outreach events to enhance congressional trust and confidence during two National Defense Authorization Act legislative cycles. The House Liaison Team was instrumental during MLA luncheons and enabled countless engagements that provided members and staff the opportunity to speak directly with Army Senior Leaders from both the Secretariat and Army Staff.

Colonel Collins was instrumental in enhancing the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison within the Army Secretariat and Headquarters, Department of the Army Staff, as well as the Army's standing with the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize and commend Colonel Collins' personal example, commitment to excellence, and exemplary performance of duty that reflects distinct credit upon himself, the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison, and the United States Army. We bid Colonel Collins farewell and best wishes in his next assignment as the Citadel's Professor of Military Science.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTINA SCHEPPELMANN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ARTS

HON. PRAMILA JAYAPAL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christina Scheppelmann, who is stepping down after five years of service as the General Director of Seattle Opera.

Seattle Opera thrived under Christina's leadership. Her passion for the performing arts will undoubtedly leave a mark on the City of Seattle for years to come. In the process of navigating a global pandemic that halted over two years of in-house performances, Christina led Seattle Opera to be able to deliver the entirety of its programming during the 2020–2021 season by recording performances for patrons to stream online. She helped hire artists to present free, online performances and expand virtual educational programming for youth and Veterans. When pandemic restrictions began to partially lift in 2021, Christina committed to offering Seattle Opera's first celebratory outdoor rendition of ''Die Walkure'' by Richard Wagner.

Throughout her tenure, Christina forged a deep commitment to community engagement as well as diversity, equity and inclusion. Under her leadership, the Seattle Opera presented a number of works by and about people of color. The productions included ''Blue'', a story about a Black family that draws strength from their community in the face of a police killing and ''Bound'', a story about a daughter of Vietnamese immigrants, as well as A Thousand Splendid Suns and X: The Life and Times of Malcolm X. In all of these productions, she engaged the community through Advisory Boards, outreach to the specific communities represented in the productions, and nonprofit organizations working on the issues. Her goal, in her words to me, was that these productions ''showcase how Seattle Opera is keeping relevant stories centered on-stage.''

In 2020, she led Seattle Opera to launch its Racial Equity and Social Impact plan. The effort contributed toward hiring a diverse staff and brought over 100 new artists from around the world to debut performances. Her addition of community programs such as the Jane Lang Davis Creation Lab and the Seattle Arts Fellowship—will serve as trademark opportunities for underrepresented communities to build careers in the arts.

Christina's leadership at the Seattle Opera exemplifies the need for all of us in the United States to ensure we support the arts and the unique ability arts have to add positively to our society. As Christina moves on from her role at the end of the 2023–24 season to lead La Monnaie De Munt in Brussels, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating her many accomplishments and contributions to Seattle Opera. On behalf of Washington's 7th Congressional District, I thank Christina for her service to the people of the Pacific Northwest and dedication to the performing arts.

HONORING SUELLEN BRILL BRAZIL

HON. JERRY L. CARL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Suellen Brill Brazil, a resident of Daphne, Alabama, as she is inaugurated as the 55th International President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC). This ceremony will take place on July 1, 2024, in Chicago, Illinois.

She is the first International President from Alabama in GFWC's 134-year history, and she will serve in this capacity from 2024 to 2026. Her leadership theme, ''Educate, Engage, Empower,'' aims to encourage meaningful discussions, provide skills, and promote action. Suellen brings over 50 years of experience in various leadership roles, characterized by enthusiasm and dedication. GFWC, a global volunteer service organization, focuses on issues like domestic violence, food insecurity, and education.

Suellen has been active in her local community, especially in addressing domestic violence and supporting the vulnerable. Professionally, Suellen concluded a 44-year career as an Elementary Administrator, managing schools and students. She is also active in her church and is a proud mother and grandmother. Suellen's presidency represents a significant milestone for GFWC, bringing her wealth of experience and dedication to furthering its mission of community service and empowerment.

We are so grateful for all she has done for Alabama's First Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING MONICA TELLES RODRIGUEZ

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Monica Telles Rodriguez for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Monica has overcome many challenges along her journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Monica, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Monica's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Monica Telles Rodriguez on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIFF ROY WHITEAKER

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and public service career of Sutter County Sheriff Roy Whiteaker who recently passed away at the age of 84 years old.

Roy was born in Calico Rock, Arkansas, to Corbin and Irene Whiteaker. From a young age, Roy displayed a strong sense of duty and integrity, traits that would guide him throughout his life and career.

Roy would join the United States Army in 1959, where he would become a military policeman beginning his law enforcement career. While in the Army, Roy was stationed in Panama for nearly three years, where he would marry his wife.

The young family would then move to Yuba City in 1962, where Roy would continue his law enforcement career with the City of Yuba City Police Department, being hired as the City's first narcotics Detective. He would also be instrumental in helping to organize the first Yuba-Sutter Narcotics Task Force.

Roy would then run for Sutter County Sheriff serving from 1971 to 1990; when he was first

elected as Sheriff, he was reportedly the youngest Sheriff ever elected in California at that time.

During his tenure, Sheriff Whiteaker would oversee many high-profile cases such as the arrest of Juan Corona, who was convicted of murder after 25 bodies were found buried in Sutter County orchards; as well as in 1989 when the Sutter County Sheriff Office seized $4.25 million worth of illegal drugs, or what would be $11 million today accounting for inflation.

