



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2022

No. 82

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 16, 2022, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2022

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 13, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LAUREN UNDERWOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Breathe on us, breath of God. Fill us with life anew. It is by You whom we have been created and for You whom we live. And even as we enjoy this gift of life that You have given us, may we realize that You have entrusted us with its living and You hold each of us accountable to Your intent.

Breathe on us, breath of God, until our hearts are pure. Reveal to us Your desires as we come to understand Your will. Would that we dedicate our efforts, not to please ourselves, but to be faithful to Your gracious plan for all Your creation.

Breathe on us, breath of God, that we shall never fail. And when we are called to account for our days, when our decisions are questioned, our motives test-

ed, may we prove worthy of the moments You have provided us and the lives You have so graciously given us.

In You, O Lord, do we live and move and have our being.

By the power of Your name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ESTES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

DON'T MESS WITH WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in outrage due to recent attacks on women's reproductive rights and now, as we have seen, maybe plans to attack other fundamental rights.

Republicans are using this leaked opinion as fuel to take their extreme policies even further. I say to my fellow colleagues, if Republicans overturn Roe, they will take aim at other privacy rights, such as same-sex marriage and access to contraception.

Indeed, in Texas, Governor Greg Abbott now wants to overturn a Supreme Court decision that ensures public education for immigrant children.

In West Virginia, a white nationalist wants to take aim at Brown v. Board of Education, which outlawed racial segregation in public schools.

I ask you, what comes next?

Madam Speaker, we are fighting to protect a woman's freedom to make her own healthcare decisions. But we will also be fighting the fight of all fights to protect all our freedoms.

Don't mess with women's reproductive rights.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOL WEEK

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Charter School Week.

National Charter School Week is a time to recognize that every student

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4923

should have access to high-quality education. It is also a time to celebrate the educators who work tirelessly to make sure that that happens.

Every family should have the ability to choose the best education that fits the needs of their child, regardless of ZIP Code. Charter schools are an important part of school choice.

Last year, I joined Senator TIM SCOTT to introduce the CHOICE Act. This commonsense bill would provide families with greater options with regard to their children's education.

When I left home to go to college at the age of 16, I did so to pursue the best educational opportunities available. I believe that students should always have the opportunity to succeed, no matter where they live, and I will always fight for them.

I would also like to take a moment to wish a happy birthday to my sister.

Happy birthday, Mariette.

REPRODUCTIVE CHOICE IS PERSONAL, PRIVATE, AND SERIOUS

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

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of every girl and woman whose rights, lives, and futures are on the line if Roe v. Wade is struck down.

For the first time in our Nation's history, the Supreme Court is poised to take a constitutional right away from the American people, creating a time when America's daughters will not have the rights their mothers had. The Court's intent to turn back the hands of time by a half century, without the consent of the governed, is devastating.

If Roe falls, there will be a patchwork of States with differing laws and restrictions, causing societal chaos. Twenty-six States are likely to ban abortion, few with exceptions for rape and incest, subjecting more than 36 million women and girls to the black markets of back-alley abortions.

House Democrats will gather on the steps of the Capitol today, across the street from the Supreme Court, to stand with the millions of women whose basic reproductive rights are being stripped away by this ruling.

The Supreme Court is now surrounded by protective fencing. I think the Justices are fenced off from reality.

This is private, personal, and serious, and women should be able to make their own decisions.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this weekend, tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from across the country will arrive in Washington for National Police Week.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress in 1962, National Police Week pays special recognition to those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others.

National Police Week is a collaborative effort of many organizations dedicated to honoring America's law enforcement community. The National Peace Officers' Memorial Service and Candlelight Vigil will take place later this evening, allowing the Nation to pause and remember the officers who have made that ultimate sacrifice.

This week honors the men and women in blue who gave everything to protect their country and their communities.

Earlier this year, Pennsylvania mourned the loss of two State troopers, Martin Mack III and Branden Sisca, who were killed in the line of duty on March 21, 2022.

Our officers put on their uniforms each day knowing that they can be in harm's way at any moment.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, thank you to all our officers who serve.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF TIMOTHY KLEIN

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, last week, family, friends, and thousands of fellow firefighters gathered to bid a final farewell to fallen FDNY Firefighter Timothy Klein.

We lost Tim in the line of duty, where he made the ultimate sacrifice in the face of incredible danger, responding to a fire in the borough of Brooklyn.

Tim was a 6-year veteran of the department. He came from a family of firefighters, including his dad. He made an impression on everybody he worked with, the junior men who he trained and the senior men and women who he impressed.

Tim was the American Dream, fueled by the will to put on his uniform, run toward danger, and put his life on the line to save others.

New York City rises today in Congress to honor his life, his service, and the memory and legacy Tim left behind.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the Biden energy crisis doesn't just extend to gas and diesel in this country. It also extends to our power grid, shutting down our hydroelectric plants, et cetera.

We also have in California a nuclear power plant known as Diablo Canyon,

which produces just under 10 percent of all of our power in California, slated to be shut down in 2024.

The California Independent System Operator warns of a critical inflection point to the stability of the grid and would require a shift to—get this—more fossil fuel, which would then require more CO₂ to be produced, even though we know CO₂ is only 0.04 percent of the atmosphere.

Summer blackouts were predicted by the California Energy Commission and the ISO just last October in information they released, so this would make a greater reliance on imported electricity from other States.

The Biden administration needs to do all it can to help have the NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission renew the licenses for Diablo Canyon for at least 20 years.

PROTECT ROE V. WADE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I am outraged.

I am outraged because, in 2022, women are still fighting for their reproductive rights.

I am outraged that women do not have autonomy over their bodies. Their bodies belong to them, not Supreme Court Justices, not politicians, and not anyone else.

I am outraged that, despite the fact that the majority of Americans support legal abortion, the Senate has voted against the bill that codifies Roe and protects access to abortion.

What these political hacks on the Supreme Court and politicians do not realize is that striking down Roe v. Wade will not end abortion. It will simply end safe access to abortion, and women's lives will be at risk.

If you are not equally enraged, you are not paying attention.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF RALENE BERGQUIST

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

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of the Fourth District of Kansas to pay tribute to Ralene Bergquist as she retires after 10 years of service in our congressional district.

Ralene has been faithfully serving the people of Kansas' Fourth District for 10 years. She began with my predecessor, Congressman Mike Pompeo, before he went to be the CIA Director.

Ralene was very familiar and a constant voice to help make sure that we had a smooth transition when I became a new Member of Congress for the Fourth District.

Ralene's dedication and work have been very much appreciated and a

great service to two Members of Congress, as well as the constituents of Kansas' Fourth Congressional District.

I speak for myself and the entire D.C. and district staff when I say we will miss Ralene as she retires from congressional service.

We are excited to see what the future holds for Ralene and wish her many blessings as she enjoys more time with her husband, Kansas State Representative Emil Bergquist, their children, and their grandchildren.

Congratulations on a wonderful career, and thank you from a grateful district.

HONORING CANTOR MARTHA NOVICK FOR HER SERVICE

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Cantor Martha Novick, who for the last 36 years has filled Temple Emanu-El, in Westfield, New Jersey, with her warmth and her voice.

Over the years, she has brought hundreds of students to Washington, D.C., to introduce them to social justice, advocacy, and action.

She has performed leading roles for the Metropolitan Opera Association and the National Shakespeare Theatre and has appeared as a soloist with the Jerusalem Symphony, the Brooklyn Philharmonic, and the Westfield Symphony.

Cantor Novick is a performer and an innovator, creating the Shabbat Hallelu worship service, which has become a national model, and working tirelessly to find a balance between traditional and modern musical styles of worship.

We are grateful to Cantor Novick for all she has done and for her commitment to Temple Emanu-El and its greater community in her new role as Cantor Emeritus.

□ 0915

WELCOME HOME CORPORAL LAVERNE "DIRK" VAN DYKE

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome home Corporal Laverne "Dirk" Van Dyke, who sacrificed his life during World War II, and was finally laid to rest in his and my hometown of Zeeland, Michigan, after nearly 80 years.

U.S. Army Air Force Corporal Dirk Van Dyke served as a flight engineer on a B-25C aircraft in the Pacific theater when his plane went missing. Corporal Van Dyke and six other crewmembers were last seen departing an airport on the reconnaissance mission off the coast of New Guinea on January 18, 1943.

Despite an extensive search, members of the Fifth Air Force were not able to locate the plane or the airmen. Many years later the wreckage was discovered in the mountains of Papua New Guinea, and the remains of Corporal Van Dyke and others were seemingly identified but were inconclusive. However, recently the Department of Defense officially considered Corporal Van Dyke accounted for.

Madam Speaker, we will never forget the selfless actions, sacrifice, and dedication to our country by these servicemembers and what they displayed.

To Corporal Van Dyke's family, our entire Nation holds you in our prayers as we get ready and prepare for Memorial Day, and as you welcome Dirk home as an American hero. Rest easy, Corporal Van Dyke. Rest easy.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2022

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1097, I call up the bill (H.R. 5129) to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and modernize the Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-42, modified by the amendment printed in part E of House Report 117-320, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5129

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 "Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION.

Subtitle B of title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle B—Community Services Block Grant Program

"SEC. 671. SHORT TITLE.

"This subtitle may be cited as the 'Community Services Block Grant Act'.

"SEC. 672. PURPOSES.

"The purposes of this subtitle are—

"(1) to reduce poverty in the United States by supporting the activities of community action agencies and other community services network organizations that improve the economic security of low-income individuals and families and create new economic opportunities in the communities where they live; and

"(2) to accomplish the purposes described in paragraph (1) by—

"(A) strengthening community capabilities for identifying poverty conditions and opportunities to alleviate such conditions;

"(B) empowering residents of the low-income communities served to respond to the unique

problems and needs in their communities through their maximum feasible participation in advising, planning, and evaluating the programs, projects, and services funded under this subtitle;

"(C) using innovative community-based approaches that produce a measurable impact on the causes and effects of poverty, including whole family approaches that create opportunities for, and address the needs of, parents and children together;

"(D) coordinating Federal, State, local, and other assistance, including private resources, related to the reduction of poverty so that resources can be used in a manner responsive to local needs and conditions; and

"(E) broadening the resources directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to promote partnerships that include—

"(i) private, religious, charitable, and neighborhood-based organizations; and

"(ii) individuals, businesses, labor organizations, professional organizations, and other organizations engaged in expanding opportunities for all individuals.

"SEC. 673. DEFINITIONS.

"In this subtitle:

"(1) AGENCY-WIDE STRATEGIC PLAN.—The term 'agency-wide strategic plan' means a plan that has been adopted by an eligible entity in the previous 5 years and establishes goals that include meeting needs identified by the entity in consultation with residents of the community through a process of comprehensive community needs assessment.

"(2) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' means the poverty guideline calculated by the Secretary from the most recent data available from the Bureau of the Census. The Secretary shall revise the poverty line annually (or at any shorter interval the Secretary determines to be feasible and desirable). The required revision shall be accomplished by multiplying the official poverty thresholds from the Bureau of the Census by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers during the annual or other interval immediately preceding the time at which the revision is made.

"(3) COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY.—The term 'community action agency' means an eligible entity (which meets the requirements of paragraph (1) or (2), as appropriate, of section 680(c)) that delivers multiple programs, projects, and services to a variety of low-income individuals and families.

"(4) COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN.—The term 'community action plan' means a detailed plan, including a budget, that is adopted by an eligible entity, for expenditures of funds appropriated for a fiscal year under this subtitle for the activities supported directly or indirectly by such funds.

"(5) COMMUNITY SERVICES NETWORK ORGANIZATION.—The term 'community services network organization' means any of the following organizations funded under this subtitle:

"(A) A grantee.

"(B) An eligible entity.

"(C) A Tribal grantee.

"(D) An association with a membership composed primarily of grantees, eligible entities, Tribal grantees, or associations of grantees, eligible entities, or Tribal grantees.

"(6) DEPARTMENT.—The term 'Department' means the Department of Health and Human Services.

"(7) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity' means an entity—

"(A) that is an eligible entity described in section 673(1) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022) as of the day before such date of enactment, or has been designated by the process described in section 680(a) (including an organization serving migrant or seasonal farmworkers that is so described or designated); and

“(B) that has a tripartite board described in paragraph (1) or (2), as appropriate, of section 680(c).

“(8) EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE.—The term ‘evidence-based practice’ means an activity, strategy, or intervention that—

“(A) demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving relevant outcomes based on at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study, or at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias, and includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention; or

“(B) demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve relevant outcomes, and includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

“(9) GRANTEE.—The term ‘grantee’ means a recipient of a grant under section 675 or 676.

“(10) PRIVATE, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘private, nonprofit organization’ means a domestic organization that is—

“(A) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(B) described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 509(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(11) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(12) SERVICE AREA.—The term ‘service area’ means the unique geographic area which the State has designated as the area to be served by an eligible entity with funding under section 679(a)(1).

“(13) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(14) TRIBAL GRANTEE.—The term ‘Tribal grantee’ means an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, as defined in section 677(a), that receives a grant under section 677(c).

“SEC. 674. AUTHORIZATION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out a community services block grant program and to make grants through the program, under sections 675 and 676, to States to support local community action plans carried out by eligible entities to reduce poverty in the communities served by such entities.

“(b) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out other community programs described in section 690.

“SEC. 675. GRANTS TO TERRITORIES.

“(a) APPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary shall apportion the amount reserved under section 691(c)(1) for each fiscal year on the basis of need, based on the most recent applicable data available from the Bureau of the Census to account for poverty, to eligible jurisdictions among Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(b) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make a grant to each eligible jurisdiction to which subsection (a) applies for the amount apportioned under subsection (a).

“(c) PLANS FOR APPORTIONMENT TO TERRITORIES.—No later than six months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make publicly available the Department’s plan for apportioning funds among territories, including factors that contribute to the calculation of need and methodology for calculating the apportionment for each territory. The Secretary must make publicly available any updates or changes to this plan no less frequently than any time new applicable data are available from the Bureau of Census.

“SEC. 676. ALLOTMENTS AND GRANTS TO STATES.

“(a) ALLOTMENTS IN GENERAL.—From the amount appropriated under section 691(a) for

each fiscal year and remaining after the Secretary makes the reservations required by section 691(c), the Secretary shall allot to each eligible State, subject to section 677, an amount that bears the same ratio to such remaining amount as the amount received by the State for fiscal year 1981 under section 221 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 bore to the total amount received by all States for fiscal year 1981 under such section, except as provided in subsection (b).

“(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall allot to each State not less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under section 691(a) for such fiscal year and remaining after the Secretary makes the reservations required by section 691(c).

“(2) YEARS WITH GREATER AVAILABLE FUNDS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), if the amount appropriated under section 691(a) for a fiscal year and remaining after the Secretary makes the reservations required by section 691(c) exceeds \$900,000,000, no State shall receive under this section less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 percent of the remaining amount.

“(c) GRANTS AND PAYMENTS.—Subject to section 677, the Secretary shall make grants to eligible States for the allotments described in subsections (a) and (b). The Secretary shall make payments for the grants in accordance with section 6503(a) of title 31, United States Code. The Secretary shall allocate the amounts allotted under subsections (a) and (b) on a quarterly basis at a minimum, notify the States of their respective allocations, and make each State’s first allocation amount in a fiscal year available for expenditure by the State no later than 30 days after receipt of an approved apportionment from the Office of Management and Budget and, for subsequent allocation amounts in the fiscal year, not later than 30 days after the start of the period for which the Secretary is allocating the funds.

“(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘State’ does not include Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“SEC. 677. PAYMENTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INDIAN.—The term ‘Indian’ means a member of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘Indian Tribe or Tribal organization’ means a Tribe, band, or other organized group recognized in the State in which the Tribe, band, or group resides, or considered by the Secretary of the Interior to be an Indian Tribe or an Indian organization for any purpose.

“(b) RESERVATION.—

“(1) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (2) shall apply only if, with respect to any State, the Secretary—

“(A) receives a request from the governing body of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in such State that assistance under this subtitle be made available directly to such Indian Tribe or Tribal organization; and

“(B) determines that the members of such Indian Tribe or Tribal organization would be better served by means of grants made directly to such Indian Tribe or Tribal organization to provide benefits under this subtitle.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall reserve from amounts allotted to a State under section 676 for a fiscal year not less than the amount that bears the same ratio to the State allotment for the fiscal year as the population of all eligible Indians in that particular State for whom a determination has been made under paragraph (1) bears to the population of all individuals eligible for assistance through a grant made under section 676 to such State.

“(c) AWARDS.—The amount reserved by the Secretary on the basis of a determination made under subsection (b)(1)(B) shall be made available by grant to the Indian Tribe or Tribal orga-

nization serving the Indians for whom the determination has been made under subsection (b)(1)(B).

“(d) PLAN.—In order for an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization to be eligible for a grant award for a fiscal year under this section, the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall submit to the Secretary a plan for such fiscal year that meets such criteria as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation.

“(e) ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM.—The Secretary may implement alternative requirements for implementation by an Indian Tribe or Tribal Organization of the requirements of section 686(a).

“SEC. 678. STATE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS; COMMUNITY ACTION PLANS AND APPLICATIONS.

“(a) STATE LEAD AGENCY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The chief executive officer of a State desiring to receive a grant under section 675 or 676 shall designate, in an application submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b), an appropriate State agency that agrees to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2), to act as a lead agency for purposes of carrying out State activities under this subtitle.

“(2) DUTIES OF STATE LEAD AGENCIES.—The State lead agency—

“(A) shall be authorized by the chief executive officer to convene State agencies and coordinate information and activities funded under this subtitle;

“(B) shall develop the State plan to be submitted to the Secretary under subsection (b), which shall be based primarily on the community action plans of eligible entities, submitted to the State as a condition of receiving funding under this subtitle;

“(C) may revise an existing State plan for submission to the Secretary, if considered a major revision under criteria established by the Secretary in regulations required under section 689(a)(1);

“(D) in conjunction with the development or revision of the State plan as required under subsection (b)—

“(i) shall hold at least 1 hearing in the State on the proposed plan or a proposed major revision to a plan to provide to the public an opportunity to comment on the public record on the proposed use and distribution of funds under the plan;

“(ii) not less than 15 days before the hearing, shall distribute notice of the hearing and a copy of the proposed plan or major plan revision statewide to the public and directly to the chief executive officer and the chairperson of the board of each of the eligible entities (or designees) and other community services network organizations; and

“(iii) in the case of any proposed plan revision, without regard to whether it is a major revision, shall notify and distribute a copy of the proposed revision statewide directly to the chief executive officer and the chairperson of the board of each of the eligible entities (or designees) and other community services network organizations, before submission of such proposed revision to the Secretary; and

“(E) at least every 3 years, in conjunction with the development of the State plan, shall hold at least 1 legislative hearing.

“(b) STATE APPLICATION FOR STATE PROGRAM AND STATE PLAN.—Beginning with the first fiscal year following the transition period described in section 3 of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022, to be eligible to receive a grant under section 675 or 676, a State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary for approval an application containing a State plan covering a period of not more than 2 fiscal years. The application shall be submitted not later than 60 days before the beginning of the first fiscal year covered by the plan, and shall contain such information as the Secretary shall require, including—

“(1) a description of the manner in which funds made available through the grant under

section 675 or 676 will be used to carry out the State activities described in section 679(b) and the State's community action plans;

“(2) a description summarizing the community action plans of the eligible entities serving the State;

“(3) an assurance that the State and all eligible entities in the State will participate in a performance measurement system under section 686(a)(1)(A);

“(4) a plan for the State's oversight of eligible entities;

“(5) an assurance that the State will make payments to eligible entities in accordance with section 679(a)(2);

“(6) an assurance that no eligible entity in the State that received, in the previous fiscal year, funding through a grant made under section 675 or 676 will have funding reduced below the proportional share of funding the entity received from the State in the previous fiscal year, or eliminated, or its designation as an eligible entity terminated, unless, after providing the affected entity (or entities, as applicable) with notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, the State determines that cause exists for the reduction or elimination of funding or for termination of such designation, subject to review by the Secretary as provided in section 684(c); and—

“(A) in the case of failure of an eligible entity to comply with the terms of a corrective action plan relating to correction of a serious deficiency, except according to the procedures set forth in section 684(b); and

“(B) for purposes of this subsection, the term ‘cause’ means—

“(i) the failure of an eligible entity to comply with the terms of a corrective action plan relating to correction of a serious deficiency as described in subsection 684(b); or

“(ii) a statewide proportional distribution of funds provided through a community services block grant under this subtitle to respond to—

“(I) the results of the most recently available census or other appropriate demographic data;

“(II) severe economic dislocation; or

“(III) the designation of an eligible entity to serve a geographic area that has been unserved for at least the previous 5 years;

“(7) an assurance that each eligible entity serving the State has established procedures that permit a low-income individual or organization to petition for adequate representation of such individuals or organizations, respectively, on the board of the eligible entity;

“(8) a description of outcome measures to be used to measure State and eligible entity performance in achieving the goals of the State plan and the community action plans, respectively;

“(9) an assurance that the State will develop a policy on board vacancies in accordance with section 680(c)(3) and provide guidance to assist eligible entities in filling board vacancies; and

“(10) an assurance that the State and the eligible entities in the State will coordinate, and establish linkages between, governmental and other social services programs to assure the effective delivery of such services to low-income individuals and to avoid duplication of such services, and a description of how the State and the eligible entities will coordinate the provision of employment and training activities, as defined in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, in the State and in communities with entities providing activities through statewide and local workforce development systems under such Act.

“(c) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall notify the chief executive officer of each State submitting an application containing a State plan under this section of the approval, disapproval, or approval in part, of the application, not later than 60 days after receiving the application. In the event of a full or partial disapproval, the Secretary's notification shall include a description of changes necessary for final approval. In

the event of a partial approval, the Secretary may allow grantee use of funds for activities included in the portions of the plan which the Secretary has approved. In the event a State application fails to be approved in whole or in part before the end of the third month of the period covered by such plan the Secretary may award funding as specified in section 684(a)(5)(B).

“(d) PUBLIC INSPECTION.—Each plan and major revision to a State plan prepared under this section shall be distributed for public inspection and comment. A hearing on such plan or major revision shall be held as required under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of subsection (a)(2), but a State application for merger, combination, or privatization of entities under section 680(b) shall not be considered a major revision.

“(e) ELIGIBLE ENTITY APPLICATION AND COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN.—Beginning with the first fiscal year following the transition period described in section 3 of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022, to be eligible to receive a subgrant under section 679(a), each eligible entity shall prepare and submit to the State an application containing a community action plan or plans covering a period of not more than 2 fiscal years. Such application shall be submitted in a reasonable and timely manner as required by the State. The application shall contain information on the intended implementation of the eligible entity's activities, including demonstrating how the activities will—

“(1) meet needs identified in the most recent comprehensive community needs assessment which has been conducted in the previous 3 years and which may be coordinated with community needs assessments conducted for other programs; and

“(2) achieve the purposes of this subtitle through programs, projects, and services.

“SEC. 679. STATE AND LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

“(a) STATE SUBGRANTS TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under section 675 or 676 shall use not less than 90 percent to make subgrants to eligible entities that enable the entities to implement programs, projects, and services for a purpose described in section 672.

“(2) OBLIGATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DATE OF OBLIGATION.—The State shall obligate the funds for subgrants described in paragraph (1) and make such subgrants available for expenditure by eligible entities not later than the later of—

“(i) the 30th day after the date on which the State receives from the Secretary a notice of funding availability for the State's application under section 678 for a first or subsequent allocation for a fiscal year; or

“(ii) the first day of the State program year for which funds are to be expended under the State application.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—If funds are appropriated to carry out this subtitle for less than a full fiscal year, a State may request an exception from the Secretary from the requirement to make subgrants available for expenditure by eligible entities in accordance with subparagraph (A), except that a State may not accumulate more than one fiscal quarter's worth of funding without making such funds available for expenditure by eligible entities.

“(C) AVAILABILITY.—Funds allocated to eligible entities through subgrants made under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the eligible entity during that fiscal year and the succeeding fiscal year.

“(b) STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) USE OF REMAINDER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State that receives a grant under section 675 or 676 shall, after carrying out subsection (a), use the remainder of the grant funds for activities described in the State's application under section 678(b) as described in subparagraph (B) and for administra-

tive expenses subject to the limitations in paragraph (2).

“(B) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—After applying subsection (a), the State may use the remaining grant funds for the purposes of—

“(i) providing to eligible entities training and technical assistance and resources to respond to statewide or regional conditions that create economic insecurity, including emergency conditions;

“(ii) supporting professional development activities for eligible entities that enhance the skills of their local personnel (including members of the board of directors of such entities) in organizational management, service delivery, and program development and management, giving priority to activities carried out through partnerships of such entities with institutions of higher education;

“(iii) supporting information and communication resources for the comprehensive community needs assessments described in section 678(e)(1);

“(iv) supporting performance measurement systems consistent with the requirements of section 686;

“(v) promoting coordination and cooperation among eligible entities in the State, including supporting activities of a statewide association of community services network organizations;

“(vi) providing training and technical assistance and resources to assist eligible entities in building and using evidence of effectiveness in reducing poverty conditions, including entities participating in or proposing to participate in the Community Action Innovations Program established under section 682(a)(2);

“(vii) supporting efforts of eligible entities to identify and respond to physical and behavioral health challenges (including substance use disorders) experienced by low-income individuals, families, and communities; and

“(viii) analyzing the distribution of funds made available under this subtitle within the State to determine if such funds have been targeted to the areas of greatest need.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—Of the amounts remaining after the required funding for subgrants described under subsection (a)(1), a State shall not spend more than 5 percent of its grant under section 675 or 676 for administrative expenses.

“(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘administrative expenses’—

“(i) means the costs incurred by the State's lead agency for carrying out planning and management activities, including monitoring, oversight, and reporting as required by this Act; and

“(ii) does not include the cost of activities conducted under paragraph (1)(B) other than monitoring.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a subgrant under subsection (a)(1) shall use the subgrant funds to carry out a community action plan that shall include—

“(1) programs, projects, and services that provide low-income individuals and families with opportunities—

“(A) to identify and develop strategies to remove obstacles and solve problems that block access to opportunity, economic stability, and achievement of self-sufficiency;

“(B) to secure and retain meaningful employment at a family supporting wage;

“(C) to secure an adequate education, improve literacy and language skills, and obtain job-related skills;

“(D) to make effective use of available income and build assets;

“(E) to obtain and maintain adequate housing and a safe and healthy living environment;

“(F) to address health needs and improve health and well-being;

“(G) to obtain emergency materials or other assistance to meet immediate and urgent needs, including to meet the collective needs of a community, and prevent greater or more prolonged economic instability;

“(H) to secure and identify assistance related to reducing energy expenses and reducing energy consumption; and

“(I) to achieve greater participation in community affairs; and

“(2) activities that develop and maintain—

“(A) partnerships for the purpose of addressing community, economic, and social conditions of poverty and promoting healthy communities, between the eligible entity and—

“(i) State and local public entities; and

“(ii) private partners, including statewide and local businesses, associations of private employers, and private charitable and civic organizations;

“(B) linkages with public and private organizations for coordinating initiatives, services, and investments so as to avoid duplication, and maximize the effective use, of community resources for creating economic opportunity, including developing lasting social and economic assets; and

“(C) new investments in the community to reduce the incidence of poverty, including developing lasting social and economic assets.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY CRITERION.—

“(1) Subject to paragraph (2), 200 percent of the poverty line shall be used as a criterion of eligibility for services, assistance, or resources provided directly to individuals or families through the community services block grant program established under this subtitle.

“(2) A State or Tribal grantee may establish procedures to ensure that a participant in a program, project, or service funded under this subtitle remains eligible to participate as long as the participant is successfully progressing toward achievement of the goals of the program, project, or service, regardless of the income eligibility criteria used to determine the participant's initial eligibility.

“SEC. 680. ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND TRIPARTITE BOARDS.

“(a) DESIGNATION AND REDESIGNATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES IN UNSERVED AREAS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If any geographic area of a State is not, or ceases to be, served by an eligible entity, the State lead agency may, in consultation with local officials and organizations representing the area, solicit one or more applications and designate a new community action agency to provide programs, projects, and services to the area, that is—

“(A) a community action agency that is a private, nonprofit organization and that is geographically located in an area in reasonable proximity of, or contiguous to, the unserved area and that is already providing similar programs, projects, and services, and that has demonstrated financial capacity to manage and account for Federal funds; or

“(B) if no community action agency described in subparagraph (A) is available, a private, nonprofit organization (which may include an eligible entity) that is geographically located in, or is in reasonable proximity to, the unserved area and that is capable of providing a broad range of programs, projects, and services designed to achieve the purposes of this subtitle as stated in section 672.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—In order to serve as the eligible entity for the service area, an entity described in paragraph (1) shall agree to ensure that the governing board of directors of the entity will meet the requirements of subsection (c).

“(3) COMMUNITY.—A service area referred to in this subsection or a portion thereof shall be treated as a community for purposes of this subtitle.

“(4) INTERIM DESIGNATION.—If no entity that meets the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) is available for designation as a permanent eligible entity, the State may designate a private, nonprofit agency (or public agency if a private, nonprofit is not available) on an interim basis for no more than 1 year while the State completes a selection process for a permanent eligible entity that meets the requirements of para-

graphs (1) and (2). An agency designated on an interim basis shall be capable of providing programs, projects, and services designed to achieve the purposes of this subtitle as stated in section 672 and have demonstrated financial capacity to manage and account for Federal funds, and may be designated as a permanent eligible entity only if, by the time of permanent designation, it meets all the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(b) MERGER, COMBINATION, OR PRIVATIZATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If an eligible entity receiving subgrant funds makes a determination described in paragraph (2) and notifies the State, the State—

“(A) shall assist in developing a plan for implementing such merger, combination, or privatization, including a budget for transitional costs not to exceed 2 years in duration;

“(B) in the case of a merger or combination, shall provide to the merged or combined entity an amount of funding under section 679(a)(1) equal to the sum of amounts the merged or combined entities each received under section 679(a)(1) immediately before the merger or combination.

“(2) COVERED MERGER, COMBINATION, OR PRIVATIZATION.—This subsection applies when—

“(A) 2 or more eligible entities determine that the geographic areas of a State that they serve can be more effectively served under common control or shared management; or

“(B) a public organization that is an eligible entity determines that the area it serves can be more effectively served if it becomes a private, nonprofit organization.

“(3) PLANS.—A State may establish requirements for merger, combination, or privatization plans and for a determination that the merged, combined, or privatized entity, or entities, will be capable of conducting a broad range of programs, projects, and services designed to achieve the purposes of this subtitle as stated in section 672 consistent with the comprehensive community needs assessments for the areas served.

“(4) STATE DETERMINATION.—If a State determines that a merged, combined, or privatized entity or entities will be capable of conducting a broad range of programs, projects, and services as specified in paragraph (3), it shall designate the merged, combined, or privatized entity or entities to serve the area(s) in question without soliciting applications from other entities.

“(c) TRIPARTITE BOARDS.—

“(1) PRIVATE, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) BOARD.—In order for a private, nonprofit organization to be considered to be an eligible entity for purposes of section 673(7), the entity shall be governed by a tripartite board of directors described in subparagraph (C) that fully participates in the development, planning, implementation, oversight, and evaluation of the programs, projects, and services carried out or provided through the subgrant made under section 679(a)(1) and all activities of the entity.

“(B) SELECTION.—The members of the board referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be selected by the private, nonprofit organization.

“(C) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—The board shall be composed so as to assure that—

“(i) $\frac{1}{3}$ of the members of the board are elected public officials holding office on the date of selection, or their representatives (but if an elected public official chooses not to serve, such official may designate a representative to serve as the voting board member);

“(ii) not fewer than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that such members are representative of low-income individuals and families in the service area; and if selected to represent a specific geographic area, such member resides in that area; and

“(iii) the remainder of the members may be comprised of representatives from business, industry, labor, religious, educational, charitable, or other significant groups and interests in the community.

“(D) EXPERTISE.—The eligible entity shall ensure that the members of the board are provided resources, which may include contracted services with individuals and organizations with expertise in financial management, accounting, and law, to support the work of the board.

“(E) COMPLIANCE WITH TAX-EXEMPT AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The board of a private, nonprofit organization shall ensure that the board operates and conducts activities under the subgrant made under section 679(a)(1) in a manner that complies with—

“(i) the requirements for maintaining tax-exempt status under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(a)) regarding the governance of charities under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)); and

“(ii) applicable requirements of State nonprofit law.

“(2) PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(A) BOARD.—In order for a local public (governmental) entity to be considered to be an eligible entity for purposes of section 673(7), the entity shall ensure that the programs, projects, and services carried out or provided through the subgrant made under section 679(a)(1) are administered under the supervision of a tripartite board described in subparagraph (C) that fully participates in the development, planning, implementation, oversight, and evaluation of such programs, projects, and services.

“(B) SELECTION.—The members of the board referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be selected by the local public entity.

“(C) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—The board shall be composed so as to assure that—

“(i) not more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the members of the board are employees or officials, including elected officials, of the unit of government in which the organization is located;

“(ii) not fewer than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that such members are representative of low-income individuals and families in the service area; and if selected to represent a specific geographic area, such member resides in that area; and

“(iii) the remainder of the members may be comprised of representatives from business, industry, labor, religious, educational, charitable, or other significant groups and interests in the community.

“(D) EXPERTISE.—The eligible entity shall ensure that the members of the board are provided resources, which may include contracted services with individuals and organizations with expertise in financial management, accounting, and law, to support the work of the board.

“(E) COMPLIANCE WITH STATE REQUIREMENTS AND POLICY.—The board of a public organization shall ensure that the board operates in a manner that complies with State requirements for open meetings, financial transparency, and State open records policy.

“(3) BOARD VACANCIES.—To fulfill the requirements under this section, an eligible entity shall fill a board vacancy not later than 6 months after such vacancy arises. In the event that an eligible entity is unable to fill a board vacancy in the 6-month period, the entity shall certify to the State that it is making a good faith effort to fill the vacancy and shall receive 1 additional 6-month period to fill such vacancy.

“(4) SAFEGUARD.—Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a religious organization to alter its form of internal governance, except (for purposes of administration of the community services block grant program) as provided in section 680(c).

“(d) OPERATIONS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—The duties of a board described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) shall include—

“(1) in the case of a board for a private, nonprofit organization that is an eligible entity, having legal and financial responsibility for administering and overseeing the eligible entity, including making proper use of Federal funds;

“(2) establishing terms for officers and adopting a code of ethical conduct, including a conflict of interest policy for board members;

“(3) participating in each comprehensive community needs assessment, developing and adopting for the corresponding eligible entity an agency-wide strategic plan, and preparing the community action plan for the use of funds under this subtitle;

“(4) approving the eligible entity's operating budget;

“(5) reviewing all major policies such that—

“(A) for private, nonprofit organizations that are eligible entities, a review includes conducting annual performance reviews of the eligible entity's chief executive officer (or individual holding an equivalent position); and

“(B) for local public entities that are eligible entities, a review includes participating in annual performance reviews of the eligible entity's chief executive officer (or individual holding an equivalent position);

“(6) performing oversight of the eligible entity to include—

“(A) conducting assessments of the eligible entity's progress in carrying out programmatic and financial provisions in the community action plan; and

“(B) in the case of any required corrective action, reviewing the eligible entity's plans and progress in remedying identified deficiencies; and

“(7) concerning personnel policies and procedures—

“(A) in the case of private, nonprofit organizations that are eligible entities, adopting personnel policies and procedures, including for hiring, annual evaluation, compensation, and termination, of the eligible entity's chief executive officer (or individual holding a similar position); and

“(B) in the case of local public entities that are eligible entities, reviewing personnel policies and procedures, including for hiring, annual evaluation, compensation, and termination, of the eligible entity's chief executive officer (or individual holding a similar position).

“(e) **CONFLICT OF INTEREST.**—In establishing the conflict of interest policy described in subsection (d)(2), a board shall ensure that such policy—

“(1) requires a board member to recuse themselves from any discussion, deliberations, and votes relating to any contract or transaction from which the following would receive a direct financial benefit from the eligible entity:

“(A) such board member;

“(B) the immediate family member of such board member; or

“(C) an organization or a business from which such board member, or an immediate family of such board member, receives a direct financial benefit;

“(2) prohibits a board member from receiving compensation for serving on the board from the eligible entity other than for reasonable expenses, except that a board member's receipt of an economic benefit from the eligible entity because such member is eligible to receive benefits and services under this subtitle shall not be considered to be compensation for purposes of this subsection; and

“(3) ensures all activities funded under this subtitle are conducted free of personal or family favoritism.”

“SEC. 681. OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES.

“(a) **OFFICE.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish an Office of Community Services in the Department to carry out the functions of this subtitle.

“(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The Office shall be headed by a Director (referred to in this section as the ‘Director’).

“(b) **GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall carry out the functions of

this subtitle through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

“SEC. 682. TRAINING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.

“(a) **ACTIVITIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) use amounts reserved under section 691(c)(2) for training, technical assistance, planning, assessment, and performance measurement, as described in this section and in sections 684 and 686, to assist States, eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations in—

“(i) building and using evidence of effectiveness in reducing poverty conditions, including through development and dissemination of information about clearinghouses and other resources that identify relevant evidence-based initiatives, for use in connection with the Community Action Innovations Program established under paragraph (2);

“(ii) carrying out professional development activities that expand the capacity of eligible entities and Tribal grantees;

“(iii) carrying out performance measurement, data collection, and reporting activities related to programs, projects, and services carried out under this subtitle; and

“(iv) correcting programmatic deficiencies, including such deficiencies of eligible entities or Tribal grantees; and

“(B) distribute the amounts reserved under section 691(c)(2)(A) through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations described in subsection (b) for—

“(i) professional development for key community services network organization personnel;

“(ii) activities to improve community services network organization programs, financial management, compliance, and governance practices (including practices related to performance management information systems);

“(iii) activities that train community services network organizations and their staff and board members to effectively address the needs of low-income families and communities through place-based strategies that address local causes and conditions of poverty through coordinated investment and integrated service delivery; and

“(iv) activities that train community services network organizations in building and using evidence of effectiveness in reducing poverty conditions and that support effective administration of funds under the Community Action Innovations Program established under paragraph (2).

“(2) **INNOVATIVE AND EVIDENCE-BASED PROJECTS TO REDUCE POVERTY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall use amounts reserved under section 691(c)(3) for a Community Action Innovations Program to—

“(i) award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations, including consortia of such entities, grantees, or organizations to facilitate innovation and use of evidence-based practice designed to reduce poverty conditions, including through whole family approaches that create opportunities for, and address the needs of, parents and children together; and

“(ii) disseminate results for public use.

“(B) **PROJECTS.**—The Secretary shall award funds from its Community Action Innovations Program for projects to enable—

“(i) replication or expansion of innovative practices with demonstrated evidence of effectiveness, with priority given to those with the strongest evidence base as determined through a broad review of available studies; or

“(ii) testing of innovative practices to determine their effectiveness, with priority given to those incorporating rigorous, independent evaluation to further build the evidence base.

“(C) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The funds reserved for use under this paragraph may be used by

awardees for resources or activities necessary to replicate, expand, or test innovative and evidence-based practices, including costs of training and technical assistance, evaluation, data collection, and technology.

“(D) **EXPENSES.**—The funds reserved for use under this paragraph may be used for reasonable expenses of awardees, associated with administration of projects and dissemination of their results.

“(E) **AWARDS AND OBLIGATION.**—The Secretary shall award and obligate funds reserved for projects under this paragraph during the first program year for which the funds are appropriated. Grant funds awarded under this paragraph shall remain available for expenditure by the awardee not later than 36 months after the date of award by the Secretary, unless a longer period of availability is approved by the Secretary based on extenuating circumstances and demonstrated evidence of effectiveness.

“(b) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES, TRIBAL GRANTEES, AND OTHER COMMUNITY SERVICES NETWORK ORGANIZATIONS.**—Eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations referred to in subsection (a)(1)(B) shall include such entities, grantees, and organizations (and their partners, including institutions of higher education) with demonstrated expertise in providing training for individuals and organizations on methods of effectively addressing the needs of low-income families and communities and, if appropriate, expertise in Tribal issues.

“(c) **TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROCESS.**—The process for determining the training and technical assistance to be carried out under subsection (a)(1) shall—

“(1) ensure that the needs of eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and programs relating to improving program quality (including quality of financial management practices) are addressed to the maximum extent feasible; and

“(2) incorporate mechanisms to ensure responsiveness to local needs, including an ongoing procedure for obtaining input from the national and State networks of eligible entities.

“SEC. 683. STATE MONITORING OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.

“In order to determine whether eligible entities receiving subgrants under this subtitle meet performance goals, administrative standards, financial management requirements, and other requirements under this subtitle, the State shall conduct the following reviews of eligible entities:

“(1) A full onsite review of each eligible entity at least once during each 3-year period.

“(2) An onsite review of each newly designated eligible entity immediately after the completion of the first year in which such entity receives funds through the community services block grant program under this subtitle.

“(3) Followup reviews, including onsite reviews scheduled in a corrective action plan (including return visits), in a calendar quarter for eligible entities with programs, projects, or services that fail to meet the State's performance criteria, standards, financial management requirements, or other significant requirements established under this subtitle.

“(4) Other reviews as appropriate, including reviews of eligible entities with programs, projects, and services that have had other Federal, State, or local grants (other than assistance provided under this subtitle) terminated for cause.

“(5) In conducting reviews, including as required by paragraph (1), a State may conduct a remote (including virtual) review of an eligible entity in extraordinary circumstances if approved by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis.

“SEC. 684. ASSESSMENTS; CORRECTIVE ACTION; REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION OF FUNDING.

“(a) **ASSESSMENTS OF STATES BY THE SECRETARY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct, in not fewer than 1/5 of the States in each

fiscal year, assessments (including investigations) of State compliance with this subtitle, including requirements relating to the use of funds received under this subtitle, requirements applicable to State plans submitted under section 678(b), and requirements of section 679(a)(2).

“(2) REPORT TO STATES.—The Secretary shall submit to each State assessed, and make available to the public on the Department’s website, a report containing—

“(A) the results of such assessment; and

“(B)(i) recommendations for improvements designed to enhance the benefit and impact of the activities carried out with such funds; and

“(ii) in the event a serious deficiency is found regarding a State’s compliance with this subtitle, including requirements relating to the use of funds received under this subtitle, a proposed corrective action plan.

“(3) STATE RESPONSE.—Not later than 45 days after receiving a report under paragraph (2)—

“(A) a State that received recommendations under paragraph (2)(B)(i) shall submit to the Secretary and make available to the public on the State lead agency’s website a plan of action in response to the recommendations; and

“(B) a State that received a proposed corrective action plan under paragraph (2)(B)(ii) shall agree to implement the corrective action plan proposed by the Secretary or propose to the Secretary and make available to the public on the State lead agency’s website a different corrective action plan, developed by the State in a timely manner that the State will implement upon approval by the Secretary.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit the results of the assessments annually, as part of the report submitted by the Secretary in accordance with section 686(b)(2).

