



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2024

No. 180

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 5, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL MEUSER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 9, 2024, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

HONORING THE LEGACY OF SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Shirley Chisholm as we mark the 100th anniversary of her birth, November 30, 1924, and as we commemorate her many achievements by posthumously awarding the Congressional Gold Medal.

The daughter of immigrants, Shirley Chisholm represents the American Dream realized. Born and raised in

Brooklyn, New York, she would go on to be a trailblazer, a catalyst for change, and an inspiration for generations after her.

In 1968, she would become the first Black woman elected to the United States Congress, and in 1971, was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

In 1972, she became the first Black woman to run for a major party's nomination for President. Before forever changing the national political landscape, Shirley Chisholm sought to change her neighborhood, jumping into local politics in the 1950s after receiving a bachelor's degree from Brooklyn College and a master's in childhood education from Columbia University.

Amid her community, she became an authority on issues concerning child welfare and was a staunch advocate for education reform. After being elected to serve in the New York State Assembly in 1964, she worked to expand food and nutrition programs for the poorest in her community and fought to provide disadvantaged students with educational opportunities.

She brought an unwavering commitment to justice, equality, and opportunity to Congress serving New York's 12th District for seven terms. It was here in these Halls and in this very Chamber that Shirley Chisholm advanced policies that provided healthy food options for mothers and children, expanded childcare, and strengthened healthcare coverage, and much, much more.

Shirley Chisholm's famous declaration during her historic Presidential bid, "unbought and unbossed," continues to resonate as a call for courage, authenticity, and integrity in public service.

I am deeply honored to represent the district that serves as her final resting place at Forest Lawn Cemetery in Buffalo, New York. It was in our community that she married her husband, the

late Assemblyman Arthur Hardwick, Jr., and it is here that the two of them made their home following her retirement from Congress.

Her presence in our community is a powerful reminder of her enduring legacy. We are forever indebted to her for her service in advancing civil rights, women's rights, and making our Nation more equitable for all.

Yet, let us remember Shirley Chisholm not only for her achievements, but for the doors she opened and for others to follow. May she rest in peace and power.

REMEMBERING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS ALLEN GANG

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn remembrance of Private First Class Allen Gang, who passed away on November 10, 2024.

Born into a family with deep military roots, he entered the United States Army at the age of 19. He served in Vietnam in the 17th Calvary Regiment of the 199th Infantry Brigade where he sustained an injury while in combat in February of 1968.

Upon his return to the United States, Private First Class Gang married his beloved wife, Kitty. Together, they raised six children.

He received numerous awards honoring his dedication and valor displayed during his service, including the Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, as well as numerous badges and ribbons.

In June, I had the distinct privilege of presenting Private First Class Gang with his Purple Heart Medal, awarded to servicemembers who have been wounded or killed as a result of enemy action while serving in our military.

A lifetime member of the Disabled American Veterans and a member of the American Legion Post 721 in his beloved south Buffalo, he exemplified the enduring spirit of camaraderie and service. He leaves behind his wife, 6

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6365

children, 15 grandchildren, and 5 great-grandchildren.

With bravery and commitment, Allen Gang served this Nation contributing to the freedoms we enjoy today.

May he rest in peace.

SHOPPING SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the economic heartbeat of Iowa, our small businesses.

In Iowa, over 99 percent of businesses are small, many of which are family-owned. That is over 282,000 small businesses employing more than 616,000 people.

At a time of great economic uncertainty across the country, Iowa has been a beacon of hope and proven to be one of the best States to own and operate a business.

This past weekend, we celebrated Small Business Saturday encouraging folks to shop local for the holidays. As we approach Christmas and the New Year, I encourage Iowans and Americans everywhere to continue supporting small businesses and shopping local during this holiday season.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and without them, we don't have large businesses and our Nation's economic engine would falter.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the vital contributions of small businesses in Iowa and across the country, and to continue advocating for their success.

RECOGNIZING IOWA REGIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR KAITLIN MAHONEY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first-ever Iowa Regional Teacher of the Year, Mrs. Kaitlin Mahoney. Mrs. Mahoney has taught at Bettendorf High School for 11 years, molding the minds of our future generations.

Mrs. Mahoney believes that education begins with the ability to engage students. She has worked vigorously to adapt the school algebra curriculum, enabling hundreds of students to move on to higher education. She also works as a student counselor, pushing students toward achievements previously unthinkable.

It is the creativity and passion of educators like Mrs. Mahoney that will push this Nation across the finish line of our educational goals. The fostering of our youth must be at the forefront of concern in this Nation if it is to remain the greatest country in the world.

She will be competing against other finalists for the title of the 2025 Iowa Educator of the Year, the winner of which will be announced later this year. I wish Mrs. Mahoney all the luck in the world.

MAINTAINING THE VALUES OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5349, the Crucial Communism Teaching Act.

This important bill directs the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation to develop a curriculum that teaches high school students about the dangers of communism and its conflict with the values of American democracy.

As communist nations continue ramping up their aggression toward the U.S., it is crucial that we educate the next generation on the stark realities of totalitarian regimes and human suffering caused by communism.

By providing students with these critical resources, we can help them understand the importance of liberty, individual rights, free markets, and the constitutional principles that define our Nation. This bill will prepare our young people to be responsible citizens who can safeguard the freedoms we hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5349 and ensure that future generations are educated on the lessons of history.

RECOGNIZING THE IOWA COMPUTER SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Iowa Computer Science Technology Association for helping Iowa rank amongst the top 10 States in the Nation for providing access to high-quality computer science education.

Iowa's top 10 ranking in the 2023-2024 academic year of computer science class availability beats the national average by 24 percent, with 84 percent of public schools offering computer science classes.

With computer and information technology jobs rising exponentially across the United States, the efforts of these passionate educators will be reflected in the success of Iowa's youth as they set the standard in the workforce.

As we move forward in the ever-changing technological climate, it is imperative that we continue to develop innovative ways of helping our students achieve success, not only on the national stage, but on the world stage, as well.

This is a win for the people of Iowa and for America. The fight for educational success is never over, and we must continue to prioritize education, continually aiming for a brighter future for our students.

HONORING THE 83RD ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as Saturday, December 7, will be the honoring and remembering of the 83rd anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a day that will live in infamy, a day that claimed the lives of 2,403 American heroes.

On December 7, 1941, a peaceful Sunday morning was torn apart when Japan launched a surprise assault on our naval base in Hawaii. Ships were

sunk, planes were destroyed, and lives were lost. Indeed, there is the USS Arizona Memorial that remains there today.

From this devastating attack, our Nation's strength and unity emerged. Pearl Harbor awakened an unshakable spirit of patriotism and resolve. Americans, ordinary men and women, answered the call to defend freedom and protect the ideals that make this country great and that continued democracy throughout the world.

Let us honor those who sacrificed everything and remember their courage and dedication. Their legacy lives on in the enduring strength of this Nation, which will never falter in the face of adversity and will always stand for freedom and justice.

FROM DETROIT TO BHOPAL

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, from Detroit to Bhopal, we have a right to breathe clean air. This week marks 40 years since the Bhopal chemicals disaster in India, and the survivors are still sick and waiting for justice.

Union Carbide, driven by corporate greed, caused one of the worst chemical disasters in history, poisoning the residents and communities.

I was honored to meet some of the survivors and proud to join them in their fight for justice. I joined Senator MERKLEY and Representative JAYAPAL to introduce a resolution reaffirming the need for stronger laws to prevent these tragedies and keep communities safe.

Many of our communities in Michigan's 12th District live in shadows of corporate polluters, so this fight is personal to me. We are tired of greedy corporations poisoning our communities and getting away with it.

In the Bhopal chemical disaster, around 20,000 people were killed when poison gas was released into the air. Nearly half a million people have suffered illnesses and premature death after the initial incident.

Of course, the U.S. refused to extradite the CEO of Union Carbide, the company that owned and ran the Bhopal facility, to face criminal charges.

We need and deserve a better world, not a world where the color of your skin, your income, or your neighborhood where you were born puts you at a higher risk of being exposed to pollution that causes disease and death.

We see it in places like Detroit and Dearborn's Southend communities where there are higher rates of cancer and asthma. We cannot tolerate a world where corporations take all of the profit and none of the liability.

Dow Chemical knowingly took responsibility for this disaster when it bought the company. Yet, they still refused to compensate the survivors. Dow was headquartered in Michigan, and if they think their actions are just going

to be lost in history, well, I am here to say they have got another thing coming. Dow must pay what is owed to the people of Bhopal.

MICHIGAN EDUCATION COMPLIANCE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Ms. TLAI B. Mr. Speaker, this is a plea on behalf 182,000 families who will have students with disabilities in Michigan. Year after year, we continue to fall short on the promise to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which many call IDEA.

Failing to help our students to obtain the services they need to learn is, again, years that we cannot get back for our children. With this shortfall, we continue to undermine our students with disabilities.

The education gap is continuing to widen. There is currently a 22 percent drop-out rate for students with disabilities in Michigan, where, for non-disabled students it is only 8 percent.

□ 1015

Schools use assessments to measure student proficiency and achievement, and under the IDEA, students with disabilities are expected to participate in State assessments.

However, every year between 2017 and 2022, the State of Michigan has requested the Department of Education to approve a waiver to increase the 1 percent gap required by the Federal Government for the number of students with disabilities who can take Michigan's alternative assessment. It is because we are at double.

We often don't do enough to support our kids who need to go through this, nor do we advise our parents properly. Budget cuts often shortchange individualized learning, plans that are crucial for students with disabilities.

However, according to the Autism Alliance of Michigan, the dropout rate for students with disabilities is double the amount. Disparities are even worse for students of color with disabilities.

We need to fully fund IDEA, and we know that will help Michigan serve our students. It will help reduce the amount of inappropriate assessments and improve access to information and support for our school districts.

It is disheartening to see the State of Michigan's Department of Education now before an administrative hearing judge because they are not in compliance with the Federal laws. This is the first time in 27 years that our U.S. Department of Education had to drag a State through an administrative hearing process. It is shameful that we are at this point after over a year of negotiations.

We have to do better. These are our children, and again, we cannot get these years back for them. We have to do right.

TRUMP TARIFFS WOULD BE DEVASTATING

Ms. TLAI B. Mr. Speaker, Detroit is not only the most beautiful, Blackest city in the country, but it also houses the most important trade corridor in the Nation. Mr. Speaker, 27 percent of trade comes through our amazing city.

Tariffs are one tool, but they have costs and benefits that must be considered regarding trade. Used strategically, we know they can help new industries, support resilient supply chains, and even promote high-road labor as well as environmental practices.

However, the cost of Trump's tariffs proposal would be devastating for our families—take our auto industry, for instance. The U.S. relies on \$97 billion worth of auto parts and millions of finished vehicles from Canada and Mexico, but Trump's tariffs, as it is now, would raise the price of new cars by \$3,000. Our families cannot afford that cost.

What about our grocery costs? More than half of our fruits and vegetables come from Canada and Mexico. My residents are already struggling to cover the rising prices of groceries. Again, we cannot toy with our residents' ability to put food on the table or provide for their families.

JUST SAY NO TO GRANTS

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, most of the stories we read every day about outrageous government waste stems from a category of government funding called grants.

From the \$3 million grant to study how hamsters fight each other to the \$3.7 million in grants given to the Wuhan virology lab that likely unleashed COVID upon the world, these are the very essence of government waste.

Government grants fall into two major varieties: gifts of public money for every cause under the Sun and grants for local projects of every variety.

They are all for good causes. They go to universities, companies, NGOs, civic groups, charities, local governments, State governments, and do-gooders of every kind, all promising some public benefit.