Current Sutter County Sheriff Brandon Barnes was quoted as saying, ''Roy was a tremendous leader and he served as a mentor to so many, including myself. He will he missed but never forgotten.'' The impact of Sheriff Whiteaker cannot be understated, he helped mold and influence the Sutter County Sheriff's Office into the force that it is today.

Roy is survived by his loving wife Gladys, along with his two children Janet Tracy, and Jim Whiteaker, as well as many grandchildren. On behalf of the people of Northern California, I thank Sheriff Roy Whiteaker for his service to the Sutter County community. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him. Rest in Peace.

WELCOME EMILY CLAIRE OLSON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dustin and Carolyn Olson, of Denver, Colorado, on the birth of their new baby daughter. Emily Claire Olson, was born on April 29, 2024, at 2:45 a.m., weighing 7 pounds and 8 ounces. She has been born into a loving home, where she will be raised by her parents who are devoted to her well-being and bright future. Her birth is a blessing. On behalf of my wife Roxanne, and our entire family, we want to wish Dustin, Carolyn, and Emily all the best.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances, I was unable to cast my votes for H.R. 6192, H.J. Res. 98, and H.R. 7423. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 182; NAY on Roll Call No. 183; YEA on Roll Call No. 184; YEA on Roll Call No. 185; and YEA on Roll Call No. 186.

RECOGNIZING MATHANIEL SANCHEZ

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mathaniel Sanchez for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Mathaniel has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Mathaniel, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Mathaniel's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Mathaniel Sanchez on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 153.

HONORING MS. MIA NORTON

HON. CHUCK EDWARDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Mia Norton for her invaluable work as a congressional intern serving in my D.C. office. I would like to take this opportunity to thank her for her hard work and recognize the meaningful contributions she has made to the office and serving the people of Western North Carolina this spring.

Mia is from Clyde, North Carolina, located in NC–11. She will soon be concluding her sophomore year at American University, where she is studying journalism and political science.

Interns work with congressional staff to serve constituents in my district. Mia was chosen from a competitive pool of applicants, and she exceeded every expectation.

It was a pleasure to work with Mia, and I am proud to have such an intelligent and ambitious intern representing my office. Mia exemplified the spirit of public service and represents the best that Western North Carolina has to offer. Congratulations to Mia on the successful completion of her internship.

HONORING THE CENTRAL CABARRUS HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. DAN BISHOP

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate the Central Cabarrus boy's high school basketball team on winning back-to-back 3A state championships. In recent years, the Central Cabarrus Vikings have been the dominant force to reckon with in North Carolina boys' basketball. Local Charlotte news anchor Jim Tritsch described it perfectly when he said, ''there is no defense they cannot breach; there is no level of dominance they can't unlock.''

Led by Coach Jim Baker, the Vikings put up an astounding record of 95–1 over the past three seasons. The Vikings' most recent win not only earned them a second consecutive championship but raised Central Cabarrus' winning streak to 65 straight games, the longest current winning streak in the country.

Once again, on behalf of the 8th District of North Carolina, congratulations to Coach Baker and Viking Nation on this outstanding achievement.

RECOGNIZING BRUNO SUACEDO MARTINEZ

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bruno Suacedo Martinez for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Bruno has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Bruno, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Bruno's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future

It is my honor to congratulate Bruno Suacedo Martinez on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

CELEBRATING 175 YEARS OF TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of a milestone in our region's history. Toledo Public Schools celebrated 175 years of education today.

As the school system notes, ''or 175 years, Toledo Public Schools has been one of the most influential institutions in the history of our city. The lives of hundreds of thousands of Toledoans have been formed within the walls of their neighborhood schools, leading to each one's mark on the future of our society. From its inception on May 8, 1849 to present day, TPS remains a progressive, forward-thinking school district.''

The first Toledo Public School Board was convened 175 years ago today. Only two years later, in 1851, Lagrange School was the first school to open. Two years after that, on August 15, 1853, the cornerstone was laid for the high school. When it opened in 1854 it also provided an education for girls, graduating the first young lady in the original Class of 1857. Leading social change again and again, Toledo Public Schools became integrated in 1871 and opened a school for children with disabilities in 1918.

Toledo has long been at the forefront of the election of women to public office, starting with the election of Pauline Steinem to the board of education in 1904, the first woman elected any office in the city. Many years later, in 1990 Toledo Public Schools would once again prove itself a progressive agent for change with the appointment of Dr. Crystal Ellis, a longtime educator, as the first African-American Superintendent.

In addition to academic excellence, vocational and college preparatory training, Toledo Public Schools' students have won praise on the athletic field as well. From its beginnings, when Scott High School was declared the national football champs in 1916 and subsequent years, Toledo Public Schools have boasted many powerhouse athletic teams. At the same time, leading citizens in our community trace part of their success to the lessons learned in Toledo Public Schools.

Reflecting the general population growth during the baby boom generation, Toledo Public Schools saw its highest numbers of both schools and students during the 1960s. Even now, it remains one of the area's largest employers and the fourth largest school district in the State of Ohio. Today, Toledo Public Schools is led by Dr. Romulus Durant, himself a product of Toledo Public Schools, who ably leads the school district's navigation in the 21st Century, declaring students, teachers, parents, administrators, and community to be ''TPS Proud.''

Toledo Public Schools is the core of our city. Graduates of years past, present and future are tied to one another with an invisible thread with memories and experience connecting them.