“(5) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(A) REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION OF FUNDING.—If the Secretary determines, in a final decision based on an assessment conducted under this section, that a State fails to meet the requirements of this subtitle, the Secretary may, after providing adequate notice and an opportunity for a hearing, initiate proceedings to reduce or eliminate the amount of funding apportioned and allocated to the State as described in section 675 or 676, as applicable (and, if necessary, deobligate such funding).

“(B) DIRECT AWARDS TO OTHER ENTITIES.—

“(i) REDUCTION OR ELIMINATION OF STATE FUNDING; LACK OF APPROVED STATE PLAN.—If the Secretary reduces or eliminates funding to a State under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall award funding directly as provided under clauses (ii) and (iii). If, for a particular fiscal year, a State plan is not approved by the Secretary in accordance with section 678(c), the Secretary may award funding directly as provided under clauses (ii) and (iii).

“(ii) DIRECT FUNDING TO ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—If funding specified in section 679(a)(1) is reduced or eliminated due to the Secretary’s reduction or elimination of funding under subparagraph (A), or if the Secretary chooses to award funding directly due to the lack of an approved State plan as authorized in clause (i), the Secretary shall award financial assistance in the amount of such reduced or eliminated funding, or in the amount the State would have received for the purposes specified in section 679(a)(1) had a State plan been approved, directly (by grant or cooperative agreement) to affected eligible entities (provided that any such entity has not had its funding under this subtitle eliminated or its designation as an eligible entity terminated by the State in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) of section 684) to carry out the activities described in section 679(c). In awarding such funding, the Secretary shall ensure that each such affected eligible entity receives the same proportionate share of funding under section 679(a)(1) that it received in the previous fiscal year.

“(iii) STATEWIDE FUNDS.—If funding specified in section 679(b) is reduced or eliminated due to

the Secretary’s reduction or elimination of funding under subparagraph (A), or if the Secretary chooses to award funding directly due to the lack of an approved State plan as authorized in clause (i), the Secretary shall reserve an amount equal to the amount of such reduced or eliminated funds, or to the amount the State would have received for the purposes specified in section 679(b) had a State plan been approved. The Secretary may use such amount for such purposes directly or through a grant or cooperative agreement to community services network organizations (other than the State itself).

“(iv) REDUCTION.—In the case of expenditure as provided in accordance with this subparagraph, the Secretary shall reduce funding the State would otherwise have received under section 675 or 676 (and, if necessary, deobligate such funding) for the appropriate fiscal year by an amount equal to the amount so expended.

“(6) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary, through the Department’s own employees or contractors (rather than under grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements issued under section 682), shall provide training and technical assistance to States with respect to the development or implementation of the States’ corrective action plans.

“(b) DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY FAILURE TO COMPLY.—

“(1) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—If the State determines, on the basis of a review pursuant to section 683 or section 685, that there is a serious deficiency regarding an eligible entity’s compliance with this subtitle, the State shall inform the entity of the serious deficiencies that shall be corrected and provide technical assistance for the corrective action.

“(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS.—An eligible entity that is found to have a serious deficiency under paragraph (1) shall develop, in a timely manner, a corrective action plan that shall be subject to the approval of the State, and that shall specify—

“(A) the deficiencies to be corrected;

“(B) the actions to be taken to correct such deficiencies; and

“(C) the timetable for accomplishment of the corrective actions specified.

“(3) FINAL DECISION.—If the State determines, on the basis of a final decision in a review conducted under section 683, that an eligible entity fails to comply with the terms of a corrective action plan under paragraph (2) relating to correction of a serious deficiency for the eligible entity, the State may, after providing adequate notice and an opportunity for a hearing, initiate proceedings to withhold, reduce, or eliminate the funding provided under section 679(a)(1) to the eligible entity (including, in the case of elimination of funding, terminating the designation under this subtitle of the eligible entity) unless the entity corrects the serious deficiency.

“(c) REVIEW.—A State’s decision to withhold, reduce, or eliminate funding, or to terminate the designation of an eligible entity (or eligible entities, as applicable) may be reviewed by the Secretary. Upon request by a community services network organization, the Secretary shall review such a determination. The review shall be completed not later than 60 days after the Secretary receives from the State all necessary documentation relating to the determination. The State shall submit such documentation within a reasonable time frame established by the Secretary.

“(d) DIRECT ASSISTANCE.—Whenever the Secretary determines that a State has violated the State plan described in section 678(b) (including the assurance described in section 678(b)(6)) and the State has reduced or eliminated the funding provided under section 679(a) to any eligible entity or entities or terminated the eligible entity designation of any eligible entity or entities before the completion of the State proceedings described in section 678(b)(6) (including, if applicable, the proceedings required by subsection (b)) and the Secretary’s review as required by

subsection (c), the Secretary may provide financial assistance under this subtitle to the affected eligible entity or entities directly until the violation is corrected by the State. In such a case, the Secretary may reduce funding the State would otherwise have received under section 675 or 676 (and, if necessary, deobligate such funding) for the appropriate fiscal year by an amount equal to the financial assistance provided directly by the Secretary to such eligible entity or entities.

“SEC. 685. STATE AND LOCAL FISCAL CONTROLS AND AUDITS.

“(a) FISCAL CONTROLS, PROCEDURES, AUDITS, AND INSPECTIONS.—A State that receives funds under this subtitle shall—

“(1) establish fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to assure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this subtitle, including procedures for monitoring the funds provided under this subtitle;

“(2) ensure that cost and accounting standards of the Office of Management and Budget apply to a subrecipient of the funds under this subtitle;

“(3) in accordance with subsections (b) and (c), prepare, not less than once each year, an audit of the expenditures of the State of amounts received under this subtitle; and

“(4) make appropriate books, documents, papers, and records available to the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, for examination, copying, or mechanical reproduction, on or off the premises of the appropriate entity, upon a reasonable request for the items.

“(b) INDEPENDENT ENTITY.—Subject to subsection (c), each audit required by subsection (a)(3) shall be conducted by an entity independent of any agency administering activities or services under this subtitle and shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

“(c) SINGLE AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any audit under this subsection shall be conducted in the manner and to the extent provided in chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Single Audit Act Amendments of 1984’) except in the event a serious financial deficiency is identified.

“(2) SERIOUS FINANCIAL DEFICIENCY.—In the event that such a deficiency is identified, the Secretary shall order—

“(A) an audit conducted as described in subsection (a); or

“(B) an audit of each of the accounts involved, in accordance with subsections (b) and (d).

“(d) SUBMISSION OF COPIES.—Not later than 30 days after the completion of each audit in a State as required in subsection (a)(3), the chief executive officer of the State shall submit copies of such audit, at no charge, to any eligible entity that was the subject of the audit, to the legislature of the State, and to the Secretary.

“(e) REPAYMENTS.—If the Secretary, after review of the audit, finds that a State has not expended an amount of funds in accordance with this subtitle, the Secretary is authorized to withhold funds from a State under this subtitle until the State remedies the improperly expended funds for the original purposes for which the grant funds were intended.

“(f) RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS.—The Secretary shall respond in an expeditious manner to complaints of a substantial or serious nature that a State has failed to use grant funds received under section 675 or 676 or to carry out State activities under this subtitle in accordance with the provisions of this subtitle.

“(g) INVESTIGATIONS.—Whenever the Secretary determines that there is a pattern of complaints regarding failures described in subsection (f) or a complaint of a serious deficiency concerning any State, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation of the use of the funds received under this subtitle by such State in order

to ensure compliance with the provisions of this subtitle.

“SEC. 686. ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.”

“(a) STATE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the first fiscal year following the transition period described in section 3 of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022, each State that receives funds under this subtitle shall participate, and shall ensure that all eligible entities in the State participate, in a results-oriented performance measurement system that the Secretary is satisfied meets the requirements of section 689(b)(1).

“(B) SUBCONTRACTORS.—The State may elect to have subcontractors of the eligible entities under this subtitle participate in the results-oriented performance measurement system. If the State makes that election, references in this section to eligible entities shall be considered to include such subcontractors.

“(C) ELIGIBLE ENTITY REPORTS.—Eligible entities shall provide the results measured by their performance measurement system and such other reports as the State may require.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Each State receiving funds under this subtitle shall annually prepare, and submit to the Secretary by March 31 of each year, a report on the performance of the State and eligible entities in the State, including achievement with respect to performance measurements that were used by community services network organizations in the State for the previous fiscal year. Each State shall also include in the report—

“(A) an accounting of the expenditure of funds received by the State through the community services block grant program, including an accounting of funds spent on administrative or indirect costs by the State and the eligible entities and funds spent by the eligible entities on local programs, projects, and services;

“(B) information on the number and characteristics of participants served under this subtitle in the State, based on data collected from the eligible entities;

“(C) a summary describing the training and technical assistance offered by the State under subparagraph (B) of section 679(b)(1) during the year covered by the report;

“(D) information on the total budget and activities of the eligible entities receiving subgrants from the State under this subtitle, including local and private resources available for a purpose described in section 672; and

“(E) a report on the manner in which the State and eligible entities and other recipients of funds under this subtitle have implemented results-oriented management practices based on their performance measurement systems.

“(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) CONTENTS.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Secretary shall, directly or by grant or contract, prepare a report including—

“(A) the information included in the State annual reports under subsection (a)(2) for the preceding fiscal year;

“(B) a report on the performance of the Department in the preceding year regarding carrying out critical roles and responsibilities under this subtitle, including with regard to timeliness in allocating and making appropriated funds available for expenditure to States, approvals or notifications to States concerning State plans and plan revisions, and conducting assessments of States and implementation of State corrective action plans (including status of and follow-up on recommendations made in previous State assessments and corrective action plans);

“(C) a description of the training and technical assistance activities funded by the Secretary under section 682 and the results of those activities; and

“(D) a report on the Community Action Innovations Program authorized under section

682(a)(2), including a description of training and technical assistance funded by the Secretary, the rationale for projects that received support, a description of funded activities and their results, and a summary of ways in which the Program has expanded use of evidence-based practice or contributed to building the evidence base designed to reduce poverty conditions.

“(2) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate the report described in paragraph (1) and any recommendations the Secretary may have with respect to such report.

“(3) ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEM FOR REPORTS TO STATES AND ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—The Secretary, through the Department’s own employees or contractors (rather than under grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements issued under section 682), shall provide technical assistance, including support for the development and maintenance of an electronic data system for the reports under this section, to the States and eligible entities to enhance the quality and timeliness of reports submitted under this subtitle. The system shall be coordinated and consistent with the data systems established for other programs of the Department that are managed by eligible entities, including all programs of the Administration for Children and Families or successor administrative units in which the office is located.

“SEC. 687. LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.”

“(a) CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.—

“(1) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection and in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 690(a), grants or subgrants made under this subtitle may not be used for the purchase or improvement of land, or the purchase, construction or permanent improvement of any building or other facility.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the limitation contained in paragraph (1) upon a State request for such a waiver if the Secretary finds that—

“(A) the request describes extraordinary circumstances to justify the purchase or improvement of land, or the purchase, construction, or permanent improvement of any building or other facilities; and

“(B) permitting the waiver will contribute to the ability of the State and eligible entities to carry out a purpose described in section 672 at substantially reduced costs.

“(3) ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS TO ACCESSIBILITY.—Grants or subgrants made under this subtitle may be used by eligible entities or Tribal grantees for making material improvements in the accessibility of the physical structures for individuals with disabilities seeking services of such entities.

“(b) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) TREATMENT AS A STATE OR LOCAL AGENCY.—For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code, any entity that assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating activities under this subtitle and receives assistance under this subtitle shall be deemed to be a State or local agency. For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of such title, any entity receiving assistance under this subtitle shall be deemed to be a State or local agency.

“(2) PROHIBITIONS.—A program, project, or service assisted under this subtitle, and any individual employed by, or assigned to or in, such a program, project, or service (during the hours in which the individual is working on behalf of the program, project, or service) shall not engage in—

“(A) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in an election for public or party office; or

“(B) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any election.

“(3) REGISTRATION.—None of the funds appropriated to carry out this subtitle may be used to conduct voter registration activities. Nothing in this subtitle prohibits entities receiving assistance under this subtitle from making its facilities available during hours of operation for use by nonpartisan organizations to increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in elections for Federal office.

“(c) NONDISCRIMINATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No person shall, on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program, project, or service funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this subtitle. Any prohibition against discrimination on the basis of age under the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.) or with respect to an otherwise qualified individual with a disability as provided in section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), or title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.), shall also apply to any such program, project, or service.

“(2) ACTION OF SECRETARY.—Whenever the Secretary determines that a State that has received a payment under this subtitle has failed to comply with paragraph (1) or an applicable regulation, the Secretary shall notify the chief executive officer of the State and shall request that the officer secure compliance. If within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 60 days, the chief executive officer fails or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary is authorized to—

“(A) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted;

“(B) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 (42 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), or title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.), as may be applicable; or

“(C) take such other action as may be provided by law.

“(3) ACTION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to paragraph (2), or whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that the State is engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination in violation of the provisions of this subsection, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

“SEC. 688. CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES AND REFERRALS.”

“During each fiscal year for which an eligible entity receives a subgrant under section 679(a), such entity shall—

“(1) inform custodial parents or legal guardians that participate in programs, projects, or services carried out or provided under this subtitle about the availability of child support services; and

“(2) refer custodial parents or legal guardians to the child support offices of State and local governments.

“SEC. 689. REGULATIONS.”

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations implementing this subtitle, including regulations regarding—

“(1) State plans, including the form and information required for State plans submitted to the Secretary, and criteria for determining whether a State plan revision is to be considered a major revision;

“(2) community action plans, including the form and information required for community action plans submitted to States;

“(3) State monitoring of eligible entities; and
 “(4) reports to the Secretary described in section 686.

“(b) GUIDANCE.—

“(1) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—The Secretary shall issue guidance regarding State and local performance measurement systems. Guidance may include one or more model performance measurement systems, facilitated by the Secretary, that States and eligible entities may use to measure their performance in carrying out the requirements of this subtitle and in achieving the goals of their community action plans.

“(2) COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF POVERTY CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall issue guidance (including models) for comprehensive community needs assessments described in section 678(e)(1). The guidance shall include methods for preparing an analysis of all poverty conditions affecting a community and of local and regional assets for alleviating such conditions.

“SEC. 690. DISCRETIONARY COMMUNITY PROGRAMS.

“(a) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, ARRANGEMENTS, LOANS, AND GUARANTEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, from funds appropriated under section 691(b), make grants, loans, or guarantees to States and public agencies and private, nonprofit organizations, or enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with States and public agencies and private, nonprofit organizations (and for-profit organizations, to the extent specified in paragraph (2)(E)) for each of the objectives described in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(2) COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

“(A) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall make grants described in paragraph (1) on a competitive basis to private, nonprofit organizations that are community development corporations to provide technical and financial assistance for economic development activities designed to address the economic needs of low-income individuals and families by creating employment and business development opportunities.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall exercise the authority provided under subparagraph (A) after consultation with other relevant Federal officials.

“(C) GOVERNING BOARDS.—For a community development corporation to receive funds to carry out this paragraph, the corporation shall be governed by a board that shall—

“(i) consist of residents of the community and business and civic leaders; and

“(ii) have as a principal purpose planning, developing, or managing low-income housing or community development projects.

“(D) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—In making grants to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into consideration the geographic distribution of funding among States and the relative proportion of funding among rural and urban areas.

“(E) RESERVATION.—Of the amounts made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary may reserve not more than 1 percent for each fiscal year to make grants to private, nonprofit organizations or to enter into contracts with private, nonprofit, or for-profit organizations to provide technical assistance to aid community development corporations in developing or implementing activities funded to carry out this paragraph and to evaluate activities funded to carry out this paragraph.

“(3) RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall provide the assistance described in paragraph (1) for rural community development activities, which shall include providing—

“(A) grants to private, nonprofit organizations to enable the organizations to provide assistance concerning home repair to rural low-income families and planning and developing low-income rural rental housing units; and

“(B) grants to multi-State, regional, private, nonprofit organizations to enable the organiza-

tions to provide training and technical assistance to small, rural communities concerning meeting their community facility needs.

“(4) BROADBAND NAVIGATOR PROJECTS.—

“(A) NAVIGATOR PROJECT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance described in paragraph (1) for broadband navigator projects consistent with the purposes of this Act to address the educational and economic needs of low-income individuals and communities.

“(B) NAVIGATOR GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make grants consistent with subparagraph (A) to community action agencies and Tribal grantees to enable them to provide assistance through trained navigators to low-income individuals and communities to help facilitate access to affordable high-speed broadband service, internet-enabled devices, digital literacy training, technical support, and other services to meet the broadband and digital needs of such individuals and communities.

“(C) PRIORITY.—Priority in the awarding of such grants under paragraph (4) shall be given to community action agencies and Tribal grantees serving underserved areas with the most significant unmet broadband and digital needs.

“(D) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Of the amounts made available to carry out broadband navigator projects, the Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent for grant review, technical assistance, and evaluation.

“(b) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall require all activities receiving assistance under this section to be evaluated for their effectiveness. Funding for such evaluations shall be provided as a stated percentage of the assistance or through a separate grant or contract awarded by the Secretary specifically for the purpose of evaluation of a particular activity or group of activities.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall compile an annual report containing a summary of the evaluations required under subsection (b) and a listing of all activities assisted under this section. The Secretary shall annually submit such report to the chairperson of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the chairperson of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

“SEC. 691. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle (excluding section 690)—

“(1) \$1,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027; and

“(2) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2028 through 2032.

“(b) DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 690 such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2023 through 2032.

“(c) RESERVATIONS BY THE SECRETARY.—Of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

“(1) ½ of 1 percent for carrying out section 675 (relating to grants to territories);

“(2) 2 percent for activities authorized in section 682(a)(1), of which—

“(A) not less than 50 percent of the amount reserved by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be awarded through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations described in section 682(b), for the purpose of carrying out activities described in section 682(a)(1)(B); and

“(B) the remainder of the amount reserved by the Secretary under this paragraph may be awarded through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible entities, Tribal grantees, and other community services network organizations described in section 682(b), or other entities with demonstrated expertise in providing training for individuals and organiza-

tions on methods of effectively addressing the needs of low-income families and communities and, if appropriate, expertise in Tribal issues;

“(3) 1 percent for the Community Action Innovations Program authorized in section 682(a)(2); and

“(4) up to \$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2023, 2024, and 2025, to carry out section 686(b)(3).

“SEC. 692. REFERENCES.

“A reference in any provision of law to the poverty line set forth in section 624 or 625 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be construed to be a reference to the poverty line defined in section 673 of this subtitle. Except as otherwise provided, any reference in any provision of law to any community action agency designated under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be construed to be a reference to an entity eligible to receive funds under the community services block grant program.”

SEC. 3. TRANSITION PERIOD.

(a) TRANSITION PERIOD.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall expeditiously announce a transition period for the implementation of any changes in regulations, procedures, guidance, and reporting requirements of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.) as amended by this Act, from the regulations, procedures, guidance, and reporting requirements of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.) as in effect immediately before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) FEDERAL TRAINING.—The transition period shall include the availability of Federal training for States and eligible entities regarding compliance with new requirements under the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9901 et seq.) as amended by this Act.

(c) TIMING.—The transition period described in this section—

(1) may not extend later than the date that is 3 months prior to the start of the second fiscal year after the date of enactment of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022;

(2) notwithstanding (1), may not extend later than two years after the date of enactment of the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022 for the issuance of final regulations implementing this subtitle; and

(3) may require that certain regulations, procedures, and reporting requirements be adopted before other regulations, procedures, or reporting requirements.

SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 306(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)(6)(C)(ii)) is amended by inserting “or subsequent years” after “fiscal year 1982” and by striking “section 676B of the Community Services Block Grant Act” and inserting “section 680(c) of the Community Services Block Grant Act”.

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 Education and Labor or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022.

In 1964, Congress first established the Community Action Program to support locally driven anti-poverty efforts.

Today, community action agencies, or CAAs, form a network of more than 1,000 organizations with a dedicated mission of assisting people in finding their way out of poverty.

These agencies provide services and programs that meet the unique needs of our local communities by helping individuals and families with low incomes achieve economic stability, secure meaningful employment, and adequate education, gain and improve job-related skills, obtain housing, access childcare, and participate in the community.

During our legislative hearing on updating the community services block grant, Katherine King Galian, the director of Family and Community Resources at Community Action in Washington County, Oregon, told us the story about Patricia.

Patricia lost her job and her home in the fall of 2019. Facing unaffordable rent and a rising risk of homelessness, she turned to Community Action and she got the support she needed.

At Community Action of Washington County, she accessed career coaching, help affording needed materials for her nursing curriculum, and other services that helped Patricia and her family get back on their feet. Patricia's story is just one of many from all across the United States where community action agencies have been helping low-income Americans get back on their feet for decades.

Unfortunately, the community services block grant program, CSBG, has not been reauthorized since 1998, the year Google was founded, and John Glenn flew the Discovery space shuttle mission. We are long overdue for Congress to pass a comprehensive reauthorization of this significant law.

Our bill continues the long tradition of broad bipartisan support for this program and makes important improvements to update CSBG. It will reauthorize CSBG for 10 years—the longest period in its history—which will provide critical stability to our local service providers.

Recognizing that there are many more families like Patricia's who can be served by CSBG, our bill strengthens funding for community action agencies and raises the program's income eligibility threshold to expand access to their important services.

I also highlight a provision championed by my friend and colead, Con-

gressman G.T. THOMPSON, to create broadband navigator projects so community action agencies can assist their clients in accessing internet services and connected devices that are necessary for learning, finding employment, and other basic activities of everyday life.

Finally, the bill will modernize the statute to strengthen accountability and performance requirements, putting CSBG on solid footing so the program can continue to meet the complex and changing needs of low-income individuals in communities without changing the local control that is such an important part of CSBG's success.

I very much appreciate the productive collaboration with my bipartisan partner from the Education and Labor Committee, Congressman THOMPSON, and his staff, in leading this legislation.

I also thank our other Education and Labor Committee coleads, Representatives DESAULNIER, STEFANIK, and COMER for leading us in this effort. I must also knowledge Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM, who led early iterations of this proposal in prior Congresses and has joined us this session to build on her foundational work to get this across the finish line.

Additionally, David Bradley, the CEO of National Community Action Foundation has been instrumental in offering his expertise to help us bring this bill to the floor today.

Finally, and importantly, I would thank Chairman SCOTT and his dedicated staff, particularly, Theresa Thompson, Jessica Schieder, Emily Hopkins, and Carrie Hughes, for working with us to bring this bill. I also thank my staff, Allison Smith, Jack Arriaga, Andrew Dunn, and Rachael Bornstein, who worked diligently on this bill from drafting and introduction through the committee markup.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill to renew our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through community action.

Additionally, I include in the RECORD letters by the National Community Action Foundation, National Association of Counties, and National Association for State Community Service Programs in support of passing the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY
ACTION FOUNDATION,
May 10, 2022.

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

HON. GLENN THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BONAMICI AND REP. THOMPSON: We are writing to you today to share our enthusiastic endorsement of your bipartisan legislation, HR 5129, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022.

As you know, CSBG touches virtually every community in the United States. With 90 percent of each state's CSBG allocation

being distributed to local Community Action Agencies (CAAs), our communities rely upon this unique flexible funding. CAAs use it to combat poverty and promote self-sufficiency, respond rapidly to unforeseen crises such as natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic and implement gap-filling activities that address unmet community needs. Additionally, CAAs use CSBG to organize and support other local charities and community-based initiatives, ensuring services are streamlined and not duplicative. Without CSBG, every single community in America would be hurt.

Your bill would codify critical updates to the program. It provides security and reliability to communities across the country by authorizing CSBG for 10 years and ensuring money flows in a timely manner. The crucial modernizations included in HR 5129, such as the new broadband navigator initiative, will increase CAAs' ability to respond to emerging needs. We are also pleased to see the emphasis on quality performance at the federal, state and local level and that the essential nature of CSBG as a locally-controlled program is retained and bolstered.

Because of HR 5129's local impact in almost every county in the country, we join in support of the bill. We hope Congress passes this essential piece of legislation quickly, thereby strengthening each community in America.

Sincerely,

David Bradley, CEO, National Community Action Foundation; Mona Stallins, Financial Specialist, East Missouri Action Agency, Ironton, Missouri; JEAN ANN MILLER, Senior Director, Office for Student Involvement Oakland University, Rochester Hills, Michigan; Esther Shuttles, Family Advocate East, Missouri Action Agency, Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Lisa Straske, Manager, Oakland County Michigan Works! Southfield, Hamtramck, Michigan; Jay Black, Jr., President CEO, Pathway Inc., Toledo, Ohio; James Fox, President/CEO, Community Action Wayne/Medina, Wooster, Ohio; Lisa Schmidtfrederick-Miller, Owner PMT Services, Inc., Jamestown, New York; Myra Lawson, Processor, East Missouri Action Agency, Park Hills, Missouri; Denise Schneider, City Manager, City of Guttenberg, Guttenberg, Iowa; Melissa Skaggs, Receptionist, East Missouri Action Agency, Inc., Bonne Terre, Missouri; Vanessa Gibson, Executive Director, Community Action of South Mississippi, Gautier, Mississippi; Paul Mark, State Representative, District 2, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Johana Lovig, Vice President of Compliance, Full Circle Services, Oelwein, Iowa; Sandra Twardosz, CAC Board Member, Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee, Knoxville, Tennessee; Michael J Murphy, Sheriff, Livingston County, Howell, Michigan; Amy Kruppe, Superintendent, Hazel Park Schools, Hazel Park, Michigan; Brenda Robbins, Teacher, LCCAA Head Start, Lorain, Ohio; Dawn Godshall, Executive Director, Community Action Lehigh Valley, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Keyon S. Payton, Lead Pastor, New Bethel Missionary Baptist Church, Pontiac, Michigan; Yvonne Cherell, CEO, Ohio Urban Resources System, Columbus, Ohio; Denise Schneider, City Manager, City of Guttenberg, Guttenberg, Iowa; Jan Cooley, Head Start Deputy Director, East Missouri Action Agency, Bonne Terre, Missouri; Kris Rowe, Executive Director, Community Action Association of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama; Mary B. Killian, East Missouri Action Agency, Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Nancy Ann Smith, Program Administrative Assistant, Lorain County Community Action Agency, Lorain, Ohio; Margaret L. Flood, Executive Director, Oberlin Community Services Council, Oberlin, Ohio; Daniel Petersen, Member, Dan's Law Office, PLC, St.

Joseph, Michigan; Sharon Harmon, Apprentice Program Manager, Lorain County Community Action Agency Head Start, Lorain, Ohio; Betty Cantley, Parent Advocate, End Childhood Lead Poisoning, Grafton, Ohio; Teresa Beltran, Assistant Teacher, Lorain County Community Action, Lorain, Ohio; Sherri Hallauer, Finance and Administration Assistant, Lorain County Community Action Agency, Elyria, Ohio; Rena Mellon, Community Integration Coordinator, Imagine the Possibilities, Guttenberg, Iowa; Kenyadah Sullivan, Board Member, CAC, Knoxville, Tennessee; Lynn A. Harden, Executive Director, Brown County Public Library, Mt. Orab, Ohio; Denise Teasley, Site Manager, East Missouri Action Agency Head Start, Park Hills, Missouri; Trisha Wilkins, Executive Director, NEICAC, Decorah, Iowa; Jolene Leon, Admin, Children's Alliance, Pleasanton, Texas; Kim L. Smith Oldham, Executive Director, Southwest Michigan Community Action Agency, Benton Harbor, Michigan; Patricia Kennedy, Family Self-Sufficiency, Coordinator, East Missouri Action Agency, St. Genevieve, Missouri; Deborah L. Rhodes, Board Member, Gallia-Meigs Community Action Agency, Gallipolis, Ohio; Dennis Phelps, Executive Director, Trehab, Montrose, Pennsylvania; David Coulter, County Executive, Oakland County, Michigan; Laura L. Smith, Owner, Asset4You Professional Services, Lorain, Ohio; Mike Mellon, Regional Assoc; Exec; Director, Imagine the Possibilities, Inc.—Northeast Region, Guttenberg, Iowa; Roger McCann, Executive Director, Community Action Kentucky, Frankfort, KY, Kentucky.

Jennifer Patrick, Board Member, ABCAP, Mt. Orab, Ohio; Cheryl Williams, Board Member, Adams Brown Community Action Program, Georgetown, Ohio; Jan F. Demers, VCAP Coordinator, Vermont Community Action Partnership, Burlington, Vermont; Linda Stepp, Board Member, Adams Brown Community Action Agency, Winchester, Ohio; Suzanne Shears, CEO, Niagara Community Action Program, Inc., Niagara Falls, New York; Sharon Daugherty, Staff Accountant, EMAA, Potosi, Missouri; Daniel Wickerham, Executive Director, Adams Brown Community Action Partnership, West Union, Ohio; Amber Coleman, Associate Executive Director, Capital Area Head Start, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Barbara Bilek, Head Start Site Manager, East Missouri Action Agency, Millersville, Missouri; Deana Hageman, Director, Northeast Iowa RSVP, Decorah, Iowa; Desiree Beasley, Board Secretary, Knoxville-Knox County CAC, Knoxville, Tennessee; Brenda S; Wilmer, Executive Director, Avoyelles Progress Action, Committee, Inc., Mansura, LA 71351, Louisiana; Darlene Bigler, CEO, Blueprints, Washington, Pennsylvania; Gale Zalar, Chief Executive Officer, Central Susquehanna Opportunities, Inc., Shamokin, Pennsylvania; Shirley Vermace, Supervisor, District 3, Winneshiek County, Iowa; Lisa Spencer, CEO, SSCAC, Inc., Plymouth, Massachusetts; Lenora Leifheit, Coordinator Health Ministries, Meigs Cooperative Parish, Pomeroy, Ohio; Patricia A. Keys, Low Income Board Member Ohio, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership, Port Clinton, Ohio.

Brenda Fry, Executive, Director, South Central Iowa Community Action Program, Inc., Chariton, Iowa; Cynthia Zwick, Executive Director, Wildfire: Igniting Community Action to End Poverty in Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona; Debbie Myers, Executive Secretary/Administration, Manager, East Missouri Action Agency, Park Hills, Missouri; Florence Greiman; County Supervisor, Hancock County Iowa, Garner, Iowa; Terry L. Barley, Board Member, Emeritus Tri-County Community Action, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania; Rhonda Williamson, Executive Direc-

tor, Safer Path Family Violence Shelter, Inc., Pleasanton, Texas; Eugene M. Brady, Executive Director, Commission on Economic Opportunity, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania; Kenneth Loy, Veterans Resources Coordinator, Community Council of South-Central Texas, Jourdanton, Texas; Jennifer Wintermyer, Chief Executive Officer, Community Action Commission, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Megan Shreve, CEO, South Central Community Action Programs, Inc., Gettysburg, Pennsylvania Ewing M. Johnson, Board Member; Knoxville-Knox County Community Action, Committee, Knoxville, Tennessee; Janine Robinson, Finance Director/Co-Director, Frontier Community Action Agency, Winnemucca, Nevada; Scott Zahorik, Executive Director, Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency, Inc., Virginia, Minnesota; Karen Snair, Executive Director, Allegheny Valley Association of Churches, Natrona Heights, Pennsylvania; Renee Hungerford, Executive Director, Community Action of Orleans and Genesee, Albion, New York; Katherine Riley Harrington, Executive Director, Iowa Community Action Association, Des Moines, Iowa; Joseph Barden, Executive Director, Margert Community Corporation, Far Rockaway, New York.

Tom Heidenwirth, Board Member, North Iowa Community Action Organization, Greene, Iowa; W. Anthony West, COO, Virginia CARES Inc., Roanoke, Virginia; Georjean W. Trinkle, Executive Consultant, Community Action Partnership NJ, Inc., Clinton, New Jersey; Bailey Maulding, President, Casey Chamber of Commerce, Casey, Illinois; Jeriemy Jones, CSR, East Missouri Action Agency, Park Hills, Missouri; Mary Jane, Ostrander, Human Services Division Manager, Carson City Health and Human Services, Carson City, Nevada; Andrea Olson, Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of North Dakota, West Fargo, North Dakota; Jim Schuyler, President & CEO, Virginia Community Action Partnership, Richmond, Virginia; Michele Bautista, Board Member, Chautauqua Opportunities Inc., Dunkirk, New York; Carol L. Kern, Local Income Rep., GLCAP, Tiffin, Ohio; Harold Monroe, CEO, Pennyrile Allied Community Services, Hopkinsville, Kentucky; Melinda Gault, Chief Executive Officer, Community Action Planning Council of Jefferson, County, Inc., Watertown, New York; Amber Freeman, Associate Director, INCA Community Services, Inc., Ardmore, Oklahoma; Patricia McFarland, Executive Director, North Central West Virginia Community Action, Association, Inc., Fairmont, West Virginia; Roger Tjarks, Board Member, District 5, Titonka, Iowa; Brian Mullins, CEO, Kentucky River Foothills Development Council, Inc., Richmond, Kentucky; Joe Pisney, County Supervisor, District 2, Howard County, Iowa; Nicole Laurin, CEO, Joint Council for Economic Opportunity of Clinton and Franklin Counties, Plattsburgh, New York; Yasmin Abdul Ghafu, Outreach Aide, East Missouri Action Agency, Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Marcia Erickson, CEO, GROW South Dakota, Sisseton, South Dakota; Erik Schoen, Executive Director, Community Chest, Inc., Virginia City, Nevada; Megan Sowers, Executive Director, Jackson-Vinton Community Action, Wellston, Ohio; Sharon Price, Executive Director, Community Action Council for Lexington-Fayette, Bourbon, Harrison and Nicholas Counties, Inc. Lexington, Kentucky; Chong-Anna Canfora, Executive Director, Michigan Community Action Association, Okemos, Michigan; Rene Ewing, Board Member, Multi Service Center, Federal Way, Washington; Debbie K. Herndon, Case Manager, Community Action of Laramie County, Inc., Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Brenda L. Fox, Executive Director, Tri-County Community Action Agency, LaGrange, Kentucky; Tom Baker, Executive Director North Hills Community Outreach, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Katie Ecker, Board Member, CAO, Kendall, New York; Gina Ward, Associate Director, Southern Tier Environments for Living Inc., Jamestown, New York; Craig A. Reiter, Board Chair, Menominee-Delta-Schoolcraft Community Action, Gulliver, Michigan; David Knight, Executive Director, California Community Action Partnership Association, Sacramento, California; Josephine M. Howard, Ed. S., Board Member, The Agricultural and Labor Program, Inc., Haines City, Florida; Daniel Brown, Executive Director, Community Action Team, Inc., St. Helens, Oregon; Heather Cole, Director of Advocacy and Public Innovation, United Way of Southwest Michigan, Saint Joseph, Michigan; Duane Yoder, President, Garrett County Community Action Committee, Inc., Swanton, Maryland; David Coplan, Executive Director, Human Services Center Corporation, Turtle Creek, Pennsylvania; Robin Whitaker, Executive Director, Daniel Boone CAA, Inc., Manchester, Kentucky; Robert S. Jones, CEO, Audubon Area Community Services, Inc., Owensboro, Kentucky; Brittany Tonet, Director of Finance & Administration/CFO, North Hills Community Outreach, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Joe Diamond, Executive Director, Massachusetts Association for Community Action, (MASSCAP), Boston, Massachusetts; Pearl L. Barth, Housing Specialist II, East Missouri Action Agency, Park Hills, Missouri; Julie Pearson, Community Service Representative, East Missouri Action Agency, Bismarck, Missouri; Amy Lynn Roark, Vice Chair, Community Action Advisory Board in Clark County, Vancouver, Washington; Heather Wallace, Board Member, Community Action of Skagit County Burlington, Washington; Kimberly Ashley-Pauley, Governing Board Chairwoman, Community Action Program of Central Arkansas, (CAPCA), Conway, Arkansas; Cindy Davis, Executive Director, North Iowa Community Action Organization, Mason City, Iowa; Angela Martin, CEO, Maryland Community Action Partnership, Annapolis, Maryland; Jill Sutton, Executive Director Mid-Michigan Community Action, Farwell, Michigan; Lyndsey Schoelzel, Executive Director, Nevada Community Action Association, Reno, Nevada; Susan L. Carr, Executive Director, Community Services Network of Wyoming, Sheridan, Wyoming; Tara Glover, Executive Director, Lowcountry Community Action Agency, Inc., Walterboro, South Carolina.

Phil Verges, Board President, WestCAP, Spring Valley, Wisconsin; Alex Fortune, City Councilperson, City of Cresco, Iowa; Philip E. Cole, Executive Director, Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies, Columbus, Ohio; James Fails, Board Member, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership, Fremont, Ohio; Carmen A. Ortega, Board Member, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership (GLCAP), Bowling Green, Ohio;

Ruthann House, President/CEO, Great Lakes Community Action Partnership, Fremont, Ohio; Keri McCrorey, Executive Director, East Missouri Action Agency, Inc., Farmington, Missouri; Michael Crouse, Executive Director, STEP Inc., Rocky Mount, Virginia; Tina Tate, Commissioner, Hospital District 304, Skagit County, Washington; Reshella Hawkins, Executive Director, Emergency Shelter Services INC, Benton Harbor, Michigan; Roseann Marchetti, Commissioner, District 4, Cass County, Michigan; Alyssa Jarrett, Community Services Representative, East Missouri Action Agency, Farmington, Missouri; Myron Gray, Owner

of Service Enterprises LLC, St. Louis, Missouri; Charles Hargitt, Maintenance Supervisor E.M.A.A., Fredericktown, Missouri; Nancy Jones, Board Member and Secretary, Mid-Michigan Community Action Agency, Farwell, Michigan; Patti Hall, Financial Specialist EMAA, Park Hills, Missouri; Amanda Garner, Board Member GLCAP, Fremont, Ohio; Ruth Johnson, Board of Directors, Gladwin County, Gladwin, Michigan; Jacqueline Orr, CEO, New York State Community Action Association, Guilderland, New York; Donna Dodgen, Mayor, City of Seguin, Texas; Karen McCandless, Chief Executive Officer, Community Action Services and Food Bank, Provo, Utah; Maria M. Tracy, Board Member, Multi-Service Center, Federal Way, Washington; C. Shawn Yardley, CEO Community Concepts, Inc., Lewiston, Maine; George T. Simon Jr., Executive Director, TriCounty Community Action, Inc., San Augustine, Texas; Thomas Mainella, Mayor, City of Fairmont, West Virginia; Bill Grant, Executive Director, Minnesota Community Action Partnership (MinnCAP), St. Paul, Minnesota; Elizabeth Jennings, Director of Community Engagement, Community Action of Skagit County, Bellingham, Washington; Roger Pavay, Sr., Chief Executive Officer, Community Action of Eastern Iowa, Davenport, Iowa.

Steven Zittergruen, City Councilperson, Ward 5, City of Decorah, Iowa; Shanna Yount, Community Services Rep, East Missouri Action Agency Inc, Potosi, Missouri; Anita Leiws, Section 8 Area Coordinator, East MO Action Agency, Caruthersville, Missouri; Don Munson, Board Chairperson, District 5, Douglas County, Illinois; Clint Cottam, Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of Utah, Layton, Utah; Susan Cooper, Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County, Santa Rosa, California; Daneen Adams, Assistant Executive Director, Open Doors, Clearfield, Utah; Teleda S. Holmes, Board Member, Multi-Service Center, Federal Way, Washington; Michelle Faught, Executive Director ICCAP, Indiana, Pennsylvania; James Hemm, Consultant, New Jersey Association on Correction, Trenton, New Jersey; Deborah Leonczyk, Executive Director, Berkshire Community Action Council, Inc., Pittsfield, Massachusetts; Barbara Kelly, Executive Director, Knoxville Knox County CAC, Knoxville, Tennessee; Kathy DiNolfi, Chief Program Officer, A New Leaf, Mesa, Arizona; Kim Embrey Hill, Executive Director, Multi-Purpose Community Action Agency, Inc., Louisville, Kentucky; Kimberly Skaggs, Housing Administrative Secretary, EMAA, Park Hills, Missouri; Erica Pogue, Associate Director, INCA Community Services, Inc., Atoka, Oklahoma; Patricia F. White, Board Member Community Action Council-Lexington, Lexington, Kentucky; Eva Felix, Director, A New Leaf, MesaCAN, Mesa, Arizona; Robin Corak, CEO, Multi-Service Center, Federal Way, Washington; Kati Ortiz, Board Member, Community Action of Skagit County, Sedro Woolley, Washington; Kenneth Walters, Executive Director, Licking Valley Community Action Program, Flemingsburg, Kentucky; David A. Rumsey, DSS Commissioner CAOG Board, Member, BOD Community Action of Orleans and Genesee, Batavia, New York; Carol A. Mack, Teacher, East Missouri Action Agency Cape Girardeau, Missouri; John W. Edwards, Jr., Interim Executive Director, Texas Association of Community Action Agencies, Austin, Texas; Chris Berry, Board Member—Treasurer, Multi Service Center, Milton, Washington; Lynne M. Johnson, Board Member, Community Action of Orleans and Genesee Counties, Lyndonville, New York.

Sandra Slade, Coordinator, East Missouri Action Agency, Belgrade, Missouri; Mary L. Chippis, Executive Director, West Virginia Community Action Partnerships, Inc., Charleston, West Virginia; Megan Adkins, Home Care Coordinator, Gallia County Council on Aging, Gallipolis, Ohio; Jennifer Trowbridge, President/CEO, Northwest Indiana Community Action, Crown Point, Indiana; Lisha Whitt, CEO, Pride Community Services, Inc., LOGAN, West Virginia; Hal B. Goode, Executive Director, Central Kentucky Community Action Council, Lebanon, Kentucky; Charlene Engle, CEO, Gateway Community Action, West Liberty, Kentucky; Kristin L. Peterson, Council Member At Large, City of Oberlin, Ohio; Janet Merrell, Executive Director, Community Action Partnership of Oregon, Portland, Oregon; Richard Brocksmith, City Councilperson, District 1, Mount Vernon, Washington; Jimmy Jones, Executive Director, Mid-Willamette Valley Community Action Agency, Salem, Oregon; Rebecca Missey, Cook Aide, EMAA, Bonne Terre, Missouri; Michael Lincoln, White County Judge, White County, Arkansas; Jada Shirriel, CEO, Healthy Start, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Amanda Ewing, Executive Director, Oklahoma Association of Community Action Agencies, Edmond, Oklahoma; Rebecca N. Brumagin, Town Supervisor, Town of Mina, New York; Drea Padgett, CEO, Mountain Heart Community Services, Inc., Oceana, West Virginia; Barbara Shine, CA Board of Directors Chair, Community Action of Orleans Genesee, Batavia, New York; William Reder, Chairman Board of Directors, Mid-Michigan Community Action Agency, Auburn, Michigan; Janet Keefe, Board Member, Chautauqua Opportunities Inc., Fredonia, New York; Steve Luse, City Councilperson, City of Decorah, Iowa; John L. Hasten, Mayor, City of Marshall, Illinois; Dean King, Board Member, GLCAP, Perrysburg, Ohio; Dean Bellack, Executive Director, United Way of Orleans County, Medina NY, New York; Susan Harding, CEO, OLHSA, Pontiac, Michigan; Paula A. Brown, Head Start Collaboration Director, Oklahoma Head Start Collaboration Office, Stillwater, Oklahoma; Tamara Turner, Board Member, Seneca County, Fostoria, Ohio; Daniel Byrnes, County Supervisor, Allamakee County, Iowa; Randy Weldon, CEO, Southwest Georgia Community Action Council, Inc., Moultrie, Georgia.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY:

On behalf of the National Association of Counties (NACo), the only organization representing the nation's 3,069 counties, parishes, and boroughs, I write to urge you to pass the bipartisan Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act (H.R. 5129) led by Reps. Suzanne Bonamici (D-Ore.), Glenn Thompson (R-Pa.), Betty McCollum (D-Minn.), Elise Stefanik (R-N.Y.), Mark DeSaulnier (D-Calif.) and James Comer (R-Ky.). While CSBG continues to receive funding through the annual appropriations process, it has not been reauthorized since 1998, making it overdue for substantive changes that could increase its ability to serve vulnerable county residents. Counties support H.R. 5129, which would strengthen funding and local administration of eligible

anti-poverty programs focused on housing, health, employment, income and civic engagement.