Unfortunately, by their very nature, they are plagued with lax oversight, political favoritism, little followup, and questionable benefits. Indeed, much of the grant money doled out each year disappears into the salaries of various groups and agencies that will then write glowing reports of their work and apply for more grants next year in an ever-expanding litany of waste.

There is never a shortage of highly paid grant application writers eager to make that case.

"Personally, I liked the university," says Dan Akroyd's character in "Ghostbusters." "They gave us money and facilities. We didn't have to produce anything. You have never been out of college. You don't know what it is like out there. I have worked in the private sector. They expect results."

If the Federal Government needs a particular good or service that it can't produce itself, it should send out a request for a proposal specifying what it needs and then award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder to provide it. Then, the contractor should be held accountable for delivering that good or service.

Another major class of grant recipients are local and State governments. Who can begrudge grants for law enforcement, wastewater treatment, transportation, homeless shelters, or schools? Yet, all of these grant programs beg a fundamental question: If a project exclusively benefits a local community, shouldn't it be paid for exclusively by that local community?

Why should the taxpayers in Pocatello be forced to pay for sidewalks in Poughkeepsie? Robbing St. Petersburg to pay Saint Paul turns our Federal Treasury into a grab bag for local pork projects that destroys the entire concept of New Federalism.

Local decisions and local money should be made and spent locally.

By definition, local grants are lower priority projects that simply can't make the cut when local governments are measuring their own local needs against their own local resources. They only make economic sense if somebody else can be stuck with the tab, and that is what grants do.

Money flows from politically powerless communities to politically powerful ones, often for frivolous projects that don't merit a place in local budgets. Because these Federal grants come with lots of strings attached, they are also inefficiently applied. But who cares since it is all free money?

A very simple test should be applied to this class of grants. If the project exclusively benefits a local community, that local community should pay for it. With that burden also comes the freedom to spend those dollars exactly as they are most needed. Federal resources should be reserved for projects that benefit the entire country. That is the difference between the Federal interstate highway system and a local street.

This is not a small matter. Between 2016 and 2020, Federal grant spending ballooned from \$675 billion to \$972 billion, and that is exclusive of Medicaid grants to States. That is nearly half of the annual Federal deficit right there.

Weeding them out or reforming them is no easy task because a thriving political ecosystem of wealth and favor supports them. In last year's spending spree, both parties indulged themselves with 8,222 congressional earmarks, a particular subset of grant spending where individual Congressmen hand-pick their recipients.

Here is a modest proposal for the DOGE boys: Stop the cash bonanza to every self-described deserving cause and influential community with a good grant writer. Budget writers and appropriators should look with extreme skepticism on every grant that awards

money without results or that robs taxpayers in one community to pay for projects in another.

It is time that we protected and reserved the Federal Treasury for the general welfare of the United States, as our Constitution envisioned.

CELEBRATING KAMBRIDGE ELDER AND COSI

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise with a heart full of pride to celebrate a little magic from my district in Columbus, Ohio, a place where innovation, creativity, and community come together.

Today, that magic has an exciting connection to the U.S. Capitol Christmas Tree. What is the magic? The magic is the bright young mind of Kambridge Elder and the incredible work of COSI, the Center of Science and Industry.

While I am here, I also want to encourage my colleagues to support the bipartisan National STEM Week Act because brighter futures don't happen by chance. They happen by choice.

Let's start with the tree. This year's Capitol Christmas tree traveled over 4,000 miles from the breathtaking forests of Alaska to Washington, D.C., making 14 stops along the way. One of those special stops was in my congressional district, where the tree picked up an ornament designed by Kambridge Elder, a seventh grader in my district at the Arts IMPACT Middle School.

Through a partnership with the Ohio Arts Council, COSI invited students from all 611 Ohio school districts to design ornaments inspired by the theme "Building STEAM in Ohio."

STEAM—science, technology, engineering, the arts, and mathematics—isn't just a buzzword, Mr. Speaker. It is a foundation for progress.

Kambridge's ornament, a train with four carts representing each of the STEAM elements, was inspired by a train at her school that she loves. Her ornament isn't just a decoration. It is a vision. It is a symbol of what happens when we invest in our children and give them the tools to dream big.

Kambridge's story reminds us of the vital role institutions like COSI play in sparking curiosity, discovery, and innovation.

Under the bold leadership of Dr. Frederic Bertley, COSI has become a powerhouse of education and inspiration, earning its title as the Nation's number one science museum 4 years in a row with USA Today Readers' Choice Awards. Forbes calls COSI "a beacon of scientific engagement," and that is exactly what it is.

From the COSI Science Festival to the wildly successful STEM Kit Program, COSI is making science accessible and exciting for families and kids—not just in Columbus, Mr. Speaker, but across the Nation.

Kambridge's creativity, fueled by COSI's mission, is proof of what is possible when we nurture curiosity and celebrate imagination.

That is why I am here to urge my colleagues to support the National STEM Week Act. This bipartisan bill, which I am a cosponsor of, will dedicate a week each year to highlighting the importance of STEM and STEAM education.

It is about bringing together Federal, State, and local governments with schools, families, and organizations like COSI to close the knowledge gap holding too many of our children back.

It is about giving every child, no matter their ZIP Code, a shot at a better future.

It is about ensuring America remains a global leader by fostering creativity and problem-solving skills that drive innovation.

It is about young people like Kambridge, who I hope is watching today, showing us what is possible when we invest in their potential.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the Capitol Christmas tree, let us remember that every ornament tells a story. Kambridge's ornament isn't just her story. It is ours.

Let us commit to building a future where every child can dream, create, and achieve, securing their future and the future of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Kambridge Elder and her principal, her teachers, and her family for being a big support to her.

SMALL BUSINESSES UNDER SIEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIFANY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the strength of our economy, employing half of all Americans and driving prosperity across our communities and our country. We all know that.

Yet, these businesses are continually put under siege by an avalanche of Federal regulations. The Biden administration has imposed \$1.5 billion in regulatory costs and 326 million hours of paperwork on small businesses. That is hard to believe, but it is true. That is time and money that entrepreneurs should be spending to grow their businesses and, of course, create jobs.

That is why I strongly support the Prove It Act, which we will be voting on today. This legislation forces Federal agencies to analyze the true costs of their regulations and consider the direct and indirect burdens on small businesses, which is so very important.

□ 1030

It allows small businesses to challenge unfair rules, ensures greater transparency, and even exempts entrepreneurs from regulations if agencies fail to comply with these requirements.

Small businesses should be able to focus on expanding operations, hiring

workers, and serving their customers, not navigating the Federal Government's continuous red tape.

The Prove It Act will empower businessowners, protect jobs, and restore common sense to our regulatory process. Let's defend the American entrepreneurial spirit by passing the Prove It Act and unleashing the full potential of every small business throughout our country and certainly throughout my State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. LEE CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Influenza Vaccination Week and to emphasize the importance of protecting our communities through vaccination.

Each year, the flu affects between 9 million and 41 million Americans, leading to 12,000 to 52,000 deaths depending on the severity of the season.

In the 2022-2023 flu season alone, we saw approximately 360,000 hospitalizations and 21,000 deaths nationally.

In Houston, home to the world-renowned Texas Medical Center, our healthcare professionals are on the front lines during peak flu season, managing increased patient loads and saving lives.

The flu is not just a seasonal inconvenience. It is a serious health threat, particularly for children like my own, older adults, and those with chronic conditions.

Vaccination is our best defense. According to the CDC, getting a flu shot reduces the risk of severe illness, hospitalization, and death.

I am highly concerned about the anti-vaccine messaging that is spread throughout social media and even on the news, and I am highly concerned that our next administration is selecting potential nominees for our most revered health agencies that have anti-vaccination messaging.

I would encourage all Americans to get vaccinated against the flu to help our vulnerable populations, including pregnant women and infants who cannot be vaccinated themselves. Each year, unfortunately, vaccination rates fall well short of recommended levels.

The National Influenza Vaccination Week serves as an important reminder that it is not too late to get vaccinated.

The flu season can last all the way through May, and every vaccination helps to protect not just the individual but also their family, friends, and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Houstonians and Americans to do their part to prevent the spread of influenza and protect public health in the United States.

TEXAS LIBRARIES

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss one of our national

treasures, and these are our libraries, especially at our schools.

Libraries are essential in addressing the achievement gap, and as a former first grade teacher, I know how important it is to all children. Libraries provide students with access to books, technology, and trained librarians who foster literacy and academic success.

Yet in Texas, we are seeing a troubling trend. Houston ISD, which is primarily in my district, has cut 28 librarian positions, and Spring Branch ISD has replaced certified librarians with less qualified staff.

Statewide, over one in five schools no longer has a full-time librarian. These cuts disproportionately affect underserved communities where students rely on libraries for resources they lack at home.

At the same time, Texas has approved a Bible-based curriculum for public schools. While this curriculum is optional, it does nothing to close the achievement gap.

Instead of focusing on ideological narratives, we should invest in proven solutions, like restoring librarian positions to provide equitable access to education and ensure all students can thrive.

Books, which could include the Bible, but many other books, are gateways to opportunity, and librarians are essential guides in that journey. Let's invest in real solutions to ensure every child has the tools to succeed.

HONORING THE FACULTY OF TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of several Texas Southern University faculty researchers in the 18th Congressional District and the great city of Houston.

Since the foundation of Texas Southern University, a historically Black college and university, it has remained a pillar to the Third Ward and the African-American community in Houston at large.

It is home to more than 1,400 outstanding faculty and staff members who each play a critical role in helping this historic institution shape and mold the future of America's finest students.

I would like to recognize a few of the contributions of these faculty researchers who have blazed a path in their respective fields of study: Dr. Robert Bullard, whom my mother, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, worked with closely, is the founding director of the Bullard Center for Environmental and Climate Justice. He is a distinguished professor of urban planning and environmental policy and is often referred to as the father of environmental justice.

He has addressed topics such as environmental racism, urban land use, housing, sustainability, climate justice, and community resilience in 18 books. Dr. Bullard has also helped garner the support of more than \$70 million in external funding.

Dr. Howard Henderson is the founding director of the Center for Justice

Research and a professor of justice administration in the Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs. He serves as an advisory board member of the Vera Institute's Rural Jail Research Policy Network. Dr. Henderson is a member of the National Scientific Advisory Committee at the Institute of Justice Research and Development at Florida State University and is a member of the National Science Foundation's STEM Opportunities in Prison Settings workgroup. He has also secured over \$2 million in research funding.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for these great leaders in research.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1432. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to certain organizations for members of the Armed Forces.

H.R. 3821. An act to reauthorize the Fire-fighter Cancer Registry Act of 2018.

H.R. 5863. An act to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 712. An act to identify and address barriers to coverage of remote physiologic devices under State Medicaid programs to improve maternal and child health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women.

S. 3242. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under that Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes.

S. 3738. An act to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 4477. An act to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF JOE TANNER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of the former Department of Natural Resources Commissioner Joe Tanner, who sadly passed away on Sunday, November 24.

Mr. Tanner had an impressive career in the State government for 26 years, making him the longest serving commissioner of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

He was first appointed to the position of commissioner for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources in 1972. Mr. Tanner served as commissioner until 1984 and completed a second term of service from 1990 to 1995.

Mr. Tanner accomplished many impressive achievements throughout his

career. He was responsible for over 400 legislative efforts and consolidated 38 State agencies into the DNR.

Mr. Tanner was a dedicated servant to the environment and law, known for establishing a State single-point environmental permitting system.

Mr. Tanner will forever be remembered for his excellence and dedicated service to the State of Georgia. My heart and my thoughts go out to his family, friends, and all those who had the pleasure of working alongside him.

CONGRATULATING CASSANDRA CANNON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cassandra Cannon for her placement in Inc.'s 2024 Female Founders 250 list.

