

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, Donald Trump lost the 2020 Presidential popular vote by over 7 million votes. Trump lost the electoral college 306–232. Trump lost the State of Arizona. Trump lost Nevada. Trump lost Georgia. Trump lost Minnesota. Trump lost Wisconsin. Trump lost Michigan. Trump lost Pennsylvania. Donald Trump lost the 2020 Presidential election.

#### YET ANOTHER TRUCKING CRISIS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, as we endure more and more of the Biden-induced energy crisis in this country, I have to point out another aspect of that which is very important that we get a handle on soon. Our ability for our trucks to deliver the goods, the products we expect to be in the stores, is going to be hampered even more not just in my home State of California \$7 diesel or \$6 in the rest of the country, and the ability to get truck drivers, but also, interestingly enough, there is a product called diesel exhaust fluid that is part of the newer truck engines that is going to run out.

It is already in short supply. The railroads are having a hard time shipping it. It is not even produced enough in this country. We have to rely on one important component, urea, that the major exporters of it are China, Russia, and Qatar. We are going to run out of the DEF that you put in the trucks. The trucks will not run without it because the computers will not let the truck run without this fluid, which is a component in the diesel exhaust system.

If we run out of DEF, the trucks can't move, and they will not move the products you need, your food, your other supplies to the stores for you to purchase. So we have yet another crisis within a crisis if we run out of DEF. DEF needs to be produced in this country. We need to produce the urea in this country.

#### FENTANYL CRISIS DESERVES URGENCY

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, last year alone fentanyl killed more Americans than any weapon of mass destruction in our Nation's history.

Fentanyl is now the number one cause of death for Americans between the ages of 18 and 45. It is not guns. It is not COVID-19. It is not even car accidents. It is fentanyl.

CDC numbers show more total drug overdose deaths last year in the U.S. than those killed by the atomic bomb blast that ended World War II.

The direct cause of so many American deaths from fentanyl is the Biden

administration's surrender on our southern border. In 2021 alone, more than 11,000 pounds of fentanyl was seized at our southern border. So just imagine how much fentanyl got across the border and into our communities.

Fentanyl is a drug so deadly poisonous that the Russian military has reportedly weaponized it. Countless families who have lost loved ones to fentanyl deserve better than what we are getting from this administration.

That is why I cosponsored Congresswoman BOBBERT's Fentanyl is a WMD Act, a designation that follows the 2019 proposal from the Trump administration that would enable our government to treat the fentanyl crisis with the urgency that it deserves.

We can't turn the other way as the Mexican drug cartels kill thousands of young Americans. We must take the fentanyl threat seriously, and we must secure our border.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### SUPREME COURT POLICE PARITY ACT OF 2022

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4160) to amend title 40, United States Code, to grant the Supreme Court of the United States security-related authorities equivalent to the legislative and executive branches.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4160

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

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supreme Court Police Parity Act of 2022".

##### SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO PROTECT FAMILY MEMBERS.

Section 6121(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by adding "and" after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) any member of the immediate family of the Chief Justice, any Associate Justice, or any officer of the Supreme Court if the Marshal determines such protection is necessary."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 4160.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 4160, the Supreme Court Police Parity Act of 2022.

While the Supreme Court police force is currently authorized to provide protection to the Justices of the Supreme Court, this bill would unequivocally extend their authority to provide protection to family members of Justices if there is reason to believe they are at risk.

It is imperative that the Justices are free from fear of violence or physical intimidation to make decisions based on the Constitution and law as applied to the facts of the cases before them. This is essential to the rule of law. Assaultants like the man arrested recently for allegedly plotting against the life of one of our Justices are a threat to our democracy, but with the right security, they can also be stopped before they inflict harm.

I thank Senators COONS and CORNYN for their work on this issue in the Senate, and Representatives STANTON, CORREA, and ISSA for their work in the House, likewise introducing bills that would extend protection to the families of Justices. I also thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE as well.

I further note that Mr. STANTON's bill would have also extended protection to the families of Court employees. We understand that there was Republican opposition to that aspect of the bill, and in the interest of protecting the Justices' families, we could no longer delay in passing the only version of the bill they would apparently agree to. But I hope we will swiftly move another bill to extend protection to families of employees as well.

I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this straightforward measure to ensure that the families of Supreme Court Justices have the necessary protection from any threats they may face.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, why did it take so long? Why did it take so long to bring this legislation to the floor? It has been over a month since the leak of the draft opinion, over a month of threats on Supreme Court Justices and their families, over a month of protests at their homes. Why did it take so long? I mean, the protests at their homes are a direct violation of the law, 18 U.S.C. section 1507. Over a month.