In the Fall of 1967, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. visited the student at Scott High School, delivering inspiring oratory. Since its inception 175 years ago, Toledo Public Schools has delivered on the promise of words Dr. King once spoke when he explained, ''The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically. Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education.'' As Toledo Public Schools marches TPS Proud into the next years, that goal remains strong. Onward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during Roll Call vote No. 186 on May 7, 2024. Had I been present, I would have voted YES.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MATTHEW B. RETTIG

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Dr. Matthew B. Rettig, Medical Director of the Prostate Cancer Program at the David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles and Chief of Hematology-Oncology at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Greater Los Angeles, on receiving the Department of Veterans Affairs' Office of Clinical Science Research and Development John B. Barnwell Award in recognition of his significant contributions to the field of prostate cancer diagnosis and treatment.

Dr. Rettig began his Veterans Affairs (VA) career as a staff physician in the Division of Hematology-Oncology at the VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System in 1996. He became a leader within the department, and his unwavering commitment to improving health outcomes for veterans diagnosed with prostate cancer led to the development of the VA Precision Oncology Program Cancer of the Prostate (POPCaP) network. Dr. Rettig is credited for fostering the partnership between the VA and Prostate Cancer Foundation (PCF), which has resulted in the PCF committing $50M to support this program and expanding services to over 20 centers across the nation to meet the critical care needs of American veterans with prostate cancer.

Along with his leadership of the Prostate Cancer Program, Dr. Rettig is also a Professor of Medicine and Urology at UCLA where he is training the next generation of clinicians and researchers. Dr. Rettig has dedicated himself to the future of the field, having generously mentored and trained over 31 residents, fellows, post-doctoral scholars, and junior faculty in veteran-centered clinical research, a majority of whom continue to serve the VA to meet the healthcare needs of veterans while also conducting their own independent cutting-edge research in various disciplines. The impact of his work is far-reaching and truly immeasurable.

Dr. Rettig is ranked among the top ten clinical investigators nationally both within and outside of the VA and is a major asset for the VA and the veterans they serve. His expertise and achievements in genitourinary oncology and research are evidenced by invitations to serve on local and national committees and boards including the VA National GU Cancer Working Group Steering Committee, Brentwood Biomedical Research Institute, Greater LA Research & Education Foundation, Department of Defense, and the Prostate Cancer Foundation, among many others. Additionally, he serves on an editorial capacity for 13 scientific and medical journals.

It is with great honor that I congratulate Dr. Rettig upon receiving the Barnwell Award, the highest honor conferred by the VA Clinical Science Research and Development Service, in recognition of outstanding scientific achievements in clinical research. I ask that all Members join me in congratulating Dr. Rettig on his award and his service to our Nation's veterans.

RECOGNIZING SUSIE BELL

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Susie Bell of Cañon City for being inducted into the Fremont Hall of Fame.

Susie was a pillar in Fremont County and spent decades improving the community before her passing in November of 2022. Her many philanthropic contributions and hours of volunteer work continue to have a transformative impact on students and so many others in Fremont County.

Susie was committed to advancing education—she built several scholarships for current and future learners, supported early childhood development programs, and donated and volunteered for many events to promote the arts. Her tireless work and dedication to Fremont County did not go unnoticed. She will be missed, but her contributions will last for generations.

On behalf of the people of Colorado's Seventh Congressional District, it is my honor to congratulate Susie Bell for being inducted into Fremont Hall of Fame and thank her for her contribution and commitment to our community.

RECOGNIZING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOSS SCHOOL

HON. CHIP ROY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the one-hundred fortieth anniversary of the Doss School in Gillespie County, Texas. It is the longest continually running school in the State and is located northwest of Fredericksburg.

Alumni, faculty, and students of the Doss School will gather to celebrate this milestone on May 18, 2024. Its motto is ''The small school with a big heart.''

School board president Cecil Crenwelge had this to say about the occasion, ''The history behind Doss School is truly remarkable. As we celebrate the incredible history of the school and its many alumni, we also have an eye to the future that is very bright.''

The original building for Doss School was officially designated a Texas Historic Landmark in 1985. The first classes at Doss School began in 1884. Mr. Tom Nixon donated land for the construction of a school building. Upon completion, students at Squaw Creek and Onion Creek schools merged with Doss and shared the new building. The school further expanded with a new building in 1927.

I would like to thank the Friends of Doss School for preserving local history and this community treasure. I wish the students and faculty of Doss School well in the upcoming school year.

HONORING JUDGE DEAN A. COLVIN'S SERVICE TO MARSHALL COUNTY, INDIANA

HON. RUDY YAKYM, III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. YAKYM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my friend and fellow Hoosier Judge Dean Colvin of Marshall County Superior Court No. 2 as he prepares to retire this coming September after more than 37 years of serving on the bench.

Born and raised in Marshall County, Judge Colvin's distinguished career in public service

goes back 50 years to 1974. Starting out as a special deputy with the Marshall County Sheriff's Department, a Plymouth Police Officer, Investigator with the Marshall County Prosecutor's Office, and Deputy Attorney General for the State of Indiana. Dean was appointed to serve the citizens of Marshall County as judge in 1986. In that time, Judge Colvin has dedicated himself to advancing the principles of justice and ensuring Hoosiers get a fair shake before the law.