Since launching her luxury lingerie company, Lake, Ms. Cannon has expanded her company immensely, growing Lake's revenue by 50 percent, customer base by 185 percent, and roster of employees by 134 percent in 2023 alone.

Prior to launching the company, Cannon was preparing to begin medical school and her cofounder, Anne Read Lattimore, was working in the pharmaceutical industry.

The two realized there were improvements to be made in the women's sleepwear industry and decided to exit the medical field to launch Lake in 2014.

The company boasts a spectacular headquarters on West Harris Street, coupled with a design studio on Broughton Street in Savannah and fulfillment center in Pooler.

Congratulations to Ms. Cannon, Ms. Lattimore, and the dedicated employees of Lake on this stellar achievement. I look forward to watching this company flourish in years to come.

KIA 15-YEAR MANUFACTURING ANNIVERSARY IN GEORGIA

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kia on 15 years of manufacturing in the State of Georgia.

Boasting 2,200 expansive acres of land in West Point, Georgia, Kia's manufacturing plant is the first North American manufacturing site for the corporation, based in Seoul, South Korea.

After its groundbreaking ceremony in October of 2006, Kia has increased its capacity to produce 350,000 vehicles per year.

Soon Kia will complete its \$217 million expansion to allow for the production of electric vehicles in addition to the plant's customary products.

I extend my most sincere thanks and congratulations to Kia and its Georgia team for their hard work and contributions to growing and strengthening American manufacturing.

Congratulations to Kia and its Georgia team on this significant milestone. I look forward to watching the company continue to provide jobs, opportunity, and top-notch products in Georgia for many years to come.

CONGRATULATING GEORGIA TECH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Georgia Tech

for ranking number one among public schools in the South. This achievement was recently reported by *The Wall Street Journal* and deservedly reflects the university's impressive legacy.

Georgia Tech has retained its number one spot for industrial engineering and has recently achieved this top ranking for civil engineering.

Meanwhile, the university's aerospace, biomedical, computer, mechanical, and materials engineering programs all ranked in the top four among all universities nationwide.

Georgia Tech is a leader in advancing research and preparing students for careers in technology and innovation. This is an incredible achievement and a source of pride for Georgians everywhere.

Our public universities are great options for young people to get a quality education, and Georgia Tech embodies this to the fullest.

These well-deserved rankings highlight the commitment of students and staff alike to maintaining a culture of innovation and of excellence.

I congratulate the students, the staff, and the alumni of Georgia Tech.

WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS ARE AT RISK

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, women's basic reproductive freedoms are under relentless attack by rightwing politicians and judges across the country.

Over 2 years ago, Donald Trump's hand-picked MAGA Supreme Court Justices overturned *Roe v. Wade*, dismantling 50 years of judicial precedent.

This catastrophic decision has left one in three women living under outright abortion bans and unleashed a coordinated effort to undermine the full range of reproductive healthcare, including access to birth control.

In his concurring opinion in the *Dobbs* case, Justice Clarence Thomas explicitly called for revisiting the right to contraception. Despite the fact that over 90 percent of women rely on contraception at some point in their lives, extremist Republicans have seized on this as a rallying cry to target birth control.

In Oklahoma, Republican lawmakers have proposed radical legislation to outlaw widely used forms of contraception, including IUDs and the morning-after pill.

In States like Virginia, Arizona, Tennessee, and North Carolina, extremist Republicans have blocked efforts to protect access to contraception.

Adding to this alarming trend, Trump's Project 2025 blueprint outlines a dangerous agenda to further dismantle reproductive healthcare, including targeting emergency contraception and insurance coverage for birth control.

Despite his campaign claims of ignorance about Project 2025, Trump is now staffing his administration with the very architects of this extreme agenda.

I refuse to stand by and let these MAGA extremists interfere with women's private healthcare decisions. That is why I am fighting to pass my Right to Contraception Act to ensure every American has the right to access the full range of FDA-approved birth control.

This legislation is a safeguard against the growing threats to contraceptive rights. It ensures that every American can make crucial decisions about their health, their family planning, and their future.

The Right to Contraception Act guarantees the right to access contraceptive services and protects healthcare providers' ability to deliver them. It also secures access to the full range of contraceptive methods, including birth control pills, IUDs, and emergency contraceptives like Plan B.

In June, I was proud to announce a discharge petition to bring my bill to the House floor for a vote, and I invited my Republican colleagues who claim to support the right to contraception to join me in signing it. All these months later, not a single House Republican has signed that petition.

This comes after 195 House Republicans voted against the right to obtain birth control in the last Congress, and the legislation was blocked by Republicans in the Senate.

To quote award-winning poet and fellow North Carolinian Maya Angelou: "When someone shows you who they are, believe them. . . ."

Time and time again, extremist Republicans have shown us exactly who they are. Their attacks on reproductive rights didn't stop with *Roe*. In fact, they are just getting started.

In contrast, we Democrats believe that every American has the right to decide whether, when, and with whom to have children. No politician or judge should have the power to take that right away.

Republicans purport to believe in small government. Let them start by staying out of our bedrooms and our doctors' offices.

While I may soon be departing Congress because of the outrageous gerrymandering by the Republican-controlled legislature in North Carolina, let me be clear: I will never stop fighting for women to receive the basic reproductive healthcare they need and deserve.

□ 1045

WASHINGTON'S FISCAL INSANITY

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, when I come to this floor, I often speak about how our brightest days are yet to come, about the next generation of

Americans, and about the future we should be working to build for them.

Currently, the Biden administration and Washington's embrace of fiscal insanity is a stumbling block to reaching that future. In November, America's national debt climbed to \$36 trillion.

This is not normal. Washington, D.C., has a spending addiction, and it is just expected that Americans and future generations of Americans will pay for it. Our Nation, our children, our future grandchildren, and our future great-grandchildren cannot afford for us to continue kicking the can down the road.

Last year, the U.S. Census revealed that the median household income was nearly \$80,000. Today, if everyone decided to pitch in and tackle our debt, every American household would need to contribute almost \$273,000 to bring our balance to zero.

Compare that price tag to the average mortgage in the United States, which is about \$245,000. Our national debt 4 years ago was nearly \$28 trillion. Over the course of 1,400 days, the United States accumulated a debt of \$68,352 per second.

No American family could survive that way. Yet, year after year, this is the way our Federal Government acts. This is not sustainable.

If any Member of this body had a loved one who was racking up debt at this rate, none of us would encourage them to mindlessly continue their spending habits. We would do what we could to help them evaluate their spending and get them back on the right track.

Yet, only about half of this body seems to care about how our Federal Government spends our tax dollars. Our fiscal house is in utter disaster, and we need to get serious and start finding solutions.

Since I was sworn into Congress, I have sounded the alarm on our national debt. I have opposed bloated spending packages that only focused on funding far-left wish lists. I fought to reduce and reprioritize our Federal spending. I have challenged this body to think about the blank checks we are writing and ask ourselves: Is there a way to do this more efficiently?

This petition has often been ignored while Washington sticks to business as normal and spends, spends, spends. Enough is enough. This is not fiscal responsibility. This is fiscal insanity.

On November 5, 2024, America made it clear that we no longer want business as usual in this town. It is time to get our fiscal house in order and to get our country back on track.

As America approaches its 250th birthday, President-elect Trump was spot-on in creating the Department of Government Efficiency as a perfect gift to our Nation and to the next generation of Americans.

Mr. President, hear me loud and clear: We will work with you to make our government work for the people again, to make it efficient again, and

to clean up our fiscal house. Let's work together to end the Federal Government's out-of-control spending once and for all.

This challenge is not going to be easy, but America is worth it. The future of our country is worth it. The next generation of Americans is worth it.

I know that we can do it. We are going to have to do it together, and our brightest days truly are yet to come.

UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR AFRICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of strengthening United States' relationships with Africa and the Caribbean.

The history and culture of the United States is inextricably linked to Africa and the Caribbean. The brutal history of colonialism, slavery, and the middle passage has shaped our shared destinies.

As people of African descent in the Americas and Africans on the continent, we commemorate all of our tragedies and triumphs of the last four centuries. We know that there is strength and comfort in celebrating our shared Black ancestry and identity.

These vital historic ties are an opportunity for the United States. As I travel in Africa and the Caribbean, I hear from many people, business leaders, and government leaders. They are actively seeking to partner with the United States. They specifically want to work with Americans to tackle global challenges that impact us all. Yet, Washington too often ignores or cannot hear these voices. We fail to invest the time, resources, and energy into building true partnerships.

We have entered a new era of global competition. Governments like those of China and Russia openly seek to be the partner of choice. There is a void, thanks to our neglect, that they are filling.

People in Africa and the Caribbean want to work with America as the partner of choice. If their partner of choice is not listening to them as sovereign countries, they will make decisions on their bilateral and multilateral alliances which exclude those countries which have all but ignored them.

America needs to step up our game if we want to build the true and deep partnerships that will advance our shared goals.

In these countries, respect, development assistance, trade, and investments go a long way. For example, in 2005, Hurricane Dennis devastated the Caribbean, causing billions of dollars in damage. I worked very hard to get a small amount of reconstruction assistance, which was \$40 million, for Grenada. When I visited Grenada later,

there were signs everywhere for the first time that read: Thank you, USA.

It is also important that Members of Congress get out and visit African and Caribbean countries. China shows up, believe me, every day in Africa and the Caribbean. Members of the United States Congress need to show up.

I remember once, when I visited Grenada just a couple of years ago, I stopped by the United States State Department Office there. I saw a picture on the wall of myself, the former chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Congressman Eliot Engel, and several Members of Congress from a codel when we visited Grenada in 2007.

I asked if that codel had made an impact, and I was told, in fact, that 2007 was the last time there had been a congressional delegation to Grenada. That is outrageous.

I believe that this work can and should be bipartisan. Two decades ago, I worked with George Bush to designate June as the Caribbean American Heritage Month. Today, that commemoration is still celebrated among people in the Caribbean and Caribbean Americans here in the United States. It is a useful tool for building bridges with our Caribbean neighbors.

I am proud that, during my term leading the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I have worked substantially to increase American investment and partnerships with Africa and the Caribbean.

As the chair of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I managed to increase the development assistance account by more than \$800 million. We were able to invest that increase in important priorities, like Prosper America, to grow jobs and incomes in Africa and the United States; Power Africa, which seeks to connect 60 million Africans to reliable electricity; and the United States African Development Foundation, which invests directly in African entrepreneurship and the Young African Leaders Initiative, which seeks to lift up and strengthen the brightest flowers of African youth.

In the Caribbean, I created a program to invest in inclusive economic growth for the first time and worked with the State Department to expand our Caribbean diplomatic presence. One of our embassies in Barbados is responsible for seven countries. They don't even have a plane. They can't travel to those seven countries they are responsible for, so we are expanding our presence there.

We expanded support for small-island states coping with sea-level rise and invested in the Caribbean Base and Security Initiative to tackle transnational security challenges, like crime and drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, these investments are crucial, not only to support American security and interests, but to build an

equitable and inclusive world which we seek.

I urge my colleagues to listen carefully to African and Caribbean voices. We have millions of people of African descent in our own country. We have to continue to build these bridges toward a shared just and prosperous future for all people.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS ARE NOT OPTIONAL

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

Mr. LOPEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that affects all of us deeply: the safety of our roads and the lives of those who travel on them.

Each year, preventable tragedies unfold on our highways. Families are shattered, lives are cut short, and dreams are lost. This is not because of chance, but because, somewhere along the way, safety standards were neglected, corners were cut, and human lives were undervalued.

This isn't just about statistics or regulations. It is about people: fathers, mothers, daughters, sons, friends, and neighbors. These are people who trust the system in place to protect them, such as the Federal highway safety standards, which exist for one purpose: to save lives.