CSBG, which supports local agencies in activities that mitigate the root causes of poverty, represents a unique and effective partnership between counties, states, federal government and community organizations. CSBG-eligible activities vary depending on local needs, but often include services related to educational attainment, accessing and maintaining employment and self-sufficiency, household budget management, obtaining adequate housing and promoting greater community participation. In FY 2019, the CSBG network operated in 99 percent of the nation's counties through over 1,000 eligible public or private entities to serve 10.2 million individuals living in poverty, including 3.2 million children.

The CSBG Modernization Act would strengthen these efforts through both the reauthorization and authorization of appropriations that create more program certainty and allow Congress to provide additional funding to meet our nation's growing needs. The bill specifically reauthorizes the program for 10 years and authorizes appropriations of \$1 billion per year for the first five years and "such sums as necessary" for the following five years. Counties also support the proposed change of H.R. 5129 that would make permanent a COVID-era flexibility that allowed states to use CSBG funding to provide services to individuals earning up to 200 percent of the federal poverty line, allowing the program to reach more people in need.

The CSBG Modernization Act would additionally create a federally administered Community Action Innovations Program to invigorate the CSBG network's ability to test new approaches to reducing poverty. The bill strengthens local control and responsiveness to local needs through strategic plans that set goals and create an action plan for meeting community needs. It would also authorize Broadband Navigator Projects as a new federal discretionary program available to Community Action Agencies. Increased internet access has major implications on socio-economic well-being and service delivery.

NACo supports these efforts to expand public-private partnerships and close the digital divide to provide reliable high-speed broadband services, especially in rural underserved areas.

Passing this bipartisan bill would ensure CSBG is meeting the current needs of counties and local communities through fully funded evidence-based program activities. During the COVID-19 pandemic, CSBG has played a key role in providing crucial services for struggling Americans including helping communities access personal protective equipment, vaccines and other health services and school supplies for remote learning. As the nation recovers from the economic impacts of COVID-19, we are long past due for Congress to pass a comprehensive reauthorization of CSBG as it is vital to anti-poverty efforts across the country.

Now that the CSBG Modernization Act (H.R. 5129) was voted out of the U.S. House Education and Labor Committee on a bipartisan basis, NACo strongly urges the U.S. House of Representatives to pass this legislation as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW CHASE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR STATE
COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS,
May 9, 2022.

Rep. NANCY PELOSI,
House Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Rep. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Rep. STENY HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Rep. BOBBY SCOTT,
Ed & Labor Committee Chairman, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER PELOSI, MAJORITY
LEADER HOYER, MINORITY LEADER MCCAR-
THY, AND CHAIRMAN SCOTT: My name is Jean-
nie Chaffin, and I am the Interim Executive
Director of the National Association for
State Community Services Programs
(NASCSPP). NASCSPP is the sole national as-
sociation charged with advocating for and
enhancing the leadership role of States in
the administration of the Community Ser-
vices Block Grant (CSBG) and Weatherization
Assistance Program (WAP) across all 50
states, Washington D.C., and five U.S. terri-
tories.

As the membership association for all
Community Services Block Grant State Of-
fices, we are intimately familiar with the
current CSBG Act, how it has helped individ-
uals and communities in all corners of the
Nation and how it can be improved upon. We
are excited that the CSBG Modernization
Act is moving forward and has such strong
bipartisan support with more than 125 co-
sponsors from more than 25 states and the
District of Columbia. We are incredibly
grateful for such a strong showing of support
for CSBG.

I am writing to you today not simply out
of gratitude but also to express our support
for the CSBG Modernization Act (HR 5129).
The Act changes the eligibility criterion
from 125% of the Federal Poverty Level
(FPL) to 200% of the FPL, enabling the fund-
ing to reach more households in need, espe-
cially as we recover from the nationwide im-
pact of COVID-19. Important language is also
included in the Act that provides for the on-
going eligibility of clients so that they do
not lose assistance as they work toward
achieving their goal. This is critical to
households' ability to exit poverty meaning-
fully and sustainably. The State Offices that
are responsible for overseeing this funding
and ensuring it is thoughtfully spent fully
and enthusiastically support these changes
in CSBG.

While our network is excited for and sup-
portive of the aforementioned language, we
also have a few concerns and must note our
primary concern below. As partners in the
work of CSBG, State Offices carry a great
deal of responsibility. States provide over-
sight of CSBG funds via monitoring, con-
tract management, policy development, and
evaluation of results. As State Offices fill
these various roles, we recognize that there
are aspects of the CSBG Modernization Act
of 2021 that could be refined to support the
efficient and effective implementation of
CSBG at the state and local levels.

We recommend revising grant obligational
requirements in Section 679 to 'date of obli-
gation' and removing language that refers to
'available for expenditure' as it creates an
unrealistic requirement on State Offices to
release funding in extremely short periods of
time (30 days). We recommend focusing on
continuous funding to Eligible Entities over
prescriptive timelines (Sec. 679(a)(2)(A) and
Sec. 679(a)(2)(A)(i)). We believe this addresses
concerns about any gaps in funding while si-
multaneously acknowledging that each state
has its own policies, procedures and regula-

tions that dictate how funding is distributed
from the federal to local level.

We are deeply committed to the success of
the CSBG and know just what a difference it
makes in communities across the country. It
is through the cooperation of all stake-
holders, from the Federal level to Eligible
Entities and, of course, State Offices, that
make the great work of CSBG possible, and
as such we want to be sure that the Mod-
ernization Act enables all to be successful
partners. Thank you for your support of
CSBG and considering our suggestions for
improvements.

Sincerely,

JEANNIE CHAFFIN,

Interim Executive Director, NASCSPP.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I
reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, today I
stand in opposition to H.R. 5129, the
Community Services Block Grant Mod-
ernization Act of 2022, CSBG.

While I recognize that the CSBG pro-
gram has been serving those in need for
decades, I do not believe that this reau-
thorization bill improves CSBG serv-
ices or fixes the program's flaws.

As Members of Congress, we have an
obligation to ensure that taxpayer dol-
lars are being spent as efficiently and
effectively as possible. In that regard,
the CSBG program is missing the
mark. Spending \$1 billion on a program
that has limited accountability is yet
another reason why our country is ex-
periencing the biggest inflation crisis
we have seen in 41 years.

With our national debt exceeding \$30
trillion, it is time to stop mortgaging
the future of the next generation with
spending on programs that may not
even work. There is little proof that
CSBG programs are accomplishing the
one goal they were created for: moving
Americans out of poverty.

In fact, there is more proof that
CSBG has become nothing but another
welfare program, which keeps Ameri-
cans in poverty instead of lifting them
into self-sufficiency.

Under current law, CSBG lets States
set their own benchmarks for progress,
allowing ineffective programs to con-
tinue receiving taxpayer dollars de-
spite poor performance. This bill con-
tinues that ineffective policy rather
than creating commonsense measures
to judge the programs' outcomes. This
does not help people in need, and it is
an irresponsible use of taxpayer dol-
lars.

When creating programs like CSBG,
our goal should be self-sufficiency, not
government dependence. This is par-
ticularly true with some of the changes
proposed in H.R. 5129.

For example, the bill raises the in-
come threshold for individuals who can
receive services under CSBG programs
from 125 percent of the Federal poverty
level to 200 percent.

In addition, it will allow individuals
in the program to continue receiving
services even after they have exceeded
the income threshold. This program
was created to help individuals most in
need, but Democrats are trying to
twist it into a permanent welfare pipe-
line.

H.R. 5129 has other troubling provi-
sions.

Under this bill, organizations would
be able to use grantee facilities for
voter registration activities. While
promoting political participation is
important, it is simply not the purpose
of this program.

This new provision risks distracting
servicers from their primary purpose
and opening the door to partisan poli-
tics. We must preserve the integrity of
CSBG by keeping in place important
safeguards that protect against inter-
twining Federal policy and partisan po-
litical activity.

This legislation also adds a new re-
quirement that will allow CSBG funds
to be used for vague, undefined
'healthcare needs.' With Democrats'
increasingly radical stance on abortion
and attempts to strip the Hyde amend-
ment from Federal legislation, this leg-
islation could open the door for tax-
payer-funded abortions and gender
transitions. This is an unacceptable
risk.

Lastly, one of the most concerning
points of this bill is how it got protec-
tions for faith-based organizations. Re-
ligious workers have been on the front
lines serving the poor long before this
program began. Instead of honoring
their long history of service, this bill
would require religious organizations
to check their faith at the door to par-
ticipate in the CSBG program. Faith-
based providers deserve an equal oppor-
tunity to serve those in need.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the
First Amendment to protect the free
exercise of religion from interference
by the Federal Government. Yet, this
bill suggests that faith-based organiza-
tions should not be able to hire em-
ployees who share the same faith if
they are going to participate in a Fed-
eral program. This is unacceptable.

The Constitution protects the right
of religious organizations to hire in ac-
cordance with their beliefs. Congress
recognized this right in enacting title
VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The
Supreme Court unanimously upheld
the constitutionality of a religious em-
ployer's staffing exemption in 1987.

The current law protections, which
were adopted in a bipartisan manner
nearly 25 years ago, should be
uncontroversial, but H.R. 5129 makes
these provisions controversial because
Democrats think religious belief is
backward and discriminatory.

□ 0930

Democrats have claimed that these
current law protections allow faith-
based providers to discriminate against
program beneficiaries. But that simply
isn't true. Democrats can't point to a
single instance of widespread discrimi-
nation in the CSBG program. These
faith-based organizations exist to serve
the neediest among us. The current law
protections ensure they can continue
to do that. If the purpose of H.R. 5129
was to improve CSBG, then I am afraid
the bill has failed miserably. This mod-
ernization attempt is a false start.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this legislation.

Today the committee action agencies, or CAAs, form a network of more than 1,000 organizations that meet the unique needs of communities to help lift low-income individuals and families out of poverty. For decades community action agencies have been central pillars to our communities. They administer programs such as Head Start, to provide quality early childhood education for low-income children and support their families; Meals on Wheels, to support seniors experiencing hunger and isolation; and LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program that helps people keep up with their utilities.

In fact, it is the only Federal program whose broad mission is to address poverty conditions and allow community action agencies to tailor services for low-income individuals in their communities, and they do this with the goal of giving a hand up, not a hand-out.

Community action agencies' work is made possible by the community services block grant, the CSBG. Unfortunately, the CSBG program has not been reauthorized since 1998 creating uncertainty in the program.

The bipartisan Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022 reauthorizes CSBG for 10 years, the longest period in history, and improves the statute to help CAAs expand their work and reduce poverty across the country.

This includes increased authorization levels and raising the CSBG program income eligibility thresholds to expand access to their services. This will put CSBG on solid footing so that the program continues to meet the complex and changing needs of low-income individuals and communities without changing local control to this important program.

I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for championing this bipartisan legislation.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her leadership.

Today I stand in opposition to H.R. 5129 because it removes longstanding

religious protections for community service providers that receive funds through the community service block grant program.

Religious providers all around the country provide food for the hungry, healthcare and hospice programs for the terminally ill, and educational opportunities for the less fortunate. This partisan bill will likely prevent certain religious groups from engaging in charity, simply because of what motivates their charity.

In 2019, the community action agencies partnered with more than 19,000 faith-based organizations around the country. In Indiana, the funds reached 335,000 Hoosiers by providing health services, housing aid, education help, income improvement, and more. If charitable choice language is removed from this bill, religious organizations may be forced to choose between serving their community and honoring their sincerely held faith beliefs. That means more Hoosiers in need. It is shameful to cut religious protections from such an impactful program.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as it will mean less charity tomorrow for all Americans. We must defend our religious freedom, and this bill is a direct attack on it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), who is a member of Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, last week, I was approached by Larry Martinez who was there when the Community Service Block Grants first started in New Mexico. He told me that my late father worked tirelessly to secure funds so the State of New Mexico could match this new program. He called my late father the conscience of the Senate.

My father knew that these funds would make a real impact in the lives of New Mexicans, and he was right. It has made a difference. The benefits are undeniable. Instead of a family shivering in the cold in northern New Mexico, we have families using LIHEAP to keep their children warm. Instead of a family being turned out of their home because they couldn't afford rising rent, CSBG provides rental assistance. Instead of a promising young man falling into homelessness or despair without an income, we have CSBG programs helping with career training and job searches.

One of my favorite programs is Head Start. I started my academic career as a Head Start baby and fell in love with learning, and we know that an investment in our children at the earliest age is the biggest and best investment we can work; and this provides Head Start.

CSBG touches every aspect of our community because there is not one root cause of poverty. We need to uplift our most vulnerable by meeting them where they are because they have aspi-

rations that we need to help them achieve. The Communities Services Block Grant Modernization Act would strengthen CSBG by increasing its authorization for annual appropriations. The bill would allow the Community Action Network to serve more people by increasing the income eligibility for services.

We should not kick people off a cliff back into poverty when they can rise into the working middle class. These are changes that will strengthen CSBG and strengthen our communities. We must be the conscience of our communities in the House.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her work on this important legislation. In fact, you can't miss it. Above our flag here have the words "In God We Trust."

Really?

Our Nation's Founders rightly recognized that every human being has a natural right to religious liberty. This right is so important that, like I said, it is enshrined as the First Amendment to our Constitution.

When language was added to the CSBG program in 1998 to protect the religious character of faith-based organizations, Congress rightly recognized the importance of this fundamental right to religious liberty and the value that religious organizations add to our society. We need to stand by these principles today.

Unfortunately, Democrats do not believe it is important to respect the religious freedom of faith-based organizations to hire according to their religious beliefs or to display religious symbols like a Bible or the Star of David while serving low-income Americans through the CSBG program. The Democrats' removal of this important language—language that has been in the law for over two decades without causing harm to anyone—shines a spotlight on their intolerance of different viewpoints and beliefs.

My colleague from Michigan offered an amendment that would have taken the important and commonsense step to reinstate this longstanding language making clear that faith-based providers should be able to live out their faith while participating in the CSBG program. I was very disappointed that Democrats rejected this amendment during markup and refused to allow a floor vote on it.

All we are asking is that the deeply held religious beliefs of faith-based organizations continue to be accommodated under the law. This approach allows many different viewpoints to exist alongside one another in our diverse country, and it makes sure that faith-based organizations can continue to do the work they do so well, and that is, help low-income Americans.

Madam Speaker, faith-based organizations are important partners to provide vital services, and for this reason I oppose this bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who is a member of the Education and Labor Committee and a lead cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Today, we have the great opportunity to move one step closer to reducing poverty across the Nation. The community services block grant is the only Federal program with the explicit and overreaching goal of reducing poverty regardless of its cause.

Originally, created in 1964, the program established local community action agencies to help identify why people were in poverty and how to address it using public and private resources. It was a public-private partnership. Community action agencies are governed by boards that are largely made up of business and industry community leaders in those counties.

Funds for this program help families and individuals achieve self-sufficiency, find and retain meaningful employment, attain an education, make better use of available income, obtain housing, and achieve greater participation in community affairs. Virtually every county in the United States has a community action agency which helps low-income individuals and families move from poverty to independence.

CSBG has not been reauthorized in more than two decades, and today's vote will renew our commitment to reducing poverty and strengthening communities across the country.

H.R. 5129 reauthorizes the community services block grant program for 10 years at an annual level of \$1 billion for the first 5 years. It maintains local control of community action planning and activities. It is largely business and industry leaders that constitute those boards. It authorizes a broadband navigator program to respond to the broadband and digital needs of low-income families and communities to find pathways out of poverty.

Madam Speaker, it does so much more.

CSBG requires some modernization to allow agencies the ability to tap their full potential and better serve families and communities. While this program has a strong history of bipartisan support, some of my colleagues have alleged faith-based organizations will no longer be able to participate in the CSBG program if this bill becomes law. This is simply untrue.

Faith-based organizations are longstanding and essential partners in community action networks. They serve as incredible forces of good in their communities.

Philippians 2:4 tells us, "Let each of you look not only to his interests, but also to the interests of the others."

Madam Speaker, as a man of faith and longtime member of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, the last thing I

would do is support legislation that removes faith-based organizations entirely from actively and equally participating in CSBG. There have been longstanding Federal regulations which were expanded under the George W. Bush administration that allow faith-based organizations to partake in Federal programs without compromising their religious beliefs. These regulations now apply to nine Federal departments and agencies, including HHS.

The Trump administration also reaffirmed these regulations through the final rule titled Equal Participation of Faith-Based Organizations in the Federal Agencies' Programs and Activities.

This bill makes Federal policy clearer, and it maintains the same protections for faith-based providers in CSBG-funded activities.

Madam Speaker, it is time for Congress to reaffirm our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty by reauthorizing the CSBG, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this righteous legislation.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

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

Madam Speaker, at the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to recommit H.R. 5129 and ask to have my amendment to restore current law protections for faith-based organizations included in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, religious liberty is foundational to America. It is enshrined as the First Amendment to our Constitution. Given this Nation's dedication to religious liberty, it is so appalling that H.R. 5129 strikes current law protections for faith-based organizations that participate in the CSBG program.

Faith-based providers have a history of leading America's fight to help those in need. From the Salvation Army to Catholic Charities, religious organizations formed the front line in assisting people in poverty. They did so not out of a desire for selfish gain or recognition but because they truly believe it is a calling.

□ 0945

That faith allows them to help those in need in unique ways that the government cannot. But instead of honoring these organizations for their long history of service, this bill suggests that religious organizations should leave their faith behind when they want to serve those in need.

This is ridiculous. More than that, it is un-American. I would also argue it directly contradicts our Constitution.

Madam Speaker, we must give faith-based organizations and providers the same opportunity to serve low-income Americans through the CSBG program that we would give any other organiza-

tion. We must also guarantee faith-based providers' rights to live out and express their faith through their work.

I include in the RECORD a letter from a coalition of religious providers, led by the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, which discusses the importance of maintaining current law protections for faith-based organizations—protections, I might add, that President Biden himself supported when he was a Member of the Senate.

MAY 10, 2022.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As leaders of faith-based service organizations, religious freedom advocates, and people of faith, we strongly implore you and your colleagues to retain the Charitable Choice provisions when reauthorizing the Community Services Block Grant [CSBG]. The current language of H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2021, would replace the detailed Charitable Choice provisions with a bare sentence. This would be a negative change that creates a harmful precedent. We ask the House instead to reaffirm Charitable Choice in the CSBG program by retaining the Charitable Choice provisions currently in the CSBG statute.

The Charitable Choice provisions (42 U.S. Code 9920) give faith-based organizations an equal opportunity to compete for CSBG funding and safeguard their religious character while also protecting beneficiary rights by prohibiting the use of CSBG grant funds for explicitly religious activities. The presence of this detailed language in the statute is a billboard announcing a welcome for faith-based organizations to compete for funding.

The provisions were added to the CSBG program in 1998 in a reauthorization bill cosponsored by Republican Senators Dan Coats (IN) and Jim Jeffords (VT) and Democratic Senators Ted Kennedy (MA) and Christopher Dodd (CT). They sought to improve the effectiveness of CSBG spending by prohibiting local governments and Community Action Agencies [CAAs] from marginalizing faith-based organizations. Protecting participation in CSBG funding by faith-based providers and houses of worship ensures that the procurement process is competitive and that CAAs utilize the most effective and accountable service providers.

The Charitable Choice provisions extend to faith-based organizations no novel or unconstitutional rights. Its principles are codified in the Equal Treatment regulations that apply to Department of Health and Human Services funding programs (45 CFR 87), but only partially to CSBG. CSBG has its own regulations, similar but distinct. If Charitable Choice is taken out of the CSBG statute, CAAs would have no guarantee that they will be afforded the same rights and protections due to other faith-based organizations under the Equal Treatment regulations. It would be better to retain the CSBG statutory language and the accompanying regulations. Statutory language provides more certainty over time to Community Action Agencies and to faith-based organizations interested in partnering with them in service.

Some in the CAA movement claim that the Charitable Choice language is dispensable because, despite its presence, few faith-based organizations receive CSBG funding. If participation is truly low, then the remedy is action by Congress and the Office of Community Services in HHS to remove the non-statutory barriers that inhibit more extensive partnerships, not to remove the protections that enable the participation of those few.

The addition of Charitable Choice in 1998 to the CSBG program was the second time that Congress and the Clinton administration added such language to a federal program (Charitable Choice was first added to the TANF program in 1996). These actions launched the faith-based or partnership initiative. The four succeeding administrations of both parties (Bush, Obama, Trump, and Biden) have worked with energy to ensure that federal social programs are maximally effective because they partner with the best non-government organizations, including faith-based organizations, with full protection for the religious freedom of the ultimate beneficiaries.

Senators Coats, Jeffords, Kennedy, and Dodd were right to add Charitable Choice to the CSBG program. Removing it will be detrimental to the participation of faith-based organizations, when it is their greater involvement that will most benefit the communities that CSBG funding is intended to serve. Removing it will create a terrible precedent by signaling that Congress is no longer as boldly committed to equal opportunity for service organizations of every faith or none.

We ask the House to reaffirm Charitable Choice in the CSBG program by amending H.R. 5129 to restore this language before the reauthorization moves forward.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Signed,

[University professors sign in their personal capacities only. Their employing universities take no position on this bill, and are listed only to help identify the individual signers.]

Stanley Carlson-Thies, Senior Director, Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, Washington, DC; Stephanie Summers, CEO, Center for Public Justice, Washington, DC; His Eminence Timothy Cardinal Dolan, Archbishop of New York, Chairman, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops Committee for Religious Liberty, Washington, DC; Rev. Dr. Galen Carey, Vice President of Government Relations, National Association of Evangelicals, Columbia, MD; Rabbi Abba Cohen, Vice President for Government Affairs and Washington Director, Agudath Israel of America, Washington, DC; Melissa Reid, Director of Government Affairs, Seventh-day Adventist Church—North American Division, Columbia, MD; Rev. Dr. Jo Anne Lyon, General Superintendent Emerita, The Wesleyan Church, Fishers, IN; Yaakov Menken, Managing Director, Coalition for Jewish Values, Baltimore, MD.

Shirley V. Hoogstra, President, CCCU—Council for Christian Colleges & Universities, Washington, DC; Robert C. Andringa, Ph.D. President Emeritus, CCCU, Washington, DC; P. George Tryfiates, Vice President for Public Policy & Legal Affairs, Association of Christian Schools International, Washington, DC; Jedd Medefind, President, Christian Alliance for Orphans, Falls Church, VA; Ronald L. Sider, Founder, Christians for Social Action, Lansdale, PA; Gary W. Blackard, President & CEO, Adult & Teen Challenge USA, Ozark, MO; Ryan Jay VerWys, CEO, ICCF Community Homes, Grand Rapids, MI; Jonathan Bradford, President and CEO Emeritus, ICCF Community Homes, Grand Rapids, MI; Douglas Laycock, Professor of Law, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Carl H. Esbeck, R.B. Price Emeritus Professor of Law, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO; Phillip L. McIntosh, Professor of Law, Mississippi College School of Law, Jackson, MS; Paul Marshall, Professor, Baylor University, Washington, DC; Robert Osburn, Ph.D., Senior Fellow, Wilberforce International Institute, Roseville, MN; Jo-

seph M. Knippenberg, Professor of Politics, Oglethorpe University, Brookhaven, GA; Abby M. Foreman, Professor, Dordt University, Sioux Center, IA; Ryan T. Anderson, President, The Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, DC; Charles Leslie Glenn Jr., Professor emeritus of Educational Policy, Boston University, Boston, MA; Gail Frances Jansen, Retired Attorney, Former Trustee Center for Public Justice, Tucson, AZ; James W. Skillen, President (retired), Center for Public Justice, Birmingham, AL; Marc Andreas, Professor, Kuyper College, Grand Rapids, MI; Michelle C. Kirtley, Fellow, Center for Public Justice, Chapel Hill, NC; Chelsea Langston Bombino, Fellow, Center for Public Justice, Catonsville, MD; Bruce Rowell, Chief Clinical Officer, Lawndale Christian Health Center, Chicago, IL; Rev. Girien R. Salazar, Minister, Ciudad de Esperanza, Farmers Branch, TX; Rev. Marian Edmonds-Allen, Executive Director, Parity, New York, NY; Mr. Roger Metcalf, Chairman Board of Trustee, Oklahoma Wesleyan University, Gresham, OR; Michael Kozlarek, City Director, The Navigators, San Diego, CA; Mark Rodgers, Principal, Clapham Group, Burke, VA; James B. Bolts, Lead Pastor, Victory Church, Yorktown, VA; Joyce Campbell, Concerned community member, Christian Reformed Church, Greenbelt, MD; Randall Kroll, Executive Consultant, Platinum Group, Minneapolis, MN; Kathryn Vasselkiv, Not for profit board member, St Moses Church, Baltimore, MD.

Deanna Stacy, Former Associate Director, HHS Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Alexandria, VA; Ashley Weiss, Staff, Youth with A Mission, Lakeside, MT; Greg Enas, Venture Catalyst, Innovatov LLC, Indianapolis, IN; Jerry S. Herbert, Elder, Washington Community Fellowship, Washington, DC; Karyl Savageau, Capitol Hill Pregnancy Center, Washington, DC; Clarke Cochran, Deacon, St. Peter Catholic Church, Charlotte, NC; Carol Veldman Rudie, Board member, Association for Public Justice, Minneapolis, MN; Dr. Paul Wrobel, Head of School, Trinity Oaks Christian Academy, Cary, IL; Bethany Schuttinga, Ph.D., President, Avail Academy, Minneapolis, MN; Steven Groen, Principal, Avail Academy, Edina, MN; Andrew Ryskamp, Christian Reformed Church in North America, Grand Rapids, MI; Perry Recker, Librarian emeritus and Ruling Elder, Eastminster Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, PA; Rev. Dr. Steven J. Koster, Pastor of Congregational Life, Grace Church, Grand Rapids, MI; David E. Campbell, Christian Reformed Church of Washington, DC, Washington, DC; Henry G. Gunnink, Regional Pastor, Classis Lake Superior of the Christian Reformed Church of North America, Inver Grove Heights, MN; Randall Hedman, Donor Relations, World Renew, Bloomington, MN.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I offered an amendment during a markup that would have protected faith-based providers, making sure they don't have to leave their faith at the door when they work to serve America's families in need. This is not only good for the religious organizations serving these families but also for the neediest among us.

Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues rejected this commonsense amendment. I was further disappointed when they did not make my amendment in order for floor consideration. This is a forthright attack on religious liberty by the Democrats, and we cannot stand for it.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the

Committee on Education and Labor to reconsider my amendment to restore these current law provisions.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 18 minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, we all agree that the inclusion of faith-based organizations and faith leaders is important for the community action network. In fact, they have a long history of being involved with community action since the very beginning of the war on poverty in the 1960s, and I have no doubt that they will continue to do their important work.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has made clear that religious entities cannot be excluded from participation in publicly funded programs because of their religious status. This legislation, despite what the ranking member and others claim, would not change that.

We are here today to reauthorize and modernize the community services block grant program, which is almost 20 years past its authorization expiration.

I also note that the bipartisan bill introduced in the previous Congress, the 116th, also removed the charitable choice provision with broad bipartisan support, and H.R. 5129 reflects the same sensible compromise on this issue.

In fact, some Members would have liked the legislation to go further to expressly address other nondiscrimination issues, but I did not take that approach as we crafted the bill because I wanted to maintain the bipartisan agreement we reached to make real progress toward the much-needed reauthorization of CSBG.

Twenty years is too long for this program, our community action agencies, and the communities they serve. It is too long for them to wait for us to reach an agreement, and we have reached an agreement.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, for 60 years, community action agencies have had relationships with faith-based organizations. The involvement of faith-based organizations in community action programs long predates the charitable choice provision, and their involvement will continue without this controversial provision.

We also know that HHS regulations have existed for nearly 20 years incorporating many of the same principles. Eliminating the duplicative charitable choice provision in CSBG allows us to move forward with a reauthorization that is vital to so many of our agencies

and allows HHS to apply a single set of rules across programs.

This is a distraction that should not prevent us from moving forward with this reauthorization and maintaining the bipartisan consensus we have achieved.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Coalition Against Religious Discrimination, a broad and diverse group of leading religious, civil rights, labor, and health organizations supporting the removal of the charitable choice provision from the community services block grant program.

THE COALITION AGAINST
RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION,

May 11, 2022.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As members and allies of the Coalition Against Religious Discrimination (CARD), we write to support the changes in H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022, that would remove charitable choice, a highly controversial policy.

CARD is a broad and diverse group of leading religious, civil rights, labor, and health organizations that formed in the 1990s to oppose adding charitable choice to social service program authorizations. Since then, CARD has continued to advocate for strengthening the constitutional and legal safeguards that apply to such partnerships in this and other social service programs. We appreciate the important role that religiously affiliated organizations historically have played in addressing many of our nation's most pressing social needs, including in some cases, with the use of government funds; indeed, many members of CARD know this firsthand. We also recognize that the separation of church and state is the cornerstone of religious freedom.

Contrary to claims of its supporters, charitable choice provisions did not remove any "barriers" to participation for faith-based providers. Faith-based organizations partnered with the government to provide services long before the addition of charitable choice to the Community Services Block Grant programs. Charitable choice instead changed the rules. But faith-based organizations should follow the same rules as all other providers, and effective government collaboration with faith-based entities does not require government-supported discrimination.

Charitable choice removed traditional church-state safeguards that applied to social service providers that accept taxpayer funds. It allows taxpayer-funded faith-based organizations to discriminate in hiring, including by undermining state and local non-discrimination protections, and threatens the rights of beneficiaries when delivering services.

People in need should never be faced with the stark choice between accessing the services they need or retaining their religious freedom protections. And no one should be forced to choose between conforming to a religious litmus test or losing a government-funded job.

Charitable choice does not protect religious freedom, rather it uses the guise of religious freedom to justify discrimination against employees and put people who need government services at risk of harm. Thus, we support the removal of the charitable choice provisions from the CSBG authorization.

Sincerely,

ADL (Anti-Defamation League), African American Ministers in Action, American

Atheists, American Civil Liberties Union, American Federation of Teachers, American Humanist Association, Americans United for Separation of Church and State, B'nai B'rith International, Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty (BJC), Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Catholics for Choice, Center for Inquiry and the Richard Dawkins Foundation for Reason & Science, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Disciples Center for Public Witness, Disciples Justice Action Network.

Equal Partners in Faith, Family Equality, Freedom From Religion Foundation, GLSEN, Hindu American Foundation, Human Rights Campaign, Interfaith Alliance, Jewish Women International, Lambda Legal, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, Metropolitan Community Churches, Global Justice Institute, NAACP, NARAL Pro-Choice America.

National Center for Transgender Equality, National Council of Jewish Women, National LGBTQ Task Force, National Women's Law Center, People For the American Way, PFLAG National, Presbyterian Church (USA), Secular Coalition for America, Secular Policy Institute, SPLC Action Fund, Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Local Church Ministries, The United Methodist Church—General Board of Church and Society.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The chair of the subcommittee has said a lot about the charitable choice provision and the fact that faith-based entities have long participated in community action programs from the very beginning in the 1960s, and there is no evidence that they will stop participating.

Charitable choice purports to advance religious freedom, ensuring participation of faith-based organizations. The fact is, they are going to participate. Some may not because they cannot operate without discriminating. Well, that is their right. But if you are going to take Federal money, you should not discriminate.

This language that is being offered, the language that is not in the bill, authorizes broad religious discrimination against employees and fails to adequately protect religious liberty rights of beneficiaries in taxpayer-funded social services.

Now, when a church runs a program, they can hire whoever they want based on religion with church money. But when you take Federal money, there ought to be equal opportunity in hiring.

So, the charitable choice language, which is not in the bill as it is, requires equal opportunity, so if you apply for a job, you won't be discriminated against.

Unfortunately, this charitable choice thing kind of redefines the victim of discrimination. When somebody applies for a job under charitable choice and is told, "We don't hire your kind because you are the wrong religion," we have

redefined the victim in that as the agency discriminating because if we don't let them discriminate, we are violating their religious liberty.

What about the person who applied for the job? They have been denied a job solely on the basis of religion. It is my view that that is the one who needs the protection. We don't need to protect the right to discriminate.

In fact, that is why a broad coalition of civil rights, labor, and health organizations supports the removal of the language that allows that kind of discrimination, and that is in the letter that the chairwoman has offered.

That letter says, in part: "Charitable choice does not protect religious freedom; rather, it uses the guise of religious freedom to justify discrimination against employees and put people who need government services at risk."

I think it is time that this language be removed, as this bill before us does, so that the real victims of discrimination who are being discriminated against can get the protection of the Federal Government as they have since the 1964 civil rights bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, if CSBG programs were fulfilling their statutory purpose, we would be hearing lots of numbers of people lifted out of poverty. But those numbers have been notably absent in the committee debate and here today.

We have been given no proof, no proof at all, that these programs are working as they have been set up. We are asking hardworking taxpayers—let me repeat that—hardworking taxpayers to give money to support these programs that have no accountability.

The goal is to take people out of poverty and have them become hardworking taxpayers to balance out the burden here in this country, but that is not happening, Madam Speaker.

This bill would appropriate \$1 billion. I said in my opening comments that we are \$30 trillion in debt. We are going to add to our debt with this program with no accountability. We should not spend a dime of taxpayer dollars without knowing that those dollars are being spent effectively.

Republicans support commonsense efforts to fight poverty and provide a safety net for Americans truly in need. We want to make our Nation's anti-poverty programs the best they can be, a streamlined network that specifically focuses on aiding those in dire need and helps lift them out of poverty, but that is not what we have here.

H.R. 5129 fails to reform CSBG. In fact, the program widely expands the pool of eligible beneficiaries, leaving those most in need with fewer resources.

It goes along with other programs that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the Biden administration keep proposing, and that is to put more people in dependency in this country, not make them independent.

It also attacks religious liberty. I believe my colleagues have basically admitted that in the last few minutes.

Over 19,000 vital faith-based organizations work tirelessly to help their communities through the CSBG program. Yet, H.R. 5129 sets a terrible and destructive precedent. Preventing faith-based organizations from competing for grants while remaining true to their religious character means fewer low-income Americans will receive the help they need.

This legislation is another Washington-knows-best approach that will keep Americans dependent on hard-working taxpayers' dollars. My colleagues should reject this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy from the Executive Office of the President supporting H.R. 5129 and praising the legislation's commitment to ensuring that communities have the tools they need to address poverty and achieve economic mobility.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5129—COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT
MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2022—REP. BONAMICI,
D-OR, AND 126 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports the poverty-fighting goals of H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022, to provide states, territories, and Tribes with resources for critical community services. This legislation will reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) for a decade and help ensure that communities have the tools they need to fight poverty and build economic mobility.

The CSBG has been supporting tribal and local governments and community organizations across the country for over 50 years with funding to help them serve low-income individuals and families. Local administration of some of the most essential community programs—such as job training and placement, food and nutrition assistance, Head Start, housing and homelessness assistance, and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program—is supported by CSBG funds. While these services and strategies have always been key to helping Americans get ahead and stay ahead, the COVID-19 pandemic underscored just how vital it is to invest in the organizations that deliver them. Faced with unprecedented demand and the operational challenges of the pandemic, the more than 1,000 organizations supported by CSBG continued working to help low-income communities address housing and food insecurity, provide high-quality early childhood education, and support individuals re-entering the workforce. Now, as this Administration works to build a strong and equitable recovery, it is more important than ever to invest in locally based solutions to the causes and conditions of poverty in communities.

The CSBG update proposed by this Act would result in greater equity for Tribes, expanded income eligibility data modernization, strengthened performance management, and support for community-based services and strategies. In addition, this Act would support new broadband navigator efforts and continues critical support for community economic development and rural development activities. And reauthorizing CSBG for the first time since 1998 would provide organizations and the millions of families they serve with the confidence and stability to make the long-term investments communities need.

The Administration looks forward to working with Congress to ensure that this bipartisan legislation achieves its purposes, continues expanding opportunity for all Americans, and ultimately is enacted.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative McCOLLUM for supporting H.R. 5129. I am thankful for her leadership in the 116th Congress' legislation to reauthorize CSBG and her continued strong support for this program.

Madam Speaker, I also include in the RECORD letters from various organizations, individuals, and localities supporting this bipartisan legislation to reauthorize this community services block grant.

LOA,

Roanoke, VA, April 19, 2022.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GLENN THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BONAMICI AND REP. THOMPSON: I am writing to you today to share my endorsement of your bipartisan legislation that supports community action agencies, including Total Action for Progress (TAP). I have the pleasure of serving on TAP's board. H.R. 5129, the Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022 is important to me and our community.

As you know, CSBG touches virtually every community in the United States. With 90 percent of each state's CSBG allocation being distributed to local Community Action Agencies (CAAs), our communities rely upon this unique flexible funding. CAAs, like TAP, use the funds to combat poverty and promote self-sufficiency, respond rapidly to unforeseen crises such as natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic and implement gap-filling activities that address unmet community needs. Additionally, CAAs use CSBG to organize and support other local charities and community-based initiatives, ensuring services are streamlined and not duplicative. Without CSBG, every single community in America would be hurt.

Your bill would codify critical updates to the program. It provides security and reliability to communities across the country by authorizing CSBG for 10 years and ensuring money flows in a timely manner. The crucial modernizations included in H.R. 5129, such as the new broadband navigator initiative, will increase CAAs' ability to respond to emerging needs. We are also pleased to see the emphasis on quality performance at the federal, state, and local level and that the essential nature of CSBG as a locally-controlled program is retained and bolstered.

Because of H.R. 5129's local impact in almost every county in the country, I join in support of the bill. It is hoped that Congress passes this essential piece of legislation quickly, thereby strengthening each community in America.

Sincerely,

RON D. BOYD,
President & CEO.

RESCUE MISSION MINISTRIES,
Roanoke, VA, April 19, 2022.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GLENN THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BONAMICI AND REP. THOMPSON: I am writing to you today to share my endorsement of your bipartisan legislation that

supports community action agencies, including Total Action for Progress (TAP). I have the pleasure of serving on TAP's board. H.R. 5129, the Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022 is important to me and our community.

As you know, CSBG touches virtually every community in the United States. With 90 percent of each state's CSBG allocation being distributed to local Community Action Agencies (CAAs), our communities rely upon this unique flexible funding. CAAs, like TAP, use the funds to combat poverty and promote self-sufficiency, respond rapidly to unforeseen crises such as natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic and implement gap-filling activities that address unmet community needs. Additionally, CAAs use CSBG to organize and support other local charities and community-based initiatives, ensuring services are streamlined and not duplicative. Without CSBG, every single community in America would be hurt.

Your bill would codify critical updates to the program. It provides security and reliability to communities across the country by authorizing CSBG for 10 years and ensuring money flows in a timely manner. The crucial modernizations included in H.R. 5129, such as the new broadband navigator initiative, will increase CAAs' ability to respond to emerging needs. We are also pleased to see the emphasis on quality performance at the federal, state, and local level and that the essential nature of CSBG as a locally-controlled program is retained and bolstered.

Because of H.R. 5129's focal impact in almost every county in the country, I join in support of the bill. It is hoped that Congress passes this essential piece of legislation quickly, thereby strengthening each community in America.

Sincerely,

C. LEE CLARK, CEO.

COUNTY OF ORLEANS,
OFFICE FOR THE AGING,
Albion, NY, April 14, 2022.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. BONAMICI: We are writing to you today to share our enthusiastic endorsement of your bipartisan legislation, H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022.

As you know, CSBG touches virtually every community in the United States. With 90 percent of each state's CSBG allocation being distributed to local Community Action Agencies (CAAs), our communities rely upon this unique flexible funding. CAAs use it to combat poverty and promote self-sufficiency, respond rapidly to unforeseen crises such as natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic and implement gap-filling activities that address unmet community needs. Additionally, CAAs use CSBG to organize and support other local charities and community-based initiatives, ensuring services are streamlined and not duplicative. Without CSBG, every single community in America would be hurt.

Your bill would codify critical updates to the program. It provides security and reliability to communities across the country by authorizing CSBG for 10 years and ensuring money flows in a timely manner. The crucial modernizations included in H.R. 5129, such as the new broadband navigator initiative, will increase CAAs' ability to respond to emerging needs. We are also pleased to see the emphasis on quality performance at the federal, state and local level and that the essential nature of CSBG as a locally-controlled program is retained and bolstered.

Because of H.R. 5129's local impact in almost every county in the country, we join in

support of the bill. We hope Congress passes this essential piece of legislation quickly, thereby strengthening each community in America.

Sincerely,

MELISSA BLANAR,
Director.

CITY OF ROANOKE,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Roanoke, Virginia, April 18, 2022.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. GLENN THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BONAMICI AND THOMPSON: We are writing to you today to share our endorsement of your bipartisan legislation that supports community action agencies, including Total Action for Progress (TAP) which assists citizens in our jurisdiction. HR 5129, the Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) Modernization Act of 2022.

As you know, CSBG touches virtually every community in the United States. With 90 percent of each state's CSBG allocation being distributed to local Community Action Agencies (CAAs), our communities rely upon this unique flexible funding. CAAs, like TAP, use the funds to combat poverty and promote self-sufficiency, respond rapidly to unforeseen crises such as natural disasters and the COVID-19 pandemic and implement gap-filling activities that address unmet community needs. Additionally, CAAs use CSBG to organize and support other local charities and community-based initiatives, ensuring services are streamlined and not duplicative. Without CSBG, every single community in America would be hurt.