The Rule of Law tradition we have inherited helps secure individual liberty and promotes the conditions necessary for human flourishing. It is incumbent on us to do our part to make sure these principles of justice and Rule of Law precepts are passed seamlessly from one generation to the next. That mission is one Judge Colvin has embraced wholeheartedly and worked tirelessly to advance throughout his career.

As Judge Colvin's career comes to a close, I am reminded of the saying "I like to see a man proud of the place in which he lives. I like to see a man live so that his place will be proud of him ." I believe this quote applies uniquely well to Judge Colvin. The Plymouth community and all of Marshall County are unquestionably better off thanks to this good man with a servant's heart. I am also very happy for him personally in that with his upcoming retirement, Dean will have more time to devote to his three great passions in life in addition to his family: baseball, cars, and cooking.

I join Hoosiers throughout Indiana's Second Congressional District in expressing our gratitude to Judge Dean Colvin for his service, and in wishing him a very happy retirement and all the best going forward. I thank Dean.

RECOGNIZING MR. EFRAIN CASILLAS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable contributions of Mr. Efrain Casillas, the Coordinator of Music Programs for the Tolleson Elementary School District in Tolleson, Arizona. For the past 24 years, Mr. Casillas has dedicated himself to the education and enrichment of his students, serving as a public-school music teacher and imparting his passion for music to countless young minds. Mr. Casillas' own journey exemplifies what it means to break through barriers to achieve success through dedication and commitment. Mr. Casillas has beaten the odds and was named the Arizona Teacher of the Year in 2024 by the Arizona Educational Foundation, representing the state of Arizona at the national level among many more recognitions.

Mr. Casillas has had a profound impact on countless students, pioneering innovative music programs, including the district's first Mariachi, Jazz, Marching, Concert, and Latin Jazz bands. As a native of Puerto Rico, Mariachi was not part of his musical heritage, but Casillas made it a priority to learn it because it is part of the culture of many of his students who are native to Mexico.

Under Mr. Casillas' guidance, the Mariachi band has secured multiple awards, including the Tucson Mariachi International Conference Choice Awards for three consecutive years. Notably, his dedication led to the Mariachi band performing at the 2024 Annual White House Easter Egg Roll event and the marching band proudly participating in the Disneyland Parade. Additionally, Mr. Casillas directed the Tolleson Elementary School marching band in the Fiesta Bowl Parade for three consecutive years. Mr. Casillas' commitment and talent have garnered numerous accolades and awards, including being named the Tolleson Elementary School District Teacher of the Year in 2015 and nominated for the Life Changer of the Year Award in 2017. He has also received the Esperanza Award from Chicanos Por La Causa and Arizona's Esperanza Latino Teacher Awards in 2018, along with the 2019 Music Teacher of Excellence Foundation Award by the Country Music Association. Furthermore, he was honored with the Music Teachers of Excellence from the Country Music Foundation Award (CMF) in 2020 and featured on the Kelly Clarkson Show.

Mr. Casillas' dedication to music education and advocacy for public education were further recognized when he received the Phoenix Arts Hero Award in 2022. Mr. Casillas' commitment to music education extends beyond the classroom, as he is an active member of many notable and impactful organizations. He has also served as a presenter for the National Symposium of Multicultural Music at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 2004 and as a clinician for the 2024 Tolleson High School Honors Mariachi Music Festival.

The highest honor Mr. Casillas has received is having many of his former students return to assist in the music program as teachers or instructors. His impact is now extending to more students.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Efrain Casillas for his unwavering dedication to music education, his outstanding achievements as a teacher, and his tireless advocacy for public education. His passion, talent, and leadership have enriched the lives of countless students and inspired us all. I join my colleagues in expressing our deepest appreciation for Mr. Casillas' contributions and in wishing him continued success in all his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING ROSS FREEMAN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCIENCE

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Ross Freeman for his historic contributions to the Scientific and Technological communities

One of the UP's very own, Mr. Freeman grew up on a farm near Engadine. He graduated from Michigan State University in 1969 and received his master's degree from the University of Illinois in 1971.

Mr. Freeman invented the Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA), a computer chip which revolutionized programming as we know it. The FPGA created what came to be known as "open gates," which allowed engineers brand new reprogramming capabilities to adapt to changing standards and specifications and make last second changes to designs.

Mr. Freeman further revolutionized the tech industry with his unique hypotheses and worked to make those customizable chips affordable for everyone.

His incredible life was unfortunately cut short at the age of 41, not long after his vision for the future began taking shape. However, his contributions to society are immense and will be remembered by proud Yoopers all across our great state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Ross Freeman for his contributions to both the Scientific Community and our Nation as a whole.

RECOGNIZING BRYAN SANTILLAN

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bryan Santillan for earning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

Bryan has overcome many challenges along his journey to success, demonstrating perseverance at every step. Students who strive to make the most of their education, like Bryan, develop crucial skills and a work ethic that will guide them for the rest of their lives. This award is a testament to Bryan's hard work, determination, and perseverance at Jefferson Jr./Sr. High School and is clearly just the beginning of a bright and promising future.

It is my honor to congratulate Bryan Santillan on achieving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth Award.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 9, 2024 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 15

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Defense

To hold hearings to examine select Department of Defense acquisition programs.