These guidelines are not arbitrary. They are the result of decades of research, real-world testing, and collaboration among safety experts, engineers, and policymakers. We know what works to prevent accidents, protect construction zones, and keep our roads safe. Yet, in Colorado, time and time again, we see these safeguards disregarded, with devastating consequences.

Think about the mother driving home from her nightshift who never made it to her kids because her car was rear-ended in an improperly managed construction zone. Think about the newlyweds, full of hope and plans for the future, killed when a semi overturned due to inadequate lane shifts and insufficient traffic controls.

These are not just accidents. They are preventable failures to prioritize safety, to honor the trust of those who use our roads, and to follow the very standards designed to prevent these tragedies.

Federal highway safety standards are not optional. They are essential safeguards meant to ensure that every person who steps onto a highway has the best chance of getting to where they are going alive and uninjured. Cutting corners on these standards isn't just irresponsible, but it is unacceptable. Every poorly designed lane shift, every missing warning sign, every unfunded safety measure represents a choice to put cost or convenience above human life.

The Colorado Department of Transportation has a responsibility and a moral and professional duty to follow

these standards without compromise. This is not about bureaucracy. This is about humanity.

The failure to adhere to these safety guidelines is a failure to uphold the sacred trust we placed in them every time we step onto the highway. It is a failure to protect the workers in construction zones, who deserve to go home to their families at the end of the day. It is a failure to protect the people who rely on these roads for their livelihoods, their loved ones, and their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand idly by as construction-zone fatalities in Colorado reach record highs. We know that CDOT receives over 40 percent of its funding from Federal programs. Yet, it continues to operate with a lack of transparency and accountability.

Legislators seeking answers to basic safety questions through CORA requests have faced roadblocks. Meanwhile, Colorado's construction-zone deaths have increased year after year, making 2024 the worst year since 2020. This points to a systemic failure not just within CDOT, but within the leadership overseeing transportation in our State.

This is not just a Colorado issue. It is a regional one. Colorado is part of the Department of Transportation region 8, which includes Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. If these issues persist in Colorado, how can we be certain they are not happening across the region? Competent leadership, from the regional director to the executive level, is critical to ensure that safety is not an afterthought, but a priority.

Federal oversight must demand adherence to safety standards and hold agencies accountable for every dollar spent and every life put at risk.

Today, I call on all lawmakers, transportation leaders, and community members to demand better and demand that Federal highway safety standards be followed to the letter. There is no excuse, no delay, and no corner worth cutting when lives are at stake. Every life matters, and every injury prevented is a victory for humanity.

Together, we can ensure that our roads are places of safety, not sorrow. We owe it to every driver, every worker, and every family to make this a reality. There is no need for loss of life on our highways because we know better and because we can do better.

SNAP REPLACEMENT

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

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the millions of Americans across the Nation who depend on SNAP benefits.

In recent months, reports of SNAP benefit theft has skyrocketed at an alarming rate, leaving many families hungry. In the city of Richmond, Virginia, alone, there has been about a

2,000 percent increase in SNAP theft over the last month. Food banks are stepping up to meet the need, but they are seeing record numbers of families relying on their services as we enter the holiday season.

Too many vulnerable families rely on SNAP to put food on the table. SNAP families often face precarious financial situations. When their benefits are stolen, they face the impossible choice of feeding their families or paying essential bills.

As the children go hungry, they struggle to learn in school.

This is not just an issue in our cities, but rural communities across the country are also facing SNAP benefit theft.

Congress has empowered the States to use Federal funds to replace stolen benefits, which has helped ease this suffering, but that authority will expire on December 20 without additional action.

That is why I am calling on House appropriators to extend this crucial authority through any funding bill that we pass and urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 205, the SNAP Theft Protection Act of 2023, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Hardworking families deserve to approach the holiday season with hope, not the looming fear of food insecurity. We must act swiftly to ensure that vulnerable communities are not left behind.

□ 1100

WE ARE \$35 TRILLION IN DEBT

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

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I will take the time to talk about the biggest threat to our Nation, our ability to thrive as a nation and an economy.

It is not really being addressed, even with the Herculean efforts of the DOGE and everybody else talking about what cuts we are going to make to the budget, which is around \$7 trillion right now. We need to have a realistic conversation.

We are \$35 trillion in debt. We bring in less than \$5 trillion per year to pay those debts and to pay for the entire budget. If we didn't have a budget, if we spent nothing on the United States, if we spent nothing for the military, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, or anything in our budget, it would take us over 7 years to pay off our debt. That doesn't count the trillion dollars of interest we are paying right now per year.

Let's have a realistic conversation. This problem is bipartisan. The real divergence of the debt-to-GDP ratio started about 2004, so about 20 years ago. It happened when we had a Republican President, and it has continued regardless of who was in control of the Presidency—or the House or the Senate, for that matter.

If we talk about the future, 75 percent of the budget is nondiscretionary. Some people call it mandatory, but we are Congress. There is nothing mandatory about spending. If we don't address these issues, we are in trouble as a nation. If we are out of balance and our debt-to-GDP ratio becomes too extreme, our currency will fail, and we will no longer hold the position we have in the world as an economic powerhouse.

If you think that I am threatening Social Security, not at all. As a matter of fact, it is just the opposite. I want to secure it because, quite frankly, if we don't do something about Social Security, it will be insolvent in less than 10 years. It will take an automatic 21 percent cut without a vote.

We have no control over that, or we can, as Congress, say no we won't just print a whole bunch more money and saddle our children and grandchildren with that burden in the future and increase our debt ratio, again threatening our currency.

If you think I am here to threaten Medicare, you are greatly mistaken. If we do nothing, within about a decade, it will be cut automatically by 11 percent, or we will have to make the emergency standard to print more money and, again, saddle our future generations with debt they cannot pay, debt that will saddle our economy, saddle our ability to function as a government, debt that will disrupt everything we know in America to be good: our abilities, our opportunities, all the things that make us thrive as a nation.

As Coolidge famously said: The business of America is business. Business cannot thrive if we don't have American currency as the standard of the world.

Therefore, I want us to have those serious conversations. I want us not to have those automatic cuts. I want to make sure that we do what we can to cut as much of the deficit spending as possible.

Remember, a 30 percent deficit per year cannot be conquered just by one budget, but we have about 2 years to take this opportunity because, quite frankly, so many times I keep hearing my peers in this Congress talk about the things we need to give away. That comes at a cost, a cost to all Americans, and it doesn't matter if you are Republican or Democrat.

We have to have real reform in not just our discretionary budget, which is only 25 percent of what we discuss, but we have to have an entire budgetary process that is bipartisan so we can have a solution for all Americans going forward.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE MILDRED C. CRUMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. McIVER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. McIVER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the life of Honorable

Mildred C. Crump, a visionary leader and trailblazer from my beloved city of Newark, New Jersey, who passed away this past Sunday, December 1, 2024.

Mildred was a woman of many firsts. Her wisdom, guidance, and unwavering belief in justice helped shape my life and career and transformed the lives of so many others. As the first African-American woman elected to the Newark City Council and as the council's first woman president, Mildred broke barriers and demonstrated a steadfast commitment to equity, justice, and community empowerment.

Her dedication to improving the lives of others, whether through her pioneering work as New Jersey's first African-American braille teacher or her tireless advocacy for housing, education, and civil rights, has left an everlasting mark on our city, State, and Nation.

Council President Crump was more than a role model. She was a relentless advocate and champion for people and a brilliant community strategist. She blazed a path for so many and was always a source of unwavering support.

For those of us who had the honor of learning from her, we are grateful for her. Mildred's leadership, compassion, and vision will be profoundly missed. All Newarkers mourn the loss of this exceptional woman.

I send my deepest condolences to her children, Larry and Sheri, the rest of her family, and her loved ones.

I know Mildred's legacy and impact will live on. It lives in me and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mildred C. Crump on behalf of all the little Black and Brown girls she inspired and provided a light to shine. We will love her forever.

RECOGNIZING AUSTIN AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO TREE LIGHTING CEREMONY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight is the beloved annual tradition of the National Christmas Tree Lighting Ceremony, and I rise to recognize the Austin Area School District's contributions to this display.

The Austin Area School District in Potter County, Pennsylvania, is the smallest public school in Pennsylvania. The school serves approximately 180 prekindergarten through 12th grade students from the surrounding communities and excels in creating innovative, personalized one-on-one experiences for their students.

This year, the Austin Area School District was selected to decorate the Pennsylvania tree, which is part of the Pathway of Peace, a display of 58 smaller trees representing each State, territory, and the District of Columbia.

The National Park Foundation and the National Park Service annually present the National Christmas Tree lighting on the Ellipse at the White House and President's Park.

This celebration began in 1923 and brings together families, friends, and communities to celebrate the holidays in one of America's national parks.

With collaboration from the National Park Service, Department of Education, and National Park Foundation, local schools from each State decorate their trees with ornaments honoring their unique traditions and heritage.

When tasked with creating ornaments for the trees, students were asked: "What makes your State beautiful?" Pennsylvania is rich in history and natural beauty, and Potter County has a distinctive lifestyle.

Austin Area School District's art teacher, Mrs. Bethany Brown, and English teacher, Mrs. Megan Walck, had students create a list of what makes our region feel like home. Students considered Pennsylvania's outdoor activities like hunting, fishing, kayaking, camping, and stargazing, as well as historic events significant to Potter County.

This attraction is open December 7 through January 1, and visitors viewing the Pennsylvania tree will see that our students showcase many unique attributes of Potter County.

The ornaments highlight a variety of experiences unique to Pennsylvania, such as our number one industry, agriculture, and Potter County's rich history of potato farming. Local farms in Potter County supply potatoes nationwide. Maple syrup production thrives in our region thanks to the abundance of forests and maple trees. Each year, at the annual Maple Festival, the county celebrates the maple season with pancake breakfasts and open houses at maple producers' facilities. There are many more ornaments that showcase Pennsylvania's natural beauty.

The Pennsylvania Wilds region is a remarkable resource for those eager to explore Pennsylvania's natural wonders. Unique attractions like the Coudersport Ice Mine, which produces ice even during the summer heat, add to the area's charm and are reflected in the students' ornament designs.

Potter County serves as the source of major river systems, including the Allegheny River, which is also represented on the Pennsylvania State tree.

Visitors will see that students also incorporated our State tree, flower, and various native animals into their design. The ornaments made by the Austin Area School District students promote some of Potter County's and Pennsylvania's proudest attractions.

When reflecting on this experience, Austin Area School District student Breanna G. said: "Having the opportunity to create a design that not only symbolizes me but my school and the area around me is so special. I feel so proud to have been given this chance,

and I hope that someone will see this ornament and agree with the beauty of Pennsylvania's land. I am also thankful to my teacher, Mrs. Brown, for introducing us to this idea and letting us be as creative as we want. This is a project that I will remember for a very long time."

Participation in the arts is wonderful for a young person's development. It can inspire confidence that often extends far beyond the classroom. Teachers like Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Walck nurture creativity and play a valuable role in shaping curious minds.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Austin Area School District students, staff, and faculty for bringing Pennsylvania's Christmas spirit to our Nation's Capital and highlighting what makes Potter County such a special place to live and visit.

Mr. Speaker, as Breanna G. so nicely quoted, it is an experience we will all remember for a very long time. I am incredibly proud of our students and their contributions to this cherished national tradition.

PAC MONEY IN POLITICS

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the unholy alliance between soulless wealth and power that is stripping away Americans' freedom.

The reality is that, in 2024, 150 billionaires spent \$1.9 billion on this election. Seventy-two percent of Americans—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—are outraged with money in politics.

We did not fight the Revolution to be spectators in a game of billionaires putting ads on our television sets and mobile phones.

