

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:  
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS AND  
POSTAL-NAMING MEASURES**

---

---

COMMITTEE ON  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 12, 2023

**Serial No. CP:118-5**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,  
*oversight.house.gov* or  
*docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	KATIE PORTER, California
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	CORI BUSH, Missouri
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
PAT FALLON, Texas	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	GREG CASAR, Texas
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	<i>Vacancy</i>
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy Director

LAUREN LOMBARDO, Senior Policy Analyst

LAUREN HASSETT, Professional Staff Member

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

---

Meeting held on July 12, 2023 ..... Page  
1

BILLS CONSIDERED

---

\* H.R. 4502, Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 3

\* H.R. 4503, AI Training Expansion Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 7

\* H.R. 1695, Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software  
Assets (SAMOSA) Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 10

\* H.R. 1209, Fair and Open Competition Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 14

\* H.R. 192, To Prohibit Individuals Who Are Not Citizens of the United  
States from Voting in Elections in the District Of Columbia  
Bill Discussed ..... 28

\* H.R. 3358, Mission Not Emissions Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 35

\* H.R. 890, Guidance Out of Darkness (GOOD) Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 38

\* H.R. 4435, Unauthorized Spending Accountability (USA) Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 40

\* H.R. 3230, Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act  
Bill Discussed ..... 56

\* Several Postal-Naming Measures  
Bill Discussed ..... 98



## INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

---

- \* Statement for the Record; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- \* Letter, July 10, 2023, from Associated Builders and Contractors; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 10, 2023, from Associated General Contractors of America; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 10, 2023, from diverse construction and business associations; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 12, 2023, from Heritage Action; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 11, 2023, from Independent Electrical Contractors; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 7, 2023, from NFIB; submitted by Chairman Comer.
- \* Letter, July 11, 2023, from Competitive Enterprise Institute; submitted by Chairman Comer and Rep. Foxx.
- \* Letter, July 11, 2023, from National Taxpayers Union; submitted by Chairman Comer and Rep. Foxx.
- \* Letter, July 10, 2023, from Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association (SMACNA); submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- \* Report, from Independent Project Analysis (IPA) on Union Labor; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- \* Letter, July 11, 2023, from various industry groups; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- \* Letter, from North America's Building Trades Union (NABTU) in opposition to H.R. 1209; submitted by Rep. Raskin.

*The documents listed above are available at: [docs.house.gov](https://docs.house.gov).*



**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:  
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS AND  
POSTAL-NAMING MEASURES**

---

**Wednesday, July 12, 2023**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, LaTurner, Fallon, Armstrong, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, McClain, Boebert, Fry, Luna, Edwards, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Norton, Lynch, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Porter, Bush, Gomez, Brown, Stansbury, Garcia, Frost, Lee, Casar, Crockett, Goldman, and Moskowitz.

Chairman COMER. The Committee will please come to order. A quorum is present.

Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 5(b) and House Rule XI, Clause 2, the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment of which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair recognizes himself to make an opening statement.

Today, the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability will consider a range of bills that go to the core of this Committee's mission to root out waste, fraud, abuse in the Federal Government and improve efficiency and effectiveness.

First, we will address the Federal Government's spending problem head on with the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, or USA Act, which would decrease and eventually eliminate funding for Federal programs that Congress fails to authorize. We will address the Biden Administration's regulatory overreach through two bills, the Fair and Open Competition Act and the Mission Not Emissions Act. Three bills, the Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act, the Guidance Out Of Darkness Act, and the Guidance Clarity Act, propose necessary regulatory reforms. Committee Members will also have the opportunity to weigh in on non-

citizen voting, which was recently authorized by the D.C. City Council.

Last, we will consider three bipartisan bills to improve Federal Government cybersecurity readiness and artificial intelligence education, as well as agency software management: the Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts Act, the AI Training Expansion Act, and the Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act. Out of these 10 bills, half have bipartisan co-sponsors. I am encouraged to see my colleagues coming together to improve our Federal Government. Congressional Republicans are committed to ensuring the accountability and effectiveness of the Federal Government. The Oversight Committee will continue to reform government spending, address regulatory burdens, and improve cybersecurity.

I now recognize Ranking Member Raskin for an opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today's agenda contains 10 substantive bills. The Majority employed a transparent and inclusive process with Democratic input and collaboration, but alas, on only a few of the 10. After close analysis of each bill, I plan to support four of them because they genuinely advance the transparency, efficiency, and accountability that the American people deserve from our government. But the remaining six are clear attempts to undermine the effectiveness of government, the will of Congress, and the will and the interests of the American people. They are part of a long, dismal process that began when Steve Bannon said he wanted to destroy the administrative state. I invite the public to closely examine these bills for themselves, so they do not start following this bunch of wolves in sheep's clothing deep into the forest.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to remind you that following the catastrophic train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio, Committee Democrats sent a letter to Norfolk Southern requesting critical information about the company's safety measures and practices. However, over the last 4 months, Norfolk Southern has only produced a small set of already mostly public documents to our Committee. Bottom line is that Norfolk Southern has failed to provide nearly all of the information and documents we have requested, obstructing our investigation into an accident that has had devastating consequences for the people of that community.

After Norfolk Southern produced an initial set of documents, their counsel falsely claimed the company cannot provide information to Congress, in part, because of the National Transportation Safety Board's investigation. In fact, NTSB told our staff that nothing in its regulations prevents Norfolk Southern from responding to our requests. I know that you will agree with me that agency regulations cannot bar the provision of documents to Congress, even if they try to. As you well know, Mr. Chairman, our Committee often conducts independent investigations even when other investigations are ongoing and that there is no real conflict here.

Since the East Palestine derailment, Norfolk Southern trains have derailed several more times, including less than a week ago on July 6, near Elliston, Virginia. It is imperative that we get the



answers and the information from Norfolk Southern that we need before another catastrophic incident occurs.

At a hearing that you convened on March 9, Vice Ranking Member Ocasio-Cortez asked for a bipartisan hearing on the East Palestine derailment, stating, “The public needs answers,” and you responded stating, “I agree. Absolutely. I look forward to working with you on that.” Mr. Chairman, I hope we can pursue that precise bipartisan agreement on rail safety, even though many weeks have passed since that terrible event occurred. In that spirit, Mr. Chairman, I would like to respectfully ask you to work with us to get those answers that the public, particularly the people of East Palestine, Ohio deserve. Will you schedule a public hearing with Norfolk Southern in the month of September?

Chairman COMER. We will certainly look at that. I was told that the Energy and Commerce Committee was going to be doing hearings on that, and I was even told they were going to have a field hearing in East Palestine. And I do not know what the status of that is or not, but I will certainly find out, and that is something that I think we are interested in that we could maybe work together on—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, great. And if they are doing—

Chairman COMER [continuing]. With Norfolk Southern and Transportation officials, too. I think that would be good. Maybe Buttigieg and Norfolk Southern—

Mr. RASKIN. Terrific. Well, if they are doing it, we could join them. If not, would you agree to schedule one ourselves for September?

Chairman COMER. We will try to see what we can come up with on that.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. I think September 20 would be a great date for us to move on that. So, I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and I hope we can move forward on that in September.

Chairman COMER. The Ranking Member yields back. Without objection, the opening statements of all other Members will be included in the record.

Chairman COMER. So, our first item for consideration is **H.R. 4502**, Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 4502, Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Act, to allow Federal agencies to establish educational requirements for certain cybersecurity positions in the competitive service, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 4502, offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

The Federal Government relies on cybersecurity professionals to protect personally identifiable information to defend against cyber threats and build secure government technology. To ensure this work is done effectively, the Federal Government desperately needs to hire more cybersecurity experts. For many cybersecurity jobs, however, the Office of Personnel Management requires applicants to have achieved a certain level of education to even be considered for the role. This prevents the government from hiring some of the best and brightest cybersecurity professionals, many experts that have the right technical skills and experience, but Federal hiring managers are not allowed to consider them because they lack a formal college degree. Representative Nancy Mace's simple bill ensures that the Federal Government can hire any qualified cybersecurity professional as long as they have the right knowledge and skills, even if they do not have a fancy degree.

I urge my colleagues to support this timely, necessary, and bipartisan bill, and I thank Nancy Mace, Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, for bringing this important reform bill to the full Committee's consideration. I now recognize the bill's sponsor for her remarks.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for bringing this bill forward today, and Ranking Member Raskin as well. I also want to thank my colleague across the aisle, Congresswoman Porter from California, for her partnership on H.R. 4502, the Modernizing Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts Act. This bill solves a simple problem. You cannot deem one applicant more qualified for a Federal cybersecurity job just because he or she has a degree in underwater basket weaving. And I actually have some experiences.

I have a family member who just turned 22. He started his career in computer engineering and programming at the age of 16 when he took a coding camp one summer, and because of dual enrollment, he was actually able to work full time starting at the age of 16 as a programmer. He just turned 22. He owns his own home, has a car, and is getting ready to buy another one. He knows more about technology and programming than any other Member of Congress, and he makes as much or more money than I do at 22. And so, we have some remarkable young people coming through this generation that have great talent because they have been around technology their entire life and should not be prevented from using those talents in the Federal IT workforce, and so this is an opportunity for us to work together.

There is a shortage of over 700,000 cybersecurity professionals in the public and private sector. People who do not attend or finish college are often barred from consideration for jobs in this field. Really, they should not be. Today, a brilliant computer whiz who drops out of Harvard for a year or two, like Bill Gates and other billionaires, would stand little chance of securing a Federal job in IT and cybersecurity, and we should be welcoming that kind of talent in any way, shape, or form we can.

While the cyber workforce is crucial to our national security is growing rapidly, according to a report issued last year, there are five times as many cybersecurity workers over the age of 55 as there are under the age of 30. Only 1 in 16 Federal cybersecurity workers are actually under the age of 30. So, this bill prohibits mandatory degree requirements for Federal cybersecurity jobs unless those credentials are legally required to perform the duties of the position, which is rarely the case. Even entry-level positions require a 4-year degree in many cases with regards to these positions. Some of these young people literally have the skills to hack into critical Federal IT systems, but they cannot get their foot in the door for employment at Federal agencies or at the same agency. So, there are many unnecessary degree barriers that we are lifting today with this piece of legislation.

Over the past few years, we have seen leaders from both parties at all levels of government rolling back degree requirements, resulting in greater economic opportunity for all Americans. Even many large companies today have done away with degree requirements. States are doing the same thing. And I have said many times, if only we can run the government like a business is run, we would save the taxpayers so much money and be so much more efficient, and this is an opportunity to do that today.

There is nothing more bipartisan than a bill that codifies a Trump-era executive order that has been maintained by the Biden Administration, and we have colleagues on both sides of the aisle supporting the bill today. I especially, again, want to thank Representative Katie Porter of California for her support as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 4502. The bill is also endorsed by the Alliance for Digital Innovation, whose member companies include Amazon Web Services, Google Cloud, and others engaged in Federal and private sector cybersecurity. And we look forward to the Committee's careful consideration of this very important legislation. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill. I now yield to the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to commend our distinguished colleague, Nancy Mace, and Katie Porter from California for introducing the Modernizing Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts Act, which will indeed eliminate the requirement that a Bachelor of Arts or Sciences degree must be a prerequisite to Federal hiring in qualifying cybersecurity-related positions. The bill addresses the big shortage of cybersecurity workers for a growing number of relevant jobs.

According to one recent study, the number of unfilled cybersecurity positions in U.S. rose to over 410,000, up 9 percent over last year. This gap in the cybersecurity workforce continues to grow, and this bill is a smart and timely attempt to meet this rising demand. It is similar to an executive order that was issued by the previous administration and has been maintained by the Biden Administration, and I support it wholeheartedly. And I would like to recognize the democratic co-sponsor, Ms. Porter.

Ms. PORTER. Thank you very much. I want to start by thanking Representative Mace for her leadership, for her advocacy, and for

her partnership. Look, government employees should be the best in the business. Taxpayers deserve nothing less from the people that they employ, but how do we get the best in our Federal jobs? Just like in any market, it all comes down to one thing: fostering competition.

When I hire staffers to represent California's 47th congressional District, I write job descriptions that describe exactly what work that person will need to accomplish, then I let candidates compete on who best demonstrates those skills. The beauty of that competition is that there is not just one credential or one requirement that guarantees someone will get the job. Sometimes I have had great staffers who have law degrees. They were successful in writing and analyzing policy because their education prepared them for it. Other times, I have had great policy staff who had no particular degree or education. They were successful because they spent years working on Capitol Hill or had other deep policy experience gained from being in the workforce. If I thought excelling in a government job always came down to one credential or one life experience, I would have missed out on some great employees, and, more importantly, taxpayers would have missed out.

No part of the Federal Government should disqualify an individual from competing for a Federal job based on whether they have one type of educational credential. We are only going to find out who is best to fill a role if we let all qualified candidates show us all their qualifications. Today, I am happy to partner with Congresswoman Mace on legislation to allow just this kind of competition when it comes to our Federal cybersecurity jobs. Just like I have employed great policy professionals with and without law degrees, there is not one type of educational experience that is always going to make a cybersecurity professional the best of the best. I am a former professor, and I know that a lot of people will learn skills in college programs that prepare them to be a Federal cybersecurity professional. At the same time, I also know that college is not always affordable and accessible for everybody. And the reality is that many people gain the skills necessary to flourish and succeed at Federal cybersecurity jobs as part of other experiences, including military service, or training and apprenticeship programs. The door needs to be open to both kinds of qualified candidates, those with or without a degree, and the Federal Government should be able to pick who is most prepared to do the job based on a holistic view of the candidates.

The Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts Act stops the Federal Government from ruling out people without a specific educational credential. Instead, it lets all qualified applicants compete, and it gives the Federal Government more choices. We should be able to agree to advance this bill regardless of party. As my colleague, Congresswoman Mace, said, there is very little as bipartisan as an executive order issued under President Trump that President Biden has chosen to keep in place, to keep on the books. This is a policy that is working under Administrations of both parties to make our government more successful. And now we need, in Congress, to do our job to make it permanent as a law.

I urge all Democrats and Republicans on the Committee to support this bill. We can only hire the best Federal cybersecurity pro-

professionals when we have had the chance to consider all the qualified options, and the Modernizing the Acquisition of Cybersecurity Experts will give us this chance. I am proud to support Representative Mace's bill, and I thank her for the opportunity to co-lead. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now in favorably reporting H.R. 4502, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the bill is ordered—

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. OK. A recorded vote is ordered. Pursuant to House rules, further proceedings on this measure are postponed. All recorded votes will be rolled to the end at a time to be announced.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 4503**, the AI Training Expansion Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 4503, AI Training Expansion Act, a bill to amend the Artificial Intelligence Training for the Acquisition Workforce Act to expand AI training within the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 4503, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

We use AI-enabled products and services each and every day to simplify our lives and empower our work, and recently powerful advances in AI have raised serious questions about how such technologies will continue to impact our lives and work. Over the past several months, the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, chaired by Nancy Mace, has held several hearings on new AI advancements. The hearings have raised questions about the government's readiness to adopt this new technology to improve service delivery and agency oper-

ations. This makes it the perfect time to ensure that Federal employees are properly trained on AI, can be responsibly used in agency operations. That is why I supported the AI Training for the Acquisition Workforce Act which this Committee helped pass into law last year.

This law's newly established government-wide training program for AI was a great first step, but other Federal employees beyond the acquisition workforce should also be prepared for the changes AI is bringing. The AI Training Expansion Act expands the law to provide training access to more Federal employees and updates the training topics. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and forward-thinking bill, and I thank Subcommittee Chairwoman, Nancy Mace, and Ranking Member, Gerry Connolly, for their work addressing this important issue. I now recognize the bill's sponsor for her remarks.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank Ranking Member, as well, Jamie Raskin. I also want to thank my colleague from Virginia, Congressman Connolly, for supporting and being an original co-sponsor on this bill.

The AI Training Expansion Act is a substantial bipartisan bill to help our Federal workforce win the race for AI. America, we all know, must be at the forefront of AI integration to counter our enemies abroad, but also use it for good, making our Federal systems more efficient as well. We all know that our Federal agencies are at risk of being hacked all the time. AI will only advance this technology bigger, faster, and more in the future.

In recent years, we have seen dozens of Federal agencies hacked by agents of China and Russia, and we have got to be prepared for the future, and AI is the future. AI is changing the way we live, and we work. And at our very first hearing on the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, our first hearing was on the advances and new applications of AI. And we even had Eric Schmidt here to testify who talked about the advances in AI, the great benefits to it in our lives and work, but also the existential risks, to quote him, as well. And the AI Training Act, which passed last Congress, established AI training requirements for some Federal employees, and this bill simply expands the availability of that training to even more Federal employees.

AI is even further integrated. As AI further integrates into our daily lives, this is important more today than ever before. AI language models, like ChatGPT, have achieved better marks on the SAT, MCAT, and bar exams than most of our colleagues. While Hollywood writers are currently on strike over the very real possibility of being replaced by AI, yesterday there was the launch by Anthropic Claude 2, which is going to compete with ChatGPT. It was launched by Dario Amodei of Anthropic. The technology is expanding rapidly. In just the first few weeks of ChatGPT, for example, over 100 million people signed up for it.