SD–192

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.
SD–138

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for Indian Country.
SD–124

Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine climate change and the costs to national security.
SD–608

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on National Parks
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2025 for the National Park Service, including S. 2620, to establish the Chesapeake National Recreation Area as a unit of the National Park System, S. 2742, to establish the Fort Ontario National Monument in the State of New York as a unit of the National Park System, S. 2743, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to designate as a component of the National Heritage Area System the Finger Lakes National Heritage Area in the State of New York, S. 2784, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to adjust the boundary of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, S. 3195, to designate the General George C. Marshall House, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, as an affiliated area of the National Park System, S. 3241, to establish the Grand Village of the Natchez Indians and Jefferson College as affiliated areas of the Natchez Historical Park, S. 3251, to modify the boundary of the Lincoln Home National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, S. 3474, to redesignate the Hulls Cove Visitor Center at Acadia National Park as the ''George J. Mitchell, Jr., Visitor Center'', S. 3534, to authorize the Pines Foundation to establish the Fire Island AIDS Memorial, S. 3542, to amend the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area Act to modify the boundary of the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area, S. 3543, to establish the Historic Greenwood District-Black Wall Street National Monument in the State of Oklahoma, S. 3568/H.R. 3448, to amend chapter 3081 of title 54, United States Code, to enhance the protection and preservation of America's battlefields, S. 4129, to contribute funds and artifacts to the Theodore Roosevelt Presidential Library in Medora, North Dakota, S. 4209, to provide greater regional access to the Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument in the State of Maine, S. 4216, to establish the Ocmulgee Mounds National Park and Preserve in the State of Georgia, S. 4218, to designate the visitor center for the First State National Historical Park to be located at the Sheriff's House in New Castle, Delaware, as the ''Thomas R. Carper Visitor Center'', S. 4222, to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve in the State of California to include the land within the Castle Mountains National Monument, S. 4227, to amend the California Desert Protection Act of 1994 to expand the boundary of Joshua Tree National Park, S. 4228, to redesignate the Cottonwood Visitor Center at Joshua Tree National Park as the ''Senator Dianne Feinstein Visitor Center'', S. 4259, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Lahaina National Heritage Area, H.R. 359, to establish Fort San Geronimo del Boquerón in Puerto Rico as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and H.R. 2717, to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on the National Mall to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients, and H.R. 4984, to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus to the Administrator of General Services and the leasing of the Campus to the District of Columbia for purposes which include commercial and residential development.
SD–366

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the future of arms control and deterrence.
SD–419

Committee on Rules and Administration
Business meeting to consider S. 2770, to prohibit the distribution of materially deceptive AI-generated audio or visual media relating to candidates for Federal office, S. 3875, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide further transparency for the use of content that is substantially generated by artificial intelligence in political advertisements by requiring such advertisements to include a statement within the contents of the advertisements if generative AI was used to generate any image, audio, or video footage in the advertisements, and S. 3897, to require the Election Assistance Commission to develop voluntary guidelines for the administration of elections that address the use and risks of artificial intelligence technologies.
SR–301

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 4066, to improve Federal technology procurement, S. 3015, to amend title 5, United States Code, to address telework for Federal employees, S. 4043, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make executive agency telework policies transparent, to track executive agency use of telework, S. 3810, to prohibit conflict of interests among consulting firms that simultaneously contract with the Government of the People's Republic of China and the United States Government, S. 2492, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve coordination between the Do Not Pay working system and Federal and State agencies authorized to use the system, S. 4181, to require the development of a workforce plan for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, S. 4035, to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to take certain actions with respect to the health insurance program carried out under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, H.R. 6249, to provide for a review and report on the assistance and resources that the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency provides to individuals with disabilities and the families of such individuals that are impacted by major disasters, H.R. 5528, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget conduct a review to determine the impact of the lowest price technically acceptable source selection process on national security, an original bill entitled, ''DHS Better Ballistic Body Armor Act'', and an original bill entitled, ''Cross Border Aerial Law Enforcement Operations Act''.
SD–342

2 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
To hold hearings to examine strengthening American competitiveness, focusing on the roles of the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation, Export-Import Bank, and Millennium Challenge Corporation.
SD–138

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Commerce.
SD–192

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Library of Congress and the Architect of the Capitol.
SD–124

2:45 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight
To hold hearings to examine the findings and recommendations of GAO's 2024 Report on Opportunities to Reduce Fragmentation, Overlap, and Duplication and Achieve Financial Benefits.
SD–342

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine frontier health care, focusing on ensuring veterans' access no matter where they live.
SR–418

4 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–232A

MAY 16

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217.
SH–216

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2025 for the Forest Service.
SD–366

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine Department of State modernization and management, focusing on building a Department to address 21st century challenges.
SD–419

MAY 21

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security
To hold hearings to examine feeding a healthier America, focusing on current efforts and potential opportunities for Food is Medicine.
SD–430

JUNE 12

10 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2025 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
SD–406

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3567–S3628

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4278–4294, S. Res. 677–679, and S. Con. Res. 36. **Page S3597**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 36, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I. **Pages S3625–26**

Recognizing the Contributions of Teachers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 677, recognizing the roles and contributions of the teachers of the United States in building and enhancing the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of the United States. **Page S3626**

United States Foreign Service Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 678, designating May 3, 2024, as ''United States Foreign Service Day'' in recognition of the men and women who have served, or are presently serving, in the Foreign Service of the United States, and honoring the members of the Foreign Service who have given their lives in the line of duty. **Page S3626**