We have more dignity. We have more power as American citizens. Our Founders would be rolling over in their graves if they saw what has become of modern American democracy.

There was \$2.7 billion of super-PAC spending—and let me tell you something, only 1 percent of Americans gave more than \$200. Who has more than \$200 to give to politicians? The money has become more important than votes.

Surely, we could agree in this body to ban super-PACs and overturn Citizens United. Short of that, surely we could agree with what Maine overwhelmingly did to restrict contributions to super-PACs. Why should it be that a politician can receive a contribution of only up to \$3,300, but somehow super-PACs should be allowed to get millions of dollars?

We need to make sure, like in Maine, in every State that, at the very least, super-PACs are restricted so billionaires aren't buying our elections. I founded the No PAC Caucus in the United States Congress. We need to end PAC money, the lobbyist money that is corrupting the soul of our democracy.

□ 1115

We may not agree on every issue, but when you look at why politicians sold our jobs overseas, why Wall Street raided our manufacturers and hollowed out industry after industry to worship shareholder profits, then you have to look at the influence billionaires have had on our democracy.

Let's return power to our citizens. Let's ban super-PACs. Let's at least regulate billionaires from contributing to super-PACs. Let's ban Members from accepting PAC and lobbyist money. That will be worthy of our time in Congress.

HONORING MAYOR ED HONEA

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of my friend, Marana Mayor Ed Honea, who passed away unexpectedly on November 22nd.

One of southern Arizona's most influential leaders, Ed was a pillar of his community who dedicated himself to serving the residents of Marana with steadfast resolve and a genuine passion.

A third-generation resident of Marana, Ed's roots ran deep in the community he served and loved so very much. Ed graduated from Marana High School and went on to serve his country during the Vietnam war as a member of the Navy and he was a lifetime member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5990 in Marana.

For Ed, politics was never an end to itself. He was deeply driven by his desire to make tangible improvements in his community. His career in public service spanned 37 years, across 3 terms on the town council, including serving as mayor since 2005. He was very committed to improving transportation infrastructure, strengthening public safety, and promoting economic growth in Marana and across the region.

He often reminded me and, quite frankly, everyone around him that he started calling me Congressman way before I even decided to go for this job.

I am deeply proud of the strong Federal-local partnership Ed and I built to benefit our constituents. In total, we worked together to preliminarily direct over \$4 million in Federal funding in Marana.

However, it was more than just a mayor-Congressman relationship. To both of us, it was just two friends working together for our communities.

Ed's legacy of servant leadership will have a positive impact in his community long into the future.

Laura and I will continue to keep his family, friends, and loved ones in our thoughts and prayers.

As we remember Mayor Ed Honea, let us honor his memory by continuing the work he was so passionate about, building stronger communities and helping

each other succeed. I will surely miss my friend.

ONSHORING AUTO AND STEEL MANUFACTURING

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I hail from the manufacturing heart of automotive and truck USA, right at the Ohio-Michigan border. As this new year beckons, Congress must do what it can, as the old saying goes, to reconnect the U.S. head bone to its neck bone.

Specifically, as co-chair of the House Auto Caucus, this means we must reshore ownership here in the USA of the Chrysler Group and its key suppliers. What America makes and grows here in America makes and grows America.

The popular Jeep Wrangler, Ram truck, and the American steel that should go into them create two of the most popular purchased vehicles in our country and world. Just these two vehicles represent a major manufacturing sector for our heartland that was traded away by Wall Street to Europe.

As a result, thousands upon thousands of skilled workers at production platforms in Toledo, Ohio; Sterling Heights, Michigan; and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, are now being idled before the holidays.

Why is it always right before the holidays?

Meanwhile, the purveyors of vast wealth actually harm the workers that create the very wealth that benefit those billionaires. The ownership of the production was moved to Europe, and their billionaire enablers and buddies on Wall Street from the world of high finance keep trading away their livelihoods.

America's truck, automobile, steel, and auto parts manufacturing workers have had enough. They deserve respect.

Wouldn't the holiday season be happier if Congress could reassure thousands and thousands of Jeep and Ram workers a better future?

The current Jeep Stellantis CEO, Carlos Tavares, is stepping down. He lives in Europe. After his dreadful 10 years as leader of this lodestar automobile company that was created in this country, he earns a whopping \$43 million a year, not counting all his perks and stock options. He just got another million-dollar raise. After his dreadful—I can't even call it leadership—heading the company, he just got rewarded that additional million dollars. Meanwhile, workers in Toledo and Sterling Heights get pink-slipped and hit the unemployment lines. How cruel. This has to stop.

Production pauses were announced just before Thanksgiving as we head into the holiday season. That is downright un-American.

It is long overdue for America to be American again. Wall Street traders

should bring back ownership of Chrysler-Jeep-Dodge to the United States of America. It is overdue to put real car builders in charge, not Wall Street traders nor hapless CEOs from another country.

The outgoing Biden administration and the incoming Trump administration must direct attention to what is occurring right at the Ohio-Michigan border. This region is the heart of the industrial Midwest, where people make and build our real wealth, not just trade it away.

Our people don't live in virtual reality or stock options. We live in places where iron sharpens iron—some might say the agony and the ecstasy of producing America's real wealth. Yet we have seen it traded away time and again, decade after decade as oligarchs and billionaires who could care less about America get richer off the sweat of our people.

This is a wake-up call for the current and future President of the United States. Hear our call. Reshore ownership of our Chrysler-Jeep-Dodge platform, both in the automotive and trucking industry. Lift up the industrial heartland of America.

As we reshore the ownership and production of our Nation's most popular vehicles, we also ensure that those who own the means of production have to live in the same reality as those who build these cars and trucks.

Both Presidents Trump and Biden have said America should stop the sale of U.S. Steel to Japanese Nippon Steel. I agree with that. Americans who are potential buyers wait in the wings. Engage them. Include those that forge quality steel that is a critical component of both our rugged Rams and Jeeps.

American steel in American cars, doesn't that sound good?

My hope for the USA is that we reclaim ownership of what we created in the first place. Our workers know it. They have surely earned it. The future of generations across our industrial heartland and Nation depends on America restoring America again. What America makes and builds makes and builds America. Bring Jeep and Ram back to the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING UNITED INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I got into the political arena, I was in the family construction and development business. It was seldom that I ever heard of or witnessed a company that stayed in business for 20, 50, or 70 years, and especially not 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate United Infrastructure Group, a South Carolina company that has done just that. It has been a successful business

for 100 years, performing outstanding work in engineering, construction, alternative project delivery, and service.

United Infrastructure Group, or UIG, was founded in 1924 by Frederick Triplett as a partnership named Small and Triplett Construction Company. The company began construction of its first bridge in Morristown, Tennessee, then continued in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and the two Carolinas.

The company completed its first major bridge project in 1926 in Chester County, South Carolina, carrying SC-9 over the Catawba River to replace the existing ferry. For the next 20 years before his death, Frederick served as a pioneer in the bridge construction industry. His legacy continues in his two sons, Fred and Tom.

An innovator and inventor, Fred graduated from Clemson College in 1948 with a civil engineering degree and began working in his father's business. He was known for designing and building overhead gantry cranes used on bridge projects during the 1950s and the 1960s.

In 1976, he was named Employer of the Year for South Carolina for modifying a crane with hand controls to assist a disabled veteran and a former crane operator.

His other son, Tom, like his father, was respected by his contemporaries for his contributions to the construction industry and local, State, and Federal organizations, but one of his most memorable characteristics was being an avid American patriot. His legacy lives on with his son, Jim Triplett, who is an American patriot in his own right and is the current chief executive officer of the United Infrastructure Group, Inc.

Many in the industry regard Jim as a top professional in his field and one who has had a major impact on the highway industry in the Carolinas as a leader in bridge construction and design-build delivery for over 30 years. He began working for his father at age 9 in 1974. He received his bachelor of science in computer engineering from Clemson University in 1986. He practiced structural engineering with Ralph Whitehead & Associates until 1992, when he returned to work at United Contractors. In 1995, Jim acquired the majority interest of the company and later acquired several other former Triplett companies to unify the companies into a single entity.

The United Infrastructure Group prides itself on fostering growth and diversity in resources and disciplines by developing and motivating exceptional leaders in a Christian environment to achieve excellence by every standard of measure. Their commitment to not only producing excellent work but excellent people has left a lasting impact on South Carolina. The growth of their family business represents the heartbeat of the American Dream.

On behalf of the Fifth District of South Carolina, it is my most sincere

pleasure to recognize the United Infrastructure Group for 100 years of outstanding service. The United Infrastructure Group and the Triplett family have set the gold standard, a century of dedicated service and commitment for which they will long be remembered. For that, I hope you will all join me in celebrating this momentous occasion.

TEN YEARS OF SPENDING DYSFUNCTION

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

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to stand before you today as I reflect on my one decade of service representing West Virginia's Second Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Over these 10 years, I have fought relentlessly to uphold the core conservative values that brought me to this Chamber, including securing our southern border, defending the Second Amendment, pro-life, and reining in the reckless spending of our tax dollars in Washington. Today, I want to focus on that last point, our government's unsustainable spending habits.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, spending comes in two primary categories: mandatory and discretionary. Mandatory spending, which includes programs like Medicare and Social Security, occurs automatically, and it accounts for two-thirds of our Federal budget. To change these programs, Congress must act deliberately.

On the other hand, discretionary spending must be approved annually by Congress and fund the vital operations of Federal agencies like the Department of Defense.

The most fundamental responsibility of this body is to fund our government in a responsible manner and on time to 12 single-subject appropriations bills. Let me emphasize that: responsibly and on time. It is called the power of the purse, which the Constitution of the United States of America specifically gives only to this Chamber, the U.S. House of Representatives.

It is designed to protect the separation of powers so the President and the administration doesn't just do whatever they want with out-of-control regulations. In my State it was a war on coal, a war on guns, and onerous regulations that go after farmers and the construction industry. By passing the discretionary appropriations bills like we are supposed to, we can rein that in and stop it. That is our job. We should not delegate that or give that up.

As I wrap up my 10th year here in Congress, let's take a hard look at how we have handled spending over that time. When I was sworn in, in January of 2015, the national debt stood at about \$18 trillion. Today, it has doubled that and stands at \$36 trillion.

Worse still, the United States now spends more on interest for our debt than the entire annual defense budget which is \$822 billion.

Frankly, this is an astonishing failure of the responsibility of Congress on both sides of the aisle. This out-of-control and growing debt is a failure to live up to the mandate we were elected to fulfill.

Congress has chosen to abandon the basic function of passing timely spending bills. We have an entire year to prepare, negotiate, debate, and pass these 12 bills, but too often we just don't do it. In my 10 years in Congress, on this chart in red, Congress has passed 34 temporary stopgap measures known as continuing resolutions. One is coming up next week because we did not do our work. By doing that, we surrender the power of the purse.

In the entire span of my service here in Congress, just two times, in 2 years, in 2017 and 2019, Congress passed the spending bills on time. In 2017, we passed only one. In 2019, we passed five. We saw a partial government shutdown because Democrats refused to help President Trump secure the border.

Each time we fail to pass spending bills on time, we kick the can down the road and leave the American people with bloated omnibus packages that are, frankly, an insult to the responsible budgeting that our Nation deserves.

When we do pass it, the game is the Senate Democrats essentially filibuster it, causing a government shutdown and trying to blame the House Republicans for it. This is political bullying. We need to stand up to this tactic. It is just not right.

The American people gave Republicans a resounding mandate for change. We have been entrusted with unified control of government, and that means one thing: cutting wasteful spending and doing our jobs on time. It is another travesty for Members of Congress to continue to vote for reckless, unsustainable spending when it is our children and our grandchildren who will bear the burden of this debt long after we are gone.