Your bill would codify critical updates to the program. It provides security and reliability to communities across the country by authorizing CSBG for 10 years and ensuring money flows in a timely manner. The crucial modernizations included in HR 5129, such as the new broadband navigator initiative, will increase CAAs' ability to respond to emerging needs. We are also pleased to see the emphasis on quality performance at the federal, state, and local level and that the essential nature of CSBG as a locally-controlled program is retained and bolstered.

Because of HR 5129's local impact in almost every county in the country, I join in support of the bill. It is hoped that Congress passes this essential piece of legislation quickly, thereby strengthening each community in America.

Sincerely,

Members of Roanoke City Council, Roanoke, Virginia:

MAYOR SHERMAN P. LEA,
SR.,
Mayor.

PATRICIA WHITE-BOYD,
Vice-Mayor.

WILLIAM BESTPITCH,
Council Member.

VIVIAN SANCHEZ-JONES,
Council Member.

JOSEPH COBB,
Council Member.

STEPHANIE MOON
REYNOLDS,
Council Member.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, millions of families and individuals across our country benefit from the locally driven antipoverty programs and services backed by the community services block grant program. We are here today to make sure it continues to meet their needs and the unique needs of our communities.

I am pleased that the House is taking up this long-overdue update to the community services block grant program with strong bipartisan support.

CSBG enables community action agencies to be innovative, leverage public and private resources for their communities, and cost-efficiently administer many programs, including Head Start, LIHEAP, nutrition assistance, weatherization, job training, housing, and assistance for those experiencing homelessness.

This bipartisan legislation will strengthen funding for community action agencies, raise the CSBG program's income eligibility threshold to expand its important services; promote innovation in the CAA network through a federally administered community action innovations program; and, importantly, modernizes accountability, which is an important part of the bill, and performance standards.

The bottom line is that this legislation will better help low-income individuals and families achieve economic stability and access housing, childcare, utility assistance, employment, and other services.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan bill to renew our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through community action, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022. This legislation renews the nation's commitment to reducing poverty through an established network of more than 1,000 local Community Action Agencies. Having authored previous iterations of this legislation, and now being an original cosponsor with my good friend Congresswoman BONAMICI, I could not be more excited to advance this bill today. At a time when it seems like Congress can't agree on anything, I am glad that we can show people that there are still issues that bring Democrats and Republicans together. And that's exactly what CSBG has been doing for more than 50 years—bringing Americans together.

For years, these agencies have served as incredible resources to help low-income families escape poverty and better their surrounding communities. These agencies served on the front lines against COVID-19, helping millions of Americans get through the pandemic. Just this past week, I visited the Community Action Partnership of Ramsey and Washington Counties where I saw first-hand the amazing work these people do for my constituents.

H.R. 5129 builds on this success by reinforcing existing efforts to improve the performance and management of Community Action at the federal, state, and local levels.

I would like to thank my friends Congresswoman BONAMICI and Congressman GLENN THOMPSON for advancing this essential legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, H.R. 5129, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act, improves and expands access to the only federal program with the overarching goal of reducing poverty, regardless of

cause or condition. Since Congress established the predecessor of the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "War on Poverty," the program has helped people achieve economic stability, secure meaningful employment and education, gain and improve job-related skills, and obtain housing. Such support is particularly crucial for communities in the Northern Mariana Islands, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa—where poverty rates are significantly higher than in the rest of America. In the Marianas, 52.3 percent of the population is considered low-income, according to census data.

The Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act helps alleviate such poverty by increasing overall funding for the program, updating eligibility guidelines, and eliminating the arbitrary grant allocations to the insular areas. H.R. 5129 provides an increased annual funding level of \$1 billion for the first five years. The bill also permanently raises income eligibility to 200 percent of the poverty line, as temporarily provided in the CARES Act, so more people can get the help they need.

To better align funding allocations to the insular areas to meet its anti-poverty mission, the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act mandates a data-based formula and transparency in how that formula is calculated. Under current law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services possesses total discretion to allocate CSBG funding based on what he or she "believes" the need is in each insular area. This changes under H.R. 5129. Language I included in the bill during the Education and Labor Committee's markup requires the Secretary to base its grant allocations on the most recent census poverty data available. That allocation formula must be published publicly and updated no less frequently than any time new applicable census data are available. Using a regularly updated, poverty-based formula will help ensure communities receive the support necessary to serve individuals and families in need.

At a time when communities nationwide continue to be impacted by the coronavirus pandemic, the improvements to the CSBG program under H.R. 5129 will increase help for the most vulnerable in our communities.

□ 1000

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

Each further amendment printed in part F of House Report 117-320 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 11 of House Resolution 1097, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time after debate for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part F of House Report 117-320, not earlier

disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 11 of House Resolution 1097, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, printed in part F of House Report 117-320, offered by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR OF TEXAS

Page 27, line 2, strike “and” at the end.
Page 27, line 6, strike the period at the end, and insert “; and”.

Page 27, after line 6, insert the following:
“(iii) if appropriate, entities and organizations that support innovative community-based approaches and research driven responses to poverty.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 27, line 2, strike “and” at the end.
Page 27, line 6, insert “and” at the end.
Page 27, after line 6, insert the following:
“(iii) institutions of higher education, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal colleges and universities, and minority-serving institutions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. HAYES OF CONNECTICUT

Page 18, line 12, strike “and” at the end.
Page 18, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 18, after line 25, insert the following:
“(11) an assurance that the State will provide on its website—
“(A) a warning notice to caution individuals that services under this subtitle are provided at no cost and that any questions regarding services provided under this subtitle should be directed to the State’s community services block grant coordinator;
“(B) a warning notice about verified scams or fraudulent activities related to the programs administered under this subtitle; and
“(C) information to direct individuals who believe they have been solicited for such a scam, fraudulent activity, or any form of payment to contact the Department of Health and Human Services’ (HHS) Fraud Hotline.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

Beginning on page 41, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 2 on page 42, and insert the following:

“(iii) activities that train community services network organizations, and their staff and board members, to effectively address the needs of low-income families and communities through place-based strategies that address local causes and conditions of poverty (including health inequities) through coordinated investment and integrated service delivery; and.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 26, line 9, insert “(including behavioral health needs)” after “needs”.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 62, after line 18, insert the following:
“SEC. 686A. GAO STUDY.

“Not later than 180 days after the effective date of the section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study, and submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Service, and the committees of jurisdiction of the Congress the results of, a study of State usage and allocation of funds received under this subtitle over the previous 10-year period—

“(1) to identify the uses, programs, and activities carried out with such funds that had the greatest impact, effectiveness, and results in achieving the purposes for which such funds were provided;

“(2) to identify best practices of States in implementing State plans and providing assistance to community action agencies to carry out activities, so that such practices can be used as models for States to follow to carry out this subtitle in the future; and
“(3) to determine with respect to such funds—

“(A) the amount of such funds received by each State for a particular fiscal year in such 10-year period to carry out its approved State plan, that was not distributed to community action agencies and other eligible entities, and not obligated for subgrants under this subtitle, during such fiscal year;
“(B) the particular disposition by the State of the funds described in subparagraph (A) received by such State;

“(C) the amount of the funds described in subparagraph (A) received by such State that were retained by such State for allowed purposes (including payment of administrative costs to carry out this subtitle); and
“(D) the amount of the funds described in subparagraph (A) received by such State that were expended by the State for a purpose not authorized under this subtitle and identification of each such purpose.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 24, line 14, strike “and” at the end.
Page 24, line 19, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 24, after line 19, insert the following:
“(ix) providing support to eligible entities to identify and respond to food insecurity by assisting them in their efforts—

“(I) to provide nutritious foods to low-income individuals, families, and communities; and
“(II) to support practices that promote healthy living.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Page 63, at the end of line 2, insert the following:

“Home repairs needed to ensure the immediate health and safety of eligible low-income individuals, including energy-related or water-related repairs, shall not be considered to be construction or permanent improvement for purposes of this section.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE OF NEW JERSEY

Page 26, line 13, insert “(which may include needs that arise due to a national or public health emergency)” after “needs”.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 26, line 25, insert “including through prevention and mitigation of trauma,” before “between”.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 18, line 12, strike “and” at the end.
Page 18, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 18, after line 25, insert the following:
“(11) a description of how the State, and eligible entities in the State, will coordinate with other programs related to meeting critical household needs that address the purposes of this subtitle, including with resources that reduce the burden of energy and water utility costs.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 43, line 4, insert “, including analysis of best practices in poverty reduction” before the period at the end.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. WILD OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 20, after line 17, insert the following:
“(f) TRANSPARENCY.—Each eligible entity shall make available to the public on the eligible entity’s website, the entity-wide strategic plan, community needs assessment, and community action plan.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, these amendments en bloc containing additional Democratic amendments from my colleagues continue to improve the implementation of the community services block grant program and strengthens partnerships with communities served by this program.

Ms. ESCOBAR’s amendment adds entities who support innovative community-based approaches and research-driven responses as partners for community action agencies in their work to broaden the resources directed to eliminating poverty.

Ms. ADAMS’ amendment clarifies that institutions of higher education, including HBCUs, TCUs, and MSIs, can be considered as partners for CSBG projects.

Mrs. HAYES’ amendment ensures that States provide notice on their website that CSBG services are offered at no cost and information about fraudulent activity related to CSBG.

Mr. HORSFORD’s amendment adds language regarding Federal activities on place-based poverty alleviating strategies, clarifying that they can address health inequities.

Ms. HOULAHAN’s amendment updates the use of funds to include behavioral health needs that an eligible entity may use CSBG funds for.

Ms. JACKSON LEE’s amendment requires the Comptroller General to conduct a study to identify the uses, programs, and activities that have the greatest impact and uses of funds under the program.

Ms. MOORE’s amendment authorizes States to use their statewide funds to ensure that eligible entities have the necessary supports to address food insecurity needs of low-income individuals, families, and communities.

Mr. PAYNE’s and Ms. TLAIB’s amendments ensure that CSBG funds can be used for home repairs for health and safety, energy, and water for low-income individuals.

Mr. PAYNE's amendment clarifies that CSBG funds can be used to address emergency needs, including emergency needs due to a national or public health emergency.

Ms. PRESSLEY's amendment ensures that eligible entities take into account trauma prevention and mitigation when establishing partnerships to promote healthy communities.

Ms. TLAI'B'S, Mr. PAYNE's, Ms. NEWMAN's, Ms. BARRAGAN's, and Mr. TORRES of New York's amendments add a requirement for the State to describe how the State and eligible entities will coordinate programs related to utility and water assistance services.

Mr. TORRES of New York's amendment revises the reporting requirements of the Community Action Innovations Program to include an analysis of best practices for reducing poverty.

And Ms. WILD's amendment requires that eligible entities post their strategic plan, community needs assessment, and community action plan on their website.

These amendments en bloc contain commonsense proposals that strengthen the underlying bill. I thank my colleagues for their contributions. I strongly urge support of the amendments en bloc and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Speaker, while the amendments before us include some positive reforms to improve accountability and transparency in the community services block grant program, there are unfortunately several problematic amendments in the mix that outweigh the improvements and require me to oppose them when considered together. These amendments are duplicative, add additional requirements to the program, and lessen accountability.

It is critical to streamline anti-poverty programs to make them work for low-income Americans. But instead, these amendments layer on duplication and move us in the opposite direction.

I cannot agree to add more inefficiency to an already ineffective program, and therefore, cannot support the Democrat amendments before us today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will ensure we address the impacts health inequities have on creating and exacerbating poverty within our communities.

As my constituents and far too many Americans know, unequal access to quality healthcare can be financially crushing.

Whether an individual is too sick to work and cannot receive adequate care or the care they received was very expensive and inadequate, we know health inequity is a root cause of poverty in Nevada and across the country.

We cannot combat poverty without recognizing the role that health inequities play to perpetuate the cycle of poverty.

Through my work coleading the Ways and Means Committee's Racial Equity Initiative, I have seen firsthand just how valuable data can be when we are examining disparities.

In our healthcare system, the data speaks for itself. In my State of Nevada, African Americans and Latinos are twice as likely as their White counterparts to develop asthma. This and other chronic illnesses exacerbate disparities due to their inherently pervasive nature.

To combat this, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the CSBG Modernization Act in a bipartisan manner.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment that ensures that States and other eligible entities under the Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022 can utilize funds for behavioral health purposes.

These past 2 years have had a devastating effect on the physical and mental health of people across the Nation, especially those who live in poverty or in under-resourced areas.

In my district, we have seen hospitals shuttered, families suffer, and young people facing unprecedented mental health challenges.

By adding explicit language on behavioral health to this bill, we underscore the heightened need for increased resources to reach those that are underserved and most at risk.

Thankfully, recipients like my home State of Pennsylvania are already receiving funding through this grant program to alleviate the causes of poverty and provide opportunities for employment.

But the community services block grant program must emphasize that in order for States to truly attack the root causes of poverty, they must address the rising rate of mental illness and substance abuse disorders.

Just yesterday, the CDC announced that there were more than 100,000 drug overdoses in 2021, a record high, and a 15 percent increase from 2020. This data shows that something must change.

We all know that for people to participate meaningfully in the workforce and to achieve self-sufficiency, they need the tools, first and foremost, to address their physical, mental, and behavioral health.

As a prior businessowner, I understand the importance of this firsthand, because America thrives when our workers thrive.

Community services block grants have been successful in supporting those who are most underserved across our communities for decades.

Let's, please, build on this mission and ensure that the program meets the needs of our diverse 21st century communities and workers.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer an amendment to protect communities from malicious scams surrounding the community services block grant program.

The CSBG program is absolutely critical to the empowerment of vulnerable communities. Funding from the CSBG program has helped nine community action agencies in my State serve 107,000 families and 260,000 individuals.

It has helped over 81,000 households avoid crisis with energy assistance and nearly 17,000 people avoid hunger with emergency or supplemental food and enrolled 5,600 children in early childcare services.

Additionally, these agencies have helped nearly 11,000 people file their income taxes, returning \$8.5 million to my State's economy.

CSBG programs empower our communities' most vulnerable, which is why they are always offered free of charge.

However, scammers across the country falsely purport to offer CSBG services for a fee, preying on those in our community when they are most in need of help. We have seen a proliferation of fraud and scams throughout the COVID-19 pandemic when emergency Federal dollars were sent to States.

These scams are illegal and morally reprehensible. It is our responsibility to ensure our communities are properly informed to combat predatory schemes. It is our responsibility to reinforce guardrails to protect the integrity of these programs and ensure they fulfill their promises to our communities.

My amendment would require that States provide easily accessible warnings about verified scams as well as information on where to seek recourse should someone believe they are the victim of a CSBG-related scam.

Making this information available will ensure that CSBG can continue to provide lifesaving services to communities without being subject to greed and mal-intent. This is a simple, commonsense amendment that the Congressional Budget Office has certified as budget neutral.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment and the underlying legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the manager of the legislation and chairman of the committee for this important legislation.

The Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act is extremely important. As we all know, this bipartisan bill will bring about an enhanced ability to serve the community.

The CSBG moneys are particularly important not only to rural areas but to urban areas. They are important as they relate to many issues, such as in my community dealing with overcoming disasters. Those dollars are utilized to ensure housing.

I include in the RECORD an article entitled, "Black communities are last in line for disaster planning in Texas" and an article entitled, "5 years after Hurricane Harvey, many in Houston are still waiting for help."

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 2022]

BLACK COMMUNITIES ARE LAST IN LINE FOR DISASTER PLANNING IN TEXAS

HOUSTON.—Lawrence Hester worries every time it rains.

During heavy storms, water overflows the dirt drainage ditch fronting his yard and the bayou at the end of his block—flooding the street, creeping up his front steps, pooling beneath the house, and trapping his family inside.

"We are always underwater here," said Hester, 61.

And yet, the state of Texas allocated none of the \$1 billion in federal funds it received to protect communities from future disasters to neighborhoods in Houston that flood regularly, according to an investigation by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

HUD has now found the exclusion of those majority Black and Hispanic urban communities to be discriminatory. The state "shifted money away from the areas and people that needed it the most," disproportionately benefiting White residents living in smaller towns, the agency concluded.

Houston has faced seven federally declared disasters in the last seven years and suffered an estimated \$2 billion in damage from Hurricane Harvey in 2017. That storm devastated Kashmere Gardens, where Hester has lived his entire life. The floodwaters from Harvey deposited black mold throughout Hester's home and left his daughter chronically short of breath.

The state, which is appealing HUD's findings, denied discriminating, saying the Texas General Land Office administered the federal grant program based on HUD approval.

The situation in Texas illustrates the challenge facing the Biden administration, which has pledged to focus on racial equity but is struggling to protect low-income communities of color from the growing threat of climate change. Even after HUD's finding of discrimination, the agency said it does not have the power at this time to suspend the rest of the \$4.3 billion in disaster mitigation money awarded to the state under criteria approved by the Trump administration.

"What is happening here with these federal dollars going through the state and not one dime coming to the City of Houston post-Hurricane Harvey is absolutely crazy, and it cannot be justified," said Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner. "What do I say to the people in Kashmere Gardens when these storms keep coming, and we are not putting in the

infrastructure that they desperately need to mitigate the risk of future flooding?"

Black and Hispanic communities in northeast Houston, including Kashmere Gardens, are especially vulnerable to the more frequent storms and catastrophic flooding expected due to climate change, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Many of the residential streets lack curbs and gutters—common storm drainage infrastructure in predominantly White neighborhoods in Houston—and rely instead on open ditches dating back to the 1930s.

"Sometimes we can't get out because the water is so high," said Jackie Spradley, Hester's wife. "You're literally trapped until the water starts to subside." She can't get to work. Their 12-year-old daughter can't get to school.

The whoosh of traffic and trains permeates the triangular neighborhood of modest single-family homes penned between two highways and two sets of railroad tracks. During large storms, runoff from impervious highway surfaces flows onto residential streets.

Piles of trash—old tires, mattresses, furniture, home insulation—accumulate for weeks in the drainage ditches along many streets, blocking water from flowing through the ditches to the bayou. Silt and other debris clog many of the culverts beneath narrow driveways and footpaths spanning the ditches. In the summers, standing water breeds mosquitoes.

The city of Houston had hoped to use \$95 million in federal grants to upgrade Kashmere Gardens' storm drainage infrastructure. The proposed improvements, including converting some of the ditches to a curb and gutter system, would have removed the flood risk to nearly 1,400 properties.

But without the money, the city shelved those plans.

Hester's daughter Ashlei was 7 years old in 2017 when Harvey floodwaters breached their family room, lapping at the legs of the card table on which the family played dominoes. Her cough worsened, and doctors prescribed four different medications for asthma. She was hospitalized in 2018 for more than a week. But doctors still did not know what was causing her illness.

It wasn't until December 2019, more than two years after Harvey, when Hester and his wife discovered the black mold that was making their daughter so sick. A city inspector recommended that the house be condemned.

"I was so ashamed," Hester said. "We didn't have nowhere else to go."

His mother had purchased the home in 1960, paying the mortgage with wages from her job flipping burgers 16 hours a day. Hester was born in the house months later.

He had stayed in the house after Hurricane Alicia flooded the home in 1983. And after Ike in 2008. Even after Harvey, Hester stayed, hoping to someday pass the three-bedroom ranch-style home onto his daughter.

But Hester, who is on disability for herniated disks in his back and neck from his years as a long-haul truck driver, and his wife, who sells insurance, never had the money to adequately repair the storm-ravaged roof and mold-covered walls.

Hester said the city informed him after Harvey that he was ineligible for funding to fix the home because of unpaid property taxes.

"It's not just about the storm drainage," Hester said. "It's about everything."

Hester said that the rainbow-hued oily waters he had splashed in while playing in the drainage ditches as a child had been polluted with cancer-causing creosote used to treat wooden railroad ties and utility poles. A 2019 state health department investigation

confirmed elevated cancer rates among residents in the southern end of Kashmere Gardens, located near two Superfund sites. Residents fear that flooding will carry toxic deposits into their yards.

Hester's mother had died of cancer. So had his father. And one of his brothers. "Cancer is killing the whole neighborhood," said Hester, who is too afraid to visit the doctor about his own health problems.

Federal disaster mitigation grants are supposed to improve the inferior flood infrastructure in lower income communities. But the HUD investigation found that competition rules set by the Texas General Land Office unfairly favored smaller towns with less urgent needs and where residents are more likely to be White and less likely to be lower income.

The state knowingly adopted scoring criteria that prioritized lower-density areas and excluded communities that HUD designated as the most impacted by disasters from half the grants, HUD said.

"Because the criteria had these unjustified discriminatory effects, their use failed to comply with HUD's regulations," the agency found.

No other state adopted Texas' method of distributing the funds, according to HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. The agency concluded that without Texas's discriminatory criteria, nearly four times as many Black residents and more than twice as many Hispanic residents would have benefited from the grants.

The General Land Office said in its April 1 appeal that the state "does not discriminate, and the projects it has funded help minority beneficiaries across Texas." The state said more than two-thirds of residents in communities that received awards are Black, Hispanic or Asian. The state pointed out that its plan was approved two years ago and characterized HUD's new objections as "politically motivated."

In addition to Houston and surrounding Harris County, the General Land Office denied grants to the predominantly Black and Hispanic cities of Port Arthur, Beaumont and Corpus Christi as well as Jefferson and Nueces counties—all of which experienced significant flooding from Harvey, according to the civil rights complaint. Texas Housers, a nonprofit focused on housing in low-income communities, and Northeast Action Collective, a grassroots advocacy group of Houston residents, filed the complaint with HUD last year.

Instead, funds were steered toward inland, Whiter communities that were far less severely impacted by hurricanes and used to fund routine infrastructure, the complaint said. That includes \$17.5 million for a new community center in Caldwell County that is supposed to double as an evacuation center; \$10.8 million to install a sewage system in the 379-person town of Iola; \$6 million for a new sheriff's department radio tower and radios for Gonzales County; and \$4.2 million for a 2,000-foot-long road in Bastrop County to connect a Walmart parking lot and a Home Depot, justified as an alternate path for emergency vehicles in case the adjacent freeway is clogged with hurricane evacuees from the Gulf Coast 161 miles away.

"These mitigation funds are a strategy to undo the systemic racism of the past, but that's not what we're seeing Texas interested in at all," said John Henneberger, co-director of Texas Housers. "This is a test of how serious HUD and the Biden administration are in enforcing civil rights."

HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development, which oversees disaster mitigation aid, wrote to the Texas General Land Office in March expressing "grave concerns" over the distribution of the first round of

grants. “The State has not identified a plan to protect communities while guarding against competition criteria that could disadvantage minority residents,” HUD wrote. If a voluntary resolution cannot be reached, HUD said it could refer the matter to the Department of Justice for enforcement.

But advocates worry that could come too late for communities like Kashmere Gardens.

While HUD said it cannot stop the state from awarding the rest of the grants “due to prior decisions,” it would begin monitoring how the money is distributed and warned it could claw back the funds if necessary.

“Texas has a history of sending money to those who are politically connected,” said Shannon Van And, a professor of urban planning at Texas A.M. University whose research focuses on hazard reduction and housing. She noted that racial disparities occurred with the distribution of disaster funds after Hurricane Ike in 2008.

Civil rights advocates say HUD has the authority to suspend Texas’s ability to spend federal grant money; it has done so under previous administrations. But Sara Pratt, former deputy assistant secretary in HUD’s fair housing office who is now representing Texas Housers as an attorney, said there is longstanding division among HUD staff over enforcing civil rights violations when making funding decisions.

“There is deep disagreement internally,” Pratt said. “The secretary’s job is to resolve disputes like this.”

HUD Secretary Marcia L. Fudge declined to comment because the Texas investigation remains open, HUD spokesman Michael Burns said.

“Her commitment to civil rights and fair housing is well documented and unwavering, and she is committed to ensuring that all HUD funds are used in compliance with all relevant laws and program requirements,” Burns said.

In response to widespread criticism over how the first \$1 billion in Harvey disaster grants was distributed, Texas now plans to allocate \$750 million to Harris County. Houston is due to receive an additional \$9 million out of \$488 million that the state plans to send to the Houston-Galveston region.

City officials point out that the \$9 million amounts to less than one tenth of the cost of its proposed improvements to Kashmere Gardens.

In Kashmere Gardens on a recent morning after a thunderstorm inundated streetside drainage ditches, bulldozers and dump trucks worked to widen and deepen Hunting Bayou to absorb runoff from future storms.

The work is a small portion of a \$2.5 billion flood protection bond that Harris County passed in 2018. The bulk of the bond money was directed to wealthier neighborhoods because the county expected to receive federal disaster funds for poorer ones, according to county commissioner Rodney Ellis.

But without money to upgrade the ditch system to drain storm water from neighborhood streets, it’s unclear if the bayou expansion will be effective.

“This is the Texas two-step in Houston. You have to get the water from the neighborhoods to the bayous. And then you have to get the water from the bayous to the Gulf of Mexico,” said Ellis, who represents the area.

Residents, too, remain skeptical.

“It’s a wait and see situation,” said Dorothy Wanza, another Kashmere Gardens resident whose street turned into a river during Harvey and flooded her home with more than a foot of water. The experience left the 80-year-old so traumatized that “every time it rains, I get the hell out of dodge.”

She spent the previous night fully dressed, prepared to evacuate to one of her children’s

homes. “The ditches overflow, and once they are full, the water comes back on you,” Wanza said.

On the other side of the bayou, Hester said the city had recently cleaned out part of a ditch lining his street for the first time he could recall in more than a decade. Dirt and bricks still block some of the culverts.

“Right up under there, look,” he said, pointing beneath the concrete walkway leading from the street to his front yard. “It’s stopped up on both sides.”

He nodded farther down the street to another culvert: “That whole drain hole was flooded.” He and his next door neighbor had removed as many bricks as they could to move the water through. “If we don’t do things around here, ain’t nothing going to get done. I have to go around here and try to help, and I’m in bad shape myself.”

Hester limped around the perimeter of his home and pointed two feet up the siding where Harvey floodwaters had reached—a reminder of the catastrophe he says he failed to protect his daughter from.

A nonprofit had removed the mold inside when it fixed up the house in 2020, installing new cabinets, a new roof and laminate flooring.

But the entryway still slopes. The floor joists need to be repaired. The porch is lopsided, its wood rotted.

Hester is stooped from years of pain. Yet he remains intent on doing what he can to make things right.

“It’s not my life I’m worried about. It’s my daughter’s,” Hester said. “I’m half dead.”

[From Grist, April 14, 2022]

5 YEARS AFTER HURRICANE HARVEY, MANY IN HOUSTON ARE STILL WAITING FOR HELP

In Billy Guevara’s neighborhood on the northeast side of Houston, people get nervous when it rains. Old ditches strain under the deluge of a Gulf storm, and mud and water fill the streets. Guevara, a writer who is blind, once had a seeing-eye dog that would navigate around the ankle-deep puddles and lingering muck. “It became unsafe because I ended up having to walk almost in the middle of the street,” he said. “It stays there for days.”

Guevara is a member of the Northeast Action Collective, a community group pushing the city and Harris County for equitable investments in flood control. He says drainage in his neighborhood of Lakewood is outdated: “It cannot handle the type of rain that we see now.” When Hurricane Harvey hit in 2017, homes across many of northeast Houston’s Black and Hispanic neighborhoods flooded, swamped under 30 inches of rain in what was the country’s costliest disaster that year. Under the rush of water, one of the walls in Guevara’s home began to bulge out.

Years after Harvey, little aid has made it to the people of Houston. The federal government budgeted some \$9.3 billion so that communities could not only rebuild, but also better prepare for the next storm. But city and regional governments have delivered little of those funds, and a state agency’s “competition” has held back aid that the Department of Housing and Urban Development designated for post-Harvey mitigation, money which would have helped upgrade drainage systems. As a result, low-income communities like Guevara’s have been left out of much-needed infrastructure improvements.

Without their fair share of aid, communities struggling to rebuild will be just as vulnerable when the next storm comes, advocates say. These obstacles also expose weaknesses in HUD’s recently created mitigation program, which aims to help reduce risks from future climate disasters.

Hurricane Harvey flooded nearly 100,000 homes in Houston, inflicting \$16 billion in residential damage. Guevara had growing mold, damaged floors, and a leaking pipe. With a small FEMA grant and the help of local nonprofits, he was eventually able to repair his home.

But today, thousands in Houston still wait for funds to rebuild. Disaster recovery aid through HUD often comes with significant delays since the program is ad hoc, requiring Congress to approve spending for each disaster. In 2018, HUD allocated \$5 billion to Texas through its Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery program, which is designed to help with long-term rebuilding.

HUD had sent the money to the Texas General Land Office, or GLO, the state agency run by George P. Bush, grandson of former President George H. W. Bush, which is responsible for public lands, mineral rights, and the Alamo historical site, as well as disaster recovery. In turn, the state agency gave Houston’s share to the city, but didn’t entirely relinquish control, continuing to oversee how funds were doled out. The city and state agency squabbled over how to run things, and when HUD began an audit of the program, the fight escalated, eventually making its way to the Texas Supreme Court. In October 2020, the feud ended with the state seizing control of the program.

All the while, many residents remained in dangerous living conditions, stuck in homes with leaking roofs and mold-filled walls, said Becky Selle, a codirector at the grassroots group West Street Recovery. It’s unclear whether those waiting will ever get assistance. In January, when HUD published its audit, only 297 of nearly 8,800 applicants had received funds. (The state has until August 2025 to use the money.)

The struggle to access federal aid extended far beyond homeowner’s assistance. Harvey was among the first disasters for which HUD’s Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery program made money available for mitigation projects like widening bayous, upgrading water and sewer systems, or buying out flood-prone homes. This marked a major shift: While disaster recovery funds had to be tied to damage from a specific disaster, the \$4.3 billion mitigation fund could be used to improve conditions, making communities safer.

Houston and Harris County accounted for more than half of Texas’ damage from Hurricane Harvey, but when the GLO released its spending plan in December 2019, city officials feared Houston wouldn’t get its fair share.

Because there weren’t enough funds for every proposed project, the state’s land office set up a competition in which jurisdictions would apply for a slice of the \$1 billion in the initial round. HUD identified 20 mainly coastal counties, including Harris County, that were most distressed by Hurricane Harvey and would be eligible for funds. The land office then expanded the list, adding counties that fell under the umbrella of the original FEMA disaster declaration in 2017. That more than doubled the list with more rural, inland counties like Milam, 200 miles from the coast.

When results from the competition came out last May, Houston didn’t get a cent. The city’s requests for \$470 million worth of projects, like flood control in the majority-Black neighborhoods Sunnyside and Kashmere Gardens, were rejected. So was the \$200 million watershed improvement plan for the flood-prone Halls Bayou, which is surrounded by some of Houston’s poorest neighborhoods. “For the State GLO not to give one dime in the initial distribution to the city and a very small portion to Harris County shows a callous disregard to the people of

Houston and Harris County,” Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner said in a statement at the time.

Instead, funds largely went to smaller, whiter, inland towns. They went to drainage upgrades in Rockdale, a two-hour drive northwest of Houston, and sewage improvements in Nixon, a small town outside San Antonio that emerged from Harvey unscathed and sheltered evacuees fleeing the storm. “The more that we’re giving this money to inland counties and jurisdictions, we are actually taking away from where we truly need the money and where the money was originally intended to assist communities,” said Julia Orduña, the southeast Texas regional director at Texas Housers, a low-income housing group.

After the snub, the city of Houston hoped for a second chance when the Houston-Galveston Area Council, a regional council spanning 13 counties, planned to deal out its own pool of the funds. But in February, the council granted just 2 percent of its \$488 million to the city, which represents around 30 percent of the council’s population.

According to the council, Houston and Harris County didn’t need much more than that because the GLO planned to grant the county a direct payment of \$750 million—a promise only made after the first competition received intense criticism. But that wasn’t a fair consideration, according to Mayor Turner, since that grant had yet to be approved.

Last June, the Northeast Action Collective and Texas Housers filed a civil rights complaint with HUD, alleging that the GLO discriminated against Black and Hispanic residents. In a recent letter sharing the findings of its investigation, the federal agency sided with the organizations, saying the competition “substantially and predictably disadvantaged minority residents, with particularly disparate outcomes for Black residents.”

A major issue, according to HUD, was that the state agency split the competition in two. Half the funds were reserved for counties that the federal government had identified as hardest hit by Harvey—where Black and Hispanic residents were most likely to live—while the other half went to more rural, inland counties included on the state’s expanded list, which tended to be whiter.

At minimum, HUD required that half of the funds would go to communities on its list of hardest-hit counties. While the state agency met that requirement, dividing the competition in two also meant awards to those counties would be capped at 50 percent. But those counties represented 90 percent of the population in the entire competition, amounting to much less money available for Black and Hispanic residents.

After the winners were announced in May 2021, GLO spokeswoman Brittany Eck backed the results in a statement to the Houston Chronicle. “It is important that Texas inland counties are resilient as they provide vital assistance to our coastal communities during events such as asset staging, evacuations, sheltering, and emergency response/recovery,” she said.

The competition favored smaller communities. A flood control project in Houston’s mostly Black and Hispanic neighborhood of Kashmere Gardens, HUD’s letter explained, would have helped 8,845 residents. But Houston’s total population is 2.3 million, so the project scored less than 1 out of 10 points because it would help only a small percentage of residents. On the other hand, the city of Iola applied for a wastewater project that all 379 of its residents would gain from. It scored 10 out of 10, and the project was funded.

In an email to Grist, Eck accused the federal agency of “blatant political theater.”

She said GLO has complied with HUD’s requirements, and now it’s being faulted for not “going above and beyond” to benefit even more minority residents than it already has. Eck said the land office is appealing HUD’s findings.

“GLO did not engage in discrimination, and HUD’s allegations amount to nothing more than unlawful attempts to ‘second-guess’ GLO’s open and transparent competition process, which was approved by HUD,” Eck said.

When the state agency’s spending plan was still a draft, Madison Sloan, director of the disaster recovery and fair housing project at Texas Appleseed, a public interest justice center, sent a letter detailing concerns that its scoring system would divert money from the hardest-hit areas. “I don’t want to deny that communities all over the state need mitigation,” she said. “But when you look at where the damage was, where people are most vulnerable, it is the coast. What this represents is a missed opportunity to do some really largescale, meaningful mitigation on the coast that’s going to protect a lot of people.”

These problems aren’t limited to Houston. Along the coast, other cities hit hard by Hurricane Harvey, like Beaumont, Corpus Christi, and Port Arthur, lost out in the competition. In Port Arthur, where the poverty rate is twice the national average, floods propelled by nearly 50 inches of rain devastated the housing stock. Decades of underinvestment have eroded residents’ ability to recover from disasters, said Michelle Smith, marketing director at the Community In-Power and Development Association, Inc., an environmental justice group in the city. Some decided to leave Port Arthur entirely because “they had nothing to come back to,” she said. So it stung when the city’s proposal for a \$97 million drainage project was rejected.

Without these funds, communities that were poorly equipped for Harvey are just as vulnerable to the next storm. “This is an ongoing thing,” Smith said. “With each hurricane, we continue to suffer because we’re not able to recover. The little bit that we can salvage is then taken away again and again and again.”

Sloan thinks the whole situation exposes fissures in HUD’s mitigation program. It’s largely up to states to decide how to divvy up funds, but studies are needed in advance to ensure fair distribution, she said. That doesn’t just benefit the vulnerable; it could make the coast, as a whole, more resilient.

“Funding to areas where vulnerable people of color live is going to benefit plenty of white people, plenty of higher-income people who also live in those areas,” she said. “In this case, in general, equity means everyone wins.”

After backlash followed the first competition, the state’s land office announced that it would give the remaining funds to regional bodies like the Houston-Galveston Area Council to distribute—the same entity that offered Houston a minuscule amount of federal aid. “The GLO’s solution to not doing a second competition was pushing the responsibility to local jurisdictions,” said Orduña, who felt the new plan does not rectify HUD’s allegations of discrimination.

There will be other storms to come, and Congress will eventually allocate more money to rebuild from them. When that happens, Billy Guevara, of the Northeast Action Collective, worries all the talk and reports will have been just that. “That’s our biggest fear,” he said. “Being overlooked again.”

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, my amendment is extremely important. Very quickly, it deals with ac-

countability and performance improvement. These are the objectives of my amendment.

My amendment also deals with making sure, through a GAO study, that CSBG has performed well; which programmatic activities, services, and other uses of funds were the most effective and had the greatest positive impact; which administrative, organizational, structural, and operational strategies and tactics that were deployed were most successful; how much of the CSBG funds were allocated to States for distribution to and use by community action agencies; and whether these grants retained by each State exceeded the percentage of such funds that were allowed to be retained.

In effect, the GAO would be conducting a performance audit of this program to position it for a fresh start by determining the extent to which these funds reached their intended beneficiaries. Many times, minorities, though it was directed for them, are disadvantaged because of the agency.

Finally, the net result will be transparency and improvement so that others will be served and helped. I thank you for including it in the amendments en bloc.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5129, the “Community Service Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022.” I applaud Leadership for bringing H.R. 5129—which has strong bipartisan support—to the Floor for consideration and votes.

For decades, the Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) has fueled a wide range of anti-poverty programs, activities, and services across the country. It has been profoundly beneficial, improving countless lives by helping Americans who are most in need of an assist, enabling them to rise up and access the path to a better quality-of-life.

H.R. 5129 not only provides a long-overdue reauthorization of the program; it also improves the CSBG in many ways, including by adding systems that will enhance the program’s transparency, accountability, and evaluations in the future.

Accountability and performance improvement are also the objectives of the Jackson Lee amendment, through additional mechanisms. My amendment would direct the Comptroller General of the GAO to study how the CSBG has performed over the past ten years, focusing on:

which programmatic activities, services, and other uses of funds were the most effective and had the greatest positive impact on individuals and communities that the CSBG was designed to serve;

which administrative, organizational, structural, and operational strategies and tactics that were deployed by states were the most productive, efficient, and successful, such that they should be considered as “best practices” for replication by other states going forward;

how much of CSBG funds that were allocated to states for distribution to, and use by, Community Action Agencies and other eligible entities were not fully disbursed by states to those intended recipients; and

whether CSBG funds retained by each state exceeded the percentage of such funds that were allowed to be retained by the state for

administrative and other permissible purposes, the amount that was retained in excess of what was allowed, and to what other uses those funds were applied or to what other account were they transmitted.

In effect, the GAO would be conducting a "performance audit" of the CSBG program to position it for a fresh start, citing its strengths and shortcomings, and making recommendations that will help states optimize their efforts in the years ahead.

By determining the extent to which CSBG funds reached their intended beneficiaries and fulfilled their intended purpose, we will see which states have been conscientiously administering the program, which could help calibrate future strategies to structure and monitor the program.

The net result is that the GAO study and report provided by the Jackson Lee amendment will provide transparency and accountability to the program's recent past performance. The findings will enable the program, and the states that administer it, to learn from the past, adjust their programs to maximize results, and revitalize their efforts for each state's next chapter of CSBG performance.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for bringing this very important bipartisan legislation to the floor today.

I urge all my colleagues to support the bill, including the Jackson Lee amendment and the entire en bloc amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, once again, I reiterate that these amendments en bloc contain commonsense proposals that strengthen the underlying bill. I appreciate my colleagues for their contributions and their strong support of improving access to services, combating poverty, and uplifting low-income people in our communities.

I strongly urge support of the amendments en bloc and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

My friends at home tell me all the time that they believe common sense is in short supply in Washington. I completely agree with them. It is practically nonexistent on the other side.

Madam Speaker, we can exercise common sense by focusing on reforming the Federal safety net so that programs pull people out of poverty and into self-sufficiency and not encouraging them to stay in dependency on the Federal Government. Adding more duplication and bureaucracy to the CSBG program will not accomplish that goal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 11 of House Resolution 1097, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 5, and 10, printed in part F of House Report 117-320, offered by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOOD OF VIRGINIA

Page 28, after line 6, insert the following: "(e) PROHIBITION.—Funds made available to carry out this subtitle shall not be used to provide direct payment or reimbursement for any health care services."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN OF WISCONSIN

Page 27, line 18, strike "200 percent of". Beginning on page 27, strike line 24 and all that follows through line 6 on page 28, and insert the following:

"(2) Whenever a State determines that it serves the objectives of the block grant program established under this subtitle, the State may revise the poverty line not to exceed 125 percent of the poverty line otherwise applicable under this paragraph."

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCLAIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 64 line 17, strike "or" at the end. Page 64, line 21, strike the period at the end and insert "or".

Page 64, after line 21, insert the following: "(C) any voter registration activity."

Page 65, line 5, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Page 65, after line 4, insert the following:

"(c) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING.—No funds available to carry out this subtitle shall be used, directly or indirectly, to influence the issuance, amendment, or revocation of any executive order or similar promulgation by any Federal, State, or local agency, or to undertake to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress, or by any State or local legislative body, or State proposals by initiative petition, except that the representatives of the entity may testify or make other appropriate communication—

"(1) when formally requested to do so by a legislative body, a committee, or a member of the body or committee; or

"(2) in connection with legislation or appropriations directly affecting the activities of the entity."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this en bloc includes several amendments that I believe would vastly improve the underlying legislation.

First, one of the included amendments will address a critical concern. I cannot support any legislation that opens the door for taxpayer funding of abortion, and this bill opens that door. The legislation includes vague language allowing program funds to address health needs and improve health and well-being. While this might sound nice at first blush, it hides a huge problem. I am concerned that instead of helping people receive high-quality healthcare, it will lead to taxpayer dollars funding abortions.

The majority of Americans oppose seeing their hard-earned dollars go to pay for abortions, and we must do all in our power to stop that from ever happening. This amendment will make sure that no taxpayer dollars are used to reimburse healthcare services. It will also ensure that taxpayer dollars are not used for experimental gender hormone medications or other harmful gender medical interventions.

Additionally, this amendment takes the commonsense steps to prohibit taxpayer dollars from funding lobbying activities and voter registration activities. H.R. 5129 would allow program funds to be used for voter registration efforts. While getting more eligible individuals registered to vote is a worthy goal, we should not jeopardize the integrity of this program or let the next election distract from serving low-income Americans.

Finally, this amendment ensures that limited Federal funds are spent on those Americans most in need by maintaining the poverty threshold that exists in current law. Increasing this threshold will just expand the pool of eligible participants and stretch resources thinner. We need to tailor the program to ensure that Federal dollars serve those most in need.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support this group of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to these amendments en bloc. The amendments contained in this en bloc are either a distraction from the bipartisan work we are doing today or fundamentally undermine the improvements we are putting forth in this legislation. Notably, this en bloc includes yet another Republican attack on women's rights and liberty.

Instead of focusing on what we have accomplished together to strengthen this program in a bipartisan way, some of my colleagues across the aisle are trying to further divide us. Madam Speaker, it has been 24 years since the last reauthorization of the community services block grant program in 1998.

Our communities need a comprehensive reauthorization, not a partisan controversy that will delay the urgent need to renew this program.

From the beginning of the program, community action agencies have addressed the health needs of low-income individuals in their communities, particularly important to rural communities. The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, which first authorized the community action program, the predecessor to CSBG, specifies that such program shall be conducted in those fields with the purposes of this part, including employment, job training and counseling, and health, indicating that health has always been and continues to be a core part of addressing poverty conditions that is the central mission of these agencies.