National Child Abuse Prevention Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 679, expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month. **Page S3626**

Diesel Emissions Reduction Act: Senate passed S. 2195, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program. **Page S3626**

America's Conservation Enhancement Reauthorization Act: Senate passed S. 3791, to reauthorize the America's Conservation Enhancement Act, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S3626–27**

Billie Jean King Congressional Gold Medal Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 2861, to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, an American icon, in recognition of a remarkable life devoted to championing equal rights for all, in sports and in society, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S3627–28**

Measures Considered:

Securing Growth and Robust Leadership in American Aviation Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 3935, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil aviation programs, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S3567–89**

Pending:

Schumer (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 1911, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3567**

Schumer Amendment No. 2026 (to Amendment No. 1911), to add an effective date. **Page S3567**

Schumer motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with instructions, Schumer Amendment No. 2027, to add an effective date. (By 12 yeas to 85 nays (Vote No. 160), Senate failed to table the motion.) **Pages S3567, S3576**

Schumer Amendment No. 2028 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2027), to add an effective date. **Page S3567**

Schumer Amendment No. 2029 (to Amendment No. 2028), to add an effective date. **Page S3567**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 12 noon, on Thursday, May 9, 2024. **Page S3628**

Appointments:

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that a correction to an appointment made on April 30, 2024, be printed in the Record:

United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106–398, as amended by Public Law 108–7, and in consultation with the Chairs of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the

United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2024 and expiring December 31, 2025. Page S3628

United States Semiquincentennial Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114–196, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission:

Member of the Senate: Senator Padilla. Page S3628

Message from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–50) Page S3592

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–51) Pages S3592–93

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–52) Page S3593

Messages from the House: Page S3593

Measures Referred: Page S3593

Executive Communications: Pages S3593–95

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S3595–96

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S3597–99

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S3599–S3600

Additional Statements: Pages S3591–92

Amendments Submitted: Pages S3600–25

Notices of Intent: Page S3625

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S3625

Privileges of the Floor: Page S3625

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—160) Page S3576

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:58 p.m., until 12 noon on Thursday, May 9, 2024. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3628.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: FDA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Food and Drug Administration, after receiving testimony from Robert M. Califf, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS: DOD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, and General Charles Q. Brown, Jr., USAF, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Deb Haaland, Secretary of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS: CBO, GAO, GPO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, and the Government Publishing Office, after receiving testimony from Phillip Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office; Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; and Hugh N. Halpern, Director, Government Publishing Office.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine military and civilian personnel programs in the Department of

Defense in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Ashish S. Vazirani, performing the duties of the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Ronald T. Keohane, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Lester Martinez-Lopez, Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Elizabeth B. Foster, Executive Director of the Office of Force Resiliency, Lieutenant General Douglas F. Stitt, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, G–1, United States Army, Vice Admiral Richard J. Cheeseman, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Personnel, Manpower, and Training, N1, United States Navy, Lieutenant General James F. Glynn, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, United States Marine Corps, Lieutenant General Caroline M. Miller, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel, and Services, A1, United States Air Force, and Katharine Kelley, Deputy Chief of Space Operations for Human Capital, United States Space Force, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Air Force modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Andrew P. Hunter, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Lieutenant General Adrian L. Spain, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Lieutenant General David A. Harris, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategy, Integration, and Requirements, and Lieutenant General Richard G. Moore, Jr., USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine Department of Defense missile defense activities in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2025 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from John D. Hill, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Space and Missile Defense, General Gregory M. Guillot, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, Lieutenant General Heath A. Collins, USAF, Director, Missile Defense Agency, and Lieutenant General Sean A. Gainey, USA, Commanding General, United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command, all of the Department of Defense.

ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS IN HEALTH CARE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine alleviating administrative burdens in health care, focusing on reducing paperwork and cutting costs, after receiving testimony from David M. Cutler, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Noah Benedict, Rhode Island Primary Care Physicians Corporation, Cranston; and Anthony M. DiGiorgio, University of California, San Francisco.

STRENGTHENING DATA SECURITY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Data Security concluded a hearing to examine strengthening data security to protect consumers, after receiving testimony from James Everett Lee, Identity Theft Resource Center, Raleigh, North Carolina; Sam Kaplan, Palo Alto Networks, Santa Clara, California; Prem M. Trivedi, New America's Open Technology Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Jake Parker, Security Industry Association, Silver Spring, Maryland.

EPA BUDGET

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2025 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Michael S. Regan, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

ALYCE SPOTTED BEAR AND WALTER SOBOLEFF COMMISSION'S REPORT ON NATIVE CHILDREN

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee received a briefing on the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission's Report on Native Children from Gloria O'Neill, Cook Inlet Tribal Council, Inc., and Don Gray, Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation, both of Anchorage, Alaska; Tami DeCoteau, DeCoteau Trauma-Informed Care and Practice, PLLC, and Leander McDonald, United Tribes Technical College, both of Bismarck, North Dakota; Anita Fineday, White Earth Nation, Brainerd, Minnesota; Delia Ulima, HI H.O.P.E.S. Initiative, EPIC 'Ohana Inc., Honolulu, Hawaii; and Gil Vigil, and Sarah Kastelic, both of the National Indian Child Welfare Association, Portland, Oregon.