I was actually a Hill staffer here in 1994 in the Republican Revolution. In 1995, Newt Gingrich became Speaker of the House. We passed all 12 single-subject spending bills like we were supposed to. We actually did it. It has only been in the last 20 to 25 years in this country where we failed to do that. From George Washington and the founding of America until about 20 years ago, standard process was to actually pass our spending bills.

What we are doing now is weird. It is wrong. It is not normal at all. It is because of these bullying tactics from the Senate because they get what they want. If they shut down government and try to blame us and we cave in, they get everything they want: no border security, transsexual sex change operations in the military. They get everything they want if they try to

shut down government. We must stand up to this.

To the Members of the incoming 119th Congress, which I will no longer be a part of, it is time to control spending and reclaim that power of the purse before it is too late.

PRESSING ISSUES FOR AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we know that small businesses are really the cornerstone of the American economy. Entry-level jobs and the corner mom-and-pop stores are what really make a town, a small town, or a neighborhood work well. Yet, the regulations that are being heaped upon them make it just about impossible for them to go much further to remain in business. Year after year there are more costs, more paperwork, more things that just make it more enticing to retire or go out of business.

Federal regulations play a big part in that. In my home State of California, State regulations heaped upon them play a big role, as well. So what do we get? Some of the bad ideas that come out of California are emulated here.

We had a bill called AB5, also known as the ABC worker classification rules. What happens? That starts affecting what they call gig workers or people who are contractors but they are trying to corral them into being employees mainly so they can be unionized. That isn't it at all.

Then what happens? AB5 passes in California and messes things up for a while. They have to pass another law to straighten out some part of it including things like Uber rides and Lyft and things like that. They got an exemption for them. There are a lot of other people who have not gotten that exemption.

In D.C., in Congress, after watching that mess, after having something at least partially corrected that didn't work well, they wanted to emulate that with something called the PRO Act here last Congress. They want to keep on adding more and more to that burden.

What we see, again, in my home State of California is our resources board came up with more and more emissions rules on vehicles. We are not talking about being against clean air and having more efficient vehicles. That comes from the marketplace. It comes from technology advancing, as it can, instead of State mandates saying that we will just force you to electrify all vehicles by 2035 or 2040 or 2045 or whatever round number fits the narrative that day for a date and time.

We see that CARB is just choking off so much for small businesses and for trucking. Trucking is essential to get finished products to the store shelves and so much of the inputs to a farm or to a factory, for example.

A lot of times a ship will bring things into port. A train might move it a long way or the truck might move it di-

rectly to where it is needed in manufacturing or processing and then it is brought to your store shelves.

Well, those prices just keep going up because they force more and more mandates on trucks and on locomotives. The technology doesn't even exist or certainly hasn't been perfected yet on those diesel engines. Diesel does power the country, like it or not. It will do so for a long, long time.

The mandates that they place at CARB are making it so much more expensive. At some point we might have to go a few weeks without food and other issues, other supplies being on the shelves to finally get the point across that truckers can't do it anymore in my home State.

You see what farmers go through with trying to comply with water supply issues where more and more water is being pushed toward environmental water and less toward farming and growing food in my home State.

The San Joaquin Valley has been devastated over 2 years with the water being taken away and flushed out to the delta. It supposedly helped something called the delta smelt or so-called saltwater intrusion coming up to the bay and salting the water that gets farther inland.

They don't need nearly the amount of water that is wasted and is going through the delta and out to the ocean to take care of some of those problems.

Indeed, the municipalities around the delta need to look at how much effluent they are putting into the delta, into that estuary, or into the ocean directly by not having cleaned up their act with the effluent coming out of the sewer treatment plant, sometimes just straight sewer. The regulations are needed on the city folks and not on the farmers and not taking away the water.

What I am talking about is that these small businesses like farms, like downtown, like trucking companies, like all that are being devastated by regulations. A lot of them start in my home State of California but then are emulated here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, so often it seems that one hasn't even talked to the other about how the rules would be effective, how they would actually be devastating, or how they would be implemented in a way that isn't hurtful.

Government is supposed to help the people. Government is supposed to help people whether they are the ones being protected by these so-called polluters or the ones who need to receive the products that they are making. Business is a big part of that.

If we don't allow these people to be in business, then those jobs will be exported. We will import everything from China at lower quality. We need relief from that at the Federal level, as well as the State level, from this regulatory overreach.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

Creator God, You have privileged us with the mandate to sow seeds of peace and love, justice and mercy. You, who are the source of all life, have entrusted us with the care for one another in the time we share together on this great Earth.

On these men and women in these Chambers You have laid the mantle of governance and leadership, calling on them to be wise in the sowing of wisdom, careful in the establishment of laws, discerning when making choices which will direct the future of our Nation.

As they bear the concerns of their constituents, give them both clarity and conscientiousness. May they aim for civility and not division.

May all of us who gather in this place who labor for both the welfare of our country and the common good of its citizens reap the joy of our labors and the fruit of our faithfulness as we each seek to be good stewards of Your generous bounty.

With the guidance of Your spirit to lead us this day, we offer our prayer in Your sovereign name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. PLASKETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING YOUNG ATHLETES

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

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize all the young athletes from Wisconsin's Seventh District who competed in the 2024 Wisconsin football State championships.

I congratulate the Owen-Withee Blackhawks on winning the program's first-ever State championship, the Edgar Wildcats and Coach Jerry Sinz on winning the Division 7 State championship title for the second year in a row, and the Stratford Tigers on winning the Division 5 State championship title for the third year in a row, setting a WIAA State record with their 10th State football title in school history.

I also wish Stratford's head coach, Jason Tubbs, all the best in retirement after 13 seasons with the Tigers.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all of these athletes and their coaches on an incredible season.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge International Day of Persons with Disabilities, which is observed annually on December 3.

Mr. Speaker, 1 in 4, approximately 70 million, adults in the United States report having a disability. In the Virgin Islands, my home, approximately 10,000 people report having a disability.

Despite significant progress within the disability rights movement, in December 2022, 40 percent of adults with disabilities reported experiencing unfair treatment and discrimination.

As elected officials and legislators, we have a special responsibility to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities. We must pass legislation that supports their right to affordable, accessible, and quality housing; educational opportunities; healthcare; technology services; transportation; and rights of work.

We must continuously champion policies that improve and make the world a more equitable place for all Americans.

Today and every day, I remain dedicated to creating a barrier-free world that values the diversity and uniqueness of each individual.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the importance of our Nation's correctional officers.

The correctional officers at the Bureau of Prisons facilities across my district and nationwide are the backbone of our correctional systems. These dedicated professionals work tirelessly and are critical to maintaining safety and security within our Federal correctional facilities and detention centers.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Prisons has faced unprecedented challenges in recruiting and retaining correctional staff. Multiple BOP facilities in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District are understaffed by at least 20 percent of their authorized levels.

Under current law, these essential workers may not receive pay during a government shutdown. Uncertainty over when the next paycheck will arrive should not exacerbate the staffing shortages and difficult conditions of working in a prison environment.

Yesterday, I introduced the Keep Our Correctional Officers Paid Act, which would guarantee that correctional officers who are required to show up to work every day of the year continue to receive a paycheck in the event of a government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, this crucial legislation recognizes the unwavering, dedicated work of correction officers in ensuring public safety and provides the Bureau of Prisons' staff with certainty. I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

RECOGNIZING AARON POINTER

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

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and service of Aaron Pointer, who is retiring from the Metro Parks Tacoma board after more than 20 years of service.

During his career in professional sports and public service, Aaron has broken records and barriers and expanded recreation opportunities in Pierce County.

While growing up in Oakland, California, Aaron was passionate about all sports and played basketball and baseball at the University of San Francisco.

In 1961, he signed a contract with the Houston Colt .45s, which is today known as the Astros. Aaron was often the only Black player on the team and faced prejudice and discrimination, including being forced to eat, travel, and stay in lodging separate from his White teammates.

Despite this, Aaron broke records on the field and became the last pro baseball player to hit over .400.

After retiring as a player, Aaron continued his exceptional career in sports through officiating football. He was the first Black official in the Pac-10 Conference, and in 1978, he became an NFL referee, where he officiated for 17 years.

He empowered the next generation of athletes with Pierce County Parks,

where he supervised sports leagues and athletics for young people. He has also been a longtime member of the Tacoma Pierce County Black Collective, working for more equitable education, healthcare, and economic opportunity for the Black community.

I am so proud to recognize Aaron for his impactful career at the highest levels of professional sports, and I thank him for his years of service to our community.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT'S SEVERE, REPEATED AUDIT FAILURES ARE EMBARRASSING

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Biden-Harris Education Department has once again failed America's hardworking taxpayers.

For 3 years in a row, the Education Department failed its audit. In other words, the Education Department has been unable to manage effectively, efficiently, or with any sense of accuracy the resources entrusted to it.

Accuracy, transparency, and consistency are critical when it comes to managing finances. The Education Department has taken a different approach. Its student loan data was full of errors, and it made up estimates it could not defend to its auditor.

Bungling and bad budgeting appear to be the Education Department's blueprint. I can't tell if this is due to general ineptness or deliberate wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars, but I can tell you it is an embarrassment. The American people deserve better.

THANKING REPRESENTATIVE DEBBIE LESKO

(Mrs. RODGERS of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and celebrate the leadership and commitment of my good friend, Congresswoman DEBBIE LESKO from the great State of Arizona, for her 16 years of public service in the Arizona House of Representatives, the Arizona Senate, and now the United States House of Representatives.

As chair of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I have witnessed Congresswoman DEBBIE LESKO as a fierce advocate for her district and a real ally in advocating for American technological and energy leadership. She has also served as our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee vice chair.

Her spirit and determination have made our committee and the House of Representatives as a whole a better place.

I look forward to seeing Congresswoman LESKO succeed in her new role, and I know she will bring that same

spirit and determination to the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING JUSTIN CAMP

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a member of my staff, Justin Camp, for his dedication and service to myself and the constituents of Arizona's Eighth Congressional District.

A native of California, Justin joined my staff as a legislative correspondent and worked his way up to becoming a legislative assistant. Justin is a committed team member who has the important job of communicating our work to our constituents and overseeing a legislative portfolio that includes education and social issues.

I thank Justin for his hard work and dedication to me, our team, and the constituents in Arizona.

As I leave Congress, I have no doubt Justin will go on to do great things as he continues his public service. I wish him nothing but the best in all of his future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Justin.

UNFAIR TAXES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate finally passed the Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act which includes in that my own bill to stop taxing wildfire survivors after they received damages and after everything has been burned out in Paradise, California, and several other northern California fires in recent years.

The IRS has treated disaster relief like a payday for themselves, taking from the survivors who have already lost so much. Now that ends.

This bill ensures wildfire victims will keep their settlement funds, money they need to rebuild their own lives. It also stops the unfair taxes on legal fees. Get this, Mr. Speaker, they have to pay the taxes on the fees that the attorneys would get when they cut their 30, 33 percent out of those award damages. It also restores their lost wages, taxes, and other recovery costs.

Taxpayers can claim refunds for taxes wrongly paid since 2020, putting over \$500 million back where it belongs: with the people.

This isn't just dollars and cents. It is about doing what is right for those facing disaster.

After years of work, I am really glad to see this legislation can finally clear both Houses of Congress and get these folks the relief they have needed for so long after nearly being disaster victims of wildfire.

KEEP COMMUNISM OUT OF OUR SCHOOLS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there are over 500 schools in the United States that are subverted with Chinese Communist Party propaganda. The endorsement of communism in American classrooms has led to a disgusting 28 percent of young adults who have a favorable opinion of communism, and another 19 percent believe that a dictatorship is the best political system.