Additionally, this en bloc would seek to strip out language from H.R. 5129 allowing CAAs, community action agencies, to serve individuals up to 200 percent of the Federal poverty line.

Congress supported, in a bipartisan manner, allowing community action agencies to serve individuals up to 200 percent of the poverty line to provide flexibility during the COVID-19 pandemic. The CARES Act, for example, the FY 2022 Labor/HHS appropriations bill, and the recently passed omnibus all included an allowance for CAAs to serve individuals up to 200 percent of the poverty line.

The CSBG statute, which we know now is more than 20 years out of date, sets the income eligibility for CSBG services at 100 percent of the official poverty line or 125 percent if the State chooses. Currently, the very low-income eligibility criteria—this is equivalent to about \$27,180 for a single person in 2022—for CSBG creates a cliff. Individuals will be cut off from public assistance and services as soon as they make a dime over the income threshold.

We must remember that community action agencies are unique, as they do not operate a single program. Rather, CAAs operate and often coordinate an array of Federal, State, and local programs, all with varying eligibility requirements. For example, more than half of community action agencies operate the Weatherization Assistance Program. That uses 200 percent of the poverty income guidance as the eligibility criteria.

I will share a story of Daniel from North Dakota. When the pandemic struck, Daniel was working in a fast-food restaurant, and his hours were reduced. With his employment income, he is above the statutory 125 percent, but below the 200 percent flexibility Congress has provided with bipartisan support. Unfortunately, Daniel's housing was unstable, and he was couch surfing. He received case management to assist with his housing search. Through CSBG funds provided under the CARES Act, he received assistance with a security deposit in February of 2021. With this assistance, Daniel has

maintained stable housing for over a year.

Madam Speaker, Daniel's story is just one example of why raising the Federal poverty level eligibility to 200 percent is so critical to this legislation. Unlike the underlying legislation, these amendments en bloc would weaken CSBG, or it offers solutions in search of problems.

One of the needless proposals in this en bloc actually duplicates the current funding restriction in the bill and statute for voter registration activities which, of course, are nonpartisan activities.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to support a bipartisan CSBG reauthorization and the important work of community action agencies in our communities. These amendments en bloc would move us backward. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject these amendments in this en bloc and support the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court seems poised to finally, mercifully, reverse the only decision in the history of the Court that has cost more than 60 million precious innocent lives which, by the way, beyond the moral travesty, has contributed massively to our labor shortages and Social Security and Medicare being on the verge of bankruptcy.

In typical fashion, Democrats are revealing who they are with their response, and their unlawful protests and intimidation tactics at the homes of the Justices, while the administration and their allies in this body cheer them on.

Democrats can't win at the ballot box or through the legislative process, so they try to eliminate the electoral college, rig election laws, eliminate the filibuster, pack the Supreme Court, pack the Senate, give statehood to D.C. and Puerto Rico, and now threaten Justices at their homes.

This is because Democrats are the radical extremists on abortion. They have become the party of death. Their position is abortion at any time, for any reason, up to and beyond the moment of birth, with taxpayers being forced to fund it.

I didn't hear any Democrats criticize the former Governor of Virginia when he said a couple of years ago that a mother and her doctor can have a conversation after a baby is born and decide whether or not to kill it.

I say, let's have this fight in this Congress.

We had an election 6 months ago in purple Virginia when everyone knew that the Supreme Court would be reviewing *Roe v. Wade*, and the party of death got trounced in that election.

Republicans must embrace this moment and stand for life, expose Democrats for the radical extremists they are, and work to end the brutal, hor-

rific practice of abortion. To Democrats, I say bring it on. Let Democrats defend piercing a baby's skull and sucking out its brains, tearing an infant limb from limb, or burning it alive with a saline injection. Call it what it is and call them out for supporting abortion with no restrictions whatsoever.

Just this week, Democrats pushed another failed abortion-on-demand vote in the Senate, a bill that passed this House with no Republican votes but, sadly, all but one Democrat supporting it, as they try to ensure that America remains among the most extreme nations in the world with the most radical laws on abortion.

Now, this current piece of legislation will permit Federal dollars to be used to harm the unborn, as it includes a provision that allows taxpayer dollars to be used to "address health needs and improve health and well-being" and "to identify and respond to physical and behavioral health challenges."

However, a recent Marist poll found that 54 percent of Americans oppose using taxpayer dollars to fund abortions.

My amendment would protect taxpayers from being forced to pay for abortions, even if Hyde were repealed. If this bill is not intended to fund abortion, then accept and pass my amendment.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I have a lot to say in response to the gentleman, but I am going to take a deep breath and say, this is a bill about helping to lift low-income Americans out of poverty. It is a bipartisan bill we have been working on for many years. It is time to update the community services block grant program and help lift low-income Americans in Oregon and across the country out of poverty.

I oppose these amendments en bloc, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose them. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN.)

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Madam Speaker, I would agree with my colleague across the aisle, this bill should be about lifting families out of poverty and providing hope to underserved communities. Let's do that, and let's actually for once in agreement, let's put our money where our mouth is and let's actually make sure that the dollars are actually used for what the bill intends them to be used for.

We should not be blurring lines between workforce issues and political campaigns. This isn't a political campaign, correct? Facilities used for community service block grants should not be open to political activities during operation hours. Sadly, this is exactly what my colleagues on the other side want, and they are notorious for talking about a bill and then packing it full of something that has nothing to do with the bill. So let's do what we say we are going to do and actually help the communities.

□ 1030

Where does this end? This is the foot in the door to allow real partisan action to be commingled with Federal programs. We have a clear example of this that is happening today.

Need I remind everyone about ACORN? That should be example enough to illustrate why this is a terrible idea but, apparently, not for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

My amendment is simple. It would remove the troubling language in this bill that allows taxpayer-funded community action centers to be used to increase voting registration.

Let's keep the bill to what you say it is going to be. It would also prohibit community service block grant funds from any lobbying activities. Again, let's actually use the funds for the people in the community, not the politics.

We all want eligible Americans to register to vote and actually get to the polls on election day. But that is not the purpose of the community block grants. This bill should not blur the lines between educational and political activities.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

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

Madam Speaker, there are certainly many concerns over this bill. The one that I would like to highlight today is that they are greatly increasing the expansion of eligibility for the bill.

Now, that doesn't necessarily mean the bill is going to make things more expensive, but you know very well if we are going to bring a whole lot of new areas into the bill, if we don't increase the spending, the areas that are currently part of the community services block grant are going to go down.

I don't believe the majority party is going to let anybody go down, which means this bill anticipates a significant increase in spending on this program. This is one of many programs that I would argue, under the Constitution, really even should not be a Federal concern. It should be a local concern.

To double the eligibility to 200 percent and make that permanent is resulting at a time when our spending is just completely out of control, setting up a situation in which there will be dramatic spending on another government program.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues have presented many good arguments against this bill in general and why we should be voting for these amendments that are in this en bloc. These amendments will provide needed improve-

ments to the underlying legislation and make sure that program funds are spent on the program's original goal, serving low-income Americans and helping them get out of poverty.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, again, I reiterate my strong opposition to this en bloc amendment and support for the underlying bill.

This bipartisan bill is about improving services for our communities through community action, and these efforts are long overdue.

Unlike the underlying bill that enjoys broad bipartisan support and reflects the input of stakeholders who represent these agencies and their vital work in our communities, this en bloc amendment ignores what we have accomplished together to strengthen this program and seeks to further divide us.

Rather than addressing the real needs of low-income individuals, this en bloc amendment attacks women's reproductive rights at a time when they are under attack nationally.

The sponsors of this en bloc amendment have injected controversy into a policy on voter registration, which is nonpartisan. Head Start has had a nearly identical policy for the last 40 years with little evidence of a problem.

Together, these amendments all failed in our bipartisan committee markup, and they should again.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this en bloc amendment and support the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part F of House Report 117-320.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 10 of House Resolution 1097, I rise to offer an amendment.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 14, strike "and" at the end.

Page 24 line 19, strike the period at the end and insert "and".

Page 24, after line 19, insert the following: "(ix) providing support to eligible entities to address the needs of veterans, particularly homeless veterans."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to the bipartisan Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act.

Before I begin, I thank all the veterans back in my home district in northern New Jersey and nationwide from the bottom of my heart for putting your lives on the line to defend our freedom, our families, and the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

Please know this: After sacrificing so much, no veteran should ever struggle to get the care or recognition he or she has earned. We should always get their backs.

My amendment to the legislation we are considering today will do just that. It will add critical support for our brave veterans, particularly homeless veterans, to the list of allowable purposes on which State governments, including my State of New Jersey, may deploy Federal community services block grant program investments.

The bipartisan community services block grant program helps to reduce poverty, revitalize communities, and empower families and individuals to become fully self-sufficient. It helps individuals, like veterans, to get and keep a good job, a good education, housing, healthcare, and emergency assistance and, above all, to participate more actively in their communities.

In New Jersey, the program annually serves more than 200,000 individuals and 130,000 families through the work of 25 community action agencies. These agencies are typically private nonprofit organizations, public agencies, or local government entities, like Greater Bergen County Community Action, which provides education and training, financial counseling, and more; or Bergen County's government, where our county executive and commissioners have focused like a laser beam on successfully helping combat veteran homelessness.

The bipartisan legislation on the floor today will make important updates to the community services block grant program. My amendment will add support for veterans and, in particular, as I said, homeless veterans to the list of investments States like New Jersey can make through the program.

With this amendment, community action agencies will work alongside State and local agencies to raise

awareness among veterans of housing programs and help those who bravely served our country to secure the housing they need. Once stable housing is secured, community action agencies will work with veterans and other eligible individuals to ensure the full range of community resources, including workforce training, health resources, and opportunities for peer support, are available to those veterans who need it most.

Supporting our Nation's veterans with the community services block grant program is the least we can do. After serving our country and putting their lives on the line to defend our freedom and democracy, our Nation's veterans should not struggle to get the resources they have earned. But far too often, our veterans face issues finding housing and employment. It is unacceptable.

On any given night, the Federal Government estimates that more than 40,000 veterans are homeless. On top of that, data shows that the unemployment rate of veterans ages 18 to 65 is higher than the unemployment rate of nonveterans.

Today's amendment builds on the work I helped lead, working with both sides of the aisle in recent months and since I was elected, to support our servicemembers, veterans, and veteran families.

The first piece of legislation I passed in Congress was to expand hiring of post-9/11 veterans. Just weeks ago, I was proud to join my colleagues in passing a 2.7 percent pay raise for members of the military to ensure we are getting the backs of those who bravely have ours.

Late last year, the House passed the bipartisan Student Veterans Counseling Centers Eligibility Act, which will expand access to mental health services for veterans utilizing their GI benefits at colleges and universities through established vet centers.

In March, we passed the bipartisan Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act to help expand access to GI benefits for members of our military who serve in the National Guard and Reserves, as they don't receive the same access to vital GI benefits that they deserve as well.

Also in March, working with the members of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, we passed the Honoring our PACT Act here in the House to help veterans exposed to burn pits, covering veterans dating back to 1991 and Operation Desert Storm and through our more recent post-9/11 conflicts.

This included my key provisions to address the mental health impacts for toxic exposure for veterans and to ensure VA information on toxic exposure illnesses is published in multiple languages, like Korean and Spanish, to help even more of our veterans.

Back home in New Jersey, I have been fighting for expanded access to healthcare services, and I helped estab-

lish the mental health services at the VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic in Newton in Sussex County, New Jersey. I am working to cut through red tape with the VA Community Care Network to ensure eligible north Jersey veterans are able to receive referrals for community care at ImageCare Centers across the Fifth District. We have made critical progress on that front. Now, more veterans in my district have greater access to healthcare that they deserve.

Let me just say, these are not Democratic or Republican issues. They are red, white, and blue issues. They are issues core to protecting our great democracy, the ones our veterans have always fought for.

There is nothing more important in this job than our responsibility to have the backs of those who have served our great Nation, whether that is at the VA, a mental health issue, or helping veterans find housing or get jobs when they come back home.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of my amendment to add support for veterans to the list of eligible community services block grant investments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we owe our military veterans a huge debt of gratitude, and we must make sure they are well supported as they transition back into the civilian workforce.

This amendment encourages the CSBG program to meet the needs of low-income veterans, especially homeless veterans. It is surprising to me that we need to put such an amendment in this bill because we would think that the CSBG program would already be doing it. But since this is a worthy goal and one that I support, I will support this amendment.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I wear a pin every day with the United States flag, the North Carolina flag, and a banner under it that says: "I support veterans." Therefore, I must support an amendment that would support veterans.

While I have concerns with the underlying bill, I think this is a good amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman offering it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her comments and for the support of veterans.

Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative GOTTHEIMER for his amendment and for his leadership in addressing the needs of our country's veterans.

Madam Speaker, this amendment will help community action agencies meet the needs of veterans, particularly homeless veterans.

Although many community action agencies already implement other Federal programs serving veterans, this amendment will emphasize that all eligible entities are able and equipped to serve veterans and their communities.

Again, I thank my colleague for offering this amendment, and I thank the ranking member for supporting it as well.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we must do all we can to make sure we help low-income and homeless veterans. I think this amendment furthers that effort.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1097, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

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

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are 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:

- Amendments en bloc No. 1;
- Amendments en bloc No. 2;
- Amendment No. 4;
- Motion to recommit, if offered; and
- Passage of the bill, if ordered.

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.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in part F of House Report 117-320, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc

offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 201, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—219

Adams	Garcia (IL)	Newman
Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Allred	Golden	O'Halleran
Auchincloss	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Axne	Gonzalez,	Omar
Barragán	Vicente	Pallone
Bass	Gottheimer	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Bera	Grijalva	Pascarell
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Phillips
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree
Bourdeaux	Houlihan	Pocan
Bowman	Hoyer	Porter
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Pressley
F.	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Brown (OH)	Jayapal	Raskin
Brownley	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Bustos	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Jones	Ruiz
Carbajal	Kahele	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Rush
Carson	Katko	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Keating	Sánchez
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Casten	Khanna	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Schiff
Cherfilus-	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
McCormick	Kind	Schrader
Chu	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Ciциlline	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lamb	Sewell
Cleaver	Langevin	Sherman
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sires
Connolly	Lawrence	Slotkin
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (CA)	Soto
Costa	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Courtney	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Craig	Levin (CA)	Stanton
Crist	Levin (MI)	Stevens
Crow	Lieu	Strickland
Cuellar	Lofgren	Suozi
David (KS)	Lowenthal	Swalwell
Davis, Danny K.	Luria	Takano
Dean	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Malinowski	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maloney,	Titus
DeLauro	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Delgado	Manning	Torres (CA)
Demings	Matsui	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Trahan
Deutch	McCollum	Trone
Dingell	McEachin	Underwood
Doggett	McNerney	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Meeks	Veasey
F.	Meng	Velázquez
Escobar	Mfume	Wasserman
Eshoo	Moore (WI)	Schultz
Espallat	Morelle	Waters
Evans	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fitzpatrick	Mrvan	Welch
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Wexton
Foster	Nadler	Wild
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Williams (GA)
Gallego	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Neguse	Yarmuth

NAYS—201

Aderholt	Bergman	Burchett
Allen	Bice (OK)	Burgess
Amodei	Biggs	Calvert
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Cammack
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Carey
Babin	Boebert	Carl
Bacon	Bost	Carter (GA)
Baird	Brady	Carter (TX)
Balderson	Brooks	Cawthorn
Banks	Buchanan	Chabot
Barr	Buck	Cheney
Bentz	Bucshon	Cline

Cloud	Hinson	Palazzo
Clyde	Hollingsworth	Palmer
Cole	Hudson	Pence
Comer	Huizenga	Perry
Crawford	Issa	Pfluger
Crenshaw	Jackson	Posey
Curtis	Jacobs (NY)	Reschenthaler
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Donalds	Joyce (OH)	Rose
Duncan	Joyce (PA)	Rosendale
Dunn	Keller	Rouzer
Ellzey	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Estes	Kim (CA)	Salazar
Fallon	Kinzing	Scalise
Feenstra	Kustoff	Schweikert
Ferguson	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Fischbach	LaMalfa	Sessions
Fitzgerald	Lamborn	Simpson
Fleischmann	Latta	Smith (NE)
Fox	LaTurner	Smith (NJ)
Franklin, C.	Lesko	Smucker
Scott	Letlow	Spartz
Fulcher	Long	Staubert
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Steel
Gallagher	Lucas	Stefanik
Garbarino	Luetkemeyer	Mace
Garcia (CA)	Mace	Malliotakis
Gibbs	Malliotakis	Mann
Gimenez	Mann	Massie
Gohmert	Massie	Taylor
Gonzales, Tony	Mast	Tenney
Good (VA)	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gooden (TX)	McCaul	Tiffany
Gosar	McClain	Timmons
Granger	McClintock	Turner
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Upton
Graves (MO)	Meijer	Valadao
Green (TN)	Meuser	Van Drew
Greene (GA)	Miller (IL)	Van Dwyne
Griffith	Miller (WV)	Wagner
Grothman	Miller-Meeks	Walberg
Guest	Moolenaar	Walorski
Guthrie	Mooney	Waltz
Harris	Moore (AL)	Weber (TX)
Harshbarger	Moore (UT)	Webster (FL)
Hartzler	Mullin	Wenstrup
Hern	Murphy (NC)	Williams (TX)
Herrell	Nehls	Wilson (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Newhouse	Wittman
Hice (GA)	Norman	Womack
Higgins (LA)	Obernolte	Zeldin
Hill	Owens	

NOT VOTING—8

Budd	McGovern	Speier
Case	McKinley	Westerman
Gonzalez (OH)	Smith (MO)	

□ 1129

Messrs. UPTON, RUTHERFORD, and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Carbajal	Doyle, Michael
(Balderson)	(Pallone)	F. (Pallone)
Barr (Guthrie)	Cárdenas (Soto)	Evans (Beyer)
Bera (Connolly)	Carter (LA)	Fallon (Nehls)
Bergman	(Blunt)	Gaetz (Boebert)
(Moolenaar)	(Rochester)	Gallego (Soto)
Blumenauer	Casten (Foster)	Garamendi
(Beyer)	Castro (TX)	(Beyer)
Bourdeaux	(Garcia (TX))	Gomez (Soto)
(Wexton)	Cawthorn (Nehls)	Green (TN)
Bowman	Crawford (Long)	(Fleischmann)
(Escobar)	Cuellar (Garcia	Jeffries (Neguse)
Brooks (Moore	(TX))	Johnson (SD)
(AL))	Curtis (Owens)	(Valadao)
Brownley	Davis (Owens)	Johnson (TX)
(Kuster)	(Foster)	(Stevens)
Bush (Escobar)	Delgado (Neguse)	Kahele (Neguse)
Bustos (Kuster)	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL) (Blunt
Butterfield	(Beyer)	Rochester)
(Ross)	Deutch (Neguse)	Khanna
		(Escobar)

Kind (Beyer)	Moore (UT)	Stewart (Owens)
Kinzing	(Carl)	Strickland
(Meijer)	Moore (WI)	(Takano)
Kirkpatrick	(Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
(Pallone)	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell
Lamb (Pallone)	(Escobar)	(Correa)
Langevin	Payne (Pallone)	Taylor (Nehls)
(Lynch)	Perlmutter	Tiffany
LaTurner (Mann)	(Courtney)	(Fitzgerald)
Lawrence	Porter (Wexton)	Tlaib (Escobar)
(Stevens)	Price (NC) (Ross)	Torres (NY)
Rice (NY)	(Peters (CA))	(Neguse)
Lawson (FL)	Rodgers (WA)	Van Dwyne
(Soto)	(Joyce (PA))	(Jackson)
Lofgren	Ryan (Kaptur)	Walorski
(Aguilar)	Sánchez (Beyer)	(Wagner)
Lowenthal	Schrader	Waters (Garcia
(Beyer)	(Kuster)	(TX))
Luetkemeyer	Scott, David	Watson Coleman
(McHenry)	(Correa)	(Pallone)
McEachin	Sewell (Cicilline)	Welch (Pallone)
(Wexton)	Sherrill	Williams (GA)
Meeks (Clarke	(Pallone)	(Neguse)
(NY))	Sires (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
Meuser	Spartz (Miller-	(Neguse)
(Reschenthaler)	Meeks)	Wilson (SC)
Mfume (Blunt	Staubert (Bacon)	(Timmons)
Rochester)		

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS.
BONAMICI OF OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 2, printed in part F of House Report 117-320, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 219, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—198

Aderholt	Crawford	Greene (GA)
Allen	Crenshaw	Griffith
Amodei	Curtis	Grothman
Arrington	Davidson	Guest
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bacon	DesJarlais	Harris
Baird	Diaz-Balart	Harshbarger
Balderson	Donalds	Hartzler
Banks	Duncan	Hern
Barr	Dunn	Herrell
Bentz	Ellzey	Herrera Beutler
Bergman	Emmer	Hice (GA)
Bice (OK)	Estes	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Fallon	Hill
Bilirakis	Feenstra	Hinson
Bishop (NC)	Ferguson	Hollingsworth
Boebert	Fischbach	Hudson
Bost	Fitzgerald	Huizenga
Brooks	Fleischmann	Issa
Buchanan	Fox	Jackson
Buck	Franklin, C.	Jacobs (NY)
Bucshon	Scott	Johnson (LA)
Burchett	Fulcher	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Gaetz	Johnson (SD)
Calvert	Gallagher	Jordan
Cammack	Garbarino	Joyce (OH)
Carey	Garcia (CA)	Joyce (PA)
Carl	Gibbs	Keller
Carter (GA)	Gimenez	Kelly (MS)
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Kelly (PA)
Cawthorn	Gonzales, Tony	Kim (CA)
Chabot	Good (VA)	Kinzing
Cheney	Gooden (TX)	Kustoff
Cline	Gosar	LaHood
Cloud	Granger	LaMalfa
Clyde	Graves (LA)	Lamborn
Cole	Graves (MO)	Latta
Comer	Green (TN)	LaTurner

Lesko Norman
Letlow Obernolte
Long Owens
Loudermilk Palazzo
Lucas Palmer
Luetkemeyer Pence
Mace Perry
Malliotakis Pfluger
Mann Posey
Massie Reschenthaler
Mast Rice (SC)
McCarthy Rodgers (WA)
McCaul Rogers (AL)
McClain Rogers (KY)
McClintock Rose
McHenry Rosendale
Meijer Rouzer
Meuser Roy
Miller (IL) Rutherford
Miller (WV) Scalise
Miller-Meeks Schweikert
Moolenaar Scott, Austin
Mooney Sessions
Moore (AL) Simpson
Moore (UT) Smith (NE)
Mullin Smith (NJ)
Murphy (NC) Smucker
Nehls Spartz
Newhouse Stauber

NAYS—219

Adams Evans
Aguilar Fitzpatrick
Allred Fletcher
Auchincloss Meng
Axne Frankel, Lois
Barragán Gallego
Bass Garamendi
Beatty Garcia (IL)
Bera Garcia (TX)
Beyer Golden
Bishop (GA) Gomez
Blumenauer Gonzalez,
Blunt Rochester Vicente
Bonamici Gottheimer
Bourdeaux Green, Al (TX)
Bowman Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan Harder (CA)
F. Hayes
Brown (MD) Higgins (NY)
Brown (OH) Himes
Brownley Horsford
Bush Houlihan
Bustos Hoyer
Butterfield Huffman
Cabajal Jackson Lee
Cárdenas Jacobs (CA)
Carson Jayapal
Carter (LA) Pingree
Cartwright Johnson (GA)
Casten Johnson (TX)
Castor (FL) Jones
Castro (TX) Kahele
Cherfilus-Katko
McCormick Keating
Chu Kelly (IL)
Cicilline Khanna
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Cleaver Kim (NJ)
Clyburn Kind
Cohen Kirkpatrick
Connolly Krishnamoorthi
Cooper Kuster
Correa Lamb
Costa Schiff
Courtney Langevin
Craig Larsen (WA)
Crist Larson (CT)
Crow Lawrence
Cuellar Lawson (FL)
Davids (KS) Lee (CA)
Davis, Danny K. Lee (NV)
Dean Leger Fernandez
DeFazio Levin (CA)
DeGette Levin (MI)
DeLauro Lieu
DelBene Lofgren
Delgado Lowenthal
Demings Luria
DeSaulnier Lynch
Deutch Malinowski
Dingell Maloney,
Doggett Carolyn B.
Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
F. Manning
Escobar Matsui
Eshoo McBath
Espaillat McCollum

Steel Stefanik
Steil Owens
Steube Steube
Stewart Stewart
Taylor Taylor
Tenney Tenney
Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
Tiffany Tiffany
Timmons Timmons
Turner Turner
Upton Upton
Valadao Valadao
Van Drew Van Drew
Van Dyne Van Dyne
Wagner Wagner
Walberg Walberg
Walorski Walorski
Waltz Waltz
Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
Wenstrup Wenstrup
Williams (TX) Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Womack Womack
Zeldin Zeldin

Armstrong
Brady
Budd
Case

Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Smith (MO)
Speier
Westerman

□ 1143

Miss RICE of New York changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the en bloc amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Balderson)
Barr (Guthrie)
Bera (Connolly)
Bergman (Moolenaar)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bourdeaux (Wexton)
Bowman (Escobar)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Escobar)
Bustos (Kuster)
Butterfield (Ross)
Cabajal (Pallone)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Carter (LA)
Carter (Blunt)
Cassidy (Rochester)
Casten (Foster)
Castro (TX)
Cassidy (Garcia (TX))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Crawford (Long)
Cuellar (Garcia (TX))
Curtis (Owens)
Davis, Danny K. (Foster)
Delgado (Neguse)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Deutch (Neguse)
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Evans (Beyer)
Fallon (Nehls)
Gaetz (Boebert)
Gallego (Soto)
Garamendi (Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)

Gomez (Soto)
Green (TN)
(Fleischmann)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (SD)
(Valadao)
Johnson (TX)
(Stevens)
Kahele (Neguse)
Kelly (IL) Blunt
(Rochester)
Khanna (Escobar)
Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)
Langevin (Lynch)
LaTurner (Mann)
Lawrence (Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Soto)
Lofgren (Aguilar)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Luetkemeyer (McHenry)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meeks (Clarke (NY))
Meuser (Reschenthaler)
Mfume (Blunt)
Rochester)
Moore (UT)
(Carl)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Ocasio-Cortez (Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)

Perlmutter (Courtney)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Ross)
Rice (NY)
(Peters (CA))
Rodgers (WA)
(Joyce (PA))
Sánchez (Beyer)
Schrader (Kuster)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sherrill (Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Miller-Meeks)
Staubert (Bacon)
Stewart (Owens)
Strickland (Takano)
Suozi (Beyer)
Swalwell (Correa)
Taylor (Nehls)
Tiffany (Fitzgerald)
Tlaib (Escobar)
Torres (NY)
(Neguse)
Van Dyne (Jackson)
Walorski (Wagner)
Waters (Garcia (TX))
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Williams (GA)
(Neguse)
Wilson (FL)
(Neguse)
Wilson (SC)
(Timmons)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—418

Adams Davidson
Aderholt Davis, Danny K.
Aguilar Davis, Rodney
Allen Dean
Allred DeFazio
Amodei DeGette
Arrington DeLauro
Auchincloss DelBene
Axne Delgado
Babin Demings
Bacon DeSaulnier
Baird DesJarlais
Balderson Deuch
Banks Diaz-Balart
Barr Dingell
Barragán Doggett
Bass Donalds
Beatty Doyle, Michael
Bentz F.
Bera Duncan
Bergman Dunn
Beyer Ellzey
Bice (OK) Emmer
Biggs Escobar
Bilirakis Eshoo
Bishop (GA) Espaillat
Bishop (NC) Estes
Blumenauer Evans
Blunt Rochester Fallon
Boebert Feenstra
Bonamici Ferguson
Bost Fischbach
Bourdeaux Fitzgerald
Bowman Fitzpatrick
Boyle, Brendan Fleischmann
F. Fletcher
Brooks Foster
Brown (MD) Foxx
Brown (OH) Frankel, Lois
Brownley Franklin, C.
Buchanan Scott
Buck Fulcher
Bucshon Gaetz
Burchett Gallagher
Burgess Gallego
Bush Garamendi
Bustos Garbarino
Butterfield Garcia (CA)
Calvert Garcia (IL)
Cammack Garcia (TX)
Cabajal Gibbs
Cárdenas Gimenez
Carey Gohmert
Carl Golden
Carson Gomez
Carter (GA) Gonzales, Tony
Carter (LA) Gonzalez,
Carter (TX) Vicente
Cartwright Good (VA)
Casten Gooden (TX)
Castor (FL) Gosar
Castro (TX) Gottheimer
Cawthorn Granger
Chabot Graves (LA)
Cheney Graves (MO)
Cherfilus-Green (TN)
McCormick Green, Al (TX)
Chu Greene (GA)
Cicilline Griffith
Clark (MA) Grijalva
Clarke (NY) Grothman
Cleaver Guest
Cline Guthrie
Cloud Harder (CA)
Clyburn Harris
Clyde Harshbarger
Cohen Hartzler
Cole Hayes
Comer Hern
Connolly Herrell
Cooper Herrera Beutler
Correa Hice (GA)
Costa Higgins (LA)
Courtney Higgins (NY)
Craig Hill
Crawford Himes
Crenshaw Hinson
Crist Hollingsworth
Crow Horsford
Cuellar Houlihan
Curtis Hoyer
Davids (KS) Hudson

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 4, printed in part F of House Report 117-320, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

This is a 5-minute vote.

Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
O'Halloran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart

Strickland
Suozi
Swallow
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong
Brady
Budd
Case

Gonzalez (OH)
McGovern
McKinley
Smith (MO)

Speier
Westerman

□ 1156

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodel
(Balderson)
Barr (Guthrie)
Bera (Connolly)
Bergman
(Moolenaar)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Bourdeaux
(Wexton)
Bowman
(Escobar)
Brooks (Moore
(AL))
Brownley
(Kuster)
Bush (Escobar)
Bustos (Kuster)
Butterfield
(Ross)
Carbajal
(Pallone)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Carter (LA)
(Blunt)
Rochester)
Casten (Foster)
Castro (TX)
(Garcia (TX))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Crawford (Long)
Cuellar (Garcia
(TX))
Curtis (Owens)

Davis, Danny K.
(Foster)
Delgado (Neguse)
DeSaulnier
(Beyer)
Deutch (Neguse)
Doyle, Michael
F. (Pallone)
Evans (Beyer)
Fallon (Nehls)
Gaetz (Boebert)
Gallego (Soto)
Garamendi
(Beyer)
Gomez (Soto)
Green (TN)
(Fleischmann)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (SD)
(Valadao)
Johnson (TX)
(Stevens)
Kahale (Neguse)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt
Rochester)
Khanna
(Escobar)
Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger
(Meijer)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Lamb (Pallone)

Langevin
(Lynch)
LaTurner (Mann)
Lawrence
(Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Soto)
Lofgren
(Aguilar)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Luetkemeyer
(McHenry)
McEachin
(Wexton)
Meeks (Clarke
(NY))
Meuser
(Reschenthaler)
Mfume (Blunt
Rochester)
Moore (UT)
(Carl)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Ocasio-Cortez
(Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)
Perlmutter
(Courtney)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Ross)
Rice (NY)
(Peters (CA))

Rodgers (WA)
(Joyce (PA))
Ryan (Kaptur)
Sánchez (Beyer)
Schrader
(Kuster)
Scott, David
(Correa)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz (Miller-
Meeks)
Stauber (Bacon)

Stewart (Owens)
Strickland
(Takano)
Suozi (Beyer)
Swallow
(Correa)
Taylor (Nehls)
Tiffany
(Fitzgerald)
Tlaib (Escobar)
Torres (NY)
(Neguse)
Van Dyne
(Jackson)

Walorski
(Wagner)
Waters (Garcia
(TX))
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch (Pallone)
Williams (GA)
(Neguse)
Wilson (FL)
(Neguse)
Wilson (SC)
(Timmons)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walberg moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 5129) to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Beginning on page 36, strike line 23 and all that follows through line 3 on page 37.

Page 39, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 680A. OPERATIONAL RULE.

"(a) RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS INCLUDED AS NONGOVERNMENTAL PROVIDERS.—For any program carried out by the Federal Government, or by a State or local government under this subtitle, the government shall consider, on the same basis as other nongovernmental organizations, religious organizations to provide the assistance under the program, so long as the program is implemented in a manner consistent with the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government receiving funds under this subtitle shall discriminate against an organization that provides assistance under, or applies to provide assistance under, this subtitle, on the basis that the organization has a religious character.

"(b) RELIGIOUS CHARACTER AND INDEPENDENCE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A religious organization that provides assistance under a program described in subsection (a) shall retain its religious character and control over the definition, development, practice, and expression of its religious beliefs.

"(2) ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS.—Neither the Federal Government nor a State or local government shall require a religious organization—

"(A) to alter its form of internal governance, except (for purposes of administration of the community services block grant program) as provided in section 680(c); or

"(B) to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols; in order to be eligible to provide assistance under a program described in subsection (a).

"(3) EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—A religious organization's exemption provided under section 702 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1) regarding employment practices shall not be affected by its participation in, or receipt of funds from, programs described in subsection (a).

"(c) NONDISCRIMINATION AGAINST BENEFICIARIES.—A religious organization that

provides assistance under a program described in subsection (a) shall not, in providing such assistance, discriminate against a program beneficiary or prospective program beneficiary on the basis of religion or religious belief."

"(d) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—No funds provided directly to a religious organization to provide assistance under any program described in subsection (a) shall be expended for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization.

"(e) FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any religious organization providing assistance under any program described in subsection (a) shall be subject to the same regulations as other nongovernmental organizations to account in accord with generally accepted accounting principles for the use of such funds provided under such program.

"(2) LIMITED AUDIT.—Such organization shall segregate government funds provided under such program into a separate account. Only the government funds shall be subject to audit by the government.

"(f) TREATMENT OF ELIGIBLE ENTITIES AND OTHER INTERMEDIATE ORGANIZATIONS.—If an eligible entity or other organization (referred to in this subsection as an 'intermediate organization'), acting under a contract, or grant or other agreement, with the Federal Government or a State or local government, is given the authority under the contract or agreement to select nongovernmental organizations to provide assistance under the programs described in subsection (a), the intermediate organization shall have the same duties under this section as the government."

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSS). Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 216, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—201

Aderholt
Allen
Amodel
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack

Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon

Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)

Griffith Lucas Roy
Grothman Luetkemeyer Rutherford
Guest Mace Salazar
Guthrie Malliotakis Scalise
Harris Mann Schweikert
Harshbarger Massie Scott, Austin
Hartzler Mast Sessions
Hern McCarthy Simpson
Herrell McCaul Smith (NE)
Herrera Beutler McClain Smith (NJ)
Hice (GA) McClintock Smucker
Higgins (LA) McHenry Spartz
Hill Meijer Stauber
Hinson Meuser Steel
Hollingsworth Miller (IL)
Hudson Miller (WV)
Huizenga Miller-Meeks Steil
Issa Moolenaar Steube
Jackson Mooney Stewart
Jacobs (NY) Moore (AL) Taylor
Johnson (LA) Moore (UT) Tenney
Johnson (OH) Mullin Thompson (PA)
Johnson (SD) Murphy (NC) Tiffany
Jordan Nehls Timmons
Joyce (OH) Newhouse
Joyce (PA) Norman
Katko Obernolte
Keller Owens
Kelly (MS) Palazzo
Kelly (PA) Palmer
Kim (CA) Pence
Kinzinger Perry
Kustoff Pfluger
LaHood Posey
LaMalfa Reschenthaler
Lamborn Rice (SC)
Latta Rodgers (WA)
LaTurner Rogers (AL)
Lesko Rogers (KY)
Letlow Rose
Long Rosendale
Loudermilk Rouzer

NAYS—216

Adams DeLauro Lamb
Aguilar DelBene Langevin
Allred Delgado Larsen (WA)
Auchincloss Demings Larson (CT)
Axne DeSaulnier Lawrence
Barragán Deutch Lawson (FL)
Bass Dingell Lee (CA)
Beatty Doggett Lee (NV)
Bera Doyle, Michael
Beyer F. Leger Fernandez
Bishop (GA) Escobar Levin (CA)
Blumenauer Eshoo Levin (MI)
Blunt Rochester Lieu
Bonamici Evans Lofgren
Bourdeaux Fletcher Lowenthal
Bowman Foster Luria
Boyle, Brendan Frankel, Lois Lynch
F. Gallego Malinowski
Brown (MD) Garamendi Carolyn B.
Brown (OH) Garcia (IL) Maloney, Sean
Brownley Garcia (TX) Manning
Bush Golden Matsui
Bustos Gomez McBath
Butterfield Gonzalez, Vicente McCollum
Carbajal Escobar McEachin
Cárdenas Gottheimer McNeerney
Carson Green, Al (TX) Meeks
Carter (LA) Grijalva Meng
Castwright Harder (CA) Mfume
Casten Hayes Moore (WI)
Castor (FL) Higgins (NY) Morelle
Castro (TX) Himes Moulton
Cherfilus-Horsford Mrvan
McCormick Houlihan Murphy (FL)
Chu Hoyer Nadler
Cicilline Huffman Napolitano
Clark (MA) Jackson Lee Neal
Clarke (NY) Jacobs (CA) Neguse
Cleaver Jayapal Newman
Clyburn Jeffries Norcross
Cohen Johnson (GA) O'Halleran
Connolly Johnson (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
Cooper Jones Omar
Correa Kahele Pallone
Costa Kaptur Panetta
Courtney Keating Pappas
Craig Kelly (IL) Pascarell
Crist Khanna Payne
Crow Kildee Perlmutter
Cuellar Kilmer Peters
Davids (KS) Kim (NJ) Phillips
Davis, Danny K. Kind Pingree
Dean Kirkpatrick Pocan
DeFazio Krishnamoorthi Porter
DeGette Kuster Pressley

Price (NC) Quigley Scott, David
Raskin Sherman Torres (CA)
Rice (NY) Sherrill Torres (NY)
Ross Sires Trahan
Roybal-Allard Slotkin Trone
Ruiz Smith (WA) Underwood
Soto Vargas
Spanberger Veasey
Stansbury Velazquez
Stanton Wasserman
Sánchez Stevens Schultz
Sarbanes Strickland Waters
Scanlon Suozzi Watson Coleman
Schakowsky Swalwell Welch
Schiff Takano Wexton
Schneider Thompson (CA) Wild
Schradler Thompson (MS) Williams (GA)
Schrier Titus Wilson (FL)
Scott (VA) Tlaib Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Armstrong Gonzalez (OH) Smith (MO)
Brady McGovern Speier
Budd McKinley Westerman
Case Sewell

□ 1211

So the motion to recommit was re-jetted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei Gomez (Soto) Perlmutter
(Balderson) Green (TN) (Courtney)
Barr (Guthrie) (Fleischmann) Porter (Wexton)
Bera (Connolly) Jeffries (Neguse) Price (NC) (Ross)
Bergman Johnson (SD) Rice (NY)
(Moolenaar) (Valadao) (Peters (CA))
Blumenauer Johnson (TX) Rodgers (WA)
(Beyer) (Stevens) (Joyce (PA))
Bourdeaux Kahele (Neguse) Ryan (Kaptur)
(Wexton) Kelly (IL) (Blunt) Sánchez (Beyer)
Bowman Rochester Schrader
(Escobar) Khanna
Brooks (Moore) (Escobar) Scott, David
(AL)) Kind (Beyer) (Correa)
Brownley Kinzinger Sherrill
(Kuster) (Meijer) (Pallone)
Bush (Escobar) Kirkpatrick Sires (Pallone)
Bustos (Kuster) (Pallone) Spartz (Miller-
Butterfield Lamb (Pallone) Meeks)
(Ross) Langevin Stauber (Bacon)
Carbajal (Lynch) Stewart (Owens)
(Pallone) LaTurner (Mann) Strickland
Cárdenas (Soto) Lawrence (Takano)
Carter (LA) (Stevens) Suozzi (Beyer)
(Blunt) Lawson (FL) Swalwell
Rochester) (Soto) (Correa)
Casten (Foster) Lofgren Taylor (Nehls)
Castro (TX) (Aguilar) Tiffany
(Garcia (TX)) Lowenthal
Cawthorn (Nehls) (Fitzgerald)
Crawford (Long) (Beyer) Tlaib (Escobar)
Cuellar (Garcia) Luetkemeyer Torres (NY)
(TX)) (McHenry) (Neguse)
Curtis (Owens) McEachin Van Duyne
Davis, Danny K. (Wexton) (Jackson)
(Foster) Meeks (Clarke) Walorski
Delgado (Neguse) (NY) (Wagner)
DeSaulnier Meuser Waters (Garcia
(Beyer) (Reschenthaler) (TX))
Deutch (Neguse) Mfume (Blunt
Doyle, Michael Rochester)
F. (Pallone) Moore (UT)
Evans (Beyer) (Carl)
Fallon (Nehls) Moore (WI)
Gaetz (Boebert) (Beyer) Wilson (FL)
Gallego (Soto) Ocasio-Cortez (Neguse)
Garamendi (Escobar) Wilson (SC)
(Beyer) Payne (Pallone) (Timmons)

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 169, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—246

Adams Gonzales, Tony O'Halleran
Aguilar Gonzalez, Ocasio-Cortez
Allred Vicente Omar
Auchincloss Gottheimer Owens
Axne Green, Al (TX) Pallone
Barragán Grijalva Panetta
Bass Guthrie Pappas
Beatty Harder (CA) Pascarell
Bera Hayes Payne
Beyer Higgins (NY) Perlmutter
Bishop (GA) Himes Peters
Blumenauer Horsford Phillips
Blunt Rochester Houlihan Pingree
Bonamici Hoyer Pocan
Bourdeaux Huffman Porter
Bowman Jackson Lee Pressley
Boyle, Brendan Jacobs (CA) Price (NC)
F. Jayapal Quigley
Brown (MD) Jeffries Raskin
Brown (OH) Johnson (GA) Rice (NY)
Brownley Johnson (OH) Rogers (KY)
Bush Johnson (TX) Ross
Bustos Jones Roybal-Allard
Butterfield Joyce (OH) Ruiz
Carbajal Kahele Ruppertsberger
Cárdenas Kaptur Rush
Carson Katko Ryan
Carter (LA) Keating Salazar
Cartwright Keller Sánchez
Casten Kelly (IL) Sarbanes
Castor (FL) Khanna Scanlon
Castro (TX) Kildee Schakowsky
Cheney Kilmer Schiff
Cherfilus-Kim (NJ) Schneider
McCormick Kind Schrader
Chu Kinzinger Schrier
Cicilline Kirkpatrick Scott (VA)
Clark (MA) Krishnamoorthi Scott, David
Clarke (NY) Kuster Sewell
Cleaver Lamb Sherman
Clyburn Langevin Sherrill
Cohen Larsen (WA) Simpson
Cole Larson (CT) Sires
Comer Lawrence Slotkin
Connolly Lawson (FL) Smith (WA)
Cooper Lee (CA) Soto
Correa Lee (NV) Spanberger
Costa Leger Fernandez Stansbury
Courtney Levin (CA) Stanton
Craig Levin (MI) Steel
Crist Lieu Stefanik
Crow Lofgren Stevens
Cuellar Lowenthal Strickland
Davids (KS) Luria Suozzi
Davis, Danny K. Lynch Swalwell
Davis, Rodney Malinowski Takano
Dean Maloney, Tenney
DeFazio Carolyn B. Thompson (CA)
DeGette Maloney, Sean Thompson (MS)
DeLauro Manning Thompson (PA)
DelBene Matsui Titus
Delgado McBath Tlaib
Demings McCaul Tonko
DeSaulnier McCollum Torres (CA)
Deutch McEachin Torres (NY)
Dingell McNeerney Trahan
Doggett Meeks Trone
Doyle, Michael Meijer Turner
F. Meng Underwood
Escobar Meuser Upton
Eshoo Mfume Valadao
Españat Miller-Meeks Vargas
Evans Moore (WI) Veasey
Fitzgerald Morelle Velázquez
Fitzpatrick Moulton Wasserman
Fletcher Mrvan Schultz
Foster Murphy (FL) Waters
Frankel, Lois Nadler Watson Coleman
Gallego Napolitano Welch
Garamendi Neal Wexton
Garbarino Neguse Wild
García (IL) Newhouse Williams (GA)
Golden Newman Wilson (FL)
Gomez Norcross Yarmuth