PROTECTING IMMIGRANT YOUTH

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the urgent need to protect immigrant youth, after receiving testimony from Mitchell

Soto Rodriguez, Blue Island Police Department, Blue Island, Illinois; Maria Gabriela Pacheco, TheDream.US, Miami, Florida; Tom K. Wong, University of California U.S. Immigration Policy Center, San Diego; Jessica M. Vaughan, Center for Immigration Studies, Washington, D.C.; and Tammy Nobles, Norfolk, Virginia.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 46 public bills, H.R. 8287–8332; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 138; and H. Res. 1209–1215, were introduced. **Pages H2995–98**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H3000**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 7581, to require the Attorney General to develop reports relating to violent attacks against law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–494); and

H.R. 7659, to authorize and amend authorities, programs, and statutes administered by the Coast Guard, with an amendment (H. Rept. 118–495). **Page H2995**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Cloud to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2941**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:01 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H2948**

Recess: The House recessed at 2 p.m. and reconvened at 3:15 p.m. **Page H2968**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024: H.R. 8289, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 385 yeas to 24 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 187. **Pages H2968–69, H2978**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Greene (GA) announced her intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H2978–81**

Question of Privilege: Representative Greene (GA) rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution did constitute a question of the privileges of the House. Subsequently, the House agreed to the Scalise motion to table H. Res. 1209, declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives to be vacant, by a yea-and-nay vote of 359 yeas to 43 nays with 7 answering "present", Roll No. 188. **Page H2981**

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121": The House passed H.J. Res. 109, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121", by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 189. **Pages H2950–63, H2981–82**

H. Res. 6192, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6192), (H.R. 7109), (H.R. 2925) and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) was agreed to yesterday, May 7th.

Mining Regulatory Clarity Act: The House passed H.R. 2925, to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 191. **Pages H2963–67, H2982–83**

Rejected the Leger Fernandez motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources by a yea-and-nay vote of 203 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 190. **Pages H2982–83**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 118–416 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H2963**

H. Res. 6192, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6192), (H.R. 7109), (H.R. 2925) and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) was agreed to yesterday, May 7th.

Equal Representation Act: The House passed H.R. 7109, to require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all persons, by a yea-and-nay vote of 206 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 193. **Pages H2970–77, H2983–86**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To require a citizenship question on the decennial census, to require reporting on certain census statistics, and to modify apportionment of Representatives to be based on United States citizens instead of all individuals.". **Page H2986**

Rejected the Manning motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability by a yea-and-nay vote of 203 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 192. **Pages H2984–85**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Accountability now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H2970**

H. Res. 6192, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6192), (H.R. 7109), (H.R. 2925) and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) was agreed to yesterday, May 7th.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures. Consideration began Tuesday, May 7th.

Fire Grants and Safety Act: S. 870, amended, to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 393 yeas to 13 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 194; **Page H2986**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "To authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, to advance the benefits of nuclear energy, and for other purposes."; and **Page H2986**

National Construction Safety Team Enhancement Act: H.R. 4143, amended, to amend the National Construction Safety Team Act to enable the National Institute of Standards and Technology to investigate structures other than buildings to inform the development of engineering standards, best practices, and building codes related to such structures, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 358 yeas to 41 nays, Roll No. 195. **Pages H2986–87**

Authorizing the Secretary of the Army to posthumously award the Distinguished Service Cross to William D. Owens for his valorous actions from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, during World War II at La Fiere Bridge in Normandy, France, while serving with the 505th Parachute Infantry: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 8063, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to posthumously award the Distinguished Service Cross to William D. Owens for his valorous actions from June 6, 1944, to June 8, 1944, during World War II at La Fiere Bridge in Normandy, France, while serving with the 505th Parachute Infantry. **Page H2987**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, May 10th, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 14, 2024 for morning-hour debate. **Pages H2987–88**

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004 is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2024—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 118–138). **Page H2967**

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2024—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 118–139). **Pages H2967–68**

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2024—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 118–140). **Page H2968**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Nine yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2978, H2981, H2981–82, H2982–83, H2983, H2984–85, H2985–86, H2986 and H2987.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Commerce. Testimony was heard from Gina M. Raimondo, Secretary, Department of Commerce.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Member Day''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Thompson, and Representatives Moylan, Stanton, and Van Drew.

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Hearing''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE COST OF THE BORDER CRISIS

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Cost of the Border Crisis''. Testimony was heard from Brent Smith, County Attorney, Kinney County, Texas; and public witnesses.

CONFRONTING PERVASIVE ANTISEMITISM IN K–12 SCHOOLS

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education held a hearing entitled ''Confronting Pervasive Antisemitism in K–12 Schools''. Testimony was heard from David Banks, Chancellor, New York City Public Schools, New York City Department of Education, New York; Karla Silvestre, President, Montgomery County Board of Education, Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland; Enikia Ford Morthel, Superintendent, Berkeley Unified School District, California; and a public witness.