As the Federal Government continues to invest in these tools and more, decision-makers, supervisors, and data and tech specialists within the Federal bureaucracy must have a comprehensive understanding of the benefits, and uses, and risks of this technology and how we can implement it within our Federal agencies to make ev-

everyone more efficient. While the American private sector is dominant in this space, a competition for government integration of AI will be won by the side with the very best talent, and we want to make sure that our Federal employees are the best talent that is available in the world. While our workforce works from home and in their pajamas on legacy tech systems, China is preparing to use AI to further the regime's aggressive policy, so we, too, must be aggressive in AI. We must beat any of our adversaries, whether it is China, Russia, or other countries around the world, in the race for AI dominance, and the Federal Government must be ready to keep up with AI.

This bill is bipartisan, bicameral, and just a simple commonsense step forward in this existential push for AI leadership. As a lead sponsor of the bill in Congress, I again want to thank Ranking Member Gerry Connolly, Senators Peters and Braun for their leadership on this legislation. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill. I now yield to the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. I strongly support this bipartisan bill which takes a positive step to ensure that the workforce in the Federal Government is equipped with both the educational training and the professional skills that are actually necessary to responsibly manage the risks and benefits and opportunities posed by artificial intelligence. I want to salute Ms. Mace for her great leadership on this matter.

Advances in AI are changing society and the marketplace in fundamental ways, including the important work of the Federal Government to serve the people of the country. The advances pose evolving challenges to oversight and accountability efforts, requiring strong proficiencies in the highest transparency and governance standards to protect governmental efficiency, privacy, civil liberties, and the public interest itself. The AI Training Expansion Act will ensure that investments of taxpayer dollars in AI are leveraged ethically and responsibly with privacy and civil liberties protections right at the heart of our decisionmaking.

I thank Subcommittee Chairwoman Mace, and our Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, Connolly, for their leadership on this bill in the House. I am happy to support it, and I yield back. Oh, actually, I will recognize Mr. Connolly, the bill co-sponsor, for his remarks.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Ranking Member, and let me also thank Chairwoman Mace for her leadership on this and other cutting-edge technology issues we face. And I echo what she said that we got to have a Federal workforce that is conversant with AI and is trained both in the positive applications of AI and in the risks AI might pose in terms of public privacy especially, and the manipulation of AI to the detriment of the people we serve, and so making sure that basic training in the Federal workforce is really important.

The Chairwoman also cited people in pajamas working legacy systems at home, and that is a continuing concern I have, and I hope the Subcommittee and full Committee has, that our work is not done in modernizing IT in the Federal Government. AI is one

set of subjects we have to address, but we are not anywhere near close to making sure that the Federal Government has the IT platforms it needs to be cyber secure and to make sure that it is serving the American public as efficiently as possible. And that is why I continue to advocate for a rigorous and vigorous implementation of FITARA, the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, which includes the retirement of legacy systems, some of which are 50-years-plus old, and to make sure that all of the IT platforms we have can be cyber secure.

We also need to address the aging Federal workforce, and this bill helps us in guaranteeing that training, but we got to make sure that the next generation of Federal employees has this kind of training so that they can interact with the private sector in a knowledgeable and equal basis, and that they can protect the American public. So, I am glad to be an original co-sponsor. I thank Ms. Mace for her leadership, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Ms. MACE. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. OK. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed. You do not want a recorded vote on—

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Yes.

Chairman COMER. Right, right.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Yes.

Chairman COMER. You want to withdraw that. That was on the—

Ms. MACE. [continuing]. Withdrawn.

Chairman COMER. Yes. All right. The lady from South Carolina withdraws her request for a recorded vote on the last motion.

Now the question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 4503, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair—the lady from South Carolina.

Ms. MACE. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. All right. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 1695**, the Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 1695, Strengthening Agency Management and Oversight of Software Assets, SAMOSA Act, a bill to improve the



visibility, accountability, and oversight of Agency Software Asset Management Practices, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment in any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 1695, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. All right. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the bill and the amendment.

Federal agencies spend billions of dollars a year on software licenses without a full understanding of what they are purchasing and how it compares to what they are already paying for. The result is wasteful spending on duplicative or unnecessary software licenses. As amended by my bipartisan and bicameral amendment in the nature of a substitute, this legislation will provide Congress better insight into how our Federal Agencies purchase and use software. The text we are considering today improves the introduced text of H.R. 1695 to improve government software purchasing without unduly limiting the procurement options of Federal Agencies. These changes reflect multiple rounds of feedback from industry groups and the Office of Management and Budget, as well as conversations between the bill sponsor and House and Senate committee staff.

As amended, 1695 requires an agency to better manage its software and develop a plan for addressing any costly unnecessary licenses. This will reduce wasteful spending and improve government efficiency. I thank Mr. Cartwright, Ranking Member Raskin, and my colleagues in the Senate for working with the Committee staff to ensure that this legislation appropriately achieves its goals. I also thank Mr. Fallon and Ms. Mace for their early support of this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. I now yield to the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including on today's agenda this bipartisan good government bill that will achieve important cost savings for the public. I want to support H.R. 1695, the SAMOSA Act, which was introduced by our colleague, Mr. Cartwright of Pennsylvania. The government will need to spend tens of billions of dollars this year on software purchases and on maintenance. This makes up a big chunk of the estimated \$100 billion that we will spend on information technology overall.

Previous efforts to increase oversight and transparency of Federal expenditures on software, including the MEGABYTE Act of 2016, have saved Federal agencies an estimated \$450 million over just a 3-year period, but serious challenges remain. For example, a recent audit by GAO found that software license data reported by Federal agencies was inconsistent to wide variation in exactly how agencies track and maintain their inventories. Current software contract and asset management practices also fall short of

achieving enough transparency to allow agencies to purchase software products and services that actually meet their specific needs and priorities.

H.R. 1695 would require Federal agency CIOs to complete comprehensive assessments of the software paid for by, in use at, or deployed throughout the government. These assessments would update and expand the software inventories required by the MEGA-BYTE Act. The bill would require agencies to submit comprehensive assessments to GSA, OMB, GAO, and Congress to facilitate stronger oversight of software contracts and Federal spending. It would also require agencies to use these assessments to develop a plan to better manage agency software, procurement, and management, which would be required to include remediation of deficiencies, automation of management processes, and workforce training.

One industry analysis estimates the cost savings of this Act at \$500 to \$750 million a year. The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs estimates that the bill could save taxpayers up to \$5 billion annually. I appreciate Chairman Gary Peters' leadership in developing and driving this legislation and his Republican co-lead, Senator Cassidy, of Louisiana. I also want to thank Representative Matt Cartwright for championing the bill over here in the House along with our Subcommittee Chairs, Mr. Fallon and Ms. Mace.

This is a good bipartisan bill that will allow the government to operate more transparently and efficiently and cost-effectively, and I am very happy to support its passage today. And I yield back to you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would the Ranking Member yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, by all means.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Ranking Member. I just want to underscore, going back to FITARA, and the scorecard that this Committee created, and the 15 hearings we have had on its implementation, that software licensing management was one of the categories on the scorecard, and I think we were able to make progress. We need to continue to monitor that. But I think it just underscores the fact that vigorous oversight of FITARA and the use of that scorecard has, in fact, made a difference. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you. Now, just to echo your point, since its inception in December 2014, FITARA has empowered the CIOs in Federal agencies. It has improved how the government acquires and manages IT, and it saved nearly \$30 billion of taxpayer money. So, this is a tool that Congress, CIOs, agency heads, and outside stakeholders use to understand how the agencies manage and secure their IT assets. And the scorecard also helps Congress hold the Federal agencies accountable for implementing fundamental and evolving best IT practice.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If my friend would yield one more time.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, by all means.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank him so much for pointing that out. GAO has pointed out that we have almost saved \$30 billion. I cannot think of another Federal piece of legislation that can claim to have saved, according to GAO, \$30 billion since it was passed into law

7 or 8 years ago. So, I think our keeping our foot to the pedal with respect to implementation of that law continues to have a return on it. I thank my friend for pointing it out.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, and I will just close by saluting you, Mr. Connolly, for your leadership on FITARA and for making sure that we have had these biannual reviews, these hearings that have been so important in the FITARA context. And I am happy to yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Mace for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank Ranking Member Raskin as well as the lead co-sponsor of this bipartisan measure. I also want to thank my colleague across the aisle, Representative Cartwright, for his leadership on the issue of government waste and software licenses, and I also want to thank Committee staff for their wise revisions.

Sometimes small parts make a huge difference in the Federal Government. And imagine that today, as the media talks about how divisive we are up here on the Hill, and oftentimes we are, but in this room, one of the most divisive committees on the Hill, we are actually working together, working across the aisle to make government work better, run better, be more efficient and save taxpayer dollars. So, I want to thank the leadership today on that.

Despite over \$100 billion in spending on Federal software licenses, most agencies have no comprehensive record of what they are actually buying and what they have already paid for. It is shocking and blows my mind that most Federal agencies do not carry a record of what licenses they have purchased or what licenses they have, how many they have. The duplicity that is happening because they do not have a comprehensive record is a place where we can be more efficient, which is the entire purpose of this legislation. Our bureaucracy is likely wasting substantial sums of unused, duplicative, and unnecessary software licenses, wasting millions, maybe billions of taxpayer dollars. No American household would have three Netflix subscriptions or two cable bills, so why should a Federal agency, right? We should work smarter, not harder, here.

The negotiated version before the Committee reflects extensive dialogs with agencies on how to best implement the goals of this legislation and slash wasteful spending. By requiring agencies to develop a plan to consolidate licenses, we give them the tools to identify and eliminate waste and improve efficiency within their operations. So, agencies spending money on software licenses without a comprehensive understanding of what they are buying and what they already have is a massive waste of taxpayer dollars.

Agencies simply do not know how many employees are using which software or where, how many seats they have in those licenses, or what restrictions are associated with those licenses. Agencies sometimes unwittingly waste money on duplicative, unused, restrictive, and unnecessary licenses. So, this is inefficient, wasteful, and impedes important IT monetization work for the government that we need to focus on.

H.R. 1695 will save money by cutting down these duplicative licenses and underused software licenses as well. It will require

agencies to update and expand their software inventory so that they have a detailed insight into their software licenses, costs, usage rates, seats, et cetera. The amended bill addresses bloated, underutilized, and costly Federal agency software licenses by requiring agencies to develop a plan to consolidate them or to update them. This legislation removes unduly prescriptive provisions present in the version introduced last year and again earlier this year. Those provisions had pre-supposed the merits of certain software licensing solutions.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his staff for working to improve this particular legislation. I also want to thank Senate staff and Committee staff. I want to thank my colleagues across the aisle as well for working together.

I have found, Mr. Chairman, that the Oversight Committee, although we have some of the most progressive and most far-right Members, and some in the middle, that cybersecurity has been a place where we have been able to work together. And I would encourage us to show leadership on the Federal level and the national level how we all can join hands and do something for the good of every single taxpayer in this country, and I want to thank my colleagues for their leadership on this.

And I would also Mr. Chairman, like to ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record the following documents. I have a coalition letter to this Committee in support of the SAMOSA Act from the Coalition for Fair Software Licensing, the Computer & Communications Industry Association, the Alliance for Digital Innovation, and NetChoice.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The lady yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 1695, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. A recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 1209, Fair and Open Competition Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 1209, Fair and Open Competition, FOCA Act, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality toward the labor relations of Federal Government contrac-

tors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 1209, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the bill and the amendment.

I am pleased to call up my bill, H.R. 1209, the Fair and Open Competition Act. As our Nation continues to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic and as tax dollars are used to fund infrastructure projects across the land, one thing should be clear. Every construction worker in every state should have a fair chance to work on any construction project funded by American tax dollars. That, however, is not what President Biden wants.

On February 4, 2022, President Biden issued Executive Order 14063, entitled, "Use of Project Labor Agreements for Federal Construction Projects." That executive order required Federal contracting agencies to mandate project labor agreements, also known as PLAs, on Federal construction projects worth \$35 million or more. Project labor agreements are, in laypersons terms, requirements to use only union workers for a project. President Biden further instructed the Federal Acquisition Regulation Council to implement his order in the Code of Federal Regulations. That new regulation is currently in its final stages of review. If it goes into effect, it will be harder for a future President to reverse President Biden's policy.

But that policy, put simply, is not a fair deal for the American construction workforce. Biden's regulation will raise taxpayer costs and prevent non-union workers from working on Federal projects. It will even force right-to-work states to freeze local workers out of cooperative Federal projects. In fact, over 80 percent of the U.S. construction workforce would be frozen out of Federal projects because over 80 percent of construction workers do not belong to a union.

Congress kept these requirements out of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Congress should act again to overturn President Biden's order and prevent the Federal Government from discriminating against contractors based on labor affiliation. That is why I introduced the Fair and Open Competition Act. Unlike President Biden's order, my bill maintains Federal neutrality on project labor agreements. It neither mandates nor prevents them. It simply allows individual agencies, contractors, and subcontractors to decide project-by-project what is best for each given circumstance. This approach is fair, and it respects the diverse needs of a vast and diverse Nation.

H.R. 1209 is an even-handed position all Committee Members should be willing to support. The bill is supported by a host of business groups, representing millions of workers. It is also supported by a broad range of taxpayer advocate groups, all of whom have the interests of Federal taxpayers in mind. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Alas, I have to strongly oppose this bill, which would prevent the Federal Government from using one of the very best tools we have got to ensure that large construction projects are completed effectively, efficiently, and safely.

People are attempting to paint H.R. 1209 as a bill about instilling fairness and neutrality, but the process is already fair and neutral. Federal construction projects are, of course, highly complex, and if they are not managed properly, they can produce expensive delays, unsafe work sites, lengthy disputes, and unethical business practices, and that is why President Biden issued Executive Order 14063 earlier this year. The order requires the use of project labor agreements on Federal construction projects above \$35 million in value to address these challenges and to ensure that taxpayers are getting the best mileage for their money.

President Biden's executive order is estimated to improve the return on investment of \$262 billion taxpayer dollars and the working conditions of nearly 200,000 workers on Federal construction projects. H.R. 1209 would reverse this progress and prohibit agencies from even considering the use of PLAs in funding construction contracts, even when the PLA would save the taxpayers money.

PLAs are an essential tool to promote transparency and accountability in Federal construction. These pre-hire collective bargaining agreements, negotiated between unions and employers, lay out the terms and conditions of employment for construction projects. They guard against risk and ensure stability by promoting fairness and transparency in the project, including through compliance with different laws and rules. PLAs help resolve disputes ahead of time, they ensure safer work sites, and they avoid work disruptions that can cause protracted and expensive delays. A wide range of research demonstrates that PLAs are effective tools to ensure the stewardship of taxpayer dollars by controlling costs, enhancing efficiency, ensuring safe and equitable working conditions, and benefiting the local community. They increase budget accuracy, ensure that skilled workers are available for the whole duration of the project, and they protect against disruption and delay.

Contrary to my colleagues' repeated claims, non-union contractors are perfectly free to bid on projects that require PLAs. Workers covered under a PLA are not required to join the union to work on the project, and PLAs are legal even in right-to-work states. All that they do is to lift the floor up to increase the fairness and the efficiency of the worksite, generally.

The markup of this anti-transparency legislation follows a series of letters from Committee Republicans to leaders at the OMB, which make outlandish and inaccurate claims about project labor agreements, including that they reduce competition and value for taxpayers and limit opportunities for communities. In fact, PLAs

protect taxpayers from the inevitable race to the bottom that incentivizes contractors to underpay and undertrain their workers, cut corners that threaten project integrity, and bring in cheaper outside labor instead of providing high-quality jobs locally to the community.

PLAs are public documents that anyone can review for their fairness and their soundness. If my Republican colleagues have identified specific concerns with any of them, I invite them to identify those concerns publicly. But absent any specific unbiased evidence, we are left to conclude that H.R. 1209 and other attacks on PLAs are simply another example of the determination to erode transparency and accountability protections for the public, to undermine labor movements, and to put special interest profits before the well-being of workers.

I urge my colleagues all to oppose this unnecessary bill, and I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the following documents: a letter to this Committee in support of FOCA from the Associated General Contractors of America; a letter to this Committee in support of the bill from the Associated Builders and Contractors; a coalition letter to this Committee in support of the bill from a diverse group of 25 construction and business associations; a letter to this Committee in support of the bill from the Independent Electrical Contractors; and a letter to this Committee in support of the bill from the National Taxpayers Union.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. I thank the Chairman and the Committee for marking up this legislation. And unlike so much legislation in Congress, the name of this bill actually accurately describes what it does, which is ensures that merit shop contractors, who employ 88 percent—so that is 12 percent otherwise—88 percent of the construction workforce which can fairly compete for Federal and federally funded construction projects. Government mandated, so the government requires it. That is freedom in America. Government-mandated project labor agreements simply drive up the cost of Federal projects.