It has been over a week, or actually a week, since an assassination attempt on a Supreme Court Justice, on Justice

Kavanaugh. Think about that for a second. An assassination attempt on a sitting United States Supreme Court Justice.

And what did the Speaker of the House say last week? No one is in danger. No rush on this legislation. No concern here.

The Senate passed this bill a month ago. Why hasn't the House? Why did it take so long? I think the answer is obvious. Because they have always wanted to intimidate the Court. That has been their goal since the get-go. Their goal was to intimidate the Court. That has been their objective all along.

Think about the history first. We had the Kavanaugh confirmation mess where the left has made up things about Justice Kavanaugh and his family. Then we had the leader of the Senate, the Democrat leader of the Senate on the Supreme Court steps say to two Justices, Mr. Kavanaugh and Mr. Gorsuch: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price.

Last April, the Democrat chair of the Judiciary Committee introduced legislation to do what? To pack the Court, to add four Associate Justices to the United States Supreme Court. Why four? Why not one? Why not two? Why not three? Why four? Because four would give them a majority on the Court.

Then there was the sustained attack on Justice Thomas and his wife over the last several weeks. The Democrats on the Judiciary Committee even had hearings about Justice Thomas.

Then, of course, there was the leak of the draft opinion itself, something that has never happened. And then there were the protests at Supreme Court Justices' homes, again in direct violation of the statute.

And then, finally, there was the hearing the Democrats had in the Judiciary Committee about the abortion issue while the Dobbs decision is pending in front of the Court. You remember that hearing. That was the one where the Democrat witness said men could get pregnant. That is the history here.

And then, of course, last week, we had an assassination attempt on Justice Kavanaugh. Intimidation is their goal. It is the same reason the Department of Homeland Security stood up the Disinformation Governance Board. It is the same reason the Department of Justice is targeting parents who have the nerve to show up at a school board meeting and speak up for their kids. It is all about intimidation. That is how the left operates, and we have seen it play out now against the Supreme Court.

But the good news is, finally, this bill is going to pass and give the Justices of the highest Court in our land the protection they and their families deserve. I say better late than never. We support this legislation. It should have passed a darn long time ago.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, let me tell you why it took us a few weeks

rather than just 1 week to pass this legislation. It is because Republicans refused to protect the families of Supreme Court employees who are at risk. Shame on you for not doing that.

And, by the way, there are threats to Justices across the board. I support this legislation. I just note that recently there was an article on CNN titled "Justice Sonia Sotomayor was targeted by gunman, Federal judge tells '60 Minutes,'" dated February 19, 2021. Intimidation goes on both sides.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, that is why Republicans have condemned violence every single time it happened. We condemned it when it happened on January 6. But guess what? We also condemned it when it happened in the summer of 2020.

It hasn't been a few weeks since the leak of the draft opinion. It has been 6 weeks. The Senate passed this legislation unanimously, and they wouldn't bring it up. They wouldn't bring it up. In fact, the Speaker of the House, as I said before, the Speaker of the House said last week there was no need to bring it up, but now we are going to. Thank goodness for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), my friend.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, listening to the initial debate here, you would believe that there was a legitimate difference of opinion here on the floor about protecting the Justices. Clearly, there was no such difference in the U.S. Senate. What there is, though, is a story that I think needs to be told.

□ 1230

When I authored this legislation a month ago, I knew that we had support in the Senate, and I knew that we would have support in the House. The first thing I did was I called up the most senior member of the Judiciary Committee on the other side of the aisle and said to him that I believe we should do this. He agreed. Not checking with staff, he agreed to this simple bill of protecting those who would be intimidated and those who would be threatened and those whose lives could not be replaced in a timely fashion without changing the outcome of the Court. And that was it; I had my cosponsor.

A day later, mysteriously, another bill, very different, was dropped in the hopper by the Speaker's staff. It was done so without a Republican cosponsor, without a call to the ranking member who stands here today. That was done because they wanted to play message with it. They wanted to delay, and the Speaker has delayed for a month.

Madam Speaker, 18 U.S.C. 1507 is not a suggestion that you prevent intimidation of the Court. It is a law. It is a law that the President of the United States has sworn to uphold and,

through his Attorney General, has not, has negated the responsibility.

This legislation is not only essential to protect against another assassination attempt of a Justice or their family, but it is even more important because this administration, as we speak, is not obeying the law that they have sworn to obey, one that the Attorney General is required to. So, it is a double-edged sword that I come with today.