EXAMINING ACCUSATIONS OF IDEOLOGICAL BIAS AT NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO, A TAXPAYER FUNDED NEWS ENTITY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Examining Accusations of Ideological Bias at NPR, a Taxpayer Funded News Entity''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISSION CRITICAL: RESTORING NATIONAL SECURITY AS THE FOCUS OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION, PART II

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, Illicit Finance, and International Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled ''Mission Critical: Restoring National Security as the Focus of Defense Production Act Reauthorization, Part II''. Testimony was heard from Laura Taylor-Kale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Industrial Base Policy, Department of Defense; Thea Rozman Kendler, Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce; and Cynthia Spishak, Associate Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

SILENT WEAPONS: EXAMINING FOREIGN ANOMALOUS HEALTH INCIDENTS TARGETING AMERICANS IN THE HOMELAND AND ABROAD

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism, Law Enforcement, and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''Silent Weapons: Examining Foreign Anomalous Health Incidents Targeting Americans in the Homeland and Abroad''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LOOKING AHEAD SERIES: OVERSIGHT OF OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Looking Ahead Series: Oversight of Office of the Clerk''. Testimony was heard from Kevin McCumber, Acting Clerk, House of Representatives.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 354, the ''LEOSA Reform Act''. H.R. 354 was ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2025 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, AND OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Examining the President's FY 2025 Budget Request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Health Service, and Office of Insular Affairs''. Testimony was heard from Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Carmen

Cantor, Assistant Secretary for Insular and International Affairs, Office of Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior; and Roselyn Tso, Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

STIFLING INNOVATION: EXAMINING THE IMPACTS OF REGULATORY BURDENS ON SMALL BUSINESSES IN HEALTHCARE

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Stifling Innovation: Examining the Impacts of Regulatory Burdens on Small Businesses in Healthcare''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8261, the ''Preserving Telehealth, Hospital, and Ambulance Access Act''; H.R. 7931, the ''PEAKS Act''; H.R. 8245, the ''Rural Hospital Stabilization Act''; H.R. 8244, the ''Ensuring Seniors' Access to Quality Care Act''; H.R. 8235 the ''Rural Physician Workforce Preservation Act''; and H.R. 8246, the ''Second Chances for Rural Hospitals Act''. H.R. 8261, H.R. 7931, H.R. 8245, H.R. 8244, H.R. 8235, and H.R. 8246 were ordered reported, as amended.

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NIP) AND MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) BUDGET REQUESTS FOR FY 2025, FEATURING THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AVRIL HAINES AND THE ACTING UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY MILANCY HARRIS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''National Intelligence Program (NIP) and Military Intelligence Program (MIP) Budget Requests for FY 2025, featuring the Director of National Intelligence Avril Haines and the Acting Under Secretary for Intelligence and Security Milancy Harris''. Testimony was heard from Avril Haines, Director of National Intelligence; and Milancy D. Harris, Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, Department of Defense. This hearing was closed.

MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY 2025, FEATURING THE MILITARY SERVICES, INCLUDING THE U.S. ARMY, U.S. MARINE CORPS, U.S. NAVY, U.S. AIR FORCE, U.S. SPACE FORCE, AND U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture held a hearing entitled ''Military Intelligence Program Budget Request for FY 2025, featuring the Military Services, including the U.S. Army, U.S. Marine Corps, U.S. Navy, U.S. Air Force, U.S. Space Force, and U.S. Special Operations Command''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Anthony R. Hale, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (G–2), U.S. Army; Vice Admiral Karl O. Thomas, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Information Warfare, N2N6/Director of Naval Intelligence, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Matthew G. Glavy, Deputy Commandant for Information, U.S. Marine Corps; Lieutenant General Leah G. Lauderback, Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and Cyber Effects Operations (A2/A6), U.S. Air Force; Major General Gregory J. Gagnon, Deputy Chief of Space Operations for Intelligence, U.S. Space Force; and Robin Meyer, Deputy Director for Intelligence (DJ2), U.S. Special Operations Command. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D421)*

H.R. 292, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 24355 Creekside Road in Santa Clarita, California, as the ''William L. Reynolds Post Office Building''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–52)

H.R. 996, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3901 MacArthur Blvd., in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the ''Dr. Rudy Lombard Post Office''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–53)

H.R. 2379, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 616 East Main Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the ''Veterans of the Vietnam War Memorial Post Office''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–54)

H.R. 2754, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2395 East Del Mar Boulevard in Laredo, Texas, as the ''Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza, Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez & Sergeant Roberto Arizola Jr. Post Office Building''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–55)

H.R. 3865, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South 8th Street in Lebanon, Pennsylvania, as the ''Lieutenant William D. Lebo Post Office Building''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–56)

H.R. 3944, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 West Church Street in Mount Vernon, Georgia, as the ''Second Lieutenant Patrick Palmer Calhoun Post Office''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–57)

H.R. 3947, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 859 North State Road 21 in Melrose, Florida, as the ''Pamela Jane Rock Post Office Building''. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–58)

S. 474, to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen reporting to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children, to modernize liabilities for such reports, to preserve the contents of such reports for 1 year. Signed on May 7, 2024. (Public Law 118–59)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2024

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine consumer protection, focusing on examining fees in financial services and rental housing, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John N. Nkengasong, of Georgia, to be Ambassador-At-Large for Global Health Security and Diplomacy, Kristen Sarri, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Elizabeth K. Horst, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, Troy Fitrell, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles, and Kelly Adams-Smith, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 1306, to reauthorize the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, S. 1979, to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving age discrimination, and the nominations of Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Brian Edward Murphy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Rebecca L. Pennell, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, and Jeannette A. Vargas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

12 noon, Thursday, May 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 3935, Securing Growth and Robust Leadership in American Aviation Act.

At approximately 1 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Schumer (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 1911, in the nature of a substitute.

Additional roll call votes are possible during Thursday's session.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12:30 p.m., Friday, May 10

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.