And look, the amount that is driving it up is a matter of conjecture. I know for certain in Pennsylvania, where contracts were bid without the agreement and then bid with the agreement, the cost was anywhere from 6 to 15 percent, but some estimate up to 20 percent, an increase through the prevention of competition combined with inefficient work rules required under the PLA.

Now, let me be clear. I got no beef with private unions and private contractors that are unionized. I got no beef whatsoever. This is an issue of fairness across the board. Whatever standard we set should be set for everyone, not one standard for some and another standard for others. This is America. We should have one standard, and all should adhere to that standard. We should not be doing things as a Federal Government that inherently increase the cost

to the people paying the bill, which are the taxpayers, and that is what PLAs do.

PLAs are there to ensure a certain sector of the workforce—the 12-percent sector—have a carve out, a set aside, have a leg up, have a different standard than the 88 percent who do not. That is why they are there. This is a special interest. This is exactly what this is, It is a special interest, and this bill seeks to end that special interest so that the taxpayers who we support, who we work for, who are our bosses, they are our special interest, they should be our special interest, we should be supporting them, and that is what this bill seeks to do.

I marvel at my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, and the claims made that this actually saves money. I do not know other Members of the body that have been contractors, but I have been one, and a contract is pretty simple. I agree to do this work by this amount of time, to this standard, and you agree to pay. That is it. We do not need a special contract that says I am not going to strike, but that is what this is. That is the safety net that is included in PLAs. Well, I will not strike as long as we have this signed, and I get to do this work under a special agreement that no one else gets to participate in.

Ladies and gentlemen, we expect people not to strike as long as they are being paid for doing the job correctly. That is the contractual relationship. I sign a contract, I say I am going to do the work at this time to this standard, and you are going to pay me for it. Well, I do not expect you to strike if you are being paid and you are doing the work appropriately. I do not expect you to strike if you do not get your way on some kind of negotiation. The Federal Government is contracting you to do the work, you agreed to it, here are the specifications, here are the plans, you understood what you are getting into, and that is why you bid on the project.

Ladies and gentlemen, 88 percent of the construction force is in the merit shop business. That is who is doing 88 percent of the work. This bill seeks to make it fair across the board for not only 88 percent, but the 12 percent. Again, I have no beef at all with private sector unions in the contracting business, and there are contractors, there are bosses that would abuse their employees and have abused their employees. There is a thing called the National Labor Relations Board that can deal with people that violate, but what we should not do is have one rule that punishes everybody for the sake of a few bad actors. The few bad actors should be punished and punished resoundingly and appropriately. But what we should not do is punish every single American who gets up every morning, early, maybe misses their kids getting off to school, packs their lunchbox, and goes to work to pay their taxes so a few folks can have a special deal. This bill would solve that.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield the balance, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Ranking Member. I will start off by saying I was an ironworker for about 20 years, a union iron worker, so I have worked on the PLAs in the past. There have



been instances where non-union contractors have been successful in getting work on PLA projects, but I would say that a great majority of the contracts are won by union firms. And I have worked all over the country, worked on projects in Louisiana, New Mexico, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois, Ohio, and so I have seen how this has worked across the country.

One of the great benefits of PLAs is the predictability that it offers on a major construction project, and that predictability is rare in an industry where every project is new and different. So, the challenges of, you know, building a major construction project in an area of the country that is in an environment that is exposed to the weather, is quite unpredictable. Oftentimes construction firms do not have a fixed workforce capable of handling these large projects, so they rely on apprenticeship programs that are run jointly by Taft-Hartley entities involving both contractor and union.

So, under this PLA, they are guaranteed there is a steady flow of skilled workers, men and women who reflect the demographic of that area, and reflect the diversity of the cities in which many of these projects are going on in order to complete that project on time and on budget. Those are very valuable factors in terms of trying to meet the obligations that we have to taxpayers and also the entities that are the end user of these facilities.

I just want to just comment on the previous gentleman's comments. Much of the disputes on these projects are between contractors. It is not between the union and the contractor. It is between the general contractor and the subcontractor. And because many of the complexities of these projects are unforeseen and they are not addressed in the original contract, it ends up in endless disputes that end up in court, and one of the things that the PLA does is it requires everybody to perform. It requires all the workers to show up every single day, no work stoppages, as the gentleman mentioned, but it also requires the contractor, the subcontractor to perform. You cannot stop this project from going forward. It needs to meet its deadline. And so, regardless of the differences you may have in how the wording of the language in the contract is, you must continue to work on the project, and you can arbitrate your disputes, but the project must go on, and the workers benefit by having, you know, a predictable pay level, although it is fixed.

I have seen PLAs that the owner, in one case, Harvard University, that had a multi-billion building project. They said we want a discount because we are giving all this work for several buildings over several years. We want a discount on what the prevailing wage is out there in the area, and they got it in return for the steady work that was available. So, there are many benefits that flow from this. Dignity of work and respect for workers is paramount. I see that—

Mr. RASKIN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I will. I will.

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Yield for a question. Because of your expertise in labor law, Mr. Lynch, I wanted to ask you what you make of the suggestion that rather than have a project labor agreement where there would be presumably a no-strike clause, there are fair wages paid to everybody whether they are union or non-union workers who participate, why not instead just say, well, let

us let the National Labor Relations Act figure it out—how effective has that been for workers? I know that the remedy under the NLRA if somebody gets fired for, say, organizing the union, is you spend a year, 2 years, 3 years before the NLRB, which is a famously cumbersome and dysfunctional body, and then at the very best, you get reinstated. That is not much of a punishment. How well does that work?

Mr. LYNCH. With 4 seconds, my contractor community and labor community would both be horrified by that prospect. That would take years and years and years and would not satisfy either the contractors or the people working out of them. Thank you. My time has expired.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Connolly for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair. And I listened with great interest to a friend from Pennsylvania who says, well, he had experience as a contractor and he has nothing against unions, but we ought not to be giving them special favors. By the way, I have experienced, as somebody who contracted with a multi-billion dollar project, the Silver Line here in Northern Virginia, a line that otherwise took 62 years to complete from the idea being proffered in 1962 when we built Dulles Airport, the premier international airport of the Nation's Capital, until we finally cut the ribbon this year for phase two. Phase one was on time and largely on budget, you know why, because it was a PLA. I insisted on it as Chairman of Fairfax County, and that PLA worked. It was efficient. It guaranteed timelines, and both contractors and workers, as well as the client, were more than satisfied with the product.

Phase two, under a Republican Governor and a Republican Secretary of Labor in the state of Virginia, who are hostile to labor, which seems to infuse a lot that is behind this, was not a PLA. In fact, they insisted it could not be a PLA or threaten the funding of phase two, and phase two was 3 years delayed: tens of millions of additional costs, substandard work product, and even material that required retrofitting brand new stations that have been constructed because of inferior material from the contractor.

So, my experience is the opposite of Mr. Perry's. PLAs work, and legalizing their non-use, mandating their non-use is fraught with problems. Let us remember the genesis of PLAs. PLAs were a war-time product to guarantee labor peace during the largest industrial production buildup in human history in World War II, here in the United States. It worked. In less than 4 years, the United States of America, using PLAs liberally in every industry, built more ships, more airplanes, more munitions, more aircraft than had ever been produced in human history and turned the tide of battle and defeated Nazi Germany and Imperialist Japan. That is one heck of a track record. So, PLAs are not some narrow special-interest provision. They are, in fact, a very nimble, and efficient, and proven tool to proceed with large projects on schedule, on budget with qualified labor working with management.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point to enter into the record a statement opposing this bill by the Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Contractors' National Association and an

evaluation Quantifying the Value of Union Labor in Construction Projects prepared for the Mechanical Industry Advancement Fund.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair, and I yield back. I am sorry. I would yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to request unanimous consent to introduce a letter from our friends at the North America's Building Trades Union, the NABTU, in opposition to H.R. 1209.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I was Mayor of Long Beach, California, I was really proud to establish the first city-wide project labor agreement in the state. So, it was not just project specific, but any public project in our city actually went through a project labor agreement process, and other cities since then have adopted that in California. And we know that project labor agreements, not just in my state, but in places across the country, have been very successful. They have been around for decades and critical to a good workforce.

We know they have been used from everything, not just in major construction projects, but also in our schools or universities, transportation, green energy, and they have been a key component to both public-and private-sector jobs as well. This has been a huge boon for the economy back in California and certainly back home in my city. We know that this policy has been good for working families and also makes financial sense.

It is really, really important to note also there has been a lot of discussion about supply chain over the last couple of years and around strengthening ports, which bring in cargo in and out, of course, across the United States. Most of the port construction that is happening on the West Coast and much on the East Coast are under these project labor agreements specifically so that these important large infrastructure projects actually do not stop, that there is a clean process, and that they move forward to not interrupt the supply chain. So, the impact to the economy and to America's ports around project labor agreements is critically important.

When Republicans attack project labor agreements, it is not just an attack on working people. It is an attack on the right to organize, it is an attack on historic investments, and it is a direct attack on our Nation's infrastructure. And this bill, of course, does not just stop at overturning President Biden's executive order. It would be essentially a blanket ban on all project labor agreements where any Federal funding is used. And so any project, whether it is Federal Government project, a state or local jurisdiction, or even in the private sector, could see these protections rolled back. It is really, again, an attack on working people.

And we also now know that this bill is not just limited to new construction, but any facilities that receive Federal funding that are maintained under a project labor agreement, and we have many of these back home in the city of Long Beach and across the state of California. These will also be targeted, threatening even

more American jobs. And so, even if you do not agree with PLAs or think they are not the best for any certain situation, a vote for this legislation completely eliminates their use for any project that uses Federal funding, and that is absolutely outrageous and shameful. It jeopardizes the livelihoods of constituents in every congressional district, opens essential projects up to the possibility of additional costs and delays, and harms your ability to maintain and improve infrastructure that we all depend on.

We know that there has been study after study across the country that concluded that PLAs attract, by the way, a similar number of bidders and have been associated with equivalent or lower costs oftentimes than projects without them. So, eliminating PLAs across the board for projects with Federal funding is really an open attack on working people, on the American middle class. And Republicans on this Committee and across Congress are pushing for it at a moment when we should literally be doing the opposite. We should be increasing the workforce, we should be creating more local hiring jobs across the country.

I find it also interesting that Republicans who voted and who have voted against the Bipartisan Infrastructure Bill and who are now, by the way, praising these projects and going across the country and celebrating these projects back in their district, many of these projects were built with project labor agreements. So, we can go on and on talking about projects across the country that Republicans are now praising, that they voted against, that were actually project labor agreement projects. And so, I want to actually thank President Biden and his leadership for the Inflation Reduction Act, for his work on the bipartisan infrastructure agreement because communities are finally getting the resources that they need.

I also want to just add that most project labor agreements have a local hiring component, and what that essentially means is that we are able to not just hire from the region or anywhere in the state, but actually from that community. So in California, in my city, we have a percentage where the actual workers need to come directly from the city and the region, so you are ensuring that your local folks actually get these jobs. And so, this is ensuring local residents and it is ensuring that projects get built on time across the state and back home. So, for us back home, project labor agreements have been a game changer. Above all, this bill, and this really attack, abandons a promise we have made to hardworking men and women across the country, and so I absolutely oppose any efforts to rollback project labor agreements. And with that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognized Mr. Palmer from Alabama for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. I thank the Chairman, and thank the Chairman for introducing this bill. I am not sure what bill some of my colleagues are reading because this is not an attack on project labor agreements. It just maintains a neutral status and a level playing field for all contractors. And I would just like to point out that more than 87 percent of U.S. construction workforce chooses not to belong to the union, so you are arguing something, an issue that does not exist.

I would also like to point out that the construction industry is facing what has been described as a historic shortage of skilled workers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that we need another 650,000 skilled workers. The Biden Administration version of the project labor agreement, again, is going to make that problem even worse. It is going to exacerbate the problem by trying to force these people who are in merit shops into union shops, further delaying major infrastructure projects that we desperately need to get underway. I just want to point out that a lot of the issues that we are dealing with with this are problems imposed on us by the Federal Government. And I think what you are trying to do with this bill, which I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reconsider and support, is to put us in a position where we can get the workforce that we need rather than create one impediment after another to getting these people in the workforce to get these jobs done.

I do want to emphasize again that this is neutral toward project labor agreements, and it allows competition for union job companies. It allows non-union companies. But the key thing that we cannot lose sight of, Mr. Chairman, is the need for getting infrastructure projects done. Our infrastructure is in decline, particularly on the transportation side, and we do not need another administration-imposed impediment to getting the workforce that we need to get these jobs done. With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Do any other Members wish to be heard? Mr. Casar for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks you mentioned that project labor agreements could discriminate against union versus non-union workers. But my understanding is that Federal law guarantees workers the right to choose whether they want to be in a union or not, regardless of a project labor agreement. Mr. Chairman, is that your understanding as well?

Chairman COMER. Are you asking me a question?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just think that it is important in this bill to make it clear that, in fact, all workers in this country can choose whether to be a member of a union or not. And in your laying out of the bill, you said that project labor agreements would discriminate against non-union workers, but my understanding is any worker on any project, PLA or not, has a Federal right to choose whether to be a part of a union or not.

Chairman COMER. You have the right to be a part of union, but the mandate says you have to be a union worker to get the job.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman, it would be good for us to check up on that because I am pretty sure that project labor agreements do not require you to be a union member to be a part of the job because if it did, then that would be violating your Federal rights, whether to join a union or not. Again, project labor agreements, for everybody, to lay out, is a pre-negotiated set of wages and benefits in order to make sure that we get good workers, train people locally, and then workers can decide whether they want to be a part of a union or not. And so Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can—

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, please.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. I thank you for the point. What the project labor agreement does is to agree upon a prevailing wage that union members may have bargained for, but then everybody has got to be paid, so—but nobody is compelled to join the union. That would indeed, as you are saying, Mr. Casar, violate the National Labor Relations Act, which gives the workers the right to decide whether or not they want to join a union. I yield back.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you, Ranking Member. That is right. For example, when it is the weekend, and whether you are a union worker or not, you still get the weekend, and so many workers can benefit on project labor agreements while choosing whether or not they want to be a union member.

Mr. Chairman, also as you laid the bill out, you said, and I think I am quoting this correctly, that there are a host of business groups representing thousands of workers supporting this bill. There were letters submitted for the bill and against the bill. Of course those business associations you listed, in fact, represent construction companies, corporations, but you said that they represent thousands of workers. Mr. Chairman, did we submit any letters from organizations supporting the bill that, in fact, are composed of construction workers instead of construction companies?

Chairman COMER. These letters represent tens of thousands of construction workers that I think are pretty happy with where they were.

Mr. CASAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My understanding—

Chairman COMER. And I do not believe you are correct in your statement, but proceed.

Mr. PALMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. I will in one moment because I do want to agree with one of your points, Mr. Palmer, and ask you a question if I have the time. My understanding is companies or associations, like the Builders and Contractors or General Contractors, represent corporations and not their workers. And organizations like SMART and NABTU represent workers and have elections where workers choose their leadership and choose the agenda.

My next question, that could go to Mr. Palmer, for example, is, these PLAs, we have not talked that much about the fact that they get us local hiring at the local level and apprenticeship training for workers, and that is a key part of addressing the worker shortages we see. My question for anybody either in the Majority or Minority is whether folks know whether the Shawnee Power Plant, the Paradise Power Plant, and the Kentucky Dam, that I understand are in Mr. Comer's district, or the Department of Energy uranium cleanup in Oak Ridge in Mr. Burchett's district, or the DOE's Savannah River Site in Ms. Mace's district, or the Ascend Elements project battery recycling plant being built in Mr. Comer's district, or the Black Hills Airport in Ms. Boebert's district, or the Intel chip plant in Mr. Turner's district, or Resolution Copper Mine in Mr. Bigg and Mr. Gosar's districts, or the Alabama Power projects in Mr. Palmer's district, or the upcoming Honda LG battery plant in Mr. Jordan's district, or Lambeau Field just outside Mr. Grothman's district, or the Toyota power plant being built or that

was built in my district, whether those were built successfully under project labor agreements or not.

Mr. PALMER. If I may respond to that. Again, it is not an issue of project labor agreements. It is this project labor agreement as determined by the Biden Administration. And there is an issue with training workforce, and I will give you an example of that is a federally assisted project here in D.C., the South Capitol Street Corridor P, a phase one project, has the following language in this agreement. Now Article 13, for instance: "The parties recognize the need to maintain continuing support of programs designed to develop adequate numbers of competent workers in the construction industry." Now, just remember that. "Parties further recognize that apprenticeship and training shall be offered consistent with the applicable union's collective bargaining agreement, consistent with the apprenticeship and training programs currently maintained by the joint apprenticeship and training committee sponsored by the unions and their signatory contractors." In other words, if your company, a contractor that is doing the work is not union and they need to train workers, it has to come from the union shop.

So again, I just want to make clear that what Mr. Comer is trying to do is not eliminate project labor agreements. It is to remain neutral on this, and, again, I want to emphasize the shortage of workers. I worked for two international engineering construction companies, and we had union workers on certain job sites, but most of our workforce was non-union. We were able to get things done. And what we do not want to do is create more impediments to developing the skilled labor force that we desperately need and getting the infrastructure projects done that we desperately need to get done.