Democrats took 30 days and waited a week after the attempted assassination of a Supreme Court Justice before they would bring a commonsense, non-controversial piece of legislation to the floor. I applaud all of those who will vote for it today, and I suspect that it will be voted for unanimously here on the floor.

But justice delayed, or protection of our Justice delayed, could have led to the death of a Justice and, even as we speak, still could.

Let's pass it. Let's pass it without further controversy. And let's never again do something as shameful as ignore the law and delay protection of people who are being intimidated.

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

The Republicans are misleading you. Supreme Court Justices already have protection. Let me say that again. Supreme Court Justices already have protection.

This is about families of Supreme Court Justices, which I support them having protection, and Democrats are fighting for families of law clerks and employees of the Supreme Court. They should have protection, too.

Let me tell you the threats to employees of the Supreme Court. Soon after the draft decision leaked, a right-wing activist posted the personal details of a law clerk who he baselessly claimed had leaked Justice Alito's draft opinion overturning *Roe v. Wade*. This rightwing activist even posted the clerk's wedding announcement and singled out the clerk's spouse. Republicans don't want to protect that person or their family.

After another Republican strategist claimed a different law clerk had leaked the opinion, an extremist anti-abortion rights group issued a press release targeting that clerk and the Justice the clerk worked for. The author of the press release had served years in prison for conspiring to blow up an abortion clinic. Referring to the people in the Justice's office, the group's leader said that he could smell their fear.

Republicans don't want to protect the families of Supreme Court employees. Shame on them.

Recently, a news outlet obtained a DHS intelligence report identifying threats to murder Justices and their clerks. Why don't Republicans want to protect the families of Supreme Court employees?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, this bill is necessary because we have a radical and unhinged leftwing activist group of individuals that also have been encouraged by the slow-walking Democratic Party in hopes of intimidation being used to influence the courts. That is why we are here today.

We have assassination attempts on Judge Kavanaugh. We have fire bombings of women's resource centers and healthcare facilities. We have U.S. Senators, sitting U.S. Senators, encouraging violence against the children and families of Supreme Court Justices.

Ever since the leak took place some 6 weeks ago, there have been at least 14 coordinated attacks on women's pregnancy care facilities, and Democratic leadership has endorsed and encouraged physical threats to their political opposition. This is totally unacceptable. It is un-American.

The unhinged left is not the party that empowers women. If that were true, they would not be trying to destroy women's resource centers, nor would they be trying to attack and intimidate those who work there. They would not be threatening the life of and encouraging violence toward the children of the fourth woman to serve on the United States Supreme Court.

The protests that have been taking place outside the Justices' homes this past month are unacceptable, and Democratic leadership has refused to condemn the threats of violence.

One great example of this is, despite the law and the prohibition against such protests, Jen Psaki, while she was White House press secretary, stated: ". . . we certainly continue to encourage that outside of judges' homes, and that is the President's position."

This is the position of the Democratic Party: intimidation and fear. Now it is getting out of control. It is about time the Democrats are coming to admit it. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, Supreme Court Justices are already protected. Really? Really? They are already protected?

The Speaker said no one is in danger, no one is in danger after an assassination attempt. I don't know if I would feel very protected. On the very day of the assassination attempt, in violation of the law, protesters are at the very house of the Supreme Court Justice being intimidated by protesters.

The Speaker says that no one is in danger. I don't want to engage in personalities, so I might say a high-ranking official on the other side of the Capitol here said: You have released

the whirlwind; you don't know what will hit you. And then down the street, Pennsylvania Avenue, a high-ranking official said there might be a mini-revolution.

Does that not sound like intimidation to you? It sure sounds like it to me. I don't know what my friends on the other side of the aisle want to happen. I don't know. I am not in their heads, and I am not in their hearts. But I listen to what they say, and I watch what they do. We should have passed this much longer ago when it was available to us, and the fact that we didn't might be the cause for people to come to assassinate a United States Supreme Court Justice.

This is not a third-world country. If you don't get your way, you don't blow up the Court and kill the Justices. But, apparently, that is what some people in America think is appropriate. It is not appropriate. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Let me say this. Reading from a headline here, this group, Ruth Sent Us, ". . . hinted at targeting Supreme Court Justice Barrett's children, church." Let me read the headline here. "Group gave details on Barrett's routine, her children's school, and family's spiritual life."

In plain English, this group was saying where Justice Coney Barrett goes each day, where her kids go to school, and where her family goes to church. They gave those details.

Last week, the Democrats said no one is in danger. After an assassination attempt on Justice Barrett's colleague, Justice Kavanaugh, they said not to worry. Everything is fine. We don't need to pass this legislation after the Senate had done it unanimously. That is the position of the Democrats in this body.