American families must stand up against Communist atrocities and support democracy, which is why this week House Republicans will consider the Crucial Communism Teaching Act, introduced by the courageous Congresswoman MARIA ELVIRA SALAZAR. This bill will provide truthful curriculum to students about the failures of communism and totalitarianism.

House Republicans, led by Speaker MIKE JOHNSON, will safeguard democracy and not allow communist infiltration.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Open borders for dictators put all Americans at risk of more 9/11 attacks imminent, as warned by the FBI. Trump will reinstate existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength.

DISASTER TAX PACKAGE

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, I share Representative LAMALFA's appreciation that last night the Senate finally unanimously passed the bipartisan Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act, sending it to the President's desk.

This bill includes language that I introduced over a year ago to help Maui fire victims deduct their disaster-related losses and keep money in their pockets. This bill will also exempt wildfire disaster settlement payments from being taxed.

As Maui and other fire-impacted communities across the country focus on their recoveries, they deserve certainty that the financial relief they receive will go entirely to them and to their "family," "ohana."

For months, this bill and the financial relief it provides to our Maui "family," "ohana," have been among my top priorities in Congress. I am proud to have been part of a majority in the House in signing a discharge petition, forcing a vote on this bill, and passing it overwhelmingly back in May, where it has remained with the Senate.

I am grateful to have been part of this bipartisan effort with my friends:

Congressmen GREG STEUBE, DOUG LAMALFA, and MIKE THOMPSON. While this has been a long journey together, I am proud we have gotten this over the finish line, and I hope President Biden will sign this bill into law as soon as possible.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF KIRK SCHURING

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

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before you to shine light on the recent passing of my dear friend, mentor, and colleague, Kirk Schuring, a true giant amongst men and known around the State as the legislators' legislator.

He passed away on November 22, 2024, following a courageous battle with cancer.

Kirk Schuring was my mentor. He was the finest thing that ever came from Ohio. Being green, getting into the Ohio Senate, he mentored me as the chair of small business, and then I became chair for 4 years of government. When I was chair, he taught me how to really do policy. He also told me that every voice in Ohio must have a voice.

He was proud of doing hard work in policy and doing amendments so all Ohioans could be represented. That was his point of focus, to do policy work, the hard, heavy lifting that most people will never see.

Some of his accomplishments were he allocated \$7 million for the jumpstart of the expansion of the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio. He was instrumental in getting \$50 million from the brand-new movie of "Superman" that was filmed in Cleveland, Ohio.

He was an advocate of the Canton Urban League, the Stark County Young Republicans, the Canton Jaycees, and a lot more than that.

Kirk Schuring will be missed. He was a dear friend, and Ohio is better that he existed.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak about my mentor.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. THOMAS CORK, SR.

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

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, legacy, and service of Mr. Thomas Cork, Sr., a United States Marine Corps veteran from my hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, who recently passed away at 95 years old.

In 1948, Thomas Cork left Louisville to serve our country as a Montford Point marine, making history as part of the first group of Black men to enlist in the Marine Corps.

As part of the famous 1st Marine Division, his bravery and service directly

helped lead to the end of the Korean war. However, like many other Black veterans, when he returned home, he wasn't given the reverence he earned.

We are trying to atone for that. Today, as we honor his life and service, I want to express our gratitude on behalf of all those who didn't and should have.

Thomas Cork, Sr., is an American hero who fought two battles, in the Pacific and on the home front.

His legacy will live on for generations to come, and we thank him for his service.

RECOGNIZING KEVIN BOYLE OF BROADVIEW HEIGHTS, OHIO

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kevin Boyle of Broadview Heights, Ohio.

Kevin came to America through adoption from El Salvador after his mom met him there while she did mission work there.

Kevin was very sick and had significant disabilities. The Boyles already had another child, Courtney, who herself had disabilities and significant medical needs. With great faith, they pursued adopting Kevin from a country that adopts out less than 10 kids per year.

After 4 years of waiting, in 2013, Kevin came home to Cleveland as an 18-pound 9-year-old. Yes, he was 18 pounds at 9 years old.

With great American medical care, he very quickly became chubby, silly, and full of life.

As an upstanding citizen of northeast Ohio, Kevin exercised his right to vote for the first time in the 2024 Presidential election.

Today, I celebrate Kevin for this milestone event. This is an incredible story to be shared around the country. What a victory.

REMEMBERING OMER NEUTRA

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

Mr. MOLINARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Omer Neutra who deferred his enrollment at Binghamton University in my district to join the Israel Defense Forces. He had been missing since October 7, 2023, in the barbaric attacks committed against Israel and Israeli citizens by Hamas.

After fighting for over a year for his return, his parents received the news no parent should ever hear: Omer was killed on October 7 by Hamas terrorists.

The monsters who did this, and, yes, they are monsters, are still out there. We are not done fighting. With our support, Israel will overcome Hamas and win its war, and at home we will win our war against anti-Semitism.

We will win by shining a light on bigotry and calling out those who sympathize with terrorists, the people who, while Omer's family lived in agony, stood on college campuses hurling insults at Jewish students and leading anti-Semitic chants like "from the river to the sea."

Our hearts and prayers go out to Omer's family, his friends, and the Binghamton campus. His life and memory will forever be a blessing, and the pain he endured will be motivation to keep fighting for justice.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER JESSE BRANCH

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay my respects to Red Lake Police Officer Jesse Branch, who was killed in a car crash last week while responding to a call for service.

At just 18 years old, Jesse committed himself to a career in law enforcement, starting as a corrections officer with the Red Lake Detention Center and eventually becoming a police officer.

During his 17 years in law enforcement, Jesse earned the reputation as a man of integrity who was dedicated to the well-being and safety of his community.

Even though Jesse's life was tragically cut short, the positive impact he had on the Red Lake Nation will be remembered for generations to come.

Minnesota thanks him for his selfless service and sacrifice. My prayers are with his family, friends, colleagues, and all those who loved him.

PROVE IT ACT OF 2024

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1602, I call up the bill (H.R. 7198) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 1602, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7198

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 "Prove It Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 603(b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) where feasible, any reasonably foreseeable potential indirect costs the proposed rule may impose on small entities, including small entities that—

"(A) purchase products or services from, sell products or services to, or otherwise conduct business with entities directly regulated by the rule;

"(B) are directly regulated by other governmental entities as a result of the rule; or

"(C) are not directly regulated by the agency as a result of the rule but are otherwise subject to other agency rules as a result of the rule.";

(2) in section 605(b), by striking "The agency" and inserting "Not later than 10 days after completing the certification described in this subsection, the agency"; and

(3) by inserting after section 605 the following:

"§ 605A. Review procedures relating to initial regulatory flexibility analysis certifications

"(a) FILING A PETITION TO REVIEW AGENCY CERTIFICATION OF A PROPOSED RULE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any small entity, group of small entities, or organization representing the interests of small entities may petition the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (in this section referred to as the 'Chief Counsel') to review a certification published under section 605(b) that a proposed rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

"(2) FORM.—The Chief Counsel shall—

"(A) determine the method, timing, and form of disseminating a petition described in paragraph (1); and

"(B) display the information described in subparagraph (A) on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in a conspicuous manner.

"(3) CONTENTS.—Each petition described in paragraph (1) with respect to a certification published under section 605(b) for a proposed rule shall clearly and concisely—

"(A) specify the name of the petitioner and a telephone number, a mailing address, and an email address that the Chief Counsel may use to communicate with the petitioner;

"(B) if the petitioner is an organization, provide additional identifying information, as applicable, including the organizational or corporate status of the petitioner, the State of incorporation of the petitioner, the registered agent of the petitioner, the interest of the petitioner in representing small entities affected by the proposed rule and the certification at issue, and the name and authority of the individual who signed the petition on behalf of the organizational or corporate petitioner;

"(C) present the specific problems or issues that the petitioner believes should be addressed or considered through a review of the certification, such as—

"(i) any specific circumstances in which the determination of the certification that the proposed rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities is incorrect, incomplete, or inadequate; or

"(ii) why the proposed rule would, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities;

"(D) cite, enclose, or reference any relevant and non-protected or confidential technical, scientific, or other data or information supporting any assertion of the problems or issues with the certification;

"(E) present a proposed solution to the problems or issues raised in the petition, including potential regulatory or compliance alternatives to the proposed rule;

"(F) provide an analysis, discussion, or argument that explains how the proposed solution

described in subparagraph (E) solves the problems or issues raised in the petition; and

“(G) cite, enclose, or reference any other publicly available data or information supporting the proposed solution described in subparagraph (E).

“(b) CONSULTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any entity or organization desiring to file a petition under subsection (a) may request a consultation with the Chief Counsel before or after filing the petition.

“(2) FORM.—The Chief Counsel shall—

“(A) determine the method, timing, and form of requesting a consultation with the Chief Counsel under paragraph (1); and

“(B) display the information described in subparagraph (A) on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in a conspicuous manner.

“(3) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—In any consultation regarding a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel—

“(A) may only—

“(i) describe the process for filing, docketing, tracking, closing, amending, withdrawing, and resolving the petition; and

“(ii) assist the petitioner to clarify the petition so that the Chief Counsel is able to understand the issues of concern to the petitioner; and

“(B) may not advise a petitioner on whether the petition should be amended or withdrawn.

“(c) PRIMA FACIE REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a petition filed under this section with respect to the certification of a proposed rule, the Chief Counsel shall make an initial prima facie determination on the merit of the issues raised in petition as to the properness of the certification and whether the proposed rule in question would, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

“(2) NO FURTHER REVIEW.—If, following the prima facie review of a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the issues raised in the petition do not merit further review by the Chief Counsel, the Chief Counsel shall, not later than 10 days after receipt of the petition, inform the petitioner of that determination and the matter shall be closed.

“(3) FURTHER REVIEW.—If, following the prima facie review of a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the issues raised in the petition do merit further review by the Chief Counsel, the Chief Counsel shall, not later than 10 days after receipt of the petition, inform the petitioner and the agency that promulgated the proposed rule that the Chief Counsel shall conduct a full review of the certification and proposed rule to which the petition relates under subsection (d).

“(d) FULL REVIEW.—

“(1) CONSIDERATIONS; MEETING.—In conducting a full review under this subsection with respect to the certification made under section 605(b), the Chief Counsel shall—

“(A) consider—

“(i) whether the agency that promulgated the proposed rule correctly determined which small entities will be affected by the proposed rule;

“(ii) whether the agency considered adequate economic data to assess whether the proposed rule will have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities; and

“(iii) the economic implications of the proposed rule; and

“(B) convene a virtual or in-person meeting between the Chief Counsel, the petitioner, representatives of the agency that promulgated the proposed rule who are determined appropriate by the Chief Counsel, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to—

“(i) provide positions and support for those positions regarding the certification of the proposed rule; and

“(ii) allow the Chief Counsel to ask questions as the Chief Counsel determines necessary to make a final determination as to the validity of the certification.

“(2) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel begins a full review of a certification made with respect to a proposed rule under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall submit to the petitioner and the agency that promulgated the proposed rule, and publish in the Federal Register and on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1).

“(3) REQUIREMENT TO PERFORM ANALYSES.—If, after a full review of a certification made with respect to a proposed rule under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the proposed rule will, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the agency that promulgated the proposed rule shall perform an initial regulatory flexibility analysis and a final regulatory flexibility analysis for the proposed rule under sections 603 and 604, respectively.

“(4) PENALTY.—If an agency fails to attend the required meeting under paragraph (1)(B) or in any other way fails to assist the Chief Counsel in a full review under paragraph (1) with respect to a proposed rule of the agency, as determined by the Chief Counsel, the final rule shall not apply to small entities.