So, do not take this necessarily as anti-union. This is just trying to maintain a neutral status. And in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the issue really here is the dire situation that we face with infrastructure and the need to get more skilled workers on the job, whether union or non-union, and get these projects completed. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. And if I may add, I just quote this from the U.S. Department of Labor. "Non-union workers covered under PLAs may have to pay agency fees to cover costs associated with the duty of unions to fairly represent all workers union and non-union in the administration of collective bargaining agreements." So—

Mr. CASAR. So Mr. Chairman, that sounds like I am correct, that non-union workers work on project labor agreements all the time. They may, just like we have to all over the country, chip in for representation because we do not want free riders and freeloading. And I actually associate myself entirely with Mr. Palmer's remarks that we need good apprenticeship programs, and these are oftentimes managed both by contractors and unions alike.

And the freeloading problem that we have started to find in the construction industry is that oftentimes those workers get trained up by unions. There may not be enough union work. Those trained workers then go work elsewhere, and there is not the economic incentive. There is a market failure for that kind of apprenticeship program, and that is part of where I believe the Federal Govern-

ment can step in is when there is a market failure. That is why the Federal Government and local and state governments pay for schools because you cannot count on any one business to educate everybody in the country.

In the same way, we need to make sure that when we are using our Federal purchasing power, that we are training the next generation to go into these jobs that are so, so critical to our economy, and that is exactly what the Biden Administration is doing. And the answer to my earlier question is that all of those projects in Republican districts, and then in mine as well, are all project labor agreement projects, are training the workforce of the future for the infrastructure projects of the future. We should be encouraging project labor agreements because on projects like Naval Base Kitsap in 2015, a multi-billion dollar project, it did not go over budget. It went \$250 million under budget. Most of our home construction projects go over budget, so that is why I will be opposing this bill.

Mr. PALMER. Well, again, I just wanted to make this point that 87 percent of your workforce is non-union in the construction trades, and they do an excellent job in those companies in training the workforce. Having worked in engineering and been involved in some major construction projects, I have seen that firsthand. So, I just want to emphasize again that, in my opinion, you are arguing against a position that harms our ability to train our workforce, to get more people into that workforce and to get these jobs done, but I understand your position on the issue and the position you are going to take on the bill. But I encourage my colleagues to reconsider this and to support this bill because it makes sense.

Mr. CASAR. I understand it, and I appreciate the conversation back and forth. Mr. Chairman, to clear up that this does not discriminate between union and non-union workers, and Mr. Palmer's reading of the project labor agreement language that, while we may disagree, I think what you read out actually solves the problem you are describing. I still do not understand how a project labor agreement having people jointly chip in for a state-of-the-art training program hurts workforce development. What you read, I think, actually shows exactly why project labor agreements are what we need to address the construction worker shortages in the future. So, I think we need that kind of article and many more construction contracts, if we want to solve that problem.

Mr. PALMER. It actually forces the contractors to let the union apprentice shops do the training rather than their own shops, which they have invested heavily in, and again—

Mr. CASAR. Yes. My understanding is, overwhelmingly—and if you go talk to the Samsungs of the world, the Toyotas of the world, the Hondas of the world, they are showing up and saying let us set up joint union and contractor training programs where we both chip in. “Forced” is another word for a contract where we all agree and say let us jointly chip in, not just one side or the other, so that we all have skin in the game, and that is what actually gets people trained, so I do not think it is forcing. It is saying, hey, we all agree to do the best thing possible.

Mr. PALMER. We are having an—



Chairman COMER. I will let Gary Palmer conclude, then we will move on to the next.

Mr. PALMER. And I will end with this, is that if this is the right thing to do, it will happen. You do not need the government to force it. And again, having worked in that industry, what we try to do is develop best practices, and if this is a best practice, it will happen. I yield back.

Mr. CASAR. One second. You have a construction worker die every 2-and-a-half days on the job, so not everything happens right on its own.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. Any other Member wish to be recognized?

Mr. Goldman of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman.

Mr. Goldman of New York. I would just like to re-emphasize the point that my colleagues from Texas and Maryland have made that I think is really the important issue here, which is prevailing wage. That is what these project labor agreements are guaranteeing. And if you do not have a prevailing wage, what you find is the opportunity to abuse the workers, and it becomes a race to the bottom to find the lowest-cost worker to do the job. That means that you get worse quality of work, you have fewer protections for the workers, and, of course, it also means that the corporations make a disproportionate amount of the money available but to be split between the corporations and the workers.

Unions and prevailing wage has been principally responsible for expanding the middle class in this country. That is what many strive for in order to be able to support their family, to have a homeownership, and to be able to live their American dream. And by eliminating of prevailing wage, what you are essentially doing is eliminating the opportunity for many to achieve their goal of becoming a productive middle class citizen in this country. And so, we can debate whether it is a union or non-union, but the point here and the point of these project labor agreements is to guarantee a certain standard of work and a certain wage for those who are working in order to ensure that there is quality of work, some worker protections, and an expansion of the middle class.

And I do not know, Mr. Casar, if you would like me to yield any more time? Apparently he does not, so I will yield back to the Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 1209, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair—the Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I call for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 192**, to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 192, a bill to prohibit an individual who is not a U.S. citizen from voting in any election in the District of Columbia.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for an amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 192, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the bill and the amendment.

Since the voters entrusted Republicans with control of the House, this Committee has conducted long overdue oversight of our Nation's capital city by convening three hearings on the District of Columbia. Our most recent D.C. hearing, held jointly with the Committee on House Administration, examined the topic of election integrity in the District. On November 21, 2022, the District Government enacted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act, allowing non-citizen residents to vote in D.C. local elections. This includes illegal immigrants and even foreign diplomats whose interests may be opposed to the interests of Americans. This radical change to our election laws upset lawmakers on both sides of the aisle. D.C. Mayor Bowser withheld her signature on the Act, something she has done only a handful times.

On February 9, 2023, 260 Members of the House voted to overturn the D.C. Act through a resolution of disapproval, which I sponsored. In that vote, I was happy to see Committee colleague, Representative Jared Moskowitz, join 41 other House Democrats in voting to block this D.C. law. However, this bipartisan resolution of disapproval was not considered in the Senate, so D.C.'s non-citizen voting law has gone into effect. This is unacceptable.

The only factor that differentiates American citizens from non-citizens is the right to vote. D.C. residents should be confident that their local government is not being diluted by lawful non-citizen residents or illegal immigrants. Article I of the Constitution grants Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the Nation's Capital, and the House Rules charge the Oversight Committee with a duty to oversee the municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

I urge my colleagues to support Representative Pfluger's commonsense bill to ensure that only U.S. citizens have the right to vote in local D.C. elections, and repeal D.C.'s radical law. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I would retitle this bill "The Insult to Injury Bill." The injury begins with the massive and globally unique disenfranchisement of the residents of the Federal capital city. The United States is the only democratic Nation on earth which disenfranchises the people who live in the capital city, which means that there are 700,000 taxpaying draftable American citizens who have participated in every war that America has ever fought, beginning with the American Revolution, and yet are denied voting representation, both in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate.

But it is not enough for Mr. Pflueger and our friends in the GOP to deny 700,000 fellow citizens equal voting rights and representation in Congress. Now they have to deny D.C. even the right to decide who is going to vote in their local elections because that is all we are talking about, who is going to vote for school board and Advisory Neighborhood Commission and who is going to vote for City Council and Mayor. There is one Federal representative from the District of Columbia, Ms. Norton, the distinguished non-voting delegate from the District of Columbia. And under the legislation that H.R. 192 would repeal in D.C., the local population does not vote, even for the non-voting delegate, as I understand it. In any event, the non-voting delegate, by definition, does not get to vote in Congress, and so this is just really pretty much a symbolic effort to add insult to injury.

It so happens, if you actually do any research on this, that the vast majority of states permitted non-citizens to vote for most of American history. Most of the states represented in this Committee allowed non-citizens to vote at the local level. Many of them allowed it even at the state and Federal level. But when the republic began, the relevant suffrage restrictions were based on wealth, property, race, and gender. And if you were a propertied white man, you could vote, regardless of what your citizenship was. Your citizenship was considered completely irrelevant to it. And this primarily became an issue there during the Civil War, where it was the Republican Party which championed non-citizen voting, which is why a number of newspapers in the South attacked Abraham Lincoln as an alien President, saying that he was carried to victory on the strength of the immigrant vote in New York, in Illinois, and in other states. The southern states opposed immigrant suffrage because they felt that immigrants were coming over to America with radical ideas against slavery as Lincoln defended the practice of non-citizen voting.

In any event, nothing remotely so controversial as what the Republican Party of the 19th century endorsed is going on in D.C. They are just talking about allowing people to vote in school board elections. Now, our friends have made a big deal out of diplomatic personnel from China and Russia. And perhaps Chinese spies, like the one who apparently was going to be the star witness for the Majority in their continuing efforts to find something on Joe Biden, these people theoretically would be allowed to vote. If you want to go after those people, well, then say that diplomatic personnel and Chinese spies should not be allowed to vote. But if they are talking about, I do not know, 80,000 or 70,000 people, I do not know how many people exactly are affected by voting in their local school

board elections, it is a very different matter than allowing diplomatic personnel from Russia or China, where conceivably there is some kind of Federal interest, although it has not been identified or elucidated, at least to my satisfaction, what that might be.

So, what is this really about? It is just about kicking around the people of Washington, DC. I do not think we have had any hearings about how we can actually assist the people of Washington in any of their efforts to deal with the problems there. Including the problem of gun violence as guns continue to pour into Washington, DC, like other big cities across the country. If we want to actually help people in Washington, why don't we start by adopting the proposal which is advanced and endorsed by more than 90 percent American people, a universal violent criminal background check? Why don't we close the internet loophole? Why don't we close the private gun show loophole? There are things that we can do to help Washington along with other big cities that exist in all of our states, but this is not one of them. This is obviously a cheap shot against the people of Washington who have decided to use their very limited democratic rights to extend rights to people who live in the city.

With that I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard? Ms. Norton is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I strongly oppose this undemocratic, paternalistic bill. This Congress, House Republicans have become obsessed with overturning the District of Columbia's election laws. They have already introduced 17 bills that would do so. Yet, they refuse to do the one and only thing D.C. residents have asked them to do about elections in D.C., which is to give D.C. residents voting representation in the House and Senate, as well as full control over their local affairs by passing the D.C. Statehood bill.

It is true that Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate on local D.C. matters, but it is false that Congress has a constitutional duty to do so. Instead, legislating on local D.C. matters is a choice. D.C. residents, a majority of whom are Black and Brown, are capable and worthy of governing themselves. I remind my Republican colleagues, who claim to revere the founders, what James Madison said in Federalist 43, about the residents of the Federal District: "A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will, of course, be allowed them."

The Supreme Court has held that Congress may delegate full legislative power—their words—full legislative power to D.C. on local D.C. matters. Last year, the D.C. Council passed the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, which allows non-citizens to vote but only in local D.C. elections. This year, the House passed a disapproval resolution that would have nullified this legislation, but the Senate never took it up. The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 is now law and it should remain law. The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 only applies to local, and I stress, local D.C. elections.

But there is a long history in the United States of allowing non-citizens to vote in local, state, territorial and Federal elections. At various points, 40 states have permitted non-citizens to vote. For

example, Texas, the home state of the sponsor of H.R. 192, and Kentucky, the home state of the Chair of this Committee, used to allow non-citizens to vote. Today, more than a dozen municipalities allow non-citizens to vote in local, and I stress, local elections.

The D.C. Council has 13 members. The members are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how members vote, they can vote them out of office. Congress has 535 voting Members. The Members are elected by residents of their states. None are elected by D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like how the Members vote, they cannot vote them out of office. The Revolutionary War was fought to give consent to the governed and taxation without representation. Yet D.C. residents cannot consent to any actions taken by Congress, including H.R. 192, and pay full Federal taxes. Indeed, D.C. residents pay more Federal taxes per capita than residents of any state and more total Federal taxes than 19 states while being denied voting representation in Congress.

I urge Members to vote no on this bill, and I urge this Committee to keep its hands off D.C. and pass the D.C. Statehood bill instead. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to note that so far in this Congress, in this Committee, we have had 12 hearings of this full body total. Of those, three of them in its entirety have been devoted to the District of Columbia, so one-fourth of all of the hearings that we have had in this body have been about Washington, DC, the District of Columbia. Now, that is more attention that we have spent on any other single issue in this full Oversight Committee, and it is not even close, not government operations, not national security, not the Federal workforce, not healthcare, all topics that are the jurisdiction of this Committee in parts.

So, we have spent more time instead on the District of Columbia, and I think that tells you everything what the priorities are here in this Republican Majority. We have real serious challenges that are facing our country, pressing issues that deserve the attention of this body. But instead of doing that work our constituents sent us here to accomplish, we have devoted 25 percent of our time to essentially have Washington, DC, be the political punching bag of this Committee. It is transparent, and, quite frankly, it should be embarrassing to this Committee.

This bill is just another opportunity for far-right House Republicans to trample on the fundamental rights of 700,000 people, create fear, and pander to an extremist base. They do not care about election integrity any more than they pretend to care about crime in our hearings earlier this year. And if they did, we would have been reviewing bills to strengthen campaign finance laws or invest in preventing foreign interference in our elections, but this is not about solutions. Obviously, this Committee is about just attacking Washington, DC, over and over and over again.

And I have said it before, and I will say it again, the House Majority Members of this Committee, if they are really that interested in Washington, DC, they should run for the Washington, DC, City

Council or even Mayor. It is a great job. I have done it before, and that is really the forum for these discussions about Washington, DC. And I am just curious, also you know, we have already held one-fourth of our hearings about Washington. And I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, should we expect more hearings about Washington, DC. as part of this Committee?

Chairman COMER. Well, let me correct you. We have had, counting our Subcommittees which we said was going to be a very substantive part of this Committee process, we have had around 60 Committee hearings total. And we have discussed a lot of things, from cybersecurity to pharmacy benefit managers. So, I think we have had a pretty substantive Committee schedule, and I would welcome you to compare our first 6 months to the first 6 months of my predecessor's Oversight Committee schedule and the topics that have been discussed.

Mr. GARCIA. Well, sir, I appreciate that, but the truth is, we have had 12 full hearings of the Oversight Committee, where all Members—

Chairman COMER. We do work in Subcommittees as well.

Mr. GARCIA. Absolutely, sir. And I just think it is interesting though of the 12 full hearings we have had of this Committee, 25 percent of them, more than any other single topic, have been about the District of Columbia, a majority Black and Brown city, of which people are disenfranchised by not having the fundamental rights of vote for representations. So to me, that is something that is transparent, and it is outrageous, quite frankly, and so I am hoping that that 25 percent number gets reduced.

And in closing, the name of this Committee, quite frankly, should be the House Oversight Committee on the District of Columbia, and with that, I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Chairman COMER. Let me just reiterate the point that our conference is serious about not letting non-citizens vote. We do not want this to be a trend across America. We want to respect our election integrity. And this is an important issue, as is crime, and the crime rate in Washington, DC. is out of control, and when we have to step in, we will do that. That is granted in the Constitution. We will continue to do that. I wish we did not have to do that, but we are opposed to letting non-citizens vote. That is a very important part of our platform.

Mr. RASKIN. Gentleman?

Mr. GARCIA. I yield to Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you for yielding. The first point I would like to make is that gun violence is crime. Some people talk about crime and hope that it evokes images that do not relate to the massacres that are taking place across the country in churches, synagogues, Walmarts, grocery stores, everywhere you turn. But the second thing is if we are really concerned about the influence of non-citizens, a much bigger problem would be non-citizen ownership of private stock in U.S. corporations, and I wonder how our colleagues feel about that. Would you be interested in a ban on non-citizens owning stock in large corporations that have power in our country? That is a much bigger threat than some non-citizens in Wash-

ington, DC, a vote-less colony, essentially, being able to vote for an advisory neighborhood commissioner.

Chairman COMER. I would like to see if the Ranking Member would yield the question with respect to gun violence. What good does it do to pass more gun laws when white privileged children of high-ranking elected officials can simply get their gun violations waived and others have to serve prison time? I mean, I do not think it is equal justice here with respect to the gun laws that are on the books. I think we need to focus on the gun laws that are on the books first before we look at other gun laws.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, Hunter Biden is being prosecuted for his gun offenses, and I am all for that. Are you opposed to him being prosecuted?

Chairman COMER. Hunter Biden is not going to pay any price for his violation of the gun laws, which you all have written. But yet, you go to the prison system in Kentucky and it is full of people who have been imprisoned for violation of gun laws, for possession of illegal drugs, and I do not think that that is fair. That is why there are certain conservatives, like me, that were open to the criminal justice reform because we believe that it has been racial in nature when you look at the prison system in America, and the number of people who have been incarcerated that are minorities for simple things like possession of illegal drugs and possession of illegal firearm, but then you see the President's son get by without anything. And I am not even going to get into the tax evasion and the being an unregistered foreign agent, and the list goes on and on, money laundering, racketeering.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, would you join me in supporting decriminalization of marijuana then?