That is why we are saying: Why did it take so long? Six weeks ago was when the draft leak happened, and the protests started at Justices' homes almost immediately after the leak of that draft, that unprecedented leak of that draft opinion. They have been doing it now for weeks and weeks and weeks.

Here is the email from this organization, this Ruth Sent Us organization. Here is one of the messages: "If you are in the D.C. metro area, join us. Our protests at Barrett's home moved the needle to this coverage. Falls Church is a People of Praise stronghold. She sends her seven kids to a People of Praise school that she sat on the board of directors for. She attends church daily," as if that is bad to go to church daily. I think that is a good thing. But this is what they are saying, this group, giving the details of where her kids go to school, where they go to church, and her daily routine.

And the Democrats said: Nothing to worry about.

That is our concern. So thank goodness this bill is here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am going to respond to that because what he just said is a lie. The fact that he is saying Democrats think there is nothing wrong, there is no danger to Supreme Court Justices, is a lie. Why? Because we are the majority party, and we just put this bill up, and we are about to vote on it. We clearly care about Supreme Court Justices.

But we also care about the families and employees of the Supreme Court, and that is what we are talking about today. Again, I just want to remind you, Republicans are misleading you. Supreme Court Justices right now have law enforcement protection details. They are protected by law enforcement. This bill has to do with the families of Supreme Court Justices. I support protecting them. I also support protecting the employees and their families of the Supreme Court.

That is the dispute. The Democrats want to also protect the employees and families who are getting threats from rightwing activists, intimidation from the far right.

Do you want to talk about intimidation? I will tell you what intimidation is. It is Trump supporters assaulting the Capitol on January 6, brutalizing 140 police officers. That is intimidation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We condemned what took place on January 6. It would have been nice if Democrats would have done the same thing in the summer of 2020 or passed this legislation 6 weeks ago or a month ago when the Senate passed it.

Let me just recite a few things here that have been said by our colleagues on the other side.

Former Attorney General Eric Holder said in 2018, at a campaign event in Georgia, to kick Republicans. "No. No. When they go low, we kick them." That is what this new Democratic Party is about.

It sure is. It is all about intimidation: intimidating the court, intimidating parents who have the nerve to show up at school board meetings, setting up a Disinformation Governance Board to intimidate free speech rights of all Americans. That is what the new Democratic Party is about.

We have seen it time and time again. In the summer of 2018, we saw one of our colleagues from California, a Democrat Member, say: Let's make sure we show up wherever we have to show up. And if you see anybody from the Trump Cabinet in a restaurant, in a department store, at a gasoline station, out in a crowd, you create a crowd and push back on them, and you tell them—think about this. This is a Member of Congress saying this to a Cabinet member—you tell them they are

not welcome anymore, anywhere. A Cabinet member of the administration not welcome in their own darn country? That is what a Member of Congress said on the Democrat side.

We had another Member of Congress on the Democrat side say this: There needs to be “unrest on the streets,” calling for unrest on the streets while there was unrest on the streets in the summer of 2020.

That is why this legislation is so darn important and why we cannot figure out—the gentleman just said something that wasn’t accurate. The Speaker of the House last week said no one is in danger. I just read you what they are posting about Justice Coney Barrett and her family and where they go to church and where her seven kids go to school. Of course, this is in the context of everything they have done to intimidate the Court and an assassination attempt on another Justice, Justice Kavanaugh.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

□ 1245

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I have missed most of the debate on the floor. Mr. JORDAN just made reference to an item that bowls me over. You wonder after you have been in Washington for a little while whether anything will surprise you. Yes, Madam Speaker, that tweet by the pro-abortion group, Ruth Sent Us, that identified Justice Barrett’s church and identified the school that her children attend and encouraged protestors to “voice your anger” by demonstrating there, is a new low.

Not just the identification of Justices’ home addresses, which I never thought we would see, not just the crowds materializing there, which I never thought we would see, not just the appearance of an assassin at the home of a Justice, which we have never seen, and yet, the response is: What about January 6?

As the gentleman from Ohio made the point, I have never encountered any Republican who declined to condemn the violence and rioting at the Capitol that day. I have never found one. I have never heard one. And yet, I never hear condemnation of such conduct as I have described from Democrats. I might be missing it. I am not hearing it now. I am hearing this, What about January 6?

I condemn the rioting and the violence at the Capitol on January 6.

I condemn the Democrat leader of the Senate standing in front of the Supreme Court to say to two specific Justices that, You have released the whirlwind. You will suffer the result. I don’t remember the exact words. And then what I do remember, the phrase that sticks in my mind: “You won’t know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.” I never hear

condemnation for that. I don’t know why.