NAYS—169

Aderholt Baird Bice (OK)
Allen Balderson Biggs
Amodei Banks Bilirakis
Arrington Barr Bishop (NC)
Babin Bentz Boebert
Bacon Bergman Bost

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. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

Brooks	Griffith	Moore (UT)	Cuellar (Garcia	LaTurner (Mann)	Scott, David
Buchanan	Grothman	Mullin	(TX))	Lawrence	(Correa)
Buck	Guest	Murphy (NC)	Curtis (Owens)	(Stevens)	Sewell (Cicilline)
Bucshon	Harris	Nehls	Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Sherrill
Burchett	Harshbarger	(Foster)	(Soto)	(Soto)	(Pallone)
Burgess	Hartzler	Norman	Delgado (Neguse)	Loftgren	Sires (Pallone)
Calvert	Hern	Obernolte	DeSaulnier	(Aguilar)	Spartz (Miller-Meeks)
Cammack	Herrell	Palazzo	(Beyer)	Lowenthal	(Bacon)
Carey	Herrera Beutler	Pence	Deutch (Neguse)	(Beyer)	Staubert (Owens)
Carl	Hice (GA)	Perry	Doyle, Michael	Luetkemeyer	Strickland
Carter (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Pfluger	F. (Pallone)	(McHenry)	(Takano)
Cawthorn	Hill	Posey	Evans (Beyer)	McEachin	Suozi (Beyer)
Chabot	Hinson	Reschenthaler	Fallon (Nehls)	(Wexton)	Swalwell
Cline	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Galatz (Boebert)	Meeks (Clarke	(Correa)
Cloud	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)	Gallego (Soto)	(NY)	Taylor (Nehls)
Clyde	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)	Garamendi	Meuser	Tiffany
Crawford	Issa	Rose	(Beyer)	(Reschenthaler)	(Fitzgerald)
Crenshaw	Jackson	Rosendale	Gomez (Soto)	Mfume (Blunt	Tlaib (Escobar)
Curtis	Jacobs (NY)	Rouzer	Green (TN)	Rochester)	Torres (NY)
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Roy	(Fleischmann)	Moore (UT)	(Neguse)
DesJarlais	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford	Jeffries (Neguse)	(Carl)	Van Dwyne
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Scalise	Johnson (SD)	Moore (WI)	(Jackson)
Donalds	Joyce (PA)	Schweikert	(Valadao)	(Beyer)	Walorski
Duncan	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin	Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	(Wagner)
Dunn	Kelly (PA)	Sessions	(Stevens)	(Escobar)	Waters (Garcia
Ellzey	Kim (CA)	Smith (NE)	Kahele (Neguse)	Payne (Pallone)	(TX))
Emmer	Kustoff	Smith (NJ)	Kelly (IL) (Blunt	Perlmutter	Watson Coleman
Estes	LaHood	Smucker	Rochester)	(Courtney)	(Pallone)
Fallon	LaMalfa	Spartz	Khanna	Porter (Wexton)	Welch (Pallone)
Feenstra	Lamborn	Staubert	(Escobar)	Price (NC) (Ross)	Williams (GA)
Ferguson	Latta	Steil	Kind (Beyer)	Rice (NY)	(Neguse)
Fischbach	LaTurner	Steube	Kinzing	(Peters (CA))	Wilson (FL)
Fleischmann	Lesko	Stewart	(Meijer)	Rodgers (WA)	(Neguse)
Foxx	Letlow	Taylor	Kirkpatrick	(Joyce (PA))	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, C.	Long	Tiffany	(Pallone)	Ryan (Kaptur)	(Timmons)
Scott	Loudermilk	Timmons	Lamb (Pallone)	Sánchez (Beyer)	
Fulcher	Lucas	Van Drew	Langevin	Schrader	
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Mace	(Lynch)	(Kuster)	
Gallagher	Mace	Wagner			
Garcia (CA)	Malliotakis	Walberg			
Gibbs	Massie	Walorski			
Gimenez	Mast	Waltz			
Gohmert	McCarthy	Weber (TX)			
Good (VA)	McClain	Webster (FL)			
Gooden (TX)	Gosar	Wenstrup			
Granger	McHenry	Williams (TX)			
Graves (LA)	Miller (WV)	Wilson (SC)			
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Wittman			
Green (TN)	Mooney	Womack			
Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)	Zeldin			

NOT VOTING—13

Armstrong	Garcia (TX)	Smith (MO)
Brady	Gonzalez (OH)	Speier
Budd	McGovern	Westerman
Carter (GA)	McKinley	
Case	Miller (IL)	

□ 1225

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, due to a schedule conflict, I was unable to cast roll call votes on Friday, May 13th. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 178, “yea” on rollcall No. 179, “yea” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodio	Bowman	Carbajal
(Balderson)	(Escobar)	(Pallone)
Barr (Guthrie)	Brooks (Moore	Cárdenas (Soto)
Bera (Connolly)	(AL))	Carter (LA)
Bergman	Brownley	(Blunt
(Moolenaar)	(Kuster)	Rochester)
Blumenauer	Bush (Escobar)	Casten (Foster)
(Beyer)	Bustos (Kuster)	Castro (TX)
Bourdeaux	Butterfield	(Garcia (TX))
(Wexton)	(Ross)	Cawthorn (Nehls)
		Crawford (Long)

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 7648

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 7648, a bill originally introduced by Representative Young of Alaska, for the purposes of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring to the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. and will recess shortly thereafter. At approximately 11 a.m., the House will meet in joint session with His Excellency Kyriakos Mitsotakis, the Prime Minister of the Hellenic Republic, Greece. Votes are expected in the House on Tuesday thereafter.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider Chairman SCOTT's H.R. 7309, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act of 2022, which is an important part of the Make It In America agenda. Now more than ever, businesses need skilled workers, and it is essential that we reauthorize WIOA to expand access to skills training for high-demand, high-wage jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 7688, the Consumer Fuel Price Gouging Prevention Act, introduced by Representatives KIM SCHRIER and KATIE PORTER. This critical legislation seeks to give the Federal Trade Commission greater authority to rein in excessive gas prices. This bill would protect consumers against irresponsible actors in oil and gas who would artificially inflate prices for extra profit, and it will help Americans struggling with higher energy costs.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider two bills under suspension of the rules in recognition of National Police Week.

Mr. Speaker, 23,229 of our fellow citizens have lost their lives, over the course of the existence of our country, in law enforcement, in doing their duties and protecting us and protecting our property.

The first of those bills is H.R. 6943, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, bipartisan legislation that would expand eligibility for the Public Safety Officers' Benefit program to include stress and trauma-related injuries and death by suicide for law enforcement officers and their families.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, that happens too often as a result of the trauma and stress which our police officers around the country confront.

The second bill is H.R. 2992, the TBI and PTSD Law Enforcement Training Act, again bipartisan legislation, Mr. Speaker, that would require the Department of Justice to develop crisis intervention training tools for law enforcement agencies so they can better equip officers to respond to individuals with traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder, some of the most dangerous confrontations that our officers have.

The House will also consider, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6531, the Targeting Resources to Communities in Need Act of 2022, sponsored by JIM CLYBURN and HAL ROGERS, the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee. Unfortunately, that failed on suspension, so it is coming back under a rule.

We will also consider S. 2938, legislation to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building, which was sponsored by Senator MARCO RUBIO, Republican Member of the United States Senate.

The House will consider other bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we obviously will be ready at any time that the Senate can pass assistance to the extraordinary, brave, and courageous Ukrainians, who are confronting the Russian criminal invasion of their country unprovoked, unwarranted, and unjustified.

We will have that legislation as soon as it comes back here considered, hopefully, on this floor so that we can get some \$40 billion in military and humanitarian assistance that is needed in Ukraine so critically.

It is a sad thing that we passed this bill Tuesday night, and it has been sitting in the Senate with essentially now one Senator, one Republican Senator, Mr. PAUL of Kentucky, holding it up. I am hopeful that the Senate can move it over to us quickly.

We passed it in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion when it was here, so that is also a possibility, Mr. Speaker, to be on the floor next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we look at some of the bills that will be brought up next week, in the price gouging bill, there are a number of concerns with the way it is not really defined in terms of what price gouging would even be. But as we know, the current state of our energy crisis is really because we, through the Biden administration, have shut down energy production in America.

In fact, just the other day, earlier this week, in the midst of dramatically high gas prices, President Biden announced that he is canceling massive oil and gas lease sales. In the Gulf of Mexico, where there are rich reserves of American energy that could be produced, and Alaska, where there are rich reserves of American energy that could be produced, President Biden said no yet again. And this isn't the first time.

In fact, since he became President, on day one, Joe Biden started attacking American energy. He killed not only the Keystone but the ability to produce and make any new pipelines in America to move energy around our country so that we don't have to import it from countries like Russia. President Biden made us dependent on Russian oil. In fact, he was begging Putin to send us more oil while he is canceling the ability for us to produce our own energy.

You have seen other steps that the President has taken all throughout his Presidency to make it almost impossible to produce American energy, to move American energy, to export American energy. LNG permits are sitting on the desk waiting to be signed for over a year, not a single new LNG export permit to help not just America lower our energy prices but to help our friends around the world, especially in Europe, not need to get energy from bad actors like Putin.

As Putin is, hopefully, going to be pushed to the side in terms of energy

that we get, the President continues to turn not to American energy but to turn to other dictators, to go to Iran, to go to Venezuela, while shutting down American energy.

So, we have a bill, and I brought this up to the majority leader a number of times, H.R. 6858, with over 130 cosponsors, a bill that would actually open up American energy so that we can lower gas prices. We can actually do something about it, not try to point the finger and blame this person.

The President tried blaming Putin. Nobody in the country bought it because they knew gas prices were going up dramatically well before Putin invaded Ukraine. In fact, President Biden, by shutting down American energy, allowed Putin to make \$700 million a day selling his oil to America and Europe, \$700 million a day leading up to the war to help fund the war against Ukraine because President Biden said no to American energy over and over again. This bill would actually fix that.

Now, when you look at the price gouging bill, first of all, Secretary Granholm, the Secretary of Energy, was asked in a committee hearing recently, just about 2 weeks ago, if there was price gouging. She said: I am not sure anyone is saying there is wholesale gouging.

Now, if you read the bill, what we have seen of it so far, it doesn't allow the FTC to take action against the President of the United States, who actually is responsible for the gouging prices, high prices, whatever you want to define "gouging" as.

Again, the bill itself is very vague. If you just don't like a high price, you can go blame somebody else, or we could actually do something about it. We could actually bring a bill, like H.R. 6858, that would actually allow us to open up American energy that is here—great technology, lowest carbon emissions in the world, by the way, as we are now forced to rely on energy from other countries that actually emit more carbon to produce their oil.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield just on that point?

Mr. SCALISE. I would yield. Especially if the gentleman would tell me we are bringing this up on the floor, I would be happy to yield right now.

Mr. HOYER. On just that point, the gentleman mentioned this the last time we had a colloquy and pointed out that the drilling and processing of petroleum products are the cleanest in the world. You made that point last week, and you have just made it now.

Does the gentleman know why that is the case?

Mr. SCALISE. Because America has the best standards in the world.

Mr. HOYER. Correct.

Mr. SCALISE. America knows how to do it better.

By the way, it is American innovation that has opened up the ability to produce more energy cleaner than anyone else in the world, and the President

of the United States is the one saying no to America. He is not saying no to all energy. He is saying no to the cleanest American energy. But then he is begging foreign countries, which actually produce energy without American standards, begging them to give us our oil at a much higher price than just doing it here in the best place to do it in the world.

It perplexes me why the President of the United States says no to American energy while begging dictators to give us our energy at a higher cost, but that is where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have had this discussion before. I am going to take a little bit of time to—because if you just listen to the Republican whip, you would think that America is bereft of production of oil, or of LNG, or of petroleum-based products.

I want to go through what America is doing, what the increase has been, and what can be done.

First of all, the United States is the largest producer of oil in the world—18.61 million barrels per day. Saudi Arabia is about half of that, at 10.8. Russia is slightly less than Saudi Arabia; Canada about half of what Russia is doing; China about half, a little less than half, of what Russia is doing. So, we are the largest producer of petroleum products.

□ 1245

We import some, and that is largely based on the type of petroleum products that we use. On crude oil we produced 11.6 million barrels in February 2022. The all-time high was 12.9, almost 13 million barrels.

When Trump took office, we produced 8.8 billion barrels in January 2017. In 2008, we produced 5 million barrels. We more than doubled that in a decade from that 5 million.

Oil production is up more than 700,000 billion barrels from January to December 2021. It is up. It is very substantially up. Oil production is projected to grow more than 1 million barrels this year alone.

The U.S. rig count—this is important because these are the rigs that are in operation. The U.S. rig count is at a current level of 705, up seven from a week ago, and 257 from 1 year ago—a 57 percent increase.

So the presentation that somehow we are handcuffed in producing petroleum products is simply not true. In terms of natural gas, the United States is also the largest producer of natural gas in the world, at 3 trillion—3.109 billion cubic feet. Russia is second, Iran is third, and China is fourth, and Qatar is fifth.

In December of 2011, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. was producing 82.1 billion cubic feet of natural gas. That was in 2011. In December 2021, we are now producing 118 billion cubic feet, a 45 percent increase in 10 years. Again, to hear the

whip talking about it, it would be as if we have been somewhat constrained and are not doing our job.

Now, I happen to have an export company in my district, Calvert Cliffs, a nuclear facility. Right south of Calvert Cliffs is an export facility for LNG, in Cove Point, Maryland. In October 2021, 66 percent of the deliveries went to Asia, 34 percent went to Europe.

In February and March of this year, it is now 80 percent to Europe and 20 percent to Asia.

Why is that? So that we can meet the cutoff that has either happened because Russia did it or it has happened because the Europeans have stopped buying, in some respects, Russian product.

In any event, at the end of 2021, the U.S. had a peak export capacity of 11.6 billion cubic feet per day. By the end of 2022, that figure is expected to increase by 20 percent. This is not a country that is locking down the production of oil.

In addition, let me point out that there are—I want to get the right figure—oil and gas companies already have 26 million acres of public lands to drill on and over 11 million acres of Federal waters that are currently at their disposal. They have 37 million acres in total. Nothing is stopping these companies from drilling there, if they choose to do so.

The industry, Mr. Speaker, holds 9,000 unused approved permits right now. There are 9,000 approved permits to drill, which they are not using.

Last fall, the Biden administration put 80 million acres of the Gulf of Mexico for auction; unfortunately, the court overturned that. There has not been a pursuit of that, as the whip will point out, since that time. The point is that the response to that offer got a 2 percent response for 1.7 million acres out of the 80 million acres that were offered.

Now, the reason I took some time to go through these figures—nobody ought to be confused by the fact that what we are experiencing is a cause of the President's proper view that we need to move to alternative fuels, a proper view that we need to, as the whip has pointed out, have safe production, safe processing, energy efficient, but also environmentally sensitive production of our oil products. All of which we are doing.

I want to make it very clear that my personal view is we need to make sure that Europe has product, period, for national security reasons and, as the whip points out, for environmental reasons. There ought to be no confusion that oil production in this country is doing very well.

Now, why do some companies say they are not producing a lot? Because they are making a lot of money, a lot of profits, and buying back stock. That enhances the value of that stock. It enhances the value of the company. It enhances the value of the CEO. I don't criticize them for that.

Very frankly, we are at war. A dictator has invaded, without justification, a friendly country, Ukraine. They have fought back with extraordinary valor. What we really ought to do is talk together about how we can make sure that we bring gas prices down.

Now, whether the FTC decides—as the gentleman has pointed out, Mr. Speaker—whether or not there is gouging, if they don't decide that then, as Secretary Granholm observed, they are not sure, so be it. If they are gouging—if they are incorrectly charging consumers a higher price just because they can, then we ought to know about that.

That is what this bill is about, and that is going to be discussed next week. There ought to be no confusion, we are producing a lot of oil. We are producing a lot of LNG. We are trying to provide for our own needs and the needs of those who are confronting tyranny in Europe and are confronting shortages in Europe, which is driving up prices.

For the gentleman to say that these are Biden prices is simply not the case. Biden didn't have anything to do with these prices. We were producing more petroleum products. What happened is the cartels, which have done so—and I am old enough to remember what happened in the early 1970s—the cartels are controlling supply.

As a result, the shortness of supply and the increase in demand—why? Because we dealt with the pandemic. We got shots in arms. Once we got shots in arms and we are not wearing masks on the floor anymore, we are in better shape health-wise.

So what are people doing? They are going out and driving. Demand is up and supply is being kept down by the cartels, not by Joe Biden.

This evidence of the companies not producing more product—I get it. They are getting very high prices.

So why should they produce more product? If you produce more product and if you want to sell more product to make more money—but they are making a lot of money right now and they are buying back stock. The dividends are being paid at a healthy rate. So here we are.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that we are going to deal with both the supply side, which is important, but I also want to make sure that we aren't gouging consumers in the process.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, to say that Joe Biden is not the reason that supply is limited just doesn't match with the facts. Again, just 2 days ago, Joe Biden, not Putin, not the big oil companies, Joe Biden canceled oil and lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico.

Joe Biden canceled lease sales in Alaska.

Joe Biden, as a candidate—this isn't just some new development for Joe Biden—Joe Biden as a candidate for President of the United States said: “No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill. Period.”

That was Joe Biden as a candidate, and he didn't stop there.

When he became President, on day one he started an attack on American energy. It is crystal clear why.

Now, I am glad the gentleman is bragging about high production levels, but let's not think for a minute that Joe Biden is the reason we have production today. If you understand the oil and gas industry—I was just on a rig in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico 2 weeks ago, one of the largest-producing rigs in the Gulf. Do you know that rig got its first lease in 2002? It took about 10 years to get the first oil. They put private money—all private money; over \$10 billion of private money—into developing those leases. There were many leases and permits along the way to finally get to the point where they could bring oil out of the ground, making money to pay back the \$10-plus billion, to ultimately get to a point where they could produce over 130,000 barrels today.

If Joe Biden wants to try to dare take credit for those 130,000 barrels today, he needs to go check the record at how long it took to get that oil from lease, permits, out of the ground, to ultimately getting it into world markets, not American markets. Oil companies don't set the price of oil, it is world markets. That oil ultimately depletes, which is why the oil companies are always looking for new opportunities.

The gentleman talks—as the White House has talked—about thousands of permits that are out there. It sounds really good. Understandably, I think people recognize it is a misleading number because many of these permits are for wells that were tried where there is no oil. There is not oil everywhere.

You buy leases to go explore. It is called “exploration” for a reason. If it was known reserves—if you go drill right under a gas tank you find oil. If you want to find oil out amongst the natural resources that leases are issued for, you do test wells, you do seismic engineering. By the way, that takes years to go through the process of permitting.

Since Joe Biden has been President they have not issued new leases for seismic. So you might have a 3-mile by 3-mile lease in the Gulf of Mexico that you paid millions of dollars to the Federal Government for years ago, and you are continuing to try to explore those 3 miles by 3 miles that the Federal Government was happy to take the money for, but you can't even get a permit from the Federal Government today to explore that lease—to exercise other permits.

You have to get permits for the pipelines. Not a single new pipeline permit has been issued. Even if you get it out of the ground, the Biden administration doesn't want you to have the ability to move it through to refineries and world markets.

What you see is a recognition by the rest of the world that America has

taken itself off the shelf in terms of the ability to produce energy. Again, Joe Biden is the one who canceled all these sales. Joe Biden is the one who, as a candidate, said there will be no drilling. Cartels love this policy because they know now they control the supply.

America is producing oil today based on permits and actions that were taken years ago. What we are seeing today is an inability to continue developing these leases, which means ultimately they will dry up, as all of those leases do. That is why you are always exploring for the next round of finds.

Those next rounds of finds are not being explored for in America, they are being explored for in other countries, but it is countries that are cartels, countries that are monopolies, so they can control the price.

It is interesting that the gentleman brought up the last time we saw these kinds of prices was in the 1970s under a similar Democrat President who had the same kind of attitude toward American energy. It made our country dependent on foreign energy and it created lines at the pump where people had to wait days to get gasoline.

When you saw President Trump opening up American energy and allowing a free market to produce energy—we don't put those constraints in place when we are operating under a free market, so the cartels have no leverage, Putin has no leverage. The only reason he has leverage is if you have a President like Joe Biden who says we are not going to produce in America.

He said it. He took the actions to follow up on it, including just a few days ago. Amidst high gas prices, he actually took more American energy off the market, giving the cartels more monopoly power to raise prices. I wish we would address that. We have a bill to address that and reverse those bad policies. Unfortunately, I haven't heard the gentleman commit to bringing those to the floor yet.

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

□ 1300

So I wish my friend would address that. We have a bill to address that and reverse those bad policies. Unfortunately, I haven't heard the gentleman bring it to the floor yet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It is unfortunate that at a time of war that we spend all our time blaming our own President.

It is unfortunate that when the Europeans put themselves over the objections of numerous administrations in a place where they had dependence on Russia, Russia has no leverage over us. We don't need Russia for energy. As a matter of fact, we voted overwhelmingly to stop buying any petroleum products from Russia which I supported strongly. On this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle we supported that strongly.

The fact of the matter is the gentleman refuses to recognize 80 million acres—now, it was overturned by the courts later—80 million acres. He says all these people want to produce it and they want to look to new places, and they want to find oil someplace. There was a 2 percent of response.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million acres out of 80 million acres were bid on. That doesn't sound to me like a stampede to find it.

But let me tell you what he doesn't tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, when he is making that presentation. And you would think the Biden administration has clamped things down. The Biden administration approved more drilling permits in 2021 than the Trump administration approved in the first 3 years they were in office. Let me say that again: The Biden administration approved more permits in the first year of their term than the Trump administration did in the first 3 years of their term.

So when he says: Oh, the Biden administration is shutting it down and that is why we are having the problem; we are having the problem because Russia—the second, third producer of petroleum products in the world—is an irresponsible dictatorship run by one man, essentially, who wants to use petroleum products as leverage. And he had leverage on the Europeans, and he had leverage certainly on the Ukrainians. They used energy as a bludgeon.

In addition to that, the oil companies were making huge profits as these prices kept going up. So they didn't go out and do a lot of drilling. They didn't bid on a lot of new opportunities that maybe they could have produced oil on. They didn't bother.

Why?

Because they were making so much money. Now, that is a business judgment. But the effect of not doing it meant that as demand went up and less of a supply, not just from their actions but from the actions of the Saudis, others, and the cartel, again, three times as many permits were authorized in the first year of the Biden administration than 3 years in the Trump administration.

So don't tell me about Donald Trump and the free market. The free market is one reason why this is happening. I am for the free market because sound business judgments work: we are making a lot of money, with that money we are going to buy back stocks; it will make the remaining stocks more valuable; we are going to pay good dividends; our stock value is going to go up, and everybody is happy—except the consumer, of course, because supply on the world markets—and it is a world market price, it is not Biden's price, it is the world market price—have gone up because demand is up and supply is down.

So I don't know how the gentleman rationalizes his comments about Biden constricting petroleum production when the permits issued are three

times—or said a different way—in 1 year three times the number of permits that Mr. Trump issued in the first 3 years of his term. I wish we would get off this and really focus on the enemy. I know there is a lot of politics here, but we are at war. We need to produce energy.

As I told my friend, Cove Point is now sending 80 percent, reversing Asia supply to European supply because they need it because we are at war. And we are up in almost every category of production of petroleum products. So we can go on and on and on about this. Rig counts that are producing oil are up 57 percent—57 percent from a year ago—a 57 percent increase in operating rigs. It doesn't sound to me like Biden is shutting people down.

Biden does want a clean environment. Biden does want us to look at alternative energy. That is what he was talking about in the campaign that he wanted to look to that. But President Biden has made it very clear he understands in the short term—short term could be 25 years or 5 years—in the short term, particularly during the course of this war, we need to have all the petroleum products, and we need to have them for ourselves and for our allies.

Mr. SCALISE. We will continue this discussion. I would like to see us bring up the bill that would actually address it. We will see this debate go on next week and beyond.

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

CELEBRATING MOTHER NATURE'S GIFTS

(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, as spring moves into full bloom, new life is bursting forth along the southern-most shore of the Great Lakes along Lake Erie. Over 100,000 nature tourists are flocking to the Ottawa and Cedar Point Federal Wildlife Refuges adjacent to Magee Marsh and Maumee Bay State Park. Nearby freshwaters hum with new life: pickerel, perch, and even salmon.

This week our region is celebrating the 30th anniversary of what has grown into the biggest week in American birding. Over 100,000 visitors head to our northern Ohio heartland region for fishing, boating, hiking, and, yes, bird watching to fully welcome and celebrate the vast array of two-winged creatures that fly and thrive along our freshwater coast and wetlands: bald eagles, egrets, trumpeter swans, blue herons, indeed, every species one might imagine.

This splendid, colorful display by nature occurs at the crossroads of the Mississippi and Atlantic flyways. Nearby the Great Lakes Black Swamp Bird Observatory is raising funds to build a new welcome and education center to

introduce youth from across our world to Mother Nature's power and the beauty and value of our environment.

Nature tourism is not only healthy, it gives an over \$40 million economic boost to our region just during May. Northern Ohio welcomes guests from around the world as we celebrate the gifts that we have been given to shepherd to generations to come. Congratulations to all who responsibly steward our region forward and our precious corner of Mother Earth.

AO DAI DAY

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

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ao Dai Day this Sunday, May 15. I am proud to represent nearly 200,000 Vietnamese Americans in my district in California.

My district is a home to Little Saigon which has the largest Vietnamese population outside of Vietnam. Many of these men and women fled communism in Vietnam in search of freedom here in America. They have worked hard to build their American Dream.

The Ao Dai, which I am wearing today, is a traditional dress that represents the adaptability and strength of the Vietnamese people. It is a symbol of beauty and pride in Vietnam's unique and wonderful culture.

Last year, the State of California officially approved a resolution to recognize May 15 as Ao Dai Day. I join them in celebrating this special day and the many Vietnamese families in my district who are proud to call our great country home.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrated National Teacher Appreciation Week earlier this month, I rise to recognize the hard work of teachers across northwest Indiana. From the time our children take their first steps into a classroom, teachers empower them with knowledge and support and serve as inspiring role models.

As a parent, I am grateful for their devotion to their students, for offering stability in an uncertain time, and for their determination to ensure that students can thrive in a safe and productive environment.

I personally thank all the teachers who helped shape me into the person I am today.

I thank Mr. Janich, may he rest in peace, for being an inspiration; Mr. Woodward, my government teacher, Mrs. Bliss; and Mrs. Marciniak. All of these teachers inspired me to be a better person.

I also thank my sister, Francis Majchrowicz, who is a teacher molding

young minds and making sure that students are taken care of.

Good educators create engaged citizens, and I appreciate the lessons and work ethic they helped to instill in me every day.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking all of the impactful teachers in northwest Indiana and throughout our Nation as we continue to recognize National Teacher Appreciation Week.

WORSENING CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we break for the weekend, I remind the other Members of this body that when we come back, there is no greater crisis this country faces than the crisis at the border.

I leave Members with just a few numbers that we want to turn around quickly: first of all, the number of people coming here who are not appropriately vetted who are sometimes referred to as illegal aliens; two Marches ago there were 11,000; one March ago 63,000; and the most recent March Border Patrol puts at 150,000.

Think of that: in 2 years from 11,000, 63,000, 153,000 per month. And the Cabinet Secretary in charge of this says that he inherited a mess. He inherited great laws including the Migrant Protection Protocol, and now we have a true mess.

The second number: 110 deaths in the past year in this country from fentanyl, a horrific drug, almost all of which comes across the southern border. By comparison, 57,000 Americans died in the Vietnam war. Twice as many people die every year in this country from illegal drug overdoses as died in 12 years in the Vietnam war.

I sincerely hope this body will deal with the southern border and make it a priority when we come back.

ABORTION ACCESS

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

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this week 51 Senators voted to allow the Supreme Court to strip women of their fundamental right to abortion healthcare. If Roe v. Wade is overturned, abortion access will be left in the hands of State legislatures dead set on turning the clock backward 50 years.

We have already seen what Republicans are capable of when it comes to women's personal liberties, and now I fear women in my home State of North Carolina could face a similar fate. All that stands between us, and an egregious abortion ban is Governor Roy Cooper and enough of his allies in the legislature.

Despite this threat, I am still hopeful because I believe that the women of North Carolina will make their voices

heard. We are ready to fight for our freedom and liberty. Women deserve to have their decisions protected and respected.

HONORING BILL JONES OF PADUCAH, KENTUCKY

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my very dear friend, Bill Jones, of Paducah, Kentucky, upon his retirement from U.S. Bank. Over his 37 years with U.S. Bank, Bill took on numerous leadership posts with the company and thrived in each role.

His time in the financial business totaled 45 years and spanned significant changes in industry operations. As a leader, he was frequently forced to adjust to modern trends to ensure customer needs were met. And time and time again he has passed that leadership test with flying colors.

In addition to his work in the banking industry, he has also served his community in the Commonwealth of Kentucky on numerous boards, including Kentucky Educational Television, Mercy Health Hospital, and other commissions geared toward economic development.

As someone who has spent a lot of time in the banking industry myself, I know that the industry is better off thanks to Bill's contributions and leadership.

Bill Jones is a west Kentucky legend. On behalf of all the residents of the First Congressional District of Kentucky, I wish Bill Jones a very happy retirement.

□ 1315

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES) laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, following consultation with the Office of Attending Physician, I write to provide you further notification that the public health emergency due to the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 remains in effect.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. WALKER,
Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the extension, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 8,

and effective May 15, 2022, of the “covered period” designated on January 4, 2021.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1988 (22 U.S.C. 6431), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2022, and ending May 14, 2024:

Mr. Nury Turkel, Alexandria, Virginia

Mr. Frank R. Wolf, Vienna, Virginia, to succeed Ms. Anurima Bhargava, Chicago, Illinois

Dr. David G. Curry, Corona Del Mar, California, to succeed Dr. James W. Carr, Searcy, Arkansas

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 1687(b)(1)(A–B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2022 (Pub. L. 117–81), I am pleased to appoint the following member to the Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States:

Mr. Matthew Kroenig, McLean, Virginia
Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 2702 I am pleased to reappoint the following member to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Mr. Günter Waibel, Oakland, California.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

WE LIVE IN INTERESTING TIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-

uary 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is truly an interesting time, which takes me back to the alleged Chinese curse that may you live in interesting times. Well, we are living in interesting times.

Growing up hearing the term “pot calling the kettle black,” it is a colloquialism. Another term, and I brought this up years ago here on the House floor, about gaslighting, we certainly seem to be experiencing some of that these days and have for some time.

But to have the Secretary of Homeland Security, who seems to be an intelligent person, come and testify under oath with a straight face that the border is secure and not be satisfied with that but refer to the Trump administration as having dismantled the immigration system, the ability to secure the border, when exactly the opposite is what was occurring and exactly the opposite of what is occurring now.

It is not secured. All you have to do is go look. I mean, it is incredible, but it is said so often, including by people on the committee of oversight for Border Patrol, the Judiciary Committee.

Having spent so much time down on the border, I like to be there late at night when there is an awful lot of movement normally across the border illegally, but I experienced under the most closed administration, the least forthcoming administration since I have been in Congress since January 2005. In fact, they zoomed up Border Patrol cars to prevent me from getting to the border to see how bad it was.

I was able to go around one night and get back to the border through the local park down south of McAllen, but that was no thanks to the Border Patrol that, in the past, most of them knew that I was their friend and asserted on their behalves because they were not being treated fairly and properly, especially during the Obama administration.

But it is important for any Member of Congress to be able to get to the border unimpeded. Now Secretary Mayorkas says he looked into it and couldn’t find anyone who had ever directed that a Member of Congress, me in particular, was not to be allowed to get to the border.

So, I look forward to using his testimony under oath and seeing who now will try to prevent me from getting to the border.

They will let you go as long as you give them time to set up a dog-and-pony show and have time to restrict the area that they are going to allow you to see, but that is not the way you do oversight.

When I was a judge, I would just show up at a prison, a jail, a halfway house, different places. If I was going to send somebody to a place, I wanted to be able to see how they were being treated without warning.

I still think that is a good idea. Of course, we know the Washington, D.C., jail out east of town where so many January 6 defendants were being held, they wouldn’t let us in, not to visit, not for any reason. It really has been astounding.

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE and I were finally allowed to get in there, and we hope to do that again soon because we are hearing more stories of abuse.

I got a letter in response from the U.S. marshal whom I asked to go do a health and safety visit regarding Ryan Nichols. As I understand the letter, they called over and got information from people who had deceived some of us before, and the U.S. marshal seemed quite satisfied with that without bothering to see for himself.

It is rather unfortunate because the U.S. marshal did an inspection last September or October, I believe it was October, and found that hundreds of the inmates were not being properly treated and needed to be transferred out. So, hopefully, the U.S. marshal will get back to doing the job of the U.S. marshal.

The law, the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court for a couple of centuries, has made clear you are not allowed to punish people in pretrial confinement.

Just as the FISA court has shown no pride and no protection of their court and authority, they have demonstrated that they don’t mind being lied to by lawyers. They don’t mind having fraud upon the court because it is a secret star chamber.

I had hoped that when FISA judges found out they had been manipulated and lied to that they would have enough integrity that they would be upset about being lied to. But, apparently, because of the lack of contempt, the lack of show cause hearings as to why contempt was not appropriate, the lack of prosecution by the Department of Justice going after people within the justice system, I have come to the conclusion—I hoped we could save the FISA court, but apparently, it does not appear that that is going to be possible.

Our Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has not had enough concern about lies being perpetuated, fraud being perpetuated on the FISA court, that he, as far as we know, has not done anything about that because certainly no one is punished, not even for perpetuating lies in order to spy on the campaign and even the Presidency after the person they were spying on and trying to prevent from winning the election won the election.

It is a very disturbing time for those of us who have spent much of our adult lives in the State and Federal justice system trying to see that justice was done. It is a very disturbing time.

Going back to the term “gaslighting,” we are told that we are crazy. We are making stuff up. I know with regard to the 2020 election, people continued to repeat the untruth that

there was no fraud in the 2020 election when most every election that has ever been did have fraud, did have improprieties. It is just a question of how much.

But it is John Fund that wrote a book on election fraud, quite good, some years back. As pointed out before, the biggest fraud about elections is saying there is no fraud in elections.

When Congress made the inappropriate step of mandating electronic voting back after the unfortunate situation in Florida, where even though fifth graders were shown to be able to utilize the butterfly ballots quite effectively, we had Democrat voters that were not able to figure them out. Perhaps another visit to fifth grade might have helped them before they voted.

That is why we were told we had to upend our election system in the United States and go to electronic voting. Many of us are hoping we will get back to paper ballots because we have seen, although people were gaslighting and saying: "Oh, no, no. These machines do not connect to the internet." Then we find out that when there was a problem with a voting machine, they would contact one of the hired guys that would use their iPad, get on the internet, and fix a voting machine without actually being in its presence.

That is using the internet. Yet, we were gaslighted and told even though it was going on, it wasn't going on.

Just to remind people who are not familiar with the term "gaslighting," I thought the 1944 movie with Ingrid Bergman is a great movie. I have watched it more than once. Her husband was making her think she was going crazy or was crazy when she wasn't at all. He was being evil. This from Medical News Today says: "Gaslighting is a form of psychological abuse where a person or group makes someone question their sanity, perception of reality, or memories. People experiencing gaslighting often feel confused, anxious, and unable to trust themselves."

"The term 'gaslighting' derives from the 1938 play and 1944 film 'Gaslight,' in which a husband manipulates his wife into thinking she has a mental illness by dimming their gas-fueled lights and telling her she is hallucinating."

□ 1330

The article goes on to give different examples. It says that gaslighting often develops gradually, making it difficult for a person to detect.

According to the National Domestic Violence Hotline, techniques a person may use to gaslight someone include countering. Countering describes a person questioning someone's memories. They may say things such as: "You never remember things accurately" or "Are you sure? You have a bad memory."

Another technique is withholding. When someone withholds, they refuse to engage in a conversation. A person using this technique may pretend not to understand someone so that they do

not have to respond to them. For example, they might say: "I do not know what you are talking about" or "You are just trying to confuse me." I would submit that withholding can include when being asked for information, for evidence, that being withheld and in return being told: "No, there is nothing there."

It comes to mind back when Jeff Sessions was the Attorney General, some of us had concerns about a matter that needed to be investigated, and we knew that there was a person of integrity who had a notebook full of documentation, many of which documents could quite easily constitute an offense under Federal law. That was pointed out that, gee, this needs to be investigated; this person needs to be talked to.

Eventually, this incredibly competent person was contacted by an FBI agent, after the Secretary of the Department of Justice asked them to take a look. The FBI contacted her and told her to come for a visit and under no circumstances was she to bring her notebook that contained valuable evidence of apparent wrongdoing. When she arrived, she was grilled for 2 hours. She did as she was instructed by the FBI and didn't bring her notebook of documents.

Then when Secretary Sessions asked about the matter, he was told: "Yeah, we looked into it. We talked to her. She didn't have anything." Well, that is a form of gaslighting. You direct a witness not to bring the documentation she has and then tell your boss: "Yeah, we talked to her. She didn't have anything." Well, you told her not to bring the evidence.

So these kinds of things, unfortunately, still go on. I can't help but suspect that when Bill Barr said there was no fraud in the election, he was relying on people, like Jeff Sessions did, when he was lied to, because obviously Bill Barr didn't go out and do an investigation personally; he relied on people perhaps he should not have relied on.

How do we know that anybody at the FBI would lie? Well, we found out it was even done before a Federal judge or Federal judges. The other shoe is yet to drop on all of that.

But something has got to be done. We can't have a star chamber system where judges are lied to. Clearly, when the judges don't care—they have got lifetime appointments—that is one thing. But then when their adjudications, their hearings, are in secret, they have a layer of anonymity that protects them from being judged and ridiculed for either stupidity, naivety, or just dishonesty. Whatever it is, it is not right. That is why our court system was required to be public originally.

But as we see these fundamental foundational principles being removed in the last decades, recent decades, it ought to be a warning, it ought to be a red light flashing, bells going off, "Danger, danger, Will Robinson." This is serious stuff, and it needs to be looked into.

According to this article, trivializing is another technique. This occurs when a person belittles or disregards the other person's feelings. They may accuse them of being too sensitive or of overreacting when they have valid concerns and feelings like, say, about an election.

Some of us who in this Chamber objected to electors exactly—well, almost exactly—like our Democrat friends did on January 6, 2001, January 6 of 2005, and 11 times on January 6 of 2017, so some of us felt like our Democrat friends understand there is nothing unconstitutional or criminal or illegal about coming into this Chamber and objecting.

Now, the difference was, the Democrats in 2017, January 6, 2017, as I recall, they didn't have a Senator to join the objection, which made them illegitimate. On some objections in 2021, we did have Senators; some we didn't. At least we had Senators join on some.

But we thought surely the Democrats, since they objected every time a Republican won since 2000, they would understand or would believe the legitimacy of raising an objection, yet they convinced so much of the American public that anybody that objected was guilty of sedition, treason, all kinds of crimes, which often is a mark—I have been a prosecutor and a felony judge. A lot of times when somebody who has done some activity accuses somebody else of having criminal intent when they do the same activity, it is evidence that they had criminal intent when they did that action.

Interestingly, I am still amazed that there are still people in this body that want to accuse those who objected—as Democrats have, like I say, in 2017, 11 times—accuse them of criminality. That is amazing. Perhaps that lends itself to being a form of gaslighting. We are crazy, we are criminal, because we did what they have done every time a Republican won in the last 20 years.

Another technique is denial. Denial involves a person pretending to forget events or how they occurred. Like when somebody says: "No, we never do that; we never did that." Well, do you think we are crazy? It is in the RECORD. There is video. You can go online and find the video of it occurring.

There were objections by Democrats, which sure sounded to be spurious. But the meme that was going around was saying, What is the difference between criminal conspiracy and truth? The answer was: About 6 months. Well, that is inaccurate, because it has been about 18 months, and we are still discovering truth on some things that we are alleged to have been just crazy—a form of gaslighting—crazy, insurrectionist, criminal conspiracies. These people are insane that think there were any problems with the 2020 election.

The movie that Dinesh D'Souza and Catherine Engelbrecht and Gregg had put together, worked on, "2000 Mules," that is one technique of fraud that was utilized in the 2020 election. These are

things that ought to cause bipartisan research and effort to try to prevent if anybody is truly interested in having free and fair elections.

Another technique, according to this psychological article, is diverting. With this technique, a person changes the focus of a discussion and questions the other person's credibility instead. For example, they might say: "That is just another crazy idea you got from your crazy friends."

I keep hearing people making allegations against Clarence Thomas. I was speaking at an event where John Yoo also spoke. He clerked, as I understand, for Justice Clarence Thomas. I was quite pleased to hear him say what I believe is absolutely true, for anybody that cares to do their research, that Justice Clarence Thomas is one of the most intelligent judges to ever sit on the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet, he is demeaned.

We had a hearing going on. A man named Mark Paoletta was testifying, and he mentioned that he believed the attacks on Justice Thomas were racist, because he is a Black person, an originalist regarding the Constitution, who appears to be conservative.

One of the Democrat members on the committee asked for any evidence whatsoever of any racist attacks on Clarence Thomas. The response was: "Well, you just had a chairman call him an Uncle Tom. That is number one, but I have got tons more, even from this hearing." And he did, but he was cut off and not allowed to give further evidence of the racism being utilized against such a brilliant Justice on the Supreme Court because he happens to be Black and he happens to think for himself.