Chairman COMER. I have always been that way.

Mr. RASKIN. Nationwide because that is something we could do.

Chairman COMER. I have been that way forever.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, let us work on that. That is something concrete and bipartisan we could do that will end a war on many communities in America, and I think we could get the support for that certainly in my side of the aisle. I hope we could get it on your side, and I would pledge to work with you on that. But I think that we need much more aggressive enforcement of the gun laws we have got. I am glad that Hunter Biden was indicted for his gun offenses. And then some people think there should be no gun laws at all, and I take it you are agreeing with me that there should be gun laws in order to put the—

Chairman COMER. But you all wrote the gun laws, but then—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, no. Actually, the NRA—

Chairman COMER. [continuing] People like Hunter Biden do not have to pay the price but minorities do. I just wonder if Hunter Biden's last name were not Biden and if he were a Caucasian, where he would be right now with just that gun law, just the gun law.

Mr. RASKIN. Let me just say one thing about the gun law. The National Rifle Association used to be in favor of commonsense gun safety laws until it was turned into a political instrument to try to divide and polarize America. And it has succeeded, unfortunately, in doing so but 90 percent of American people think that we should

close all of these loopholes and that everybody who purchases a gun should have a background check. I hope you would agree with me on that.

Chairman COMER. I believe that you all are being very hypocritical on the gun laws that are already on the books. And the topic of this debate was whether or not illegals should vote in elections, and that is something that our side of the aisle is firm in being against. And quite frankly, a pretty good percentage of your side of the aisle will vote for this bill on the Floor as well.

Mr. RASKIN. And then there is a strong argument that people who are here on an undocumented basis should not be able to purchase guns and should not be able to vote.

Chairman COMER. We believe that people who are here illegally should not be here, period.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. And we should stop them from purchasing arms, right?

Chairman COMER. We believe in securing the border, but anyway, I am going to get back to the topic. I think the gentleman's time has expired. Any other Members wish to speak? Ms. Norton, did you finish? Are you good?

Ms. NORTON. I am fine, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. All right. Good deal.

Mr. CASAR. I just had one last question, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Casar. I think your time has expired, but I will grant you—

Mr. CASAR. My time for the whole hearing expired. Got it. Thank you for granting it. You were correcting Mr. Garcia that we have not spent 25 percent of our full Committee hearings on D.C., but you said you were correcting that, but is it the case that it is a different number? Is it 25 percent, or is a different percentage of our full Committee hearings have been dedicated to D.C.?

Chairman COMER. And I just have to say since you keep bringing up the D.C., but we invited the D.C. Mayor to come here. We were not critical. We were looking for opportunities to work together, and I think that there are opportunities where we can work together. I think we were very cordial to the D.C. Mayor, and that has always been a practice of this Committee to have the D.C. Mayor come and be treated with cabinet secretary status.

Mr. CASAR. No, I thought it was a good hearing. You had mentioned you were correcting Mr. Garcia about the percentage of hearings of this full body that have been dedicated to D.C. I have not kept track. He said it was 25 percent of our full Committee hearings. Has it been 25 percent of our full Committee hearings are dedicated to D.C.?

Chairman COMER. Do any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. CASAR. So, I suppose that number is correct then.

Chairman COMER. Did you yield back?

Mr. CASAR. I yield back to the Ranking Member—

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. Good deal. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a recorded vote on it.



Chairman COMER. OK. You mean on the next one? We got one that was on the amendment. We will do the full bill then. OK. All right.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 192, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair—a recorded vote was requested by Ms. Norton. So, as previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 3358, Mission Not Emissions Act.

The Clerk will please report to bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 3358, Mission Not Emissions, a bill to prohibit any requirement for recipients of Federal contracts to disclose greenhouse gas emissions and climate-related financial risk, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3358, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 3358, the Mission Not Emissions Act. Since assuming office after campaigning to be the unity president, President Biden has launched a slew of whole-of-government efforts to impose a radical progressive vision upon America. Nowhere has this been more the case than in President Biden's crusade to impose a progressive climate agenda on our entire economy. And one of the worst features of President's climate campaign is the President's attempt to impose burdensome new requirements on the entire Federal contracting community, including critical defense contracting.

On May 20, 2021, in service to the progressive's climate ideology, President Biden signed Executive Order 14030 on climate-related financial risk. Among other things, this executive order directed the Federal Acquisition Regulation Council to consider an amendment to the Federal Acquisition Regulation framework that imposes requirements to disclose and minimize Federal contractor greenhouse gas emissions. On November 14, 2022, the FAR Council issued a proposed rule that, if finalized, would mandate Federal contractors make extensive disclosures of greenhouse gas emissions related to the business operations.

The rule requires that contractors submit new emissions reduction targets to a progressive nongovernmental organization, the Science Based Targets Initiative, for validation and subsequent compliance monitoring. This is a matter for alarm. Science Based

Targets Initiative is an international third-party organization with unclear funding sources and a clear bias against the fossil fuel industry. The proposed rule's outsourcing of emissions target setting and compliance monitoring to this NGO raises great concerns that Federal contracting, including critical defense contracting, will become subject to the whims of radical NGO funded by foreign actors.

Commenters on the proposed rule have raised clear warnings that if the rule is implemented without change, it may become impossible for fossil fuel contractors to deliver mission-critical fuels to our armed forces and the Federal vehicle fleet. Put simply, the proposed rule places radical environmental activist goals over U.S. national security interests. It should be stopped, and this bill, the Mission Not Emissions Act, will stop it.

The bill prohibits any requirement that recipients of Federal contracts disclose greenhouse gas emissions and climate-related financial risk as described in the proposed rulemaking or any substantially similar future rule. It similarly prohibits any requirement that recipients of Federal contracts provide any greenhouse gas inventory or any other report of greenhouse gas emissions to the Federal Government. Finally, the bill prohibits requirements that recipients of Federal contracts develop greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and submit them for validation to any non-governmental organization. As the title of the bill puts it, this bill puts the mission, not emissions, first.

I thank Budget Committee Chairman, Jodey Arrington, for introducing this unfortunately necessary bill, and I urge my colleagues' full support. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I do not know what progressive climate ideology is, but I do know that the scientific consensus is 99 percent or a 100 percent that the Earth has warmed considerably over the last 100 years and that there are man-made industrial causes behind the radical climate change that the whole Earth is experiencing. Look, the Federal Government has got to be an instrument for the common good of all of the people. And today, the week after the Earth suffered its 3 hottest days in at least 125,000 years, the common good requires us to confront the reality of this climate emergency and to intensify our actions to address it.

I strongly oppose H.R. 3358 because it does the exact opposite of what we need. It attempts to keep emissions and other critical public data about climate secret, as if the best response to the out-of-control forest fires in California, or crippling heat waves through the South and Texas, or the unbreathable air we suffered in the Midwest and the mid-Atlantic from Canada, or the brutal floods experienced over the weekend in Vermont and upstate New York, is just to sweep climate change under the rug and describe the opinion of science and the common sense of the people as radical environmentalist ideology. That is just a deranged way to go.

June and July's scorching temperatures devastated states across America. In Texas, the power grid again teetered on the brink of catastrophic failure that appears to have been staved off, so far, thanks only to renewable wind and solar energy. Oil and gas companies released hundreds of tons of toxic climate warming carcino-

genic gas into the air to avoid explosions as the heat caused the gas to expand inside the pipeline systems. And on a single day in June—June 20th, to be exact—at least 350 residents of Texas wound up in emergency departments due to heat illnesses, and hundreds of people have died in Europe from the heat waves there.

Eugene Gates, a postal worker in Congresswoman Crockett's district in Texas, lost his life to the heat. And we wrote you a letter about this, Mr. Chairman. June and July's devastating heatwaves swept across the country alongside the toxic smoke from Canada's record-breaking wildfires. Climate change is increasing the intensity of wildfires so rapidly that researchers are grappling with cost estimates, but some recent estimates put the cost of adverse health effects in Ontario alone at \$1.28 billion for just 5 days in early June. If you extrapolate that estimate for all of Canada and the United States and across the full timeframe of that smoke disaster, which blanketed these areas, it makes the full toll of this one climate crisis incident beyond staggering: hundreds of billions of dollars or even over a trillion dollars from one episode.

Now, my GOP colleagues have observed these disasters, runaway floods, runaway wildfires, storms of unprecedented severity, dangerous air quality, deadly heat, and they have decided the best way to deal with it all, the best way to address the climate crisis is by using the magical thinking of a 2-year-old and pretending that it does not exist. H.R. 3358, the so-called Mission Not Emissions Act, would prohibit anyone from requiring a Federal contractor to disclose greenhouse gas emissions and climate-related financial risks, or to provide a greenhouse gas inventory or any other report on greenhouse gas emissions, or to develop and validate emission reduction targets.

The Federal Government is the world's single largest purchaser of goods and services, and the American people depend on it in Congress to ensure that the more than \$650 billion spent annually on Federal contracts is done in the most effective and productive way. And if one of the critical contractors in our supply chain is vulnerable to climate risk that could shut down its operations at any time, we need to know that. Not knowing it poses a grave threat to the missions of each Agency of the Federal Government and the American people that we serve. Public disclosure is essential to reducing risk and fully understanding the scope of the threats we face. We cannot afford to not know.

James Madison said that those who mean to be their own Governors must arm themselves with the power that knowledge gives. And why would we pass a law that specifically suppresses the knowledge that we need in order to address the climate emergency that is bearing down on us? So, I strongly oppose this bill and I thank you for the time, Mr. Chairman. I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the following document: a letter to this Committee in support of the Mission Not Emissions Act from the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 3358, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion—Mr. Burlison?

Mr. BURLISON. Request a recorded vote.

A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 890**, Guidance Out of Darkness Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 890, Guidance Out of Darkness (GOOD) Act, a bill to increase access to Agency guidance documents.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 890, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I am pleased to call up for consideration today my bill, H.R. 890, the Guidance out of Darkness Act, or the GOOD Act. Regulatory guidance includes Agency statements that while not intended to have the force and effect of law, establish Agency policies on statutory, regulatory, or technical issues. Because it communicates how an Agency will administer the law and its programs, regulatory guidance has a significant effect on the public and the behavior of regulated entities. Regulated entities and the public should be able to know what an Agency has said in Agency guidance about the laws and programs that affect them. And here is the problem: agency guidance documents are not easy to find. The problem is so bad that Agency guidance documents are known as “regulatory dark matter.”

Prior to the Trump Administration, guidance documents were not consistently posted on Agency websites. This inconsistency burdened regulated entities, and small businesses who often lack the resources to hire compliance experts are especially negatively impacted. For a brief time, the Trump Administration brought needed sunshine to this situation. Following the GOOD Act’s passage by the House during the 115th Congress, President Trump voluntarily adopted the bill’s reforms through an October 2019 executive order after the Senate failed to act.

Under the executive order, guidance was required to become fully transparent online. Across the government, each Agency was directed to make available on its website a single searchable index data base with links to all guidance documents in effect. As a result, and for the first time, members of the public could easily find whatever Agency guidance they needed online and in a central location. However, the Biden Administration rescinded Executive Order 13891. Ever since, agencies have been pulling down their guidance web pages and guidance has once again fallen into the darkness, increasing the potential for Agency abuse.

It is time the GOOD Act becomes law and agencies are required to publish their regulatory guidance in a single, easily accessible location. This will restore agency guidance document transparency. The American public deserves nothing less from their government. I urge my colleagues to support this simple and necessary bill. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that eloquent statement on behalf of the bill. I support H.R. 890. I appreciate the changes you have made to it since the Committee last took it up. The bill would require agencies to publish guidance documents on a dedicated website, and for the Director of OMB to designate a single website where all guidance could be found. In many cases, these documents are already public information, and making them more accessible and more centralized in a public way is a good and transparent idea. So, I thank you for that.

I am still moved by your statement that we could perhaps work together on reforming marijuana policy in the country. Mr. Chairman, I have got a bill that I want to show to you right away, which would keep our people—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—safe from being denied security clearances because they admit to having used marijuana even lawfully under a medical marijuana program or in a state which permits it to be used, and this is a serious problem for my constituents. I imagine it is a serious problem for your constituents, too.

But I have gotten bunches of letters from people who have made it all the way through the Federal Government hiring process and then get cutoff at the end when they tell the truth that they have used marijuana for a medical condition or they have used it in some other way. So, I would love to show that to you, and I would love to invite your participation in that with me. I have got a copy of it for you, and I yield back to you. Thank you very much.

Chairman COMER. I thank the Ranking Member. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the following documents: a letter to this Committee in support of the GOOD Act from the Competitive Enterprise Institute; a letter to this Committee in support of the GOOD Act from the National Taxpayers Union; a letter to this Committee in support of the GOOD Act from the National Federation of Independent Business.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 890, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Burlison.

Mr. BURLISON. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote has been requested and ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 4435**, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act or USA Act.

The Clerk will please report the bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 4435, a bill to establish a budgetary level reduction schedule, and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as an original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the bill and the amendment. congressional Republicans are committed to ensuring that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely on Federal Government programs. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Government spent \$510 billion on programs with expired operations in Fiscal Year 2023. About half of these programs expired more than a decade ago. This is unacceptable. Congress needs to pay closer attention to the many Federal programs left on autopilot. These programs are operating without diligent congressional oversight and timely legislative authorizations to keep these programs relevant to the challenges of today.

The Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, or USA Act, addresses this problem by requiring Congress to review unauthorized programs on a recurring basis. It also creates a clear process for terminating programs that are no longer needed or which do not have the legislative support within Congress for their reauthorization. The bill would implement a gradual reduction in the overall appropriated funding levels over a 3-year period for the total amount of unauthorized programs. This gives Congress time to consider each program and pass necessary reauthorization legislation. It is not too much to ask that Congress provide the appropriate level of scrutiny over the Federal programs it has established and find the time every 3 years to ensure that Federal funds are being used responsibly and effectively. The timeframe under the USA Act forces that to happen. This bill will increase government efficiency,

improve the effectiveness of Federal Agency programs and missions, and help reduce government spending.

I want to thank my House colleague, Energy and Commerce Committee Chairwoman, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, for working with me on this important legislation. I call upon my colleagues to support this necessary legislation. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. You know, the Constitution has an appropriations clause, Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, but it does not have an authorization clause. In other words, Congress must appropriate money for it to be spent, but it does not have to authorize money to be spent. It can just appropriate it. The distinction between authorization and appropriation is a parliamentary expedient which Congress has used in order to clarify and elucidate the process.

The H.R. 4435, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, should perhaps be renamed the "Dysfunction Proliferation Act," because it would mire congressional proceedings down in a new and overwhelmingly untenable workload and threaten important Federal programs. It would ultimately terminate all discretionary Federal programs without permanent authorizations that are not expressly reauthorized by Congress at least every 3 years, a radical departure from current congressional practice and one that has no basis in the Constitution. Congress routinely appropriates funding for important programs and activities whose authorizations have lapsed, including an estimated \$510 billion in 2023. This bill would wreak havoc on important government programs and services that our constituents rely on every single day, programs like hospital care and medical services for veterans, Section 8 housing assistance, Pell Grants for America's college students, and essential Head Start programs for children.

The GAO's definitive guide on the Principles of Appropriations Law states that the very existence of a statute that requires funding in order to perform substantive functions "is itself sufficient legal authorization for the necessary appropriations." In other words, whether or not a Federal program's authorization is expired is of virtually no consequence to Federal agencies, the rule of law, the courts, or our constituents who depend on them. This GOP bill benefits absolutely no one but extremist mega lawmakers who want to defund programs and entire agencies and offices that they just do not like.

According to the CBO, in Fiscal Year 2023, Congress saw fit to appropriate funding toward 428 expired authorizations associated with extensively deliberated and well-supported public laws, including the Veterans Health Care Eligibility Reform Act, the 21st Century Cures Act, the Violence Against Women Act, and many more. An additional 355 authorizations expire this year. If this bill were to become law, Mr. Comer's fellow committee chairs would need to immediately set aside their agendas for the rest of the term to deal with the self-inflicted catastrophe of these reauthorization needs, which would consume up vast amounts of time and resources and likely still fail given the dysfunctional nature of the House Republican caucus, which we have seen on display recently.

If my colleagues are sincere in their interest to address some of the incoherence of the authorization and appropriations practices in Congress, I would embrace a serious analysis and transparent process to examine viable alternatives. This should include the solicitation of views from Democratic and Republican committee leadership, a consideration of recommendations arising from rigorous academic studies of Congress, and technical assistance from both Federal Agencies and community groups to understand the full implications of proposed changes. Such scrutiny would clearly show that this Dysfunction Expansion Act is a thinly veiled attempt just to kneecap vital Federal programs, taking Congress's internal problems, and then making them all of the problems of America.