I do think I know why this bill had to be delayed from last week when we were here and could have passed it. That is because you want to protect the leaker. That implies that although this has been pending for a month and a half and the Nation doesn’t know who the leaker is, somebody knows who the leaker is; and that is who you want to protect, amazing as that is, unprecedented as that is.

We certainly ought to pass this legislation and protect the Justices of the United States Supreme Court from assassins, assassins responding to the unprecedented advocacy on the left.

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

I condemn violence whether it is from rightwing groups or leftwing groups or white supremacist groups or any other group. Democrats say this all the time.

I will tell you why Republicans don’t hear it. Because they are in their bubble watching just Fox News, who won’t even show the January 6 hearings. That is why they don’t hear any of this stuff because it is never played to them or their base. Democrats condemn violence all the time.

By the way, last year—I am just going to tell you the headline of this article again: “Justice Sonia Sotomayor was targeted by gunmen . . .” Did Republicans jump up in outrage? No, no, they didn’t.

So let’s just be clear here what we are talking about today, once again: Supreme Court Justices get law enforcement protection right now, as we speak.

This is actually a dispute about employees. So I am going to ask Republicans a question, and I bet you they will not answer it: Why do they not want to protect the employees and their families of the Supreme Court?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the employees of the Supreme Court are already protected. This is about protecting the Justices’ families, and we know that is needed based on the headline I read and the email that Mr. BISHOP just talked about.

The gentleman said that Democrats condemn violence. No, they don’t. No, they don’t. They called rioters and looters the entire summer of 2020, they called them “peaceful protestors.” And that same summer, then-Senator now-Vice President HARRIS raised money to bail those rioters and looters and people who went after the police out of jail. So you have got to stick with the facts here, and that is just not accurate what was stated earlier.

For all the reasons we have highlighted, Madam Speaker, we are glad this bill is finally going to pass. We just wish it would have happened when it should have, weeks and weeks ago when this threat was first present for Supreme Court Justices.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, it is incredible to stand here and listen to our Republican colleagues talk about the risks and the dangers that exist to the Supreme Court.

I want to know where they were when the risks and the dangers existed for my community, El Paso, Texas, where 23 innocent people were slaughtered by a white supremacist with an AK-47? Where were they then? How about Uvalde? Where were they then? How about every other mass shooting? Buffalo? You name it.

Last week, we brought to the floor legislation intended to protect millions of Americans, especially and including children. The vast majority of our Republican colleagues voted against those protections for vulnerable people who don’t have access to 24-hour, round-the-clock U.S. Marshal protection. They don’t have access to round-the-clock, 24/7 Capitol Police protection, which Supreme Court Justices have today. Supreme Court Justices have far more protections than Members of Congress do, but more importantly they have more than those innocent lives that were taken in innumerable cities across America.

And as they rail about and clutch their pearls over the fact that it took House Democrats some time to get this bill to the floor, the reason it took that much time is because it was House Democrats that at least wanted to get one itty-bitty concession out of this bill to protect the staff of that institution, the United States Supreme Court. But they refused.

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

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I remind the American public why they brought this bill to the floor, both in the Senate and here; it is a talking point. It is not because it really does anything, it is simply a talking point. It came as a result of a leaked decision on the Justices’ desire to take away women’s reproductive care.

Guess who else doesn’t get protections in America the way that they would like to protect others? It is those healthcare providers and patients and staff who are vulnerable every day, especially because of the actions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, a talking point? The left is telling people where Justice Barrett’s kids go to school. That is not a talking point, that is a fact. That is one of the craziest things I have heard said on this floor.

A talking point? Every single Senator voted for this package. That includes Democrats. Every single one.

A talking point? You have got to be kidding me.

They are reporting where a Supreme Court Justice's kids go to school, where her family goes to church, her daily routine, and the left calls it a talking point?

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, S. 4160 is a straightforward bill that will protect the families of the Justices. Democrats also fought to try to protect the families of Supreme Court employees. Republicans objected and won't do that, so this is the best we can get.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 4160.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2543, FEDERAL RESERVE RACIAL AND ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2773, RECOVERING AMERICA'S WILDLIFE ACT OF 2021; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7606, MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR ACT OF 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 1170**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2543) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to add additional demographic reporting requirements, to modify the goals of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-49, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate

equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-47, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 6 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. After debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 7 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in

the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 8. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7606) to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-50, modified by the amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 10 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. After debate pursuant to section 9 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 11. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1153, agreed to June 8, 2022), is amended by striking "June 17, 2022" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "June 22, 2022".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

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