I mentioned this in our hearing, because I don't think people know his background. I was greatly intrigued and found it extremely interesting reading Clarence Thomas's autobiographical book "My Grandfather's Son."

He has been accused—I have heard him be accused many times of not being Black by people who don't know what it is to be poor and Black. Justice Thomas does. He lived with his mother, as I understood, I recall from the book, about 6 months in Atlanta, a horrendous time. But basically, he and his little brother were raised by their grandparents in Pin Point, Georgia, right on the coast.

Because they were on the coast, he pointed out, they had food, they could get greens that were called poke sallet. I don't like them, but they could always go out and pick poke sallet growing wild. Because they were right there on the coast, they could get fish or different type things, whether it was mussels or clams or fish, whatever, they were able to get a lot of food.

He was so smart, so intelligent, he got a scholarship to Holy Cross and then ultimately decided he wanted to go to law school, applied to Harvard. But I think it was half a day he was at

Harvard, and as he thinks of himself, he was an angry, Black, radical, liberal, and he felt like Harvard was too conservative.

□ 1345

He felt like Harvard was too conservative, so he left and applied for Yale, and he liked Yale better because it was much more liberal, he felt like.

But he began to notice that liberals seemed to look down on him, that they didn't want to talk to him about anything but sports or oppression of Blacks in America, and he noticed that the two or three conservatives in the school were interested in his opinions on all kinds of things and would talk to him about things, and he began to notice and appreciate that.

In a discussion with one of the few conservatives that were talking about seatbelts, helmets, whether they should or shouldn't be mandatory, and he expressed the opinion that, gee, he felt like they just ought to have a law passed that required everybody to wear a seatbelt and everybody on a motorcycle to wear a helmet.

And the conservative, giving a more libertarian question, said, in effect, you have seen government used to oppress Blacks in America, why in the world would you ever want to give the government any more control over your life? That set him thinking. Eventually he began to realize, you know what, it is not a good idea to continue to give the government more and more power because it can be abused.

This is a man who thought for himself. But he also knew how intelligent he was, and it had to be a bit insulting to have people act like, gee, if it weren't for us liberals, you, as a much less intelligent Black, would never have even gotten to be in the school with me, whereas he knew the truth. He was there because he was a brilliant person, and he has not gotten credit for his consistency, for his intellect, for his integrity. It is constantly being demeaned, and they try to gaslight him. It hasn't worked.

Another technique is stereotyping. An article in American Sociological Review states that "a person using gaslighting techniques may intentionally use negative stereotypes of a person's gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, or age to manipulate them. For example, they may tell a female that people will think she is irrational or crazy if she seeks help for abuse."

As an assistant DA, I saw that, and it was amazing to me. I was a bit naive, but to see a woman bruised and battered, clearly beat up, we wanted to see her husband put in jail. Nobody should ever treat anybody—male, female, anybody—the way that some of these battered women got treated. And yet they would be gaslighted to the point that after the bruises and the abrasions went away, they would come back and say, "I don't want to press charges."

In one particular case, I said, "This is not your choice. Under the law, we

have the right to go after your husband because he clearly abused you, and it is going to keep continuing. We asked you when you came in, you know, do you promise you will not back off this time, you will let us go after your husband for this kind of abuse?" And she had said, "Absolutely," with her face all swollen, black and blue, scraped. It was horrendous.

And yet he worked on her psychologically. She eventually comes back and says, "I want to withdraw the charges." We said, "We have got the pictures. We are going to go ahead and press charges this time." "Well, if you do, I am going to say that I was trying to kill him and he was just defending himself." The psychological abuse had worked, and it was just so heartbreaking. Usually they had been gaslighted to the point they thought they deserved it. Nobody deserved that. But we are seeing these same techniques being used today.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, for such time as she may utilize.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GOHMERT for yielding. I am a survivor of domestic violence, and it is still hard for me to talk about it, and it has almost been 30 years ago since I left my abusive ex-husband.

Domestic abuse and violence is very common, unfortunately. I think one in four women are abused by either a boyfriend or a husband, and it is a very, very big issue that I am glad Mr. GOHMERT is showing attention to and shining light on.

At this time, very briefly, I thank our U.S. Supreme Court Justices for the hard work and dedication that they have, and I condemn the intimidation tactics that are taking place against our U.S. Supreme Court Justices. It is an absolute shame. It needs to be stopped.

As we await the U.S. Supreme Court's decision that may overturn *Roe v. Wade*, I stand with the vulnerable women and girls grappling with unplanned pregnancies and the precious infants that they carry.

Pro-abortion advocates and some elected officials push vulnerable women and girls toward abortion and deem it as an empowering choice. There is no empowerment nor compassion in abortion. There is no encouragement in crushing, dismembering, poisoning babies, and sucking them out of the womb with a vacuum.

That is why it is so important that we support vulnerable women and girls who are facing unwanted pregnancies and help them during that critical time. That is why myself and millions of women across the country support pro-life pregnancy centers, support adoptions, support housing for vulnerable women.

What is often forgotten in this argument is the long-term psychological mental health of the mother who aborted their baby.

One of the reasons that I believe I have been led to serve in Congress is to help save the lives of innocent babies in the womb. And now as you see on this floor, Republicans over and over again have called on Speaker PELOSI and the Democrats to put up a bill to save babies that are born alive—yes, born alive—from a botched abortion. Right now we have found that they are being laid aside on a table or they are found in a wastebasket and left to die. Certainly America can do better. We must do better.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Arizona so much. I miss her on the Judiciary Committee because of the very type of insights that we just heard from her. I am grateful for her service, her intellect, her insights, and especially her pugnacious nature that did not cause her to back down, that caused her to stand up after being a victim herself.

I was approached by a lady in a store in Longview, Texas, an adjoining county to where I was a district judge, and she asked if I remembered her. I didn't. She never testified in court, but she said she was there in the courtroom when I sentenced her husband. She said she and her daughter had been abused year after year, and her husband had been arrested different times, but he was such a smooth salesman that he always convinced judges to give him a slap on the wrist and probation and be on his way. She said that I was the first judge in all those years to be able to see through her husband's great salesmanship and send him to prison.

There are a lot of things that aren't pleasant about being a judge or a justice, been that, too, but to have somebody say, "You gave my daughter and me our lives, and we are doing great, and she is doing great, and she is going to go to a great college now," but you have got to be able to see through gaslighting. You have got to be able to see through lies and get to the facts.

Now, we are being told about what a terrible shortage of baby formula there is in this country; and there is. You go in the stores, the shelves have a tremendous shortage. We hear different excuses. But if you had a businessman like President Trump in the White House, when he would see a shortage of something that was needed, he would find out where the problem is. He would call the people that could do something about it, "Hey, we have got to do something about this," and they would figure out a way to get something done about it, find out where the holdup was, where the problem was.

But, instead, when there seems to be a shortage or a problem, Republicans say, "Hey, why aren't we doing something about the baby formula?" This gaslighting technique is used. And then we find out not only is there a shortage in the store, but you just shipped truckloads of baby formula to the border, which acts as a draw to more illegal immigration, especially women with babies or parents with babies to

come across and get the baby formula that is not being allowed to go to Americans and American citizens or people who are legally here.

The thought comes of the flights. Every week we are in session, flight up here, flight back, we sit through the same presentation over and over again by the flight attendants. Sometimes they do it live, sometimes they are just going through the motions and there is a tape playing, but they make very clear, if we have a problem like the fuselage depressurizing, the oxygen mask will drop down, and adults are to put the mask on themselves before they put it on the child, and the reason is rather simple, because if you are trying to put your child's mask on and you don't have oxygen, there is a good chance you will pass out, and then both you and your child will die. You get that on yourself, and then you will have the oxygen you need to think clearly, to make sure your child or children or those dependent upon you can get what they need.

□ 1400

When someone is determined not to provide help to Americans that you are sending all over the world, or you are sending as a lure to people to come in illegally—which we heard during our committee hearing: Yes, we do want to make these people into voters that are flooding in illegally. That was quite a revelation; although, we had suspected that for some time. But there are consequences to not taking care of the greatest, most philanthropic country in the history of the world that has done more for other people, other nations.

Yes, we have had our own problems, but no one has fought racism like was fought here. The most loss of life ever in any war was in the Civil War; over half a million people died over this issue of slavery. There is no country that has ever fought to end slavery, to end racism the way this country has. I thought we had made tremendous progress.

That was one of the things about the United States Army—I was at the Home of the Infantry—you just wanted to make sure that the person next to you was going to be helpful. You weren't concerned about their race or anything like that, you just wanted to make sure that you were going to work together. It was quite a good microcosm. Even though the 4 years I was in, it was not a pleasant time to be in the military. We were sometimes ordered not to wear our uniform off-post because there were people that hated us for wearing a uniform. That was post-Vietnam.

With regard to the baby formula, if you keep drawing people into this country—and now we are told we need to pay people to have abortions—you keep taking those actions, you will destroy this Nation. And once this most philanthropic country in the history of the world is destroyed or converted

into some dictatorial Orwellian society, all these countries that we have been able to help, since particularly 1789 when the Constitution was ratified, that help is not going to be there.

Having heard from people and countries, especially legislatures and parliamentarians in other countries that we consider to be free, they privately will say—and have—you have got to protect America's freedom. We see you losing it. And when you lose your freedom in America, there will be no place else to go to have freedom. You are the one that has secured it for the places that have it. This is so important.

So when our judiciary and our executive Department of Justice abuses people and abuses the system, and uses lies instead of truth, and uses technology to spy on its citizens, we are in big trouble.

I know when I first got here in January of 2005, Republicans were in the majority but when it came to civil rights, we had a lot of friends on the other side of the aisle that felt the same way. There were some on our side who wanted to protect all the power we could give to the Department of Justice, but again, there were people on both sides of the aisle that said this is a threat to our democratic Republic. We can't give them this much power.

Over the years, after Democrats took the majority in January of 2007 through January of 2011 and then got it back, we are not getting the kind of help we did those first 2 years with dealing with the abuses within our own ministry of truth. Because the DOJ really, using Orwellian terms from 1984, and as I have said before, what we are seeing is, the only thing Orwell got wrong was the year. It wasn't 1984, it's now. And it's not called the ministry of truth or the ministry of love.

The ministry of love, of course in 1984, people will remember, that was the entity that took people into custody, knocked down doors. They used techniques like our current DOJ does to intimidate people, to use much more power than they ever need just to intimidate—like 1984, like a totalitarian government.

I bring that up because I remember in the 1980s—and I had so much respect for the FBI agents I knew, and I had seen numerous times. I didn't do a lot of criminal work during the 10 years that I was a civil trial lawyer, but they would contact a soon-to-be defendant saying, we got an indictment, we got a warrant. You can either report to the jail at 10 a.m. tomorrow or we will come get you, and you would much rather come in on your own. If they had a lawyer, they would call the lawyer: Have your client come in at 9 or 10 a.m.

Not now. Oh, no. Oh, no. The Justice Department wants to come in and knock down your door because it is a lot more fun. They have got the battering ram. And it is a lot more fun to get people in their underwear or maybe

in their pajamas that are in bed, because you get to scare them. It is easier to intimidate them.

What happened to those days when it didn't matter whether the assistant U.S. attorney or the FBI agents voted Democrat or Republican? They were going to make sure they didn't abuse their power. I am not seeing that kind of concern like I used to see from people in the Department of Justice.

I know there are some that feel that way but, yet they are being gaslit if they try to report or be whistleblowers, and their careers are destroyed. Kind of like Director Mueller destroyed the career of the FBI agent that was the whistleblower and reported the unethical and, I would say, illegal conduct by the FBI in trying to persecute during the prosecution of Ted Stevens when they abused the system and convicted an innocent man.

Yeah, the Mueller way. You promote the one that engaged in the fraud, and you punish the one who reported the fraud within the FBI.

We have just seen it grow worse and worse as Mueller's dear friend, James Comey, took over. The abuses grew. And then Christopher Wray was appointed to clean up the FBI. It appears to me his way of cleaning things up is just to sweep it under the rug. If somebody lies to the FISA court, commits a crime, whereas if it were a conservative, they would put him under the prison rather than punish him, would just let him go get a higher paying job somewhere else.

That is not punishment. It is not deterrent. And it is doing massive damage to this country.

So we have the ministry of truth now called the disinformation board that has been created. This is being led and created by people who have been champions of disinformation, champions of gaslighting, who want to convince America: If you think there is a problem, if you think there is abuse in the FISA court, if you think there was any impropriety in elections, then we need to come after you and charge you with disinformation.

For those who have not read 1984, or don't remember, the ministry of truth, in this case now called the disinformation board, they were charged with rewriting history every day. As Orwell pointed out through, I believe his name was Winston, one day they might say, well, this government did not invent the airplane but all of the good changes that have made it more effective, more efficient, faster, those came by our great, Big Brother Government.

Then eventually, you would get to the point where you would just forget all of that and say, Big Brother Government created the airplane, has had everything to do with making it effective, and just take credit for everything good and then blame anybody else for anything bad.

So that seems like where we are going. We could call it the gaslighting

board, but it is called the disinformation board. And it is headed by a person who, herself, has been quite guilty of disinformation, yet she is going to be in charge of coming up with disinformation for the future, apparently. We can expect problems ahead for sure.

Now, this article from yesterday, May 12, from the New York Post, Nina Jankowicz says, "Verified Twitter users should edit others' tweets."

I mean, we are right out of 1984, going back to the days of the 1950s when some songwriter wrote, If your mommy is a commie, well you gotta turn her in.

This is where it appears the disinformation board wants to go. Yeah, kids, turn in your parents if you find out that they have said anything privately at home that is inconsistent with the new truth that the disinformation board has come up with.

This is dangerous stuff. It cannot be overstated. We have got to stop the disinformation board. The solution to misinformation is more freedom so that people that have accurate information can come out with it. But when the government puts its finger on the scales of justice, on the balance, then you can be assured you are going to get less truth and less justice because it is not going to be fair.

I mentioned before that I was an exchange student for the summer to the old Soviet Union. From what I understood, it was the Soviet government, it was the Communist Party that put out all this misinformation. They would lie about things. They would cover up. I still wonder how many cosmonauts may have died during their space program, but they never came out truthfully with what all happened.

I was with a couple of Soviet college students, who I liked a great deal; they were wonderful people. We were looking at an exhibit about some of the space program things. Gagarin was the first human ever in space, and there were some entries about Gagarin and the world hero that he was. Up to that point, I felt like, well, these are college students who would be the most likely to get upset if they were lied to. And it said something about Gagarin being killed by testing a new experimental plane. My Soviet male, college friend, who spoke terrific English, said, Yeah, well, we know that is not true. I was intrigued. I never heard them indicate that they knew they were being lied to by the Soviet government.

The other Soviet college student said, Yeah, there is no way that happened. And I said, You don't believe he was killed testing a plane as a test pilot?

□ 1415

They both chimed in that, no, there is no way. He was the greatest hero in the history of the world, the first man in space. There is no way the Soviet government would allow him to get

into a plane by himself that wasn't safe. That didn't happen. It was too important. He was too important as a hero, as someone that made us admire our government. They wouldn't let him die like that.

Well, I don't know whether he died as a test pilot or not, but I was intrigued that they believed to their core that the Soviet government lied to them. Why? Because the Soviet government constantly lied to them.

They wouldn't make up lies. In fact, remember, this was 1973. I found it interesting, in Pravda, they were reporting some things about Watergate emerging back in the U.S., and because it really was like a disinformation board or ministry of truth, whichever one you want to call it, they made everything about the Soviet Union. Everything was centered on the Soviet Union.

So their take on Watergate was that because Richard Nixon came to the Soviet Union, the first President ever to do so, that is why the Democrats came after him and were wanting to throw him out of office or put him in jail, because he made friends with the Soviets.

That was their take in order to make it all about the Soviet Union. Of course, we know crimes were committed, and the coverup was the worst of it.

But this is where we are headed, and it is a very dangerous time. We do not need a disinformation board. We need people being able to stand up and speak up without intimidation because they are conservative Black or because they are abused or whatever. They need to be able to speak up and bring evidence forward, or at least have an investigation to get to the bottom of things without being belittled, without being gaslit. That will do more to secure our freedom for the future.

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

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do the impossible. We are going to do like 20 boards in 30 minutes. Just please wave at me if I start rambling at hyper rates of speed.

One of the reasons for today's presentation, it is somewhat of a follow-up from a couple of weeks ago, but also somewhat of just this frustration of statements from our brothers and sisters on the left, from the President, even the comments this week of: Okay, Republicans, where is your plan?

Have you seen the numbers of bills that we have offered to take on inflation, to promote economic growth, to promote fairness? None of them can get a hearing around here.

My point comes to something very, very simple. We intend to judge the

left over what you have accomplished the last 15 months, and we will make it to 2 years.

Are the poor better off, the working poor better off, the middle class better off? Is the environment better off? Is the world safer and healthier?

Then, we expect you to turn around and judge us when we had the majority and the White House. Take a look at 2017, '18, '19, and we will bookend the pandemic, and judge us. I believe you will see the policies we brought to this floor, to this country, made the poor less poor, the working poor substantially less poor, the middle class much more prosperous, and it didn't have the cruelty that Democrat policy has executed the last 15 months.

Look, I am not being hyperbolic. It is a crappy environment out there.

It is just exhausting having to do this every couple of months because of the willingness just not to tell the truth here by my brothers and sisters on the left.

Once again, tax reform was done at the very end of 2017. Speaker after speaker, the Speaker herself, came to the floor and told us how this was a giveaway to the rich, that it was going to crash revenues, that we are heading to recession. None of that was true.

We ended up having a couple of years there before the pandemic—and I am going to show you, if we hadn't had it, how miserable the pandemic economics would have been.

The fact of the matter is, when we passed tax reform, corporate tax receipts—we don't call them revenues; we call them receipts if you are on the Ways and Means Committee—went up 75 percent, far beyond CBO's early projections.

The fact of the matter is individual income taxes were up 27½ percent, and 80 percent of that was paid by the top 10 percent.

Bit of trivia, Mr. Speaker pro tem, and to my Democrat colleagues. Our tax reform was more progressive, meaning the top tier of income earners were paying a higher percentage, a larger percentage, of the Federal income tax burden than the previous tax system.

Stop lying about what we did because what we did was pretty darn amazing. When you think about just the economic effects, income inequality shrank, food insecurity shrank, and we did it without inflation.

Look, I accept there is a huge divide here. Democrats don't particularly like Republican policies. We obviously don't like theirs. Fine.

Do you care about poor people? Do you care about the middle class? Then step up and just steal our ideas. We will be happy to let you take them if it is good for America. But the crap that has been moved here in the last 15 months has just been cruel.

Let's go back and, one more time, take a look at the actual math. If you take a look at the middle income, what was happening in that mean of our

country—and this is adjusted to, I believe, 2019, so it is all consistent.

You take a look at that growth, the opportunity, and you take a look at what happened when we did tax reform, just the incredible growth of income. This is real purchasing power. This is adjusted for inflation.

The fact of the matter is, take a look at these miserable years here during the Obama administration, where we basically just flatlined, and we stayed there.

The 2008 recession was brutal. Why did it take years and years and years and years and years just to get back to mean?

The fact of the matter is regulatory policy, tax policy, and trade policy make a difference, and you have to basically embrace something. Maybe this is where some of the left and right divide is.

As a conservative, I believe growth is moral. I believe my daughter and the next generation of Americans deserve to live better tomorrow and the next year and the next decade better than they did yesterday. Instead, the policies of this administration and this Congress have made America poorer.

Once again, you take a look at what was being said here. That blue is what all the pretax reform trend line was. This is where we were going. We were all excited that we might get slightly over 2 percent GDP growth.

Understand, when we talk about gross domestic product growth, it is a big deal because it builds on itself. It is like a staircase. When you get another 1 percent here, 1 percent may not seem like a lot to you, but it becomes the new basis for the next year and the next year. When you start to look at that over a decade, it starts being remarkable amounts of wealth that is distributed throughout society.

The red is what we accomplished by fixing the regulatory and tax system around here.

The fact of the matter is, if you care about the middle class, if you care about the working poor, if you care about this society, if you care about our future, embrace the truth. Embrace that it worked. If you want, say you could have done it better. But the fact of the matter is, what we accomplished worked.

This is taking a little bit to geekdom, and I am sorry about that, but how horrendous the Democrats' forecasts were on accuracy, and how, when Republicans took over the majority, we functionally nailed it.

As a matter of fact, for 2018, we substantially underestimated the amount of growth we were going to accomplish with our regulatory and tax reform.

I know this may not seem important, but it is because, once again, in this place, we play this game: "Well, CBO says this." But for some reason, when the Democrats are in charge of this place, CBO gives these projections, and we never get there. When Republicans are in charge, CBO gives us projections, and we touch them or exceed them.

Then, we turn around and see the President and Democrat leadership talk about it as if it was some dystopian time. It is just this bizarre place, being judged by what we actually accomplished just as we intend to judge you and what you have done to this country.

This one is actually important because we are going through this right now. There is an argument that inputs in inflation is basically it is too many dollars—simplistic—too many dollars chasing too few goods and services.

You can do what the Federal Reserve is doing right now, which is basically squeeze dollars, squeeze liquidity out of our society. It will drive us into a recession, and it will raise misery, and people will lose their jobs. But that is what is being required to get out the excess liquidity that the Democrats here—not a single Republican voted for it—did to this country.

There is a reason Larry Summers begged you not to do it. You know, big-time Republican Larry Summers, right? He begged you not to do it. You did it anyway, and you set it off. You basically took a flaming log and threw it on the kindling. Then you run around and say, "Well, it was Russia." I am going to show you over and over here that it was going on before the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

I am going to show you that your policies, for years, are what set off energy prices. But one of the inputs, if you want to tamp down inflation, that we as Members of Congress can do is incentivize society. You incentivize industry to make more stuff.

Some of the ways you do that is you get more of our brothers and sisters to participate in the economy. The fact of the matter is that was also one of the miracles that we accomplished with tax reform, the number of folks that came from the sidelines and came back into work because it became profitable for their lives, because there were opportunities.

Once again, is growth moral? Because what we accomplished was pretty remarkable.

I know it may be hard to try to get your head around some of these charts, but the fact of the matter is the spike we saw of people coming back out of retirement and going back into the labor force and young people, I guess, dropping their video games and going into the labor force, it didn't set off inflation. In many ways, what it did was help set off productivity so we had those amazing wealth effects there, particularly in 2018, 2019, the first quarter of 2020 before the pandemic.

Look where we are at today. Today, we are now seeing articles that labor force participation—our numbers of brothers and sister who are going to choose not to participate in the economy, who are going to take early retirement, not come back into labor—continues to leave us flatlined, leaving our country with the solution the left is going to give us for inflation is to let

the Federal Reserve drive us into a recession. That is all you are giving us right now.

This chart is absolutely fascinating for folks. Remember how Democrats believed they made people's lives so much better by functionally handing out cash?

□ 1430

Did you know that our brothers and sister had a hell of a lot more cash in their bank accounts before COVID? The amount of economic growth that was happening over here—they weren't spending it as fast as they got it. It was actually starting to go into their future retirement, their retirement security, the money for their kids' education.

The fact of the matter is the chart is the chart. These are the increases in household income, household checking deposits for the lowest 20 percent of quartiles. I despise that term. The fact of the matter is these are our brothers and sisters who are considered to be at the bottom 20 percent of the income quartiles. You see this dramatic change in how much money they had in their checking accounts? Over here you can see—here is the blip where we sent out COVID money, and here is where they are today. It is gone. As a matter of fact, it is now lower than it was pre-COVID.

This is the Democrats' great success in the Keynesian stimulus model of handing out cash. Our brothers and sisters have less cash in the bank than they did before. When we were doing it through economic growth and not handouts, our brothers and sisters out there—if you care about the poor and the working poor, you made them poorer.

If I get one more Democrat here who comes behind the microphone, and says: Well, energy prices are because of the invasion. Come on. We all know that isn't true.

How many times have there been votes in this House and every single Democrat voted no to construction of new refineries, no construction to even provide permits for new refineries, no new drilling? We have vote after vote after vote and this has been going on for decades.

You have all heard this discussion of when the Biden administration took over and they functionally took their regulatory apparatus, and said, you give a loan, you are a pension system, and you invest in hydrocarbons. We need you now to file new disclosures on what you did for the environment and greenhouse. What are your risk levels?

You functionally basically created this chilling effect for what we call the capital stack, the access to capital to extract and refine hydrocarbons. It sounds a little geeky. Let's make this simple.

It is not because of the cancellation of the pipelines; it is a little bit. It is not because of the lack of leases; it is a little bit. It is substantially because

in 2020 you had the collapse of the useful hydrocarbons because everyone is staying home. If you remember, we went to negative oil prices. Lots and lots of fields and lots of delivery systems shut down. A year later, we desperately need those back into production.

The Democrats have taken over everything and now they make it damn hard to get any money. They make it damn hard to put that field back into production. What did you think was going to happen?

I am going to show you in a couple of charts—it is a couple charts away—the pricing that we are paying today for heating and cooling our homes, for filling up our vehicle, was coming before the invasion. What Russia is doing to Ukraine just brought it forward by a few months, but you could already see it in the futures market.

Don't you remember last fall we were having discussions here on the floor about how people were going to heat their homes this winter? Once again, you are going to have the President and Democrats say, well, it is Putin's inflation. It is just not true. It is Democrat policy.

The fact of the matter is—think about this—when we functionally hit 2019 and going into the first part of 2020, we were energy independent. We functionally had accomplished the miracle that we had not seen for 30, 40, 50 years. Imagine if we had that today? It shows you how much damage the left has been able to accomplish in 15 months.

There is a great irony here. One of the pledges of the Democrats when they were running in the last election and the Biden campaign, and even the people that ran against me—we are going to clean the environment. We actually care. We are going to deal with greenhouse gases. Their lack of understanding of basic economics—they do all these things, they screw up the capital stack, they screw up the ability to extract natural gas, natural gas goes way up in price, and power plants all across the country have to convert back to coal.

Congratulations, guys. Last year, America burned 23 percent more coal because you raised the price of the dramatically cleaner natural gas so much they had to convert back to coal. So when the environmental party—at least the party that claims to be. But if you look at the math, the Republicans' ability to get natural gas to the market cheaply and efficiently is what got us so darn close to those Paris accord numbers, just organically, because we believed in economics.

The control freaks here that thought they controlled the energy markets—sorry, guys, you made it much worse. You made it much worse. The math is the math. This is math coming from the Democrat administration admitting they made it much worse.

Once again, if you take a look at the futures market—and this is long before

the invasion—when you see these spikes, this is almost a year ago, it was already coming because the constraint on supplies was already built into the policy of Democrat control of this government.

The misery today—even though there is going to be this desperate attempt to say it is Putin's inflation and Putin's gas prices—it is just not true. Some of us were on this floor last October saying that we were already seeing this in the futures market. The only thing the invasion did is just brought it forward by a few months.

You wonder why you have inflation. Let's see. Left policies blew up the energy market. Left policies financed massive amounts of liquidity and the incentive to functionally stay home and not be part of a productive society. Great Democrat policies again.

Take a look at the misery index—which actually I should do a calculation. I should go back and try to figure out—in this misery index we would probably just do inflation and how many people are living on the street and how many kids are dying of fentanyl overdose because the border is open. That may be one of our coming projects.

The fact of the matter is, the CPI calculation—and this is just from the last couple of weeks—is now well over 14 percent, and we are seeing food, energy, shelter coming close to 20 percent. These are the core components. This is year over year. This isn't the little transitory—do you remember how we were promised over and over by the administration and my Democrat colleagues that it was transitory? This is year over year. This is your version of transitory?

If you want to make Americans poorer, what are some of the cruelest things you can do? Let's go back to our working poor. What are the two things you do to crush the working poor? Inflation and open up the border. You flood the population with individuals with similar skill sets and then you make the core things you need: food, rent and fuel—if you are rich, which we know the Democratic Party now has become substantially an elite party. If you take a look at your money, it is rich coastal people that write the checks. It is what it is.

That working class, particularly the poor working class, are just getting their heads kicked in. The only solution we get from the left is, well, let's send them more checks, even though that worked brilliantly a year ago.

If you start to look at fuel, 58.8, gasoline up 43 percent. Then you start taking a look at changes in food and shelter. In my community, I represent a population that has had the highest inflation now for almost a year and a half. The calculation that just came out last week, my community just suffered 11 percent year-over-year inflation. Last January, the year-over-year inflation was 10.9. My community has gotten poorer, substantially poorer, because of Democrat policies.

Now you start to think about that middle class, how much of their income actually goes to buy fuel or, in this case, buy food? You get the con job here saying, well, the core CPI says this. Okay.

When you adjust core CPI, the consumer price index, and you start to think about individuals of—if I am in the working middle class, that hard-working middle class, or even some of the lower quartiles, the amount of your income that goes to food, fuel and shelter, you start to realize across the country that it is not 8.1 or whatever that number is that was the national average, it is over 10.

It is folks with assets, like a bunch of the Members here. They own houses, they own a second house, they own a vacation home. They are invested in real estate equities. They own some REITs holdings. They are doing fine. All those adjust with inflation.

But for our brothers and sisters who are just trying to survive, we are kicking their heads in. It is policy that came from the floor of this House that did it.

You start to think about the share of income now having to be spent just on shelter, when our lowest quartiles, or quintiles, however you prefer to say it, is now over 24½ percent for our lowest quintile to basically just pay for their rent. These are nationwide numbers. This isn't my Phoenix-Scottsdale number where it is actually substantially higher.

Congratulations to my community, Democrats brought you 11 percent inflation. Yay. After redistricting—I am blessed, I have an amazing community, but my community voted for Joe Biden by a couple of points, but they didn't vote for this.

If you want to make someone that is retired, if you want to make a working person poorer, do this. This is misery. The unwillingness—this is an uncomfortable analogy, but I think it works.

Does anyone have a friend that they tried to help through being an alcoholic and you took them to their 12-step meeting?

What is the first step? They admit they have a problem. My brothers and sisters on the left here won't admit they have a problem because they won't admit they did this.

Let's start going over some of the brilliant policy ideas—and I only use this one as a simple example because it is easy to digest. In the Democrats' Build Back Better, they have been speechifying to us that supply chains are setting off inflation, we need more production, we need this.

Then they slip language into their own legislation that says—but you can't automate the ports because we are beholden to the unions. Think about that. The Build Back Better has a provision in there, slipped in there, hidden in there, that you can't automate the very things that technology disruptions can help make us more productive, so that we can actually start

to drive inflation down and get the wealth cycle back to our brothers and sisters here in this country. They are more beholden to their union constituency than the working men and women of this country.

□ 1445

Then here is the very last slide.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask for my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It shows you how fast you can talk if you have been just sucking down coffee all day, Mr. Speaker.

I should throw this out: I have had the pleasure of sitting there when I have someone on the other side, and I know it is sometimes like fingernails on a chalkboard, and you are a good guy to tolerate because I am frustrated. I am frustrated that this body is not living up to what we are capable of. There are lots of reasons and lots of excuses. But, please, to anyone here, no more going behind the microphone and saying: but it is all paid for.

The math up to this point of just what has been passed—this isn't what has been proposed, what is proposed is off the chart—just what has been passed, the left has functionally increased the deficit by \$2½ trillion dollars.

That is actually using the much more favorable CBO scoring. So no more pretending and saying everything is paid for. It is not.

All I'm trying to do here is a simple point: judge us as conservatives and Republicans by what we did policywise in 2017, '18, and '19 and the good it was for the country. It was good for everyone across the board. And then take a look at particularly the last 15 months.

I beg of my Democratic colleagues: reach back, figure out what we did that worked, steal the ideas and call them your own. But the country deserves so much better than what they are getting from this body today.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With respect to a unanimous consent request entered earlier today by Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, the Chair would clarify that such request cannot be entertained with respect to H.R. 7648.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 16, 2022, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4122. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Commercial Prerinse Spray Valves [EERE-2019-BT-TP-0025] (RIN: 1904-AE55) received March 30, 2022, 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-4123. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(j), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcasting Services (Vernon, Alabama) [MB Docket No.: 22-30] (RM-11916) received April 26, 2022, 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-4124. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(j), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcasting Services (Billings, Montana) [MB Docket No.: 22-39] (RM-11917) received April 26, 2022, 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-4125. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(j), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcasting Services (Albany, New York) [MB Docket No.: 22-13] (RM-11914) received April 26, 2022, 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-4126. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG technical report — Consolidated Decommissioning Guidance, Characterization, Survey, and Determination of Radiological Criteria, Final Report received April 28, 2022, 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-4127. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Anacostia River, Washington, DC [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0212] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4128. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Columbia River, Rufus, OR [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0176] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4129. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0234] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4130. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Bonita Tideway, Brigantine, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0232] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4131. A letter from the Legal Tech, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone for Pollution Responders; Neva Strait, Sitka, AK [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0216] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4132. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Montlake Cut, Union Bay Reach, Seattle, Washington [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0774] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4133. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Chincoteague Bay, Chincoteague, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2021-0751] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4134. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Chattanooga, TN [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0250] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4135. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Cooper River Bridge Run, Cooper River and Town Creek Reaches, Charleston, SC [Docket Number: USCG-2022-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4136. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rates-2022 Annual Review and Revisions to Methodology [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0431] (RIN: 1625-AC70) received April 25, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4137. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Firestone Grand Prix of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Florida [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0075] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4138. A letter from the Legal Tech, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Maumee River, Toledo, OH [Docket

No.: USCG-2021-0303] (RIN:1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4139. A letter from the Legal Tech, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters, and Shipping; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0348] received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4140. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone, Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No. USCG-2022-0040] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4141. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Tschefuncta River [Docket No.: USCG-2016-0963] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4142. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zones; Christina River, Wilmington, DE; Darby Creek and Schuylkill River, Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0145] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4143. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Lake Havasu, Lake Havasu City, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0032] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4144. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone for Navy Diving Exercise; Gastineau Channel, Juneau, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0893] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4145. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Jackson Fireworks Scattering; Yellow Bluff San Francisco Bay, Sausalito, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0069] (RIN: 1625-AA00) March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4146. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zones; Anacostia River, Washington, DC and Susquehanna River, between Cecil and Harford Counties, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0127] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4147. A letter from the Legal Technician, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Shore (Belt) Parkway Bridge Construction, Mill Basin; Brooklyn, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0848] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4148. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Grounded Tug and Barge, Deerfield Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-0222-0074] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4149. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Chicago River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0035] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4150. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; CBWTP Outfall Diffuser Improvements, Columbia River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0647] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4151. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD and King George County, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0112] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4152. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Cape Lookout, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0094] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4153. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2022-0126] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4154. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Old River, Between Victoria Island and Byron Tract, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0181] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4155. A letter from the Legal Technician, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Sector Ohio Valley Annual and Recurring Special Local Regulations, Update [Docket No.: USCG-2021-0873] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4156. A letter from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Operational Risk Assessments for Waterfront Facilities Handling Liquefied Natural Gas and Fuel, and Updates to Industry Standards [Docket No.: USCG-2019-0444] (RIN: 1625-AC52) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4157. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2022 Indexed Qualifying Payment Amount (Rev. Proc. 2022-11) received April 26, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. Thompson of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 6873. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for Bombing Prevention to address terrorist explosive threats, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 6868. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for financial assistance to fund certain cybersecurity and infrastructure security education and training programs and initiatives, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 6824. A bill to authorize the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security to hold an annual cybersecurity competition relating to offensive and defensive cybersecurity disciplines, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-324). 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 Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7762. A bill to amend the Act of August 10, 1956, to provide for the payment of pay and allowances for certain officers of the Army who are assigned to the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 7763. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support and incentivize domestic activities to address fertilizer shortages and deficiencies, diversify fertilizer sources, and reduce dependency on foreign

sources for fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 7764. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional payments under the environmental quality incentives program for implementation of a nutrient management practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 7765. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish Supply Chain Regional Resource Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 7766. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 7767. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for the enforcement of mental health and substance abuse disorder parity requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 7768. A bill to affirm that the Farm Credit Administration is the sole and independent regulator of the Farm Credit System; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 7769. A bill to establish a commission to develop a helicopter usage management plan for certain airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 7770. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to permit additional leave for bone marrow or blood stem cell donation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, 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. ROUZER:

H.R. 7771. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a study analyzing the cost to permit applicants and permit holders of complying with sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. BIGGS):

H.R. 7772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to suspend the entry of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 7773. A bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 7774. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 7775. A bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr.

GARBARINO, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. RYAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEHLS, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. MANN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LATTI, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. STEIL, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BACON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. EMMER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. HARRIS):

H. Res. 1114. A resolution expressing support for recognizing "National Police Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H. Res. 1115. A resolution requiring each Member of the House of Representatives to serve one shift in a passenger seat of a law enforcement vehicle observing the work day of a local law enforcement officer once each session of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H. Res. 1116. A resolution expressing support for the annual Childhood Apraxia of Speech Awareness Day on May 14, 2022, coinciding with Better Hearing and Speech Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H. Res. 1117. A resolution expressing support for the designation of 2022 as the "Year of the Parents"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 7762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 7763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The commerce clause power under article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 7764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 7765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 7766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 7767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 7768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 7769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 7770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 7771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 7772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 7774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 7775.

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 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 68: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 123: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 419: Mr. EMMER and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 426: Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 497: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 541: Mr. OWENS and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 622: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 774: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 959: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1179: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1397: Mr. GALLEGGO.

H.R. 1474: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

H.R. 1553: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1631: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1684: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1733: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1771: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1816: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1946: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 1978: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 2143: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2187: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 2256: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2374: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 2565: Mr. McCAUL and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2604: Mr. JACOBS of New York.

H.R. 2839: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2900: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 2992: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 3339: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 3425: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.

H.R. 3513: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3808: Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 3836: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 4057: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4147: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 4151: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4268: Ms. ROSS, Ms. MANNING, and Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4436: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 4442: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4587: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 4716: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 4870: Mr. GUEST and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4943: Mr. GALLEGGO and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 4944: Mr. GALLEGGO and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 4949: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 5232: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JACOBS of New York, and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 5444: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 5527: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 5537: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5540: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5754: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5769: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 5800: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 6093: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 6161: Ms. TITUS, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 6171: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 6202: Mr. BUDD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 6216: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 6381: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 6398: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 6448: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 6480: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 6543: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 6544: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 6613: Mr. LIEU, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 6658: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 6668: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 6681: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 6702: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 6704: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 6852: Mr. UPTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 6860: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 6913: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.

H.R. 6921: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 6943: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 6949: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 7076: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 7176: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 7198: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 7267: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 7331: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7352: Ms. VAN DUYNE.

H.R. 7361: Mr. MELJER.

H.R. 7366: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 7382: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 7395: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 7438: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 7439: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PORTER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 7465: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 7477: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 7479: Mr. GIMENEZ.
 H.R. 7482: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LIEU, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 7492: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 7510: Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 7533: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H.R. 7535: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 7537: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H.R. 7550: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 7578: Mr. DONALDS.
 H.R. 7579: Mr. BARR, Mr. HERN, and Ms. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 7628: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 7644: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 7660: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 7680: Ms. VAN DUYN.
 H.R. 7688: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 7693: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 7699: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 7703: Ms. TITUS and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 7713: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 7718: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 7719: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
 H.R. 7725: Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 7736: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 7743: Mr. BUDD and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 7758: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. TRONE.
 H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. KAHELE.
 H. Res. 1013: Mr. MORELLE.
 H. Res. 1019: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Res. 1076: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H. Res. 1078: Mr. CARSON.
 H. Res. 1081: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 1091: Mr. BABIN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. TIFFANY.
 H. Res. 1100: Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TURNER.
 H. Res. 1110: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H. Res. 1111: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BABIN, Ms. MACE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOONEY, and Ms. TENNEY.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 11 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT on H.R. 6009: Mr. LaMalfa.

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46: Ms. Foxx, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Mast, Mr. Hern,

Mr. Womack, Mr. Donalds, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Banks, Mrs. Harshbarger, and Mr. Arrington.

Petition 13 by Mr. BANKS on H.R. 426: Mr. Rice of South Carolina, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Armstrong, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Burgess, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Carey, Mr. Ellzey, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Crenshaw, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Cloud, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Donalds, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Carter of Texas, Mr. Pence, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Barr, Mr. Bentz, Ms. Van Duyne, Mrs. Hinson, Mr. LaTurner, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Scalise, Mr. Kustoff, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Garcia of California, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Allen, Mr. Hill, Mr. Comer, Mr. Huizenga, Mr. Bost, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Emmer, Mrs. Steel, Mr. Garbarino, Mr. Womack, Ms. Malliotakis, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Mr. Harris, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Cole, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Latta, and Mr. Lamborn.

Petition 14 by Mr. MAST on House Resolution 1039: Mrs. McClain, Mr. Gibbs, Mrs. Hartzler, Ms. Foxx, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Norman, Mr. McClintock, and Mr. Rosendale.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DARRELL RICCI

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Marine Corps veteran, accomplished dairy farmer, and American patriot Darrell Ricci.

Darrell Ricci was born in 1935 and raised on his family's dairy farm in Snohomish, Washington. He was an active member of the Future Farmers of America (FFA). In 1953, Darrell received the Star State Dairy Farmer Award and graduated from Monroe High School. Darrell was then awarded the American Farmer Degree, the highest degree achievable in the National FFA Organization due to his hard work and dedication. Darrell also attended Washington State College to study animal science. Towards the end of the Korean War, Darrell enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. He served for two years in Twentynine Palms, California and Bremerton, Washington. While in the Marine Corps, Darrell met his sweetheart, Joanne Cicelski. They got married and began their life together in Snohomish Valley.

Darrell and Joanne were innovative and accomplished dairy farmers. Darrell was one of the first dairy farmers to utilize artificial insemination with All-West Breeders. He used the "Ricville" prefix for over fifty years to identify his purebred Holsteins. In 1976, Darrell and Joanne were awarded the Washington State Dairy Family of the Year. Darrell was a member with the Washington State Holstein Association, serving as Snohomish North-King Holstein Club president, state director, and state president. The Riccis won many awards for their incredible achievements in breeding and showing registered Holsteins along with their contributions to the dairy industry.

Darrell also cared greatly for his local community. He served on the Snohomish School Board for several terms and was an active member of St. Michael Catholic Church and later Maltby Christian Assembly. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I am honored to recognize my great-uncle Darrell Ricci's extraordinary life of exemplary service to his country and community. His contributions to the Washington State dairy farming industry cannot be understated. It is my hope that his diligent work ethic, integrity, and commitment to public service will be carried on by those who knew and loved him.

THOMAS CECIL HARMAN OBITUARY

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following obituary for Thomas "Tommy" Cecil Harman.