I urge my colleagues to do the obvious thing and join me in opposing this ill-conceived legislation that will defund veterans' healthcare, housing assistance, programs helping college students afford their tuition, and programs that support early education for infants and children across the country. If we want to do this, let us do it seriously with some hearings. And I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the following documents: a letter to this Committee in support of the USA from the National Taxpayer Union.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

Mr. RASKIN. I have an amendment at the desk now, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the amendment?

THE CLERK. Amendment Number 1 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, offered by Mr. Raskin of Maryland.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order. The Ranking Member is recognized for 5 minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly, Mr. Chairman. My amendment prohibits budgetary reductions in program terminations that would otherwise be required by the bill unless they have been determined to have no adverse effect on the entities or populations they are designed to serve. It also changes the terms used throughout the bill from "unauthorized programs," which misleadingly suggests that the programs were never authorized or are operating without legal authority in some way, to instead refer to "legally authorized programs." This aligns with the determination made by the Government Accountability Office, as I mentioned previously in my statement.

I have here a list of the 428 programs or activities the CBO has identified as having been funded in 2023, even though they are associated with expired authorizations for appropriation. They include the Agricultural Improvement Act, the Agricultural Credit Act, the National Defense Authorization Act, the Healthcare and Education Reconciliation Act, Every Student Succeeds Act, Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act, Every Student Succeeds Act, Higher Education Opportunity Act. That is



just the first page on what looks to be about 28 or 30 pages of programs. More than half of these authorizations expired more than 10 years ago, demonstrating that both Republican and Democratic majorities understand the value and importance of the current practice we have in place, which, again, is perfectly consistent with the Constitution.

To provide just a few more examples of what would be threatened if this bill were to become law without my amendment, the authorization for veterans' medical care appropriations. Over 9 million veterans are currently enrolled in the VA healthcare program. Do we really just want to essentially cut the lifeline for 9 million veterans because there has not been an authorization when Congress is voting constitutionally to appropriate money for that exact purpose, which had been authorized before?

The authorization for the National Institute for Health expired in 2020. This is a matter of some moment in my district because I represent the NIH and a lot of people who work there. Life without the NIH would mean severely reduced hope for better treatments and cures for devastating diseases, like cystic fibrosis, and multiple sclerosis, and Alzheimer's disease, and lung disease, and colon cancer, heart disease, ALS, substance use disorders, stroke, and Parkinson's. Do we really just want to terminate all of that? The authorization for the Child Care and Development Block Grant expired 3 years ago. As of Fiscal Year 2020, the program served almost 1.5 million children and their families in the country. Head Start expired in 2012. That provides 1 million children in need with early education and support services.

So my amendment, Mr. Chairman, I think everybody should agree, belongs in this bill. If we really think that we need the shock to the system administered by this bill, all right, you guys go ahead and vote for it. But please do not send all of these dependent populations on particular programs, from veterans to children to NIH patients, often to the wilderness on their own. And I move the amendment, and I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I recognize myself for 5 minutes. I unfortunately must oppose this amendment because it undermines the purpose of the bill. This legislation is intended to force Congress to give the appropriate oversight and legislative attention to individual agencies and programs within their appropriate authorizing committee.

I agree with the Ranking Member on one point: we should indeed determine the impact of programs on affected populations. That is the entire point of the authorization process. The USA Act will force long-overdue deliberations to take place. We should not let ourselves off the hook by granting exemptions to various programs. Additionally, I am not sure who would be conducting the valuation of impacted population under this amendment, the agencies themselves? I think I know what agencies are likely to say about how impactful all their programs are. Authorizations and determinations of a program's impact on impacted populations requires Congress. The USA Act does not impact an individual program for the first few years. This is by design to give the appropriate legislative authorization committees time to do their oversight and authoriza-

tion work. For these reasons, I oppose Ranking Member Raskin's amendment.

Do any other Members wish to speak on this amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment offered by Mr. Raskin.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk also.

Chairman COMER. All right. Will the Clerk please report?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, could we have a recorded vote on the amendment?

Chairman COMER. Yes. That is what I was thinking. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute. So, a recorded vote has been requested. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

OK. The Clerk will report the Garcia amendment.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Amendment Number—

Chairman COMER. Wait, wait, wait. The Clerk needs to report it first.

THE CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, offered by Mr. Garcia of California.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee. I just want to be also clear. The act that is being discussed is really nothing more than a scheme to cripple Congress and to give right-wing extremists more and more opportunities to sabotage our government and eliminate, essentially, programs that help people. So, eliminating agencies and programs which are funded each year through Congress, even though committees have not consistently reauthorized them, sounds like a good idea, I know, to some, until you realize it is really just a tool to cripple agencies and programs that House Republicans might deem unworthy. So, this is despite Americans' overwhelming support for these programs.

Now, let us actually consider if this bill, the so-called USA Act, were into effect today. The bill would cut 10 percent of funding for the National Institutes of Health, essentially destroying our public health research and leaving us wide open to the threat of future pandemics, then another 15 percent cut the next year and another 15 percent cut the year after that, so essentially eliminating the National Institutes of Health in our government. It would slash, to be clear, veterans' medical care. It would slash, and defund, and gut NASA, and in 3 years, it would end all funding for Section 8 housing and throw families out onto the street when we have a

homelessness crisis happening across the country and in many of our states.

It would also slash programs that fight lead poisoning, asthma, or epilepsy in children, and it essentially would defund and end the FBI as we know it. And now I know that many of my colleagues in this Committee would probably welcome that in their blind defense of indebted criminal, Donald Trump, and certainly, there have been Members of this Committee that have actually called to actually defund the FBI and law enforcement, but we know that the American people overwhelmingly recognize that this is a ridiculous proposal. Now, the party that claims to support law enforcement would also eventually abolish the U.S. Marshals Service with this act, and also important programs for Federal, and local, and state law enforcement officers that are critical would all be damaged because of these cuts that would happen year after year after year.

I want to remind my friends in the Majority on this Committee that they actually control the agenda, and if they would like to write authorizations for these programs, they should go right ahead and do those. But we know that House Republicans will not do any of the work of actually governing the country, but they are really here to cripple our government. And that is why I am offering this amendment, which is to save some of the most critical programs, which are funded at over \$10 billion a year, and each of which would face massive cuts under this extreme proposal.

So, let us be clear. If you vote against this amendment and for this bill, you are voting to cut veterans' healthcare, slash the National Institutes of Health, throw families out of housing through Section 8, gut NASA, and defund the FBI. So, please support my amendment and vote no on the underlying bill. I yield back. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I oppose this amendment because it undermines the purpose of the bill. This legislation is intended to force Congress to give the appropriate oversight and legislative attention to every Agency and program within their appropriate authorizing committee. The USA Act will force long-overdue deliberations to take place. This amendment would exempt programs under \$10 billion in funding from the requirements of the Act. That would exempt the majority of Federal programs and make the bill moot. Congress should be conducting regular oversight of all programs at all funding levels to ensure that American taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly. This is by design to give the appropriate legislative authorization committees time to do their oversight and authorization work. For these reasons, I oppose the Garcia amendment.

Does any other Member wish to be heard?

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Chair, can I also have a recorded vote, please?

Chairman COMER. OK.

Mr. GARCIA. Well, actually, Mr. Raskin, I will yield my time.

Chairman COMER. All right. The Chair recognizes Mr. Raskin for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of Mr. Garcia's amendment, and I thank him for his care in developing it. You know, I guess what troubles me about the whole exercise is

that there is a kind of devil-may-care cavaliness about the whole thing, as if the sponsors know it is not really going to happen so they can just make a statement with the bill. If there is a serious problem with us voting for appropriations for programs where the underlying authorization has lapsed, then we should have hearings about that, and we should analyze how to move forward in a serious and constructive way.

But I do not think anybody believes that this is productive unless the idea really is to throw veterans off of their healthcare and to end our funding for Head Start and so on because, as we said before, we know that there will be enough opposition within the GOP Majority caucus that there will not be the ability to actually get those programs authorized, especially with such a tiny, slender margin, and such tumult and turbulence within the GOP caucus right now, and the dependence on the votes of Members like George Santos. So, I would much prefer if we would spend our time actually examining the problem rather than going through the motions of this pretend legislation.

But in any event, if we are going to move forward with this rather hollow exercise, we certainly need to adopt Mr. Garcia's amendment because if we do not, we could end up doing some serious damage. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to speak on the amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by Mr. Garcia.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

Mr. Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Recorded vote please, if I could request that? Thank you.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman requests a recorded vote. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Do any other Members wish to be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment? Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I proceed?

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the Crockett amendment?

THE CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, as offered by Ms. Crockett of Texas.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes to explain her amendment.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask consent to offer an amendment to Bill H.R. 4435, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act. Under this bill, there will be a reoccurring 3-year budgetary level reduction cycle with respect to any unauthorized program beginning in Fiscal Year 2024, consistent with the requirements of this act. My amendment would exempt the adminis-

tration and operation of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, from this bill.

As we all know, FEMA's primary mission is to help those within the country before, during, and after disasters. Disasters can come in many forms. FEMA responds to all declared domestic disasters and emergencies, whether natural or manmade, whether it is responding to a severe storm, like those in Arkansas, Florida, Oklahoma or Texas, wildfires, or severe flooding, or even horrific events like those from 911.

FEMA has never faltered from assisting those who have experienced horrific events that have altered the lives and livelihoods of U.S. citizens. However, with extreme weather events happening, like hurricanes and tornadoes, becoming more and more prevalent, I have grave concerns of the impact of this bill on FEMA's ability to help our constituents. FEMA has assisted in shelter, food, clothing, health, and housing during moments when our constituents are facing some of the most challenging that they have ever faced in their lives. For example, over the last year, FEMA has spent more than \$9 billion in assisting our constituents impacted by Hurricane Ian, but FEMA relief also is being provided across the country to areas hit by wildfires, floods, mudslides, and more.

As one of my colleagues recently stated, emergency management cannot be politicized and should always be prioritized. Accordingly, while I believe all of us want a government that is fiscally responsible, I believe we also want a government that is accountable and reliable to its people in times of disaster and tragedy. That is why I believe this amendment is vital and should be adopted.

And let me just add to this. When we start talking about FEMA and the work that FEMA does, FEMA does not just do work in red states, blue states, or help out just independents. FEMA helps everyone out, and we recently here in D.C. were actually under air quality warning simply because of the wildfires that were spreading from Canada. So, we know that these events are occurring, and so the last thing that I like to do is pretend that any of us have a magic globe that will allow us to tell us how many disasters are coming and how much money is going to be necessary to adequately take care of our shared constituencies.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentlelady yield for a question?

Ms. CROCKETT. Absolutely.

Mr. RASKIN. Ms. Crockett, thank you for your leadership in bringing forward this amendment. As you were talking, it made me wonder why the Majority, since it is in the Majority, if they care about the authorization of FEMA or any other Agency, why do not they just move to authorize it and put that on the agenda rather than moving to de-fund all of these agencies unless they are authorized. In other words, why do not they take the positive step of moving forward to authorize? And I wonder if you have any insight into that.

Ms. CROCKETT. I actually do not. I have no insight as to why we would not move to authorize agencies such as this one considering the important work that is done. I come technically from a red state, but let me tell you that we have had historic flooding down in Houston that so many people still have not recovered from. We have had historic flooding in Dallas as well, and not to mention,

as someone who also serves on the Ag Committee, just listening to my farmers, and them talking about the historic droughts and the burning that is happening as well as the flooding. This is affecting their livelihoods, and so their shared stories of what is happening in Texas, especially for our farmers, is happening throughout the entire country, in rural America.

So, this is really important, no matter, really, what state you come from, that we do not strap them down because the one thing that we do know is that there is an emergency coming. The one thing that we do not know is how much it is going to cost us.

Chairman COMER. Does the gentlelady yield back?

Ms. CROCKETT. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back.

The Chair recognizes himself for 5 minutes. This amendment, unfortunately, goes directly against the problem the USA Act is trying to solve. The Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, is a primary agency designed by Congress to ensure safety and readiness should disaster strike our great country. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree that FEMA's programs, which aim to provide a safety net in the case of emergencies, are important enough for Congress to examine on a regular basis. Are we the authorization committee with relevant expertise of FEMA? No. So, I would defer to my colleagues, Chairman Mark Green, and Ranking Member Bennie Thompson, and their Members, as to the legal authority and authorized appropriations FEMA needs to deliver on its mission.

But I do know this. The Homeland Security Committee should be conducting regular oversight of FEMA and not letting this critical executive branch agency run on autopilot. Because of this, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Crockett amendment, and I yield back.

Do any other Members wish to be recognized?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank Ms. Crockett for laying out in important detail and with a lot of evidence why it is so important. FEMA is our emergency management and emergency response Agency, and it is charged with responding to unforeseen emergencies. That is, therefore, in and of itself very difficult to identify and predict. And if we are going to reduce the amount of money available to FEMA simply because they cannot designate or specifically authorize their money, we are undermining the purpose of FEMA and the essential work that it does.

And I think Ms. Crockett's point that this is not a red state or blue state issue is very well taken. This is an American issue. And I would note that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can rail against government spending, can oppose government spending, but when there is an emergency in their district, they are the first to reach out to FEMA and the Federal Government for assistance. And so, the fact that that this bill would potentially and almost automatically limit FEMA's resources undermines the important work it does and will have a detrimental effect to Americans all around the country, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to speak on the Crockett amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the Crockett amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

And Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. I would ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote has been requested and ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

All right. Do any other Members wish to be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. RASKIN. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the Raskin Number 2 amendment?

THE CLERK. Raskin Amendment Number 2 to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, as offered by Mr. Raskin of Maryland.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order. The Ranking Member is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. RASKIN. And thank you kindly, Mr. Chairman. My amendment would exempt programs and associated budgetary levels that pertain to the defense of Ukraine against the imperialist invasion of Ukraine by Vladimir Putin and the Russian military. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is a war that has divided the world as the autocratic, authoritarian, dictatorial nations of the world have supported Russia's bloody, imperialist, atrocity-fueled invasion of Ukraine. The free and democratic nations of the world have rallied to the side of Ukraine, which is defending its sovereignty in a just war of self-defense against Putin's forces.

So, this is about wartime, and we would not want anything in this legislation, which obviously I have already expressed my misgivings over, but we would not want anything to endanger our support for the people of Ukraine and the forces in Ukraine that are resisting this autocratic aggression against the people they are, and in defense of their own sovereignty, and in defense of their democracy.

We know that Putin decided to go to war precisely because it was such a threat to his form of autocratic and kleptocratic rule to have an example of a free democratic society that is based on the values of pluralism and tolerance and the education and the nurturance of all the people of the society. That was just too much of a threat to him. So, America has been a critical and indispensable ally, as it always has been in struggles for democracy and human rights against authoritarian and totalitarian aggression. And I do not know if this was an oversight on the part of the drafters, but certainly, we would not want anything in this legislation to endanger American support for the ongoing struggle of the Ukrainian people to defend their country.

So with that, I urge approval of this amendment on a unanimous and bipartisan basis to demonstrate continuing congressional support for the people of Ukraine. I know that there are a handful of Members who have expressed support for Vladimir Putin and are questioning support for Ukraine. I know that there are people who have been attacking President Zelensky, but I do not know that any of them are on this Committee. They are certainly not in the room right now, and I hope that all of us could agree to adopt this amendment together. And I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself now for 5 minutes. Again, I must, unfortunately, oppose this amendment for the same reason I opposed the Ranking Member's first amendment. It would undermine the purpose of the bill, which is intended to force Congress to do oversight of the programs it creates and funds and reauthorize them regularly. If there is any place the Congress should be conducting regular oversight within the appropriation authorization committees, it is with the financial assistance the American taxpayer is providing for the Ukrainian conflict. Times of international conflict should require more, not less, congressional oversight.

Second, today, the House is considering the Annual Defense Authorization Act, one of the few authorization bills Congress considers every year. The invasion of Ukraine prompted an urgent response and significant financial investment to the part of our Defense Department. But this was never intended to turn into a blank check on spending and put spending on autopilot. The House Foreign Affairs Committee as well as the Armed Services Committee should carefully weigh the future of unauthorized programs and do a full assessment of our priorities from year to year as circumstances change. While the U.S. continues to prioritize foreign assistance to our allies, we cannot use this as an excuse for runaway spending without sufficient analysis or oversight. For these reasons, I oppose the Raskin's Number 2 amendment.

Do any other Members wish to be recognized?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I do not understand how this is an oversight issue. This is an automatic reduction by 10 percent of any program that has been authorized and then that authorization expires, so at some point, it was authorized. And you rail and my colleagues on the other side frequently rail against wanton and excessive spending, but what this bill is targeting is the Administration, the executive branch, actually being quite judicious in its spending because if there remains money from previously authorized programs, then that necessarily means that the executive branch has not been wantonly spending. And so, the notion that you oppose this amendment simply because it provides an exemption from this bill makes no sense. It especially makes no sense when we cannot foresee what exactly will happen in the brutal attack, violating all sorts of international law, by the dictatorial regime under Vladimir Putin against a democracy next door to it.

And Mr. Raskin made a comment that this is about international warfare. That is true, but it is also fundamentally about democracy. And for this Committee and this body to try to limit the abil-



ity of the Department of Defense or other executive branch agencies to defend democracy around the country, which, I might add, has a very significant impact on our own national security, notwithstanding many comments from colleagues on the other side, you are handcuffing our ability to support Ukraine against a brutal, dangerous, unwarranted, unprovoked, and wholly improper attack by a dictatorial regime.

And so, the Republicans can couch objection to this amendment in a vague concern that it is contrary to the purpose of the bill, which does not really explain why a bill cannot have an amendment, and because of your designation or your determination that it can be dealt with in the NDAA, but we are dealing with it right now in this bill in addition to the NDAA. And I think it is shameful that the Republicans on the other side of the aisle are effectively taking the side of Vladimir Putin against the democracy in Ukraine by refusing to exempt any funding to support Ukraine, our democratic ally in its fight for its own freedom, its own democracy, against authoritarianism, which is a fight that the United States must never ever cease to participate in. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. All I will respond by saying that just because the Republicans do not want to provide a blank check to Ukraine does not mean that Republicans support Vladimir Putin. Does any other Member—

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Chairman COMER. Your time has expired. No. Your time has expired. Any other Member who wishes to add to that?

Mr. GOLDMAN. So, you can respond, but I cannot respond to you?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. I would like to yield time to my colleague.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lynch. We are not talking about a blank check. We are talking about money that has already been authorized for this purpose but has not been used by the expiration of that authorization. So, it is not an open checkbook to Ukraine or any other authorized program. There is a specific amount that was authorized, that was not used by the time of that expiration of authorization, and what you are saying here is false. It is not a blank check. It is a check that has already been authorized by Congress that the Administration has the discretion to use as it sees fit. And so, I wholly object to the characterization that it is a blank check to Ukraine. It is not. And I yield back to Mr. Lynch. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. LYNCH. I am reclaiming my time, and I yield additional time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. And I want to thank the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. But just a quick postscript to what our colleague from New York just pointed out. It is not just that the money has already been authorized or the program has been authorized. It is that the money has been appropriated. We are talking about money that has already been voted on in a bicameral fashion presented to the President under the Constitution and that has gone out the door. But the claim here is that if the underlying authorization had technically expired, even though the expenditure of the money was appropriated and voted on in proper constitu-

tional fashion, that should be revoked, that that should not be possible.

And that is obviously an attempt to throw a monkey wrench into the way that Congress has acted for decades under both Republicans and Democrats controlling the gavel. And to me, it smacks of this continuing effort that began with Steve Bannon to, you know, demolish what he called the administrative state, or the Deep State, or, essentially, democracy, and that is really what is at stake here, both in America and in Ukraine because democracy needs to have procedures and rules and traditions for operation. And they want to take a wrecking ball to all of them so that the government shuts down the way that the Republican caucus itself seems to be in a completely dysfunctional in broken-down mode. I do not want the government United States to operate with the extremism, fanaticism, and dysfunctionality that we have seen on display within the GOP caucus, and that is precisely what this bill would accomplish at this point.

So, we are talking about the defense of democracy here as well as the allies of the United States. In Ukraine, we do not want to endanger our ability to support the people of Ukraine with appropriations that have already been made by Congress to support that just war of self-defense against Putin's invasion. President Biden has said numerous times that the autocrats of the world have told him, like President Xi, that they do not think democracy can work in this century. It is subject to too much division and polarization. It is subject to too much extremism and fanaticism. You need tough guy dictatorship to make it work, and there are those who want to fulfill the predictions of the autocrats and see democracy break down, and we cannot allow that to happen.

If we think there is a real problem with the way the interaction between authorizations and appropriations works in Congress, let us have some hearings. Let us analyze it. There are people who study these things. Let us not just, you know, come down on the whole thing with a sledgehammer. Let us analyze it and let us proceed in a thoughtful and deliberate way. But in the meantime, let us not endanger our support for people who are fighting for their democratic sovereignty against an autocrat's invasion. And I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts yielding. I would be very curious to know what his thoughts are on this, too.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. Look, I have had a fair opportunity on many times, many occasions, to travel to Ukraine, and I honestly feel that our funding, as it stands, to that sovereign nation is highly consistent with the ideals of our own democracy here at home. And I fully support every last dollar that we have committed to the Ukrainian people to maintain their freedom and their democracy, and there is nothing better that we could be doing than fighting the gangsterism that is going on in Eastern Europe right now. So with that, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comment is going to be very, very brief. I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I am not getting involved in the discussion about Ukraine, but I am very frustrated when I hear Members of Congress talk about a democracy. We live in a republic, and I think

it is really important that we remember that we live in a republic, the fact that we are here as representatives of the people we represent. And when we pledge allegiance to the flag, we pledge allegiance to the republic for which the flag stands. So, we do not live in a democracy. We live in a republic, and I think it is important that that be pointed out occasionally. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Down here. So, is it your belief that the United States is not a democracy?

Ms. FOXX. I just call your attention to the fact that we pledge allegiance to the flag and to the republic for which it stands.

Mr. GOLDMAN. But you just said that we are a republic, not a democracy. So, do you believe—

Ms. FOXX. I said, we are a republic. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Any other Members wish to speak?

Mr. FROST. I do.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Thank you. I yield my time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Frost. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I just wanted to weigh in on the distinguished gentlelady from North Carolina's last remark because it seems as if when we talk about the defense of democracy around the world or the defense of democratic institutions in America, we now often hear this refrain "we are not a democracy, we are a republic," and of course, in the strict sense, that is true. A republic of course, is just a representative democracy. It is where the people elect their own representatives because we do not have a Capitol Building that will hold 400 million. The country does not operate like a New England town hall meeting, but rather, we elect representatives under Article I of the Constitution to the House and also to the U.S. Senate. In that sense, that is true. We are a republic, but we are a democratic republic.

And although we began as a slave republic of white male property owners over the age of 21, in fact, we have evolved to become a far more democratic republic with the addition of the Fifteenth Amendment, which banned race discrimination in voting after the Civil War; the Seventeenth Amendment, which gave us direct election of U.S. Senators instead of state legislatures doing it in 1913; the Nineteenth Amendment which gave women the right to vote and to run for office, which women did not have before. The Twenty-Third Amendment gave our friends in D.C. the right to participate in Presidential elections. The Twenty-Fourth Amendment banned poll taxes. The Twenty-Sixth Amendment lowered the voting age to 18.

So, the whole trajectory of American constitutional development has been toward making the republic a more democratic republican and more perfect union. And we have stood up for democracy and human rights all over the world, fellow democratic republics. And again, not New England town hall meetings although, you know, some of those things exist in certain parts of America at the local level, but governance by the people, what the great founder of your party, Abraham Lincoln described in his visionary terms as, gov-

ernment of the people, by the people, and for the people. Like that is been the tantalizing dream of America. So, the idea that we would somehow set a republic at odds with a democracy makes no sense. We have struggled to become an ever more democratic republic, and when we say we are a republic, that does not mean we do not recognize the civil rights and civil liberties of the people.

Now, in Eastern Europe, as Mr. Lynch was saying, there is a kind of authoritarian gangsterism at large. And a lot of it revolves around Hungary, where they are in the process of building something they call illiberal democracy, which means democracy mob rule without rights, without liberties for the people, an attack on minorities, whether it is religious minorities, or racial minorities, or LGBTQ minorities, or whatever. But it is time for us to bring back together the idea of popular democracy with Republican institutions because when we elect people, we send them to go and to fight for a more perfect union for everybody.

So, I appreciate the gentlelady's points that we have republican institutions. And I appreciate Mr. Goldman's point that we are very much a political democracy striving to become ever better and for a more perfect union, which is built into our mission statement, the preamble of the Constitution. And I thank you for yielding, and I would welcome your thoughts to on this, Mr. Frost, since I know you have been so involved in trying to deepen the meaning of democracy in America.

Mr. FROST. No. Thank you so much, Mr. Ranking Member, and I agree with everything that was just said. I think it is important that we continue to fight for democratic values around the entire world, especially here at home. There are folks within this Committee, I would argue, and within this chamber in the House of Representatives that it seems to me like they are fighting against democracy here at home, when we talk about our voting systems, when we talk about the ability for people be able to cast their ballot, similar conversation we were just having around local laws here in D.C. So, to say that being a republican is at odds with being a democracy is just not true. And I yield back.

Chairman COMER. All right. Any other Members seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the amendment—I do not remember who offered the amendment. Raskin Number 2.

All those in favor of the Raskin Number 2 amendment, say aye.

All those opposed, say no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. RASKIN. Could we have recorded vote, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The gentleman requests a recorded vote. A recorded vote will be ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Does any other Member seek recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment? Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk.

Chairman COMER. Would the Clerk please report?

THE CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435, as offered by Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I will reserve a point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the interest of what I know is our shared commitment to ensure that Americans' veterans receive healthcare services that are reflective of their service to our Nation. This amendment would exempt veterans' medical care from the drastic cuts in Federal funding and program termination that would be required under the so-called, Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act.

Under the guise of fiscal responsibility, the underlying legislation targets Federal programs that have continued to receive annual Federal funding from Congress, but whose statutory authorization has technically expired. The bill specifies that programs and activities listed by the Congressional Budget Office in its annual report on expired authorizations are deemed "Unauthorized programs" and therefore, eligible for extreme budget cuts and even termination, absent congressional action.

To the great detriment of America's estimated 18 million veterans and particularly the more than 9 million veterans currently enrolled in the VA Health Care System, this misguided legislation places the quality and continuation of veteran's healthcare at risk. Considering that the Congressional Budget Office recently cited the Veterans Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996, as a public law whose statutory authorization has expired, Veteran's Health Care falls squarely within the scope of the bill and as stated goal of budgetary reduction.

As underscored by the nonpartisan congressional Research Service, the Veterans Health Care Eligibility Reform Act of 1996 is the enabling statute for the vast network of veterans healthcare and medical service programs, from those providing treatment from post-traumatic stress, mental health conditions, substance abuse, to those specializing in prosthetic services, care for the homeless veterans, women's healthcare, and disease prevention.

Over the last 2 years, Congress has appropriated more than \$220 billion toward these programs and services precisely because they remain a critical lifeline for veterans with service related disabilities and other health challenges. In my home state of Massachusetts, I have worked closely with the Home Base program, a non-profit organization founded by Massachusetts General Hospital and the Boston Red Sox, that operates in close cooperation with the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense to provide world class clinical care, not only to veterans, but we take warfighters right from the battlefield when necessary for rehabilitation within that facility.

I am quite sure that the dedicated administrators and healthcare professionals at home base would attest to the severe challenges that drastic funding cuts that the VA would impose on their fundamental mission to treat veterans with post-traumatic stress, depression, and brain injury, and other invisible wounds of war.

In further support of my amendment, to exempt veterans' medical care from the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, I would note that the bill requires a program to receive express and regular reauthorizations from Congress in order to avoid funding reductions and termination. While I firmly believe that Members of this Committee are united in our respect and support for American veterans, that is beyond doubt, we need only look at the recent debt ceiling crisis to demonstrate that funding for veterans' medical care should not be susceptible to political brinksmanship and the constant threat of disruption.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. I recognize myself for 5 minutes. Again, I must unfortunately oppose this amendment for the same reason I opposed previous amendments. It would undermine the purpose of the bill, which is intended to force Congress to conduct oversight of the programs it creates and funds and reauthorize them regularly. If there is any place that Congress should be conducting regular oversight, it is on programs addressing our veterans medical care. A full assessment of those priorities and the effectiveness of these programs should be conducted from year to year.

While I understand this amendment is trying to safeguard veterans' medical care, I believe this amendment may actually harm the very people it is trying to help. Our veterans put their lives on the line in service to our great Nation, providing the American people safety and security. Congress has a duty to ensure our veterans are taken care of and their wellbeing is secure.

So, I would defer to my colleagues, Chairman Mike Bost and Ranking Member Mark Takano and their Members, as to the legal authority and authorized appropriations that the Veterans Affairs Department needs to deliver on its mission. The House Veterans Affairs Committee should carefully weigh the future of the Veterans Affairs Department, Veterans Health Administration, and any related authorized programs. For these reasons, I respectfully oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. Lynch.

Does any Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by Mr. Lynch.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I like to request a roll call.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman requests a recorded vote. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Seeing that there are no further amendments on the bill, we will now take up for consideration, H.R. 3230, Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency. The Clerk will please report to bill.

THE CLERK. H.R. 3230, Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Bill, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analysis for certain rules and for other purposes.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Clerk will please report the amendment.

THE CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3230, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 3230, the Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act. First introduced several congresses ago and still very much needed. This bill strengthens the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. UMRA formed part of the original contract with America. It attempted to bring the flood of unfunded mandates issued to states, localities, and tribal governments by the Federal bureaucracy under control. It was later amended to help stem the flow of unreasonably costly mandates imposed upon the private sector. But unfortunately, Federal Regulatory Agencies have typically treated this compliance as a box checking exercise and not a true constraint on their activities.

Thus, the flood of unfunded mandates has continued. This has been particularly true under the Biden Administration. Just last month, this Committee received testimony that costs imposed by the new Biden Administration regulations in 2021 and 2022 equal \$10,000 per household. And it gets worse. Witnesses before this Committee estimated that if President Biden gets a full two terms in office, which is doubtful, the ultimate burden imposed by his Administration regulations could approach a mind boggling \$60,000 per household. That is nearly the annual U.S. median household income. Thankfully, there are solutions.

One of the most important is to enact the Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act. This bill strengthens UMRA in numerous ways. The bill will help bring down the cost of unfunded mandates imposed by regulation upon states, localities, tribal governments, and the private sector. It increases earlier stakeholder engagement on rules that may impose costly mandates, better positioning stakeholders to help agencies identify ways to achieve goals at lower costs. It extends UMRA to independent agencies. It requires agencies to prepare Regulatory Impact Analysis, including analysis of cost benefits, alternative disproportionate impacts, and effects on jobs.

For major rules that mandate economic impacts of \$100 million or more, present major increases in costs for prices, or had significant adverse effects on competition employment or markets, it requires agencies to publish additional assessments in the Federal register and receive public comment in response to notices of proposed rulemaking. And it requires final Agency regulatory impact analyses to accompany notices on final rulemaking.

These and other provisions in the bill ensure agencies will better analyze the potential costs of newly proposed mandates. H.R. 3230 ensures agencies will collect better information and inform the public about those costs and alternative ways to achieve Agency goals. Therefore, agencies will have stronger incentives to bring the cost of unfunded mandates down. And I thank Dr. Foxx for her unwavering efforts over several Congresses to enact this bill into law.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical bipartisan reform bill, and I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I oppose the legislation. As we discussed at length in our June hearing on regulations, most Americans support government regulation across a whole range of industries because they enable us to feel confident that the food we eat and the water we drink and the air we breathe will be safe for human consumption. That is why we have regulations. Regulations help curb the worst abuses of the alcohol and tobacco industries. The few meager regulations we have over firearms, including the Brady background check, have saved lots of lives although, we need to be going a lot further there. But I think Americans understand that regulations are an essential component of the American Governmental system and indeed governance, democratic governance all over the world. Regulations translate the legislative purposes and enactments of government into actual rules for the road and deliver concrete benefits to all of our people.

The H.R. 3230, as far as I can understand it, and I must confess, I had a very difficult time understanding what this will do. And maybe somebody could explain it in more detail. But as far as I get it, 3230 will make an already complex regulatory process even more complicated and burdensome, and give the most powerful private actors and corporations even more power over the regulatory process.

In contrast, in April, President Biden issued an executive order to modernize the regulatory process, strengthening democracy by advancing the values of transparency, inclusivity, and effectiveness of regulations. So, the Biden's regulatory modernization plans, which I understand, promote both efficiency and fairness. Well-funded and well-connected corporations should no longer have outsized influence over the Federal rulemaking process simply because they have got the time and the resources and then layers to bombard Federal officials with their points of view in their meeting requests.

The Biden changes require Federal officials to proactively seek out the voices of those people who otherwise would be under-represented in even if still critically affected by the rulemaking process, including people living in rural areas, people in minority groups and people with disabilities. This bill would undermine that effort by only allowing the consideration of alternatives to implementing regulations that take into account only the strict financial costs and benefits within the scope of the statutory provision that authorize the rulemaking procedure.

This is not the best way to increase public participation or welcome public views, or to reduce opaqueness in the regulatory process. It is a thinly veiled effort to expand the power of private actors over the regulatory process and to hamstring Federal Agencies.



This is part of the assault on the ability of Federal Agencies to implement congressional will and to impose more red tape on them. The aim of this effort is to elevate the interests of private concerns over Agency expertise in service of the public good.

The bill will be the first amendment to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act in almost 20 years. The changes are sweeping, and the Committee at the very least must examine them more thoroughly so we even understand what we are voting on. I have read it several times and could not really make heads or tails of it. But at the very least, we should first have a hearing on legislation and its far-reaching consequences, so at least the Members of the Committee can explain what is in there. Regulations are a tool in our democracy that necessarily will serve the public good. Despite claims to the contrary, this bill will hinder, not improve, the regulatory process. We want to make sure that the rules and regulations that are coming out of the regulatory process really serve the public interest and not the interests of private actors.