Tommy was the loving husband of Bobbie Sue Harman with whom he celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on January 1, 2022. He was the father of Andrea Harman Duncan (Mark) and Jason Thomas Harman (Christina). His six grandchildren, whom he loved and cherished, are Abbie and Austin Duncan and McElson, Madison, Jase, and Jacob Harman. He is also survived by loving brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, loving nieces and nephews, a special aunt and uncle, and many dear friends. He was predeceased by his parents, Layman and Ganelle Harman and brother, Archie L. Harman.

Tommy was born on December 6, 1950. He attended Lexington 1 schools and then Clemson University where he graduated in 1973 with a degree in Financial Management. He was employed by the Lexington State Bank from 1973-1995 where he was vice-president, loan officer, and in human resources. He was then President and CEO of the Lexington Chamber of Commerce from 1995-1999 and later head of public relations for Pond Branch Telephone Company (PBT Telecom), which later became Comporium, until his retirement in 2015.

Tommy tirelessly served his family, community, and church. He has been a member of Lexington Baptist Church for 50 years where he served terms as a deacon, served on the kindergarten and stewardship committees, was a former church treasurer, former children's Sunday school teacher, and a faithful servant in many other ways.

Tommy was the charter president of the Lexington Sertoma Club, where he remained a member and leader for 45 continuous years. He led many fundraising projects including his idea of celebrating "Big Thursday" with Carolina and Clemson fans each October. The club has been able to provide funding for speech and hearing projects and help the community of Lexington through this event.

Tommy headed up the Lexington Community Committee "Power Up Lunch" for businesses from 2003 to 2013. He served several terms on the Board of Directors for the Batesburg-Leesville and Lexington Chambers of Commerce. He was a former member of the Batesburg-Leesville Rotary Club and the Gilbert Ruritan Club. He was also a 1997 Leadership Lexington graduate.

Because of his community work, Tommy received numerous awards. Among these are the 2015 State of South Carolina Order of the Silver Crescent, the A. L. Harman award by the Lexington Chamber of Commerce, and the Lexington Sertoma Club Achievement Award.

Tommy loved helping coach his son Jason's baseball and basketball teams. He greatly enjoyed Clemson sporting events with family and friends. He loved traveling and especially enjoyed planning trips. He was proud of the fact that he had visited 54 National Parks and every state in the United

States. He loved to take his family and friends to show them the beautiful parks and God's handiwork. He truly loved life and he loved living it. More than anything else, he loved Jesus Christ and wanted everyone to know about the power of God's saving grace.

Funeral services will be held at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, May 2, 2022 at Lexington Baptist Church with interment to follow at Lexington Memorial Cemetery. The family will receive friends from 4:00-7:00 p.m. on Sunday, May 1, at Caughman-Harman Funeral Home, Lexington Chapel.

RECOGNIZING MEDGLOBAL'S HUMANITARIAN MISSIONS TO UKRAINE

HON. MARIE NEWMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Ms. NEWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the selfless and heroic work of the nurses, doctors, and staff of MedGlobal, a humanitarian and health non-governmental organization based in Chicago Ridge, Illinois, on their recent medical missions to Ukraine. To date, MedGlobal, which is headquartered in Illinois' Third Congressional District, has helped train nearly 1,000 Ukrainian doctors in 8 hospitals in Lviv, Ukraine, and brought nearly \$1 million worth of life saving medical supplies generously donated by the American people to help Ukrainians in need.

On March 9, 2022, the MedGlobal team of health care providers departed Chicago, Illinois, and arrived in Warsaw, Poland, the following day. The group brought with them desperately needed medical supplies and medications requested by Ukrainian doctors working at hospitals in Lviv. The team traveled by bus from Warsaw to the Polish-Ukrainian border and completed a nearly 45-mile trek through Ukraine to reach Lviv. After a successful mission, the providers made their safe return on March 13.

On April 4, 2022, another MedGlobal team deployed from Chicago to Lviv, and over the course of their mission provided training to Ukrainian doctors in mass casualties, chemical weapons, and management of trauma patients. After another successful mission, the team made their safe return on April 10.

During each trip, Lviv endured multiple bombings from Russian long-range missiles, causing the MedGlobal teams to seek refuge in bomb shelters several times in response to sirens. But this did not deter these individuals from taking the risk to discharge their humanitarian duty and complete their mission.

Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the following individuals who took part in these efforts and recognize their selfless acts of courage bringing vital access to care to Ukrainians caught in the horror of war. The members of the March trip include Dr. Hena Ibrahim, Azeen Ibrahim, Dr. John Kahler, Dr. Riley Jones, Dr. Irina Lelik, Dr. Susan Buratto, and Rita Vaitauskaite, RN. The members of the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

April trip include Dr. Judah Slavkovsky, Dr. Nahreen Ahmed, Dr. Kathleen Gallagher, Dr. Christopher Miller, Dr. John Peter McBryde, Dr. Tanya Bucierka, Dr. Mila Felder, Ismail Ajooka, Lauren Cohen, Tonya Sompalli, Erica Havelka, Tim Conley, Scott and Maria Ruden, and Jessica Szotak, RN. The teams were led by my dear friend, Dr. Mohammed Zaher Sahloul, the co-founder and president of MedGlobal and a respected leader in Chicago. Many of these health care providers also call my district home, while others live around the Chicago land region or other states. They reflect the very best of America, and I could not be prouder to represent many of them and recognize their service today.

WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 2022

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL and Congresswoman MALONEY, for leading today's special order on the threat to reproductive rights and the devastating impact that the loss of our rights would have on communities and families.

Reproductive rights have constantly been at risk since *Roe vs. Wade* became the law of the land almost 50 years ago. But never have they been in jeopardy as much as they are today.

The recent disclosure of the U.S. Supreme Court's draft opinion in the *Dobbs* case shows just how precarious reproductive rights are in the United States.

By imposing their personal views and impetuous whim, the five justices who support that opinion could eliminate essential rights that are Constitutionally protected, relied upon by American society, and supported overwhelmingly by the American people.

Yet, these five Supreme Court Justices—who embody antiquated, regressive views—could turn the clock back to days when women did not have the right to control their bodies or their reproductive health.

In fact, by basing the draft opinion on a strict textualist interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, the five renegades would be issuing an opinion that reverses a whole roster of Constitutionally protected rights, even beyond reversing *Roe vs. Wade*.

If the draft opinion is issued, these five jurists would be doing exactly what they testified under oath at their confirmation hearings that they would not do. It seems clear to me that they were not forthcoming—even worse, they were not truthful—when they testified to the U.S. Senate under penalty of perjury.

The myopic rationale on which the draft opinion is based reveals a lack of fidelity to the principle of *stare decisis*, despite the claims to the contrary that each of the five made when asked about the *Roe* case at their confirmation hearings.

Equally tragically, if the draft opinion in the *Dobbs* case becomes law without major changes, it will open the floodgates for states to curtail women's reproductive rights in myriad nefarious ways. Many states have already enacted laws which severely restrict access to

abortions and other reproductive rights, and many more have accelerated the process to follow that path.

These are tragically just the latest in a long history of conservative efforts to marginalize women by eliminating our reproductive rights. These draconian efforts have an impact that disrupts every aspect of women's lives, extending to their educational plans, economic status, career paths, family choices, and role in society.

Restrictions on reproductive rights have a disproportionate effect on low-income individuals and women of color.

Low-income individuals and people of color face a range of worse health outcomes than higher income individuals and white people.

These worse outcomes are the result of higher barriers to quality health care, higher rates of stress, poorer living and working conditions, and, for people of color, racial discrimination.

People of color and low-income individuals, experience the highest rates of unintended pregnancy, partially because of barriers to accessing quality family planning services and contraception, lack of insurance coverage, and, for racial minorities, discrimination in health care.

Because of this, low-income people and people of color have higher rates of abortion, as abortion rates mirror rates of unintended pregnancy.

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), in 2018 the reported legal abortions in Texas broken down by race were:

White: 27 percent

African American: 27 percent

Hispanic: 39 percent

Other: 7 percent

Because people of color are disproportionately low income, they are also disproportionately impacted by abortion restrictions: policies such as early abortion bans, and mandatory waiting periods disproportionately hurt people of color, who are less likely to be able to miss work to travel to far-away clinics. Abortion restrictions put the health of people of color at risk.

According to the CDC, Black, American Indian, and Alaska Native pregnant people are nearly two to three times as likely to die from pregnancy-related complications than white people.

A new study by Dr. David Eisenberg, a board-certified obstetrician-gynecologist, estimates that Texas SB 8's new restrictions on women's health could cause increases in maternal mortality of up to 15 percent overall, and up to 33 percent for Black women next year.

Texas Senate Bill 8, or the "Texas Heartbeat Act" which has recently been passed in my home state restricts access to abortion and is one of the harshest laws regarding abortion access in the Nation.

According to the Guttmacher Institute, before the ban, the average woman of child-bearing age in Texas lived 17 miles from the nearest abortion provider, now, the average driving distance is 247 miles.

This ban is a clear violation of the right to abortion established by the Supreme Court's landmark 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision.

The *Roe* Court rooted its decision in the right to personal privacy, connecting it to other fundamental rights of self-determination such

as the freedom to marry, the freedom to procreate or use contraception, and the right to make one's own decisions about child rearing and education.

The *Roe* Court also rejected the argument that an embryo or fetus constitutes a "person" for purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

Nearly two decades later, in 1992, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the basic right to terminate a pregnancy but weakened Constitutional safeguards surrounding abortion in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*.

However, the *Casey* Court concluded that states could enact certain types of pre-viability regulations to protect fetal life, holding that abortion, "the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause," is only protected "where state regulation imposes an undue burden on a woman's ability to make this decision."

In the decades following *Casey*, many states sought to reduce or eliminate abortions: Texas, for example, passed a law requiring abortion clinics to meet ambulatory surgical center standards even though other providers of procedures such as colonoscopies and liposuction—which have far higher mortality rates—were subject to none of the same regulations.

In 2016, the Supreme Court in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* held by a margin of 5–4 that this Texas law was unconstitutional, and also struck down a provision of the same law that required physicians performing abortions in Texas to have active admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of their facilities.

Today, we see the state of Texas once again attempting to curtail women's constitutional right to terminate pregnancy through SB 8.

SB 8 bans abortions at around six weeks into the gestation period, when fetal cardiac activity can be detected, which falls before many people even know that they are pregnant.

The bill doesn't stop there, as the enforcement of the law by private citizens is incentivized.

This law places a bounty on people seeking healthcare—a minimum of \$10,000 plus costs and attorneys' fees—to the individual who successfully brings a suit under the law's private right of action.

Not since the Fugitive Slave Act has a law been enacted that turns people into bounty hunters to hunt people for profit in the pursuit of enforcement of an unjust immoral law.

This empowers any private citizen—including but not limited to, antichoice extremists, ex-partners, assaulters, and strangers—to sue any person or organization that helps someone access abortion care after about six weeks of pregnancy.

SB 8 promotes, encourages, and will lead to vigilante justice, which many anti-choice organizations and activists actively try to deny. The law, and how it is enforced, is purposefully designed to have a chilling effect on a deeply private decision.

The private right of action also provides a tool for harassing abortion providers with costly lawsuits, discouraging them from providing services, and limiting access to reproductive healthcare.

As anti-choice activists continue to face questions and criticism, they will continue to

distort the reality of the law and deflect attention from its enforcement mechanism.

However, the effect of the enforcement mechanism is already in the making, as anti-abortion groups in Texas have already set up anonymous tip lines to allow individuals to act on their vigilante desires to punish people for making a personal decision.

This is why, in October 2021, I introduced H.R. 5710, the “Preventing Vigilante Stalking that Stops Women’s Access to Healthcare and Abortion Rights Act of 2021”; my Senate companion bill S.3057.

This bicameral bill will enhance criminal penalties under the federal stalking statute if the stalking is done with the intent to prevent or report on a woman’s health decisions. This bill does not include any mandatory minimums.

The “Preventing Vigilante Stalking that Stops Women’s Access to Healthcare and Abortion Rights Act of 2021” will save lives—not only for women seeking essential healthcare services; it would also stop the threats poised by abusive partners who may feel emboldened by this heinous Texas law.

Thus far, SB 8 has accomplished exactly what it was meant to: the law’s in terrorem effect has forced women to flee the state in order to obtain a safe and legal abortion.

For example, at 21 years old, Texas college student Madi was a senior in college when she discovered that she was pregnant. Madi was in a committed relationship and on birth control, and did not experience any early pregnancy signs until the nine-week mark, which she initially chalked up to the typical stress of being a senior and starting a new semester.

Madi immediately began to research nearby clinics across state lines, because SB8 prevented her from obtaining an abortion in Texas.

Madi called more than 30 clinics in Louisiana, Alabama, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Nevada—they were all booked for weeks.

Eventually, Madi was able to obtain an appointment at Jackson Women’s Health in Mississippi, more than 400 miles away.

Another example is Ianthe Davis, who at just over six weeks pregnant ended her bartending shift at 4 a.m. one morning in Dallas in order to drive three three hours up Interstate 35 to Trust Women clinic in Oklahoma City.

She was treated by Dr. Rebecca Taub, an obstetrician and gynecologist who travels once a month from California to perform abortions for women.

After the procedure, Davis drove home; according to Davis on the need for the procedure, “If I don’t work, I don’t make money.”

A Texas woman, an Oklahoma clinic, a California doctor: this scene offers a snapshot of the landscape under this horrific Texas law that bans nearly all abortions after an embryonic heartbeat is detected.

And there is Dr. Alan Braid, who was sued in Arkansas and Illinois for carrying out an abortion on a woman who was in the early stages of her pregnancy but beyond the six-week limit set by the law.

Dr. Braid, who has been practicing medicine for nearly 50 years, wrote in a September 18 opinion column in the Washington post that: “I acted because I had a duty of care to this patient, as I do for all patients, and because she has a fundamental right to receive this care.”

As Dr. Braid demonstrates, this law places doctors in the impossible position of either

obeying an unjust law or upholding their Hippocratic oath.

In addition to this heinous privatization of vigilante bounty hunters, the law has an enforcement mechanism that is uniquely crafted to be difficult to challenge in court.

Unlike other laws that restrict abortion access, SB 8 does not allow for any state officials to enforce the statute.

Rather, the lone enforcement mechanism is a private right of action that allows any individual who knowingly engages in or intends to engage in “conduct that aids or abets the performance or inducement of an abortion” in violation of the six-week ban.

SB 8’s enforcement structure represents a deliberate and disturbing effort by the State of Texas to evade judicial scrutiny long enough for a clearly unconstitutional law to take effect. Through this enforcement mechanism, a deeply troubling precedent is set.

This precedent could be followed by other states aiming to undermine the constitutional right to abortion, but for any state efforts to undermine any other of our rights protected by the constitution.

If this enforcement mechanism found in SB 8 is to stay, the similar measures can be utilized by any state in order to slowly chip away at constitutional rights.

This bill also willfully ignores the fact that many women will not know they are pregnant at the six-week mark, and this will disproportionately effect women who are struggling to make ends meet, and women of color.

Even if a woman did know that she was pregnant within the narrow six-week period allowed by SB 8, it is not always possible for someone to get an abortion as soon as they have made that decision.

Many things can stand in their way, from not being able to afford it, travel distance to a clinic, not being able to get off work, or barriers put in place by politicians, such as bans on abortion coverage; or they may get new information about their health or their pregnancy.

Ensuring that everyone can get reproductive health care, including abortion is part of addressing racial and economic injustice.

Our Nation is amid a racial reckoning and transformation and we must unite against racism and discrimination and this will always include ending policies that deny people equitable access to healthcare, including abortion.

Forcing someone to continue a pregnancy against their will is simply a violation of their rights and their basic humanity.

The deeply private decision-making process of accessing abortion care is essential to women’s bodily autonomy, and SB 8 greatly infringes on that of the people in my home state.

One of the most important and consequential decisions we as people ever make is whether we become parents, and these restrictions were designed to control, dehumanize, and criminalize women and their doctors.

We need to ensure that all people have access to the reproductive health care that they need, including access to abortion.

Once someone has decided to seek abortion care, I want them to be able to have access to safe and affordable medical care. I want them to be supported, not restricted by laws that dictate their decision or place unnecessary barriers on the process.

The decision to have an abortion should happen between those seeking abortions, and

their doctors—there is no place for the Governor of Texas, the Texas Legislature, or any other individual to control this private decision.

The Texan government needs to trust people to make decisions for their own lives, their own bodies, and their own futures, and I trust Texans to always do what is right for themselves and those they love.

Those seeking abortion should not be punished or shamed for having an abortion but supported and treated with compassion.

SB 8 and other laws like it are the antithesis to what this country is supposed to be about, which is having the freedom to make your own life.

I have heard some say that this bill is popular in Texas, and that is not the case.

A poll done by NPR found that a clear majority of Americans, specifically 59 percent of Republicans, 61 of Democrats and 53 percent of independents, oppose a ban on abortions at the 6–8 week mark.

Furthermore, the poll found that 74 percent of those polled opposed legal action by private citizens—which broken down was 57 percent of Republicans, 90 percent of Democrats, and 74 percent of Independents.

To say this legislation is popular or is at the wishes of the constituents is a lie.

It’s egregious to be focused on outlawing something that most Americans believe should be a personal decision, as a pandemic ravages our communities and basic health care needs go unmet.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL
ANNIVERSARY OF F.O. BARDEN
AND SON, INC.

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the 100th Anniversary of F.O. Barden and Son, Inc. of Boyne City, Michigan. Through its century of service and steadfast devotion to their community, F.O. Barden and Son, Inc. has become a local landmark and an indispensable part of Michigan’s First District.

Frank Orin Barden was born on a farm in Nunica, Michigan, on February 3, 1876. Frank cultivated a passion for hard work from his upbringing on the family farm, leading him to start working at a young age with local lumber camps on Lake Michigan. For his education, he attended Davenport Institute in Grand Rapids to receive business training and began working in the lumber industry in several positions—eventually becoming manager in different mills across the state. After working for several Michigan companies, such as the Michigan Trust Company, the Boyne City Railroad, and Boyne Lumber, Frank created F.O. Barden & Sons Lumber Company in 1922 in Boyne City, MI, with his son Russel, and then later his son Al.

F.O. Barden and Son, Inc. continues to serve communities across Northern Michigan and remains headquartered in Boyne City. This centennial milestone denotes the years of service that the Barden family has dedicated to the economic wellbeing of the area and the lives of countless residents. Today, F.O. Barden and Son, Inc. is still owned and operated by the family, and Frank Orin Barden’s

son, Paul, serves as President of the company.

Madam Speaker, it's my honor to recognize F.O. Barden and Son, Inc. for a century of success and service to Northern Michigan. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

**PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE
HONORABLE NORMAN Y. MINETA**

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 2022

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize our former colleague and my friend Norman Mineta—an amazing man who broke ground in so many ways and was thoroughly committed to public service.

Norm's commitment was strong despite the injustices he and his family suffered. During World War II, they were sent from our shared hometown of San Jose to an internment camp in Wyoming. The imprisonment of Norm and his family was a terrible wrong, but it never interfered with Norm's love of the United States. He just kept going. Kept striving to make our country better. To make it more inclusive.

I knew Norm since the 1970s. When Norm was elected to the House of Representatives, I worked with his office when I was a staffer for my predecessor, Congressman Don Edwards.

I always found Norm to be tenacious—focused on getting things done. And he did accomplish quite a lot. He authored the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which officially apologized for the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. That meant so much to so many people. Another law authored by Norm was ISTEA, which set up many of the transportation corridors we use today.

Norm and I only overlapped as Members of Congress in 1995, but throughout the years, I've looked up to his spirit of bipartisanship. Norm, well-known as a transportation leader and Chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, often said, "bridges and tunnels are not Democratic or Republican." And his ability to work across the aisle was useful when he served as a Cabinet Member for Presidents of both parties: Commerce Secretary in President Bill Clinton's Administration—and Transportation Secretary for George W. Bush.

One thing I always found fascinating about Norm was that he never forgot anyone's name. He could meet someone once . . . and then, 10 years later walk up and know exactly who that person was and when they first met. Not many of us in this Chamber would be able to do that, I presume.

And not many of us could say we achieved so many "firsts." Norm went from becoming the first non-white Member of the San Jose City Council to the first Asian American serving in two Presidential Cabinets. While, the whole time, he served as an all-American representative for his constituents.

Norm Mineta made a huge impact on our San Jose community, and he changed our country for the better. He will be missed.

HONORING 25 YEARS OF THE
LORING JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. JARED F. GOLDEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Loring Job Corps Center in Northern Maine on 25 years of dedicated support for young Mainers. Our nation's Job Corps programs are vital for preparing the next generation for employment and furthering their education. It is an honor to support their mission to better the lives of Mainers and their community through technical and academic training. Since its first class of students in 1997, the Loring Job Corps Center has become a bridge to assist over 12,000 young adults earn their high school diplomas, build careers, and obtain employment. None of this would be possible without a team of committed staff, many of whom have been at the Loring Job Corps Center for more than two decades. It is with great pride and appreciation that I congratulate the Loring Job Corps Center on 25 years of success, and I look forward to what the next 25 years brings to this important institution.

**RECOGNIZING IGA NEPHROPATHY
DAY**

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize May 14th as IgA Nephropathy Awareness Day. IgA Nephropathy (IgAN) is a rare autoimmune disease that causes a person's immune system to attack the kidneys. Fewer than 200,000 people are diagnosed with this incurable condition per year in the United States, yet it is one of the most common diseases affecting the kidneys other than those caused by high blood pressure or diabetes.

IgA Nephropathy is a condition in which an abnormal build-up of a protein called immunoglobulin A (IgA) causes the immune system to attack the kidneys, often leading to kidney damage and failure. The cause of abnormal IgA build-up in patients with this condition is unclear, though it is likely due in part to genetic factors. While IgA Nephropathy impacts women and men of every ethnicity, it is most prevalent in those from Asian backgrounds. In fact, kidney failure among Asian Americans is 5 times more likely to be the result of IgA Nephropathy than among Caucasians, and 15 times more likely compared to African Americans.

Although IgA Nephropathy can develop at any age, the National Organization for Rare Disorders (NORD) notes that it most often affects younger Americans, usually appearing between the teen years and the late 30s. Furthermore, according to the IgAN Foundation, as many as half of those affected by IgAN will develop end-stage kidney disease and eventually require dialysis or a kidney transplant.

As is often the case with rare diseases, the diagnostic journey to IgA Nephropathy tends to be long. There are usually little or no immediate signs and symptoms. The disease

causes inflammation that can trigger complications, including high blood pressure and chronic kidney disease. In fact, many patients are not diagnosed until they show some of these complications and blood or protein in the urine.

IgA Nephropathy was first identified in 1968, and it is viewed as a condition without a cure. While some patients have been able to delay kidney decline and failure through lifestyle changes, supplements, and medication, many others have seen no effective treatments whatsoever.

We believe this is about to change. The FDA approved the first-ever medication for IgA Nephropathy in late 2021. Another drug is currently under FDA review with more therapies in phase 2 and 3 trials. Additionally, a growing number of clinical trials are underway.

These advancements in IgA Nephropathy treatment provide hope for so many patients struggling with this chronic disease. It's important we help raise awareness of this condition to counter the fear and uncertainty that can come with an IgA Nephropathy diagnosis. More needs to be done to develop the means for patients to manage their conditions and live normal lives even while dealing with this cruel disease.

I also want to salute by name the IgA Nephropathy Foundation. On May 14, 2004, Bonnie Schneider and her husband established the IgA Nephropathy Foundation from their home. Eddie, their 13-year-old son, had been recently diagnosed with the condition, and they saw firsthand the unmet need for answers, resources, and a supportive community for individuals with IgAN and their families.

In addition, I am proud to say that California's 33rd Congressional District is fully engaged in this effort, as IgA Nephropathy Foundation Board Secretary Mary Schneider is from Venice in my district.

So on May 14th, the 18th anniversary of its founding, the IgA Nephropathy Foundation and the entire IgAN community and partners will come together to raise awareness about this disease, while celebrating the strength of those warriors who battle it every day. Their hope is that this important day will drive people to check their risk and recognize symptoms, improve awareness among primary care physicians, build a stronger network of support for patients, and encourage further research to find effective therapies and, one day, a cure.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the IgA Nephropathy Foundation for creating this important day of awareness. I am proud to stand with the brave Americans and their families who must battle this disease and who continue in their efforts to educate the public on IgA Nephropathy. On May 14th, we honor them and all their efforts as we recognize IgA Nephropathy Awareness Day.

**RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY
OF JEFFERSON UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Jefferson Union High School District upon the occasion of its 100th anniversary. At inception, the district had one school,

Jefferson High, which also recently celebrated its 100th anniversary. Today, the district encompasses five schools across two cities serving over 4,000 students. The district also offers an adult school program.

For the first thirty-six years, the district was composed of Jefferson High School but in 1958 Westmoor High opened in Daly City. As the City of Pacifica grew, Terra Nova opened its doors in 1961, followed the next year by Oceana. Serramonte opened in 1970 in Daly City and then closed in 1981, although many classes for the adult school continue at the site as do district administrative functions. Thornton High School, also in Daly City, opened in 1975.

There were schools serving students before the district existed. San Francisco provided the main high schools, but in 1922 local leaders realized that a nearer site was needed.

The school district officially commenced operations on June 2, 1922, and the first members of the school board were Matthew Grady, chairperson, Stella Jensen, clerk, Florence Stockton, Adolph Gehrenger, and Roderick McDonald. Mr. Neill O. Best was the head of the school and he had three colleagues, Gilda Belloni, Gladys Lukes, and Barto Molineaux. Over fifty students were in the entering class of the district's first school, and they had their choice of multiple subjects including mathematics, science, athletics/PE, Spanish, drama, commercial arithmetic, typing, book-keeping, spelling, penmanship, civics, free hand drawing, music and vocational guidance.

Today's district offers classes spanning the range of traditional high school subjects such as English, math, science and social science, but also includes advanced placement instruction for those who want to earn college credits. Oceana offers a food and nutrition elective. Jefferson's website points students in the direction of the Skyline Promise Program, a pathway to free community college. At Terra Nova, students may take ceramics while at Westmoor ceramics and drawing are available. Bands, sports and other offerings keep students throughout the district engaged. The adult school offers classes in work training and technology, English, high school diploma and GED preparation, citizenship test preparation, and art.

Most importantly, the Jefferson Union High School District is dedicated to serving the individual needs of each student. A robust vocational support system exists and of course college preparation is available to all. The cost of living in our community is high, and rents force many parents to struggle. The district offers students additional services to assist with household stresses.

On the same day as the celebration of the district's 100th anniversary, the district will also cut the ribbon on a 122-unit apartment project that will offer employees rent at well below market rates. This should help to stabilize the district's employee base and strengthen education over the years. A similar strategy was enacted by the local community college district and has been decisive in reducing turnover. Taxpayers in the high school district voted to support bonds to provide funding for this outstanding project. It was a very wise choice. It will ease the financial pressure on teachers and employees and will allow them to live in the community in which they teach. It's not quite a return to the 1960's when housing was far less expensive and

much more plentiful, but this apartment development is an example of public resources—scarce public land—put to significant and beneficial use for decades to come. Its success in this and other endeavors is due to its superb leadership. The Board of Trustees includes Ms. Rosie Tejada, President, Mr. Andrew Lie, Vice President, Ms. Kalimah Salahuddin, Clerk, Mr. Nick Occhipinti and Ms. Carla Ng-Garrett.

In closing, let me note that Jefferson Union High School District achieves the goals of Horace Mann and other early advocates for free, universal, public education. The district prepares young people for their lives as citizens in a democracy, and it equips them with skills to enter the modern economy. Whether in the trades or college, in our region or abroad, whether in service to the public or to the private sector, the graduates of Jefferson Union High School District have a golden opportunity to understand their current place in the world and to create their own path for a great future. On behalf of the community, I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the Jefferson Union High School District. They are 100 years young, and ready to meet all challenges.

RECOGNIZING SENIOR PASTOR THOMAS ZOBRIST

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize Reverend Thomas (Tom) Zobrist, Senior Pastor of Liberty Bible Church in Eureka, IL, for being conferred an Honorary Doctorate Degree from Calvary University.

Prior to his service as senior pastor, Tom served in the U.S. Air Force for six years as a B-52 crew chief. After returning home from his time in the military, Tom graduated from Cavalry Bible College with a Pastoral Degree. Tom was later called as pastor of the Liberty Bible Church. As Senior Pastor of Liberty Bible Church for the past 34 years, Tom has faithfully been a shepherd for the congregation of Liberty Bible Church.

Tom's commitment to the Eureka community and central Illinois is unquestionable. Over the years, Tom has held influential roles with the Board for the Brazil Gospel Fellowship Mission, Calvary University Board of Trustees, and IFCA Board of Directors. He has selflessly dedicated his time as senior pastor to improving the lives of his congregation and strengthening his community. The religious values instilled through Tom's teachings will continue to strengthen our community for years to come.

Our community has been fortunate to benefit from the service and leadership of Tom Zobrist. I extend my sincere congratulations to Tom on being conferred an Honorary Doctorate Degree from Calvary University. I wish him much success as he continues to lead a life of service to the Eureka community and central Illinois.

HONORING THE INVESTITURE OF
THE HONORABLE JUDGE
YVONNA C. ABRAHAM

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Yvonna C. Abraham of Dearborn Heights, Michigan, on the occasion of her investiture as a judge of the Wayne County Third Circuit Court. Appointed by Governor Gretchen Whitmer on July 1, 2021, Judge Abraham is the first Palestinian American judge in the state of Michigan. Her significant contributions to our community are worthy of commendation.

Judge Abraham is a graduate of the University of Michigan—Dearborn and earned her law degree from the University of Detroit Mercy. Prior to her appointment to the circuit court, Judge Abraham served as magistrate and director of probation for the 20th District Court in Dearborn Heights. She also taught courses in Business Law at Lawrence Technological University in Southfield. As a judge serving in the Family Division, she handles cases involving domestic relations; including divorce, child custody, and personal protection matters.

Paving the way for future legal professionals, Judge Abraham is the first Palestinian American judge in the state of Michigan. Known for her integrity and fairness in difficult matters, Judge Abraham continues to serve her neighbors inside and outside of the courtroom. A mentor to aspiring law students, she serves on the court's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee. She is also a member of the State Bar Judicial Ethics Committee and was President of the Michigan Association of District Court Magistrates. At home she is a member of the Wayne Mental Health Advisory Board, the Women Lawyer Association of Michigan, and the Arab American Women's Business Council Board. Judge Abraham resides in Dearborn Heights with her husband Marwan and daughter Lena.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Yvonna C. Abraham on the occasion of her investiture as a judge of the Wayne County Third Circuit Court. This is a historic day and a culmination of Judge Abraham's lifetime of hard work and dedication to our community. We wish her the best as she takes on this new role.

HONORING BAILEY FORD ON THE
GRAND OPENING OF THEIR NEW
DEALERSHIP IN PLATTSBURGH

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Andrew Bailey on the grand opening of Bailey Ford's new state-of-the-art facility in Plattsburgh, New York. The Bailey family has been proudly serving the Plattsburgh community in the auto industry for four generations, and I look forward to their continued success in the North Country.

The Bailey name has an extensive history in the North Country auto industry. In 1942, Albert Bailey, Sr., great-grandfather of current

company President Andrew Bailey, opened his first dealership in Dannemora. After the success of his first dealership, Albert Sr. opened a Ford dealership in the 1960's with his son, Lloyd.

In the eighty years since Albert Sr. opened the first dealership, Bailey Ford has become a staple in the North Country. In 2019, they acquired an 8,000-square-foot facility in Plattsburgh. Bailey Ford quickly outgrew this location as sales skyrocketed by over 90%, despite challenges posed by the pandemic. In 2021, the Baileys were ready to expand, and they began construction on a brand-new 40,000 square-foot dealership across town. The new dealership is five times the size of their current location, which will allow them to expand their inventory and service capacity. They will also bring new jobs to the Plattsburgh community, as they are expected to double their staff once the project is complete.

The Bailey family has continued to be committed to the development and success of the North Country community for over eighty years. We look forward to the opening of their new dealership on May 14, 2022. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to thank and congratulate Andrew Bailey and the entire team on this incredible achievement and wish them the best of luck.

HONORING THE CHARITABLE
WORK OF WILLIAM LORENZ, JR.

HON. CHRIS JACOBS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. William Lorenz, Jr.'s devotion to our Western New York communities.

Mr. Lorenz was born and raised in Buffalo, New York and has lived there his entire life. After high school, Mr. Lorenz attended Canisius College and graduated with a degree in political science and a classics minor. Mr. Lorenz was also member of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity at Canisius College, and after completing his undergraduate studies, Mr. Lorenz attended the University at Buffalo School of Law, where he graduated with an intellectual property concentration. Since graduating from law school, Mr. Lorenz has worked in the legal field, currently serving as a Senior Associate for the Mura Law Group.

Mr. Lorenz has been volunteering in our Western New York communities for several years. He has raised thousands of dollars for various charities including the Mental Health Association of Erie County, Compeer of Greater Buffalo, Mercy Flight, Inc., and Hearts for the Homeless. Mr. Lorenz has also donated his time and expertise as a litigator by teaching and coaching the Canisius College Mock Trial Team.

In 2020, during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, Mr. Lorenz volunteered at social distancing parades for children with special needs, collected donations at food and blood drives, and delivered groceries to those unable to get groceries for themselves.

While selflessly volunteering at these events, Mr. Lorenz found that there was a food shortage emergency in Western New York. After this realization, he partnered with FeedMore WNY to organize the first-ever Superhero Food Drive and he is now recognized as "Buffalo's Best Batman." Through Mr. Lorenz's efforts, the Superhero Food Drive collected over 1,300 pounds of non-perishable donations in a single day. These donations were critical to helping those in need within our Western New York communities.

I thank Mr. Lorenz for his commitment to community service and his dedication to our Western New York communities, and I believe that Mr. Lorenz exemplifies what it means to be a Western New Yorker.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking Mr. Lorenz for service to our communities and in honoring the positive impact he has made and continues to have on New York's 27th Congressional District.

HONORING RALENE BERGQUIST
FOR HER TEN YEARS OF SERVICE
TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. RON ESTES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of the 4th District of Kansas to pay tribute to Ralene Bergquist as she retires after ten years of service to our congressional district.

Ralene Bergquist has faithfully served the people of Kansas' Fourth Congressional District for ten years. She began her career as a U.S. House of Representatives district staffer during the tenure of my predecessor, former Kansas' Congressman Mike Pompeo. When Congressman Pompeo accepted the call to become Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Ralene was instrumental in facilitating the smooth and successful transition when I first took office.

Ralene joined my district office shortly after my special election. Despite all the changes that come with a change in a district's Member of Congress, Ralene remained as the familiar, constant voice and compassionate listener for the constituents of the Fourth District of Kansas. She has served as the friendly face in the lobby and office manager of our district office for five years, following her five years of service with former Rep. Pompeo.

Ralene's dedication and work has been very much appreciated and a great service to two

members of Congress as well as the constituents of Kansas' Fourth Congressional District. I speak for myself and the entire D.C. and district staff when I say we will miss Ralene after she retires from congressional service.

We are excited to see what the future holds for Ralene and wish her many blessings as she enjoys more time with her husband, Kansas State Representative Emil Bergquist, their children, and their grandchildren.

I congratulate Ralene on a wonderful career and say thank you from a grateful district.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE IMMIGRANTS' ASSISTANCE CENTER

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2022

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Immigrants' Assistance Center of New Bedford, Massachusetts.

Founded in 1971 by members of the New Bedford Portuguese community, the Immigrants' Assistance Center has served as an invaluable resource to the Southcoast of Massachusetts for over 50 years. Working with 12,000 immigrants and non-English speakers a year, the Immigrants' Assistance Center provides case management and legal assistance all throughout the immigration process and road to citizenship. The multilingual staff offers language and literacy classes and works tirelessly to ensure work force readiness by assisting members of the immigrant community obtain employment to become financially self-sufficient.

With its dedicated staff advising clients on the steps necessary to access essential resources—such as food, clothing, shelter, and healthcare—the Immigrants' Assistance Center is the organization that many look to for guidance when first coming to the U.S. This incredible organization assists members of the community in a variety of circumstances and across all ages. From their at-risk youth program to their elder services program, which provides healthcare coordination assistance as well as a weekly Health, Wellness, and Social program, it is clear why the Immigrants' Assistance Center has grown to become a pillar of the Greater New Bedford area.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the 50th anniversary of the Immigrants' Assistance Center for their dedication to bettering their community. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking them for their service and wishing them all the best in the years to come.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, May 16, 2022.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 7762–7775; and 4 resolutions, H.Res. 1114–1117 were introduced. **Pages H4970–71**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4971–72**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 6873, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office for Bombing Prevention to address terrorist explosive threats, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–322);

H.R. 6868, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for financial assistance to fund certain cybersecurity and infrastructure security education and training programs and initiatives, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–323); and

H.R. 6824, to authorize the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security to hold an annual cybersecurity competition relating to offensive and defensive cybersecurity disciplines, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–324). **Page H4970**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Underwood to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4923**

Community Services Block Grant Modernization Act of 2022: The House passed H.R. 5129, to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and modernize the Act, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 246 yeas to 169 nays, Roll No. 182. **Pages H4925–56**

Rejected the Walberg motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor by a yeas-and-nays vote of 201 yeas to 216 nays, Roll No. 181. **Pages H4954–55**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–42, modified by the amendment printed in part E of H. Rept. 117–320, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. **Pages H4925–32**

Agreed to:

Bonamici amendment en bloc No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part F of H. Rept. 117–320: Escobar (No. 1) that broadens the resources directed to the elimination of poverty to promote partnerships that include entities or organizations that support innovative community-based approaches and research-driven responses to poverty; Adams (No. 2) that inserts language clarifying that institutions of higher education, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal colleges and universities, and minority-serving institutions, can be considered as partners for Community Service Block Grant projects; Hayes (No. 6) that requires States to provide a warning notice to communities about potential scammers or fraudulent activity related to the programs administered, such as a notice on their website; Horsford (No. 7) that revises the section relating to training and technical assistance provided by Department of Health and Human Services to eligible entities clarifying that place based poverty reduction strategies include addressing health inequities; Houlahan (No. 8) that revises the

Eligibility Uses of Funds to specifically include behavioral health needs; Jackson Lee (No. 9) that requires the Comptroller General to conduct a study to identify the uses, programs, and activities carried out with such funds that had the greatest impact, effectiveness, and results in achieving the purposes for which such funds were provided; and to identify best practices of States in implementing State plans and providing assistance to community action agencies to carry out activities, so that such practices can be used as models for States to follow to carry out this subtitle in the future; Moore (No. 11) that authorizes states to provide technical assistance to eligible entities on meeting the nutrition needs of the families and individuals they serve; Payne (No. 12) that ensures repairs to homes for health and safety, energy, and water purposes are permissible uses of funding; Payne (No. 13) that clarifies that CSBG funds may be used by eligible state and local subgrantees on emergency materials or other assistance due to a national or public health emergency; Pressley (No. 14) that revises the eligible uses of funds to include partnerships that promote healthy communities through preventing and mitigating trauma; Tlaib (No. 15) that requires a state plan to describe how the state and eligible entities will coordinate other programs related to critical household needs which includes reducing the burden of energy and water utility costs; Torres (NY) (No. 16) that revises the reporting requirements of the Community Action Innovation Program to include an analysis of best practices shown to be effective at reducing poverty; and Wild (No. 17) that requires each eligible entity to publicly post on its website its strategic plan, community needs assessment, and community action plan (by a yeas-and-nays vote of 219 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 178); and

Pages H4943–49, H4951–52

Gottheimer amendment (No. 4 printed in part F of H. Rept. 117–320) that adds support for veterans, particularly homeless veterans, to the list of permissible purposes for which States may use remaining Community Services Block Grant Program funds (by a yeas-and-nays vote of 418 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 180).

Pages H4950–51, H4953–54

Rejected:

Bonamici amendment en bloc No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in part F of H. Rept. 117–320: Good (VA) (No. 3) that sought to prohibit CSBG funds from being used to reimburse health care services; Grothman (No. 5) that sought to reinstate the current law eligibility and strike the 200 percent federal poverty line increase from the bill; and McClain (No. 10) that sought to add a funding prohibition on any voter registration activity and prohibit using grant funds for lobbying (by a

yeas-and-nays vote of 198 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 179).

Pages H4948–50, H4952–53

H. Res. 1097, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 903), (H.R. 2499), (H.R. 5129), and (H.R. 7691) was agreed to Tuesday, May 10th.

Communication from the Sergeant at Arms: The House received a communication from William J. Walker, Sergeant at Arms. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, following consultation with the Office of Attending Physician, Mr. Walker notified the House that the public health emergency due to the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 remains in effect.

Page H4960

Announcement by the Chair: The Chair announced the extension, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 8, and effective May 15, 2022, of the covered period designated on January 4, 2021.

Pages H4960–61

Commission on International Religious Freedom—Reappointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's reappointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective May 14, 2022, and ending May 14, 2024: Mr. Nury Turkel of Alexandria, VA; Mr. Frank R. Wolf of Vienna, VA, to succeed Ms. Anurima Bhargava of Chicago, Illinois; and Dr. David G. Curry of Corona Del Mar, California, to succeed Dr. James W. Carr of Searcy, Arkansas.

Page H4961

Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative McCarthy, Minority Leader, in which he appointed the following member to the Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States: Mr. Matthew Kroenig of McLean, Virginia.

Page H4961

Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative McCarthy, Minority Leader, in which he reappointed the following member to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Mr. Gunter Waibel of Oakland, California.

Page H4961

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yeas-and-nays votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4952, H4952–53, H4953–54, H4954–55, and H4955–56.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. AIR FORCE; U.S. SPACE FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Space Force. Testimony was heard from Frank Kendall, Secretary of the Air Force; General Charles Q. Brown Jr., Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and General John W. Raymond, Chief of Space Operations, U.S. Space Force.

FISCAL YEAR 2023 MARINE CORPS MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2023 Marine Corps Modernization Programs”. Testimony was heard from Frederick Stefany, Senior Executive Service, Principal Civilian Deputy, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition; Lieutenant General Mark R. Wise, U.S. Marine Corps, Deputy Commandant for Aviation; and Lieutenant General Karsten S. Heckl, U.S. Marine Corps, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command and Deputy Commandant for Combat Development and Integration.

KEEPING UP WITH THE CODES—USING AI FOR EFFECTIVE REGTECH

Committee on Financial Services: Task Force on Artificial Intelligence held a hearing entitled “Keeping Up with the Codes—Using AI for Effective RegTech”. Testimony was heard from Kevin Greenfield, Deputy Comptroller for Operational Risk Policy, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury; Kelly Lay, Director, Office of Examination and Insurance, National Credit Union Administration; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, MAY 16, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, May 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 7691, Additional Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, May 16

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E499
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E501
Estes, Ron, Kans., E502
Golden, Jared F., Me., E500

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E498
Jacobs, Chris, N.Y., E502
Keating, William R., Mass., E502
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E501
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E500
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E500

Newman, Marie, Ill., E497
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E500
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E497, E501
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E497



Congressional Record

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.