For that reason, I oppose this legislation. And I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Dr. Foxx for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Before I begin, let me ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the following documents: a letter to this Committee in support of the Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act from the Competitive Enterprise Institute and a letter to the Committee in support of the Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act from the National Taxpayers Union.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this bill in almost the same forum has passed the House three or four times already sometimes as a standalone, sometimes with other pieces of legislation designed to improve our regulatory process. The cost of existing Federal regulations are staggering and estimated to exceed \$2 trillion. This figure does not even account for the Biden Administration's new regulatory burdens, which this Committee recently learned add up to over \$10,000 per household. I believe you mentioned that, Mr. Chairman.

We need to stop adding to the regulatory burden that threatens to choke off innovation and economic growth in this country. That is why I introduced H.R. 3230, The Unfunded Mandates Accountability and Transparency Act or UMATA. This bill will strengthen Congress' ability to stop Federal regulators from loading up the private sector, the state, and local governments with costly new unfunded mandates. UMATA requires Federal Agencies to consider, accurately, the cost of their regulations, consult the stakeholders, publish their assessments, and ensure that any new regulations produce the most benefits for the least cost.

It also closes key loopholes in the 1995 Unfunded Mandates Reform Act or UMRA. This is a bipartisan bill that will prevent the Federal Government from crushing Americans under an ever-growing mountain of costly regulations and unfunded mandates. I want to point out, again, that these unfunded mandates and regulations come not from the Congress, those of us elected to serve the people,

but from unelected bureaucrats who write regulations based on legislation.

So, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to speak on the amendment or on the bill?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now in favorably reporting H.R. 3230, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the bill—

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Dr. Foxx.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote has been requested and ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The Committee will reconvene at 3 p.m.

The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will please come back to order. A quorum is present.

The Committee will now resume consideration of H.R. 4435, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ranking Member Raskin from Maryland. This will be the Raskin Number 1.

Will the Clerk please call the roll?

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. McCLAIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Brown?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. I vote no.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Turner recorded?  
THE CLERK. Mr. Turner is not previously recorded.  
Mr. TURNER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. And how is Ms. Greene recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Greene is not previously recorded.  
 Ms. GREENE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. How is Krishnamoorthi recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi is not recorded.  
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I vote aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. Armstrong recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong is not recorded.  
 Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Any other Members wish to be recorded?  
 [No response.]  
 Chairman COMER. If not, the Clerk will——  
 Mr. RASKIN. I believe Ms. Lee—how is Ms. Lee recorded?  
 Ms. LEE. I voted.  
 Chairman COMER. Yes. I think she voted.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee is recorded as voting aye.  
 Mr. RASKIN. Great. OK. Thanks.  
 Chairman COMER. No other person seeks recognition. Will the Clerk please report the total?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote the nays are 21. The ayes are 13.  
 Chairman COMER. The amendment fails. The question is now on the amendment to the amendment in the nature of the substitute offered by Mr. Garcia.  
 The Clerk will please report.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
 Mr. TURNER. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.  
 Mr. Gosar?  
 Mr. GOSAR. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.  
 Ms. Foxx?  
 Ms. FOXX. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
 Mr. Grothman?  
 Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
 Mr. Palmer?  
 Mr. PALMER. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.  
 Mr. Higgins?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
 Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
 Mr. Biggs?  
 Mr. BIGGS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.

Ms. Mace?  
 Ms. MACE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
 Mr. LaTurner?  
 Mr. LATURNER. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
 Mr. Fallon?  
 Mr. FALLON. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
 Mr. Donalds?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
 Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
 Mr. Perry?  
 Mr. PERRY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
 Mr. Timmons?  
 Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
 Mr. Burchett?  
 Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
 Ms. Greene?  
 Ms. GREENE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
 Mrs. McClain?  
 Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
 Mrs. Boebert?  
 Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
 Mr. Fry?  
 Mr. FRY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
 Mrs. Luna?  
 Mrs. LUNA. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
 Mr. Edwards?  
 Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
 Mr. Langworthy?  
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
 Mr. Burlison?  
 Mr. BURLISON. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
 Mr. Raskin?  
 Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
 Ms. Norton?  
 Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
 Mr. Lynch?

Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
 Mr. Connolly?  
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
 Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
 Mr. Khanna?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
 Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
 Ms. Porter?  
 Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
 Ms. Bush?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
 Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
 Ms. Brown?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?  
 Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz?  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
 Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Has any Member not yet recorded their vote?  
 Mr. KHANNA. How am I recorded?  
 Chairman COMER. Who is that?  
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Khanna.

Chairman COMER. Oh. Has Mr. Khanna been recorded?

THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna is not recorded.

Mr. KHANNA. I vote aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.

Chairman COMER. And, Mr. Casar, did you vote?

Mr. CASAR. No. I vote aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.

Chairman COMER. I think that is everything. Would the Clerk please record the vote?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the nays are 23. The ayes are 16.

Chairman COMER. The Garcia amendment fails.

The question is now on the Crockett amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Ms. Crockett.

The Clerk will please call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. No.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.

Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.



Mr. Perry?  
 Mr. PERRY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
 Mr. Timmons?  
 Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
 Mr. Burchett?  
 Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
 Ms. Greene?  
 Ms. GREENE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
 Mrs. McClain?  
 Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
 Mrs. Boebert?  
 Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
 Mr. Fry?  
 Mr. FRY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
 Mrs. Luna?  
 Mrs. LUNA. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
 Mr. Edwards?  
 Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
 Mr. Langworthy?  
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
 Mr. Burlison?  
 Mr. BURLISON. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
 Mr. Raskin?  
 Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
 Ms. Norton?  
 Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
 Mr. Lynch?  
 Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
 Mr. Connolly?  
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
 Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
 Mr. Khanna?  
 Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
 Mr. Mfume?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
 Ms. Porter?  
 Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
 Ms. Bush?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
 Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
 Ms. Brown?  
 Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
 Ms. Stansbury?  
 Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
 Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Has any Member not yet been recorded on the Crockett amendment?  
 [No response.]  
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the nays are 23. The ayes are 18.  
 Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Crockett amendment is not agreed to.  
 The question is now on the Raskin Number 2, amendment in the nature of a substitute.  
 The Clerk will call the roll.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.  
Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.  
Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?

Mr. FRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.

Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Casar?

Mr. CASAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.

Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Has anyone yet to be recorded?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally? Has Mr. LaTurner been recorded?

Mr. LATURNER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is not recorded. Mr. LaTurner votes no.

Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the nays are 23. The ayes are 17.

Chairman COMER. The nays have it, and the Raskin Number 2 amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of substitute, offered by Mr. Lynch.

The Clerk will please call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes no.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes no.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes no.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.

Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes aye.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman COMER. Has anyone not been recorded on the Lynch amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the nays are 23. The ayes are 19.

Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the Lynch amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4435.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of substitute to H.R. 4435 is agreed to.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 4435, as amended.

The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner? Sorry. Excuse me.

Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?



Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. No. Aye. Sorry.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Nay.

THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes nay.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes nay.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes nay.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes nay.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes nay.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes nay.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
Mr. Moskowitz?  
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.  
Mr. Chairman?  
Chairman COMER. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
Chairman COMER. Has Ms. Bush been recorded?  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush has not been recorded.  
Ms. BUSH. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes no.  
Chairman COMER. Did anyone else fail to be recorded yet?  
[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 20.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably, as reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 1209, as amended.

The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes yes.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.

Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. McCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes nay.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes nay.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes nay.  
Mr. Gomez?

Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
 Ms. Brown?  
 Ms. BROWN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.  
 Ms. Stansbury?  
 Ms. STANSBURY. Nay.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes nay.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. Nay.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes nay.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. Nay.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes nay.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Biggs recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs is not recorded.  
 Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. And how is Mr. Turner recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner is not yet recorded.  
 Mr. TURNER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Moskowitz recorded? Has he been recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz is not recorded.  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, please.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes nay.  
 Chairman COMER. Anyone else fail to vote yet?  
 [No response.]  
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 22. The nays are 20.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.  
 Now the question is on favorably reporting H.R. 192.

The Clerk will call the roll.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
Mr. TURNER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.  
Mr. Gosar?  
Mr. GOSAR. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.  
Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes nay.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes nay.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes nay.  
Ms. Stansbury?

Ms. STANSBURY. Nay.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes nay.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. Has any Member failed to vote on this bill yet?  
 [No response.]  
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Edwards recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards is not yet recorded.  
 Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the tally? How about Mr. Langworthy? Has he been recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy is not recorded.  
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.  
 Chairman COMER. Yes.  
 Voices. Yes.  
 Chairman COMER. Did you vote yes? No? OK.  
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. Oh. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes yes.  
 Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 19.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.  
 Now the question is on favorably reporting H.R. 3230.  
 The Clerk will please call the roll.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
 Mr. TURNER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner votes aye.  
 Mr. Gosar?  
 Mr. GOSAR. Aye.



THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.  
Ms. Foxx?  
Ms. FOXX. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.  
Mr. Grothman?  
Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.  
Mr. Palmer?  
Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
Mr. Higgins?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?  
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes nay.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes nay.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes nay.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.  
 Chairman COMER. Has Mr. LaTurner been recorded?  
 Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner was not previously recorded. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. Thank you. Any other Members wish to be recorded? Mr. Moskowitz?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz was not previously recorded.  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I vote no.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.  
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the tally?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 23. The nays are 20.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table. Now the question is on favorably reporting H.R. 3358.  
 The Clerk will please call the roll.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
 Mr. GOSAR. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.  
 Ms. Foxx?  
 Ms. FOXX. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.  
 Mr. Grothman?  
 Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.  
 Mr. Palmer?  
 Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
 Mr. Higgins?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
Ms. GREENE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Greene votes aye.  
Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes nay.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes nay.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes nay.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Nay.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes nay.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. No.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, may I—

Chairman COMER. Ms. Stansbury.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes. May I ask how I am recorded?

THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury is not yet recorded.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to vote—

Chairman COMER. Oh, I thought—yes, please.

Ms. STANSBURY. OK. Nay.

THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes nay.

Chairman COMER. Any other Member wish to vote?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report to tally?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 22. The nays are 20.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 890.

The Clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.  
Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
 Mr. Khanna?  
 Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
 Mr. Mfume?  
 Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
 Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
 Ms. Porter?  
 Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
 Ms. Bush?  
 Ms. BUSH. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.  
 Mr. Gomez?  
 Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
 Ms. Brown?  
 Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
 Ms. Stansbury?  
 Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. I vote aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. Would the Clerk please report the tally?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 41. The  
 nays are zero.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favor-  
 ably.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.



Now the question is on favorably reporting H.R. 4502.

The Clerk will please call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.

Ms. Greene?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain?

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.

Mrs. Boebert?

[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
 Mr. Garcia?  
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
 Mr. Frost?  
 Mr. FROST. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes yes.  
 Ms. Lee?  
 Ms. LEE. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
 Mr. Casar?  
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.  
 Ms. Crockett?  
 Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
 Mr. Goldman?  
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
 Mr. Moskowitz?  
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.  
 Mr. Chairman?  
 Chairman COMER. I vote yes, and is Mr. LaTurner recorded?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is not recorded.  
 Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 40. The nays are zero.  
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.  
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.  
 The question now is on favorably reporting H.R. 4503.  
 The Clerk will please call the roll.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?  
 Mr. GOSAR. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.  
 Ms. Foxx?  
 Ms. FOXX. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.  
 Mr. Grothman?  
 Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.  
 Mr. Palmer?  
 Mr. PALMER. Aye.  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
 Mr. Higgins?  
 [No response.]  
 THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.  
Mr. Biggs?  
Mr. BIGGS. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.  
Ms. Mace?  
Ms. MACE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.  
Mr. LaTurner?  
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.  
Mr. Fallon?  
Mr. FALLON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.  
Mr. Donalds?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?  
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.  
Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. No.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.  
Mr. Timmons?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
Ms. Porter?  
Ms. PORTER. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.  
Ms. Bush?  
Ms. BUSH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.  
Mr. Gomez?  
Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.  
Ms. Brown?  
Ms. BROWN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.  
Ms. Stansbury?  
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.  
Mr. Garcia?  
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.  
Mr. Frost?  
Mr. FROST. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.  
Ms. Lee?  
Ms. LEE. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.  
Mr. Casar?  
Mr. CASAR. Yes.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.  
Ms. Crockett?  
Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.  
Mr. Goldman?  
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Chairman COMER. Has Mr. Timmons been recorded?

THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons has not been recorded.

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report to tally?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 39. The nays are 2.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The question is now on favorably reporting H.R. 1695.

The Clerk will now call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes aye.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes aye.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?  
Mr. PERRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.  
Mr. Timmons?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett?  
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.  
Ms. Greene?  
[No response.]  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain?  
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.  
Mrs. Boebert?  
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.  
Mr. Fry?  
Mr. FRY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.  
Mrs. Luna?  
Mrs. LUNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mrs. Luna votes aye.  
Mr. Edwards?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.  
Mr. Langworthy?  
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
Mr. Burlison?  
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.  
Mr. Raskin?  
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.  
Ms. Norton?  
Ms. NORTON. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.  
Mr. Lynch?  
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.  
Mr. Connolly?  
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.  
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?  
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.  
Mr. Khanna?  
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.  
Mr. Mfume?  
Mr. MFUME. Aye.  
THE CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.  
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

Ms. Porter?

Ms. PORTER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.

Ms. Bush?

Ms. BUSH. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.

Mr. Gomez?

Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.

Ms. Brown?

Ms. BROWN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.

Ms. Stansbury?

Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.

Mr. Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.

Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.

Ms. Lee?

Ms. LEE. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Lee votes aye.

Mr. Casar?

Mr. CASAR. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.

Ms. Crockett?

Ms. CROCKETT. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes aye.

Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please report the tally?

THE CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 39. The nays are zero.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The last item. Pursuant to notice, I now call up the following postal-naming bills which were distributed in advance on this markup: House Resolutions 292, 996, 1060, 1098, 1687, 2379, 2754, 3728, and 3944.

Without objection, the bills are considered read.

Before we consider today's package of bipartisan postal naming bills, I want to thank the Ranking Member for agreeing to make some small, but important changes to the Committee's procedures



for considering postal-naming bills prior to advancing them to the consideration of the full house.

I respect the fact that the entire state delegation must come together in support of a postal-naming measure prior to the Oversight Committee's consideration of a bill. I also respect the expressed wishes of my colleagues to ensure that the honor of naming Federal property is reserved for honorees who are U.S. citizens or risked their lives in service to our great Nation. I hope these small modifications will make it easier for the Committee and the entire House to consider postal-naming bills that honor local public servants and heroes of our great Nation.

If any Member would like to speak on any of the measures, they may do so now. Yes?

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chairman, can I address the new rule, regarding the new rules, regarding the citizenship requirement?

Chairman COMER. I am sorry. I did not hear. Could you repeat that?

Mr. GOMEZ. May I address—

Chairman COMER. Yes, yes, absolutely.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chairman, I think that, first, so I have a situation in my district, which I explained to you.

Chairman COMER. Right.

Mr. GOMEZ. I reintroduced a bill to name a post office in my district where one had closed, and it was named after Dosan Ahn Chang Ho, who was a Korean American, first came to this country a long time ago. He died in 1938. He could never become a citizen because there was the Chinese Exclusion Act that prohibited him, because of his Chinese citizenship, from becoming a citizen. This is a bill that is bipartisan. I was the first one to introduce a post-office-naming bill in this Congress. Actually, all Republicans and Democrats in California co-sponsored it, and we were the first one to submit it in the entire 118th Congress, so it was before this acknowledgement.

So, I want full due consideration of this bill under the old rules because I do not agree with the rules as they stand. And this was Republicans and Democrats in California, the largest delegation, so it is not an easy feat to get everybody to sign on to a bill. So with that, I will ask for due consideration that the bill move forward.

Chairman COMER. And I will give you my commitment, like I said yesterday, to work with you on that. I respect the fact that the whole California delegation, in a bipartisan way, signed on to that. If you are good with this, we will work and you and I will go meet with leadership and see what we can come to terms with on this. Is that good enough?

Mr. GOMEZ. Yes. It is just a very unique situation.

Chairman COMER. I understand, and the fact that the entire California delegation signed on to it, I think that is a great selling point there. It is with me, and I pledge to work with you on that.

Mr. GOMEZ. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Any other Member seek recognition?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Hearing no more discussion, I request unanimous consent for these bills' immediate consideration en bloc.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The en bloc measures are agreed to and shall be reported favorably to the House.

Pursuant to House Rule XI, Clause 2, I ask that Committee Members have the right to file with the Clerk of the Committee supplemental additional Minority and dissenting views.

Without objection.

Additionally, the staff is authorized to make necessary technical and conforming changes to the bills ordered reported today, subject to the approval of the Minority.

Without objection, so ordered.

If there is no further business before the Committee, without objection the Committee stands adjourned. Thank you, everyone, for being here.

[Whereupon, at 4:02 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]