“(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—For purposes of judicial review under chapter 7 of this title, a certification made by an agency under section 605(b) for which a petition is filed under subsection (a) shall be considered final agency action as of the date on which the Chief Counsel—

“(A) makes a determination under subsection (c)(2) that the issues raised in the petition do not merit further review; or

“(B) publishes the results of a full review of the certification under paragraph (1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605 the following:

“605A. Review procedures relating to initial regulatory flexibility analysis certifications.”.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF GUIDANCE.

Section 609 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) With respect to any rule that an agency determines is likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the head of the agency shall, on regulations.gov or any similar internet website—

“(1) publish all guidance documents and other relevant documents, as determined by the agency, including any updated guidance documents that set forth interpretations of the rule; and

“(2) allow for comments on the documents described in paragraph (1) to ensure that small entities may access and provide feedback on those documents.”.

SEC. 4. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SECTION 610 PERIODIC REVIEW OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 610 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the following factors”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) any indirect costs described in the initial regulatory flexibility analysis under section 603(b)(6), and any other indirect costs that may have arisen during the 10-year period described in subsection (a).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) If an agency fails to conduct a review of a rule as required under this section within the 10-year period described in subsection (a)—

“(1) the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall notify the agency that the rule has ceased to be effective;

“(2) the agency shall publish in the Federal Register a notification that the rule has ceased to be effective, and solicit comments for why the rule should be reinstated; and

“(3) if, based on the comments received under paragraph (2), the agency determines that the rule should be reinstated—

“(A) the agency shall have 180 days beginning on the date of that determination to complete the review of the rule under this section; and

“(B) upon completion of the review under subparagraph (A), the rule shall be reinstated, notwithstanding the notice and comment rule-making procedures under section 553 of this title.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to any final rule issued by an agency—

(1) during the 5-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 118-791, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 7198.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024.

This is an important bipartisan piece of legislation that will help small businesses around the country comply with the overwhelming weight of Federal regulation.

It is no secret that small businesses around the United States face an uphill battle when complying with Federal regulations. Many regulations cause significant economic impacts on these small businesses.

□ 1230

When small businesses are forced to shoulder the burden of these regulations, it results in higher prices at the cash register. It also can keep some small businesses out of the market altogether. Rather than facing a mountain of regulation and compliance

costs, some would-be small business owners may never achieve their dream of opening a small business.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the agencies that make these damaging regulations are supposed to take small businesses into account when writing the rules. All too often, however, the agencies are out of compliance with the RFA's mandates.

One report actually found that, in 75 percent of the rulemakings, the agencies either ignored costs on small businesses, or underestimated the regulations costs. H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, would strengthen the RFA's already-existing provisions and make it so that agencies have a much harder time skirting their statutory obligations to our country's small businesses.

The Prove It Act of 2024 allows small businesses to petition the Small Business Administration to investigate a rulemaking process when a small business owner believes the agency inadequately performed its regulatory analysis as required by the RFA. It also authorizes the SBA's chief advocacy counsel to independently investigate a rulemaking agency's compliance with the RFA. Finally, it creates a penalty for rulemaking agencies that failed to comply with the RFA's requirements.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may claim that this bill is only an attempt to slow down the agency rulemaking, making it more difficult for the Federal Government to oversee the economy. This is incorrect.

There are no provisions in this bill that are designed to slow down rulemaking. In fact, the only thing that may slow down an agency's rulemaking endeavor is having to fully comply with the law as it is already written. The RFA was passed in 1980. Yet, there are still agencies which do not take the specific needs of small businesses into account when crafting regulations.

If Federal regulators followed the law as Congress intended, the legislation before us would not be necessary. Unfortunately, Federal regulators have been delinquent in their obligations to American small business owners.

H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, is a bipartisan effort to force regulators to comply with existing statutes and consider small business owners when crafting legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act, represents the latest effort by Republicans to dismantle the regulatory process, giving well-resourced special interests a powerful new cudgel to wield against regulations, while causing harm to the very small entities the bill purports to help.

This legislation would vest enormous and unreviewable authority over agency rules to the chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy within the Small Business Administration, a chronically

underfunded office that has not even had a Senate-confirmed leader since 2017.

It authorizes the chief counsel, unilaterally and without review, to exempt large parts of the business community from proposed rules if he or she determines that an agency did not properly consider how a proposed rule would affect small entities.

Not only would this broad and vaguely defined authority apply to proposed regulations, but the bill would also charge the chief counsel with tracking agencies' completion of mandatory reviews of existing rules every 10 years. If they find that an agency failed to conduct the required review of the rule, they can simply suspend operation of the rule.

I note that, while this legislation would impose significant new burdens on the SBA, it would provide no additional funding to carry out these duties, putting a further strain on the agency's ability to assist small businesses.

Our public agencies are responsible for writing rules that protect our community from harm. They make sure that the toys our children play with are safe. They make sure that the vehicles we drive and the buildings we live in are up to code. They make sure that the legislation we pass in Congress for tackling issues like climate change and public health are implemented as we intend.

The Prove It Act would grind all of this to a halt. Rules that would ban toxic chemicals or take contaminated food out of the market would hang in limbo while petitions mount before this single official to complete his or her reviews, if he or she can ever complete them at all.

This bill is not about lessening the burden on small businesses. By law, agencies already must take small businesses into account. These small entities already have power through the Office of Advocacy to champion their concerns, so the bill is entirely unnecessary if that was truly the purpose of the bill.

In reality, this bill is about giving big businesses the ability to shut down the regulatory process. Any group that merely purports to represent small businesses, no matter how large or well-resourced they may be, could petition this one official to block a pending rule they do not like. There would be no limit to how many times they do this. This is a recipe for chaos and dysfunction. That, of course, is the point.

Republicans do not want to empower the agencies that ensure the drugs we take are safe, that ensure child car seats protect the most vulnerable among us, and that enforce our competition laws to ensure that small businesses have a chance to thrive. They want to throw sand in the gears of these agencies to ensure that they never issue the regulations we depend on to keep us safe.

This bill would do little to help small businesses, but it could prove to be a

windfall for powerful companies and special interests. It is no surprise, therefore, that this legislation is right out of the Project 2025 playbook, which calls for "supercharging" the Office of Advocacy at the SBA so the entity can "dismantle extreme regulatory policies and advance limited-government reforms."

Republicans are so determined to carry out this dismantling of the regulatory process that they are even willing to violate their own House rules against legislation that will increase mandatory spending, ignoring a CBO estimate that the bill would add millions of dollars to the deficit.

We all want to ensure that small businesses can thrive, but this bill would not help them. Instead, it would create uncertainty and chaos while giving big businesses a new tool to dismantle the regulatory process that protects public health and safety and that protects consumers from rising costs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO score for this bill.

H.R. 7198, PROVE IT ACT OF 2024 AS REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON NOVEMBER 22, 2024

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2025	2025–2029	2025–2034
Direct Spending (Outlays) ..	1	5	10
Revenues	*	*	-7
Increase or Decrease (-)			
in the Deficit	1	5	17
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	6	40	not estimated

* = between -\$500,000 and zero.

Increases *net direct spending* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035? < \$2.5 billion.

Increases *on-budget deficits* in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035? < \$5 billion.

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes.

Mandate Effects:
 Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.
 Contains private-sector mandate? Yes, under threshold.

The bill would:
 Allow small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and small local governments to request that the Small Business Administration (SBA) review a certification that a proposed rule would not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of such small entities

Require the SBA to declare a rule no longer in effect if the issuing agency fails to review that rule periodically

Impose mandates on private-sector entities
 Estimated budgetary effects would mainly stem from:

Requiring some federal agencies to devote staff to meet new analysis and reporting requirements

Increasing costs for agencies that are funded through annual appropriations to carry out the bill's provisions

Increasing direct spending and decreasing revenues for several fee-funded, independent

agencies and the Federal Reserve System to carry out provisions of the bill

Bill summary: H.R. 7198 would allow small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and small local governments to request that the Small Business Administration (SBA) review federal agencies' certifications that proposed rules would not significantly affect a substantial number of small entities. The bill would require the SBA to establish a process for reviewing those requests and determining whether certifications merit further review. (Federal agencies currently evaluate proposed rules' economic effects on small entities and either certify that a rule would not significantly affect them or they prepare a detailed regulatory flexibility analysis for the rule. A regulatory flexibility analysis is an assessment of a proposed regulation on small entities.)

If further review is required, the SBA would consult the rulemaking agency, rep-

resentatives of the small entities, and the Office of Management and Budget to determine whether, in place of a certification, the rulemaking agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis. If the agency does not complete that process, the final rule would not apply to small entities.

Additionally, under the bill, if an agency fails to update its analysis of a rule's effect on small entities within 10 years of the rule taking effect, as they are required to do under current law, the rule would no longer be in effect. That provision would apply to rules for which agencies should have provided updated analysis within the 5-year period prior to the bill's enactment. Under the bill, a rulemaking agency could seek to reinstate a rule by carrying out a new rulemaking process.

Estimated Federal cost: The costs of the legislation, detailed in Table 1, fall within multiple budget functions.

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 7198 will be enacted near the end of calendar year 2024, that the estimated amounts will be appropriated in each year, and that outlays will follow historical spending patterns.

If an agency fails to comply with the bill's requirements, the SBA would determine that the existing or proposed rule is no longer in effect or would not apply to small entities. Because CBO expects that federal agencies would generally comply with the bill's requirements, we estimate that any budgetary effects stemming from that change would be insignificant.

In addition, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would increase administrative costs for most agencies because they would need additional staff to carry out the bill's provisions.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF H.R. 7198

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—											2025–2029	2025–2034
	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034			
INCREASES IN DIRECT SPENDING													
Estimated Budget Authority	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10
Estimated Outlays	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10
DECREASES IN REVENUES													
Estimated Revenues	*	*	*	*	*	-3	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	*	-7
NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT FROM CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES													
Effect on the Deficit	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	5	17
INCREASES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION													
Estimated Authorization	8	8	8	9	9	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	42	n.e.
Estimated Outlays	6	8	8	9	9	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	40	n.e.

n.e. = not estimated.
* = between -\$500,000 and zero.

Direct spending: The administrative costs of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), are classified in the budget as direct spending. Two of those agencies, the NCUA and the OCC, collect fees from financial institutions to offset their costs; those fees are treated as reductions in direct spending.

Using information about the rulemaking activities of those agencies, CBO estimates that the increased administrative workload under H.R. 7198 would increase net direct spending for those independent agencies by \$10 million over the 2025–2034 period.

Revenues: H.R. 7198 also would affect revenues by increasing operating costs for the Federal Reserve System, which remits its net earnings to the Treasury; those remittances are classified as revenues in the federal budget. Based on the costs of similar activities, CBO estimates that the increased costs under the bill would reduce revenues by \$7 million over the 2025–2034 period.

Spending subject to appropriation: CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 7198 also would increase spending for agencies that are funded by annual appropriations. CBO estimates that agencies that produce large numbers of rules affecting small entities would need more staff to meet the bill's requirements.

CBO expects that the agencies most affected by the bill include the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Labor, and Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Using information about similar activities, CBO estimates that the administrative costs for federal agencies to

implement H.R. 7198 would total \$35 million over the 2025–2029 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Under current law, the SEC is authorized to collect fees sufficient to offset its annual appropriations. Therefore, CBO estimates that the net budgetary effect of that commission's activities to implement H.R. 7198 would be less than \$500,000 over the 2025–2029 period, assuming appropriation actions consistent with the commission's authorities.

Finally, the requirement for the SBA to establish and carry out a process for small entities to request certification review would pose additional costs to that agency. Using information from the SBA, CBO estimates that those administrative costs would total \$5 million over the 2025–2029 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. The net changes in outlays and revenues that are subject to those pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in Table 1.

Increase in long-term net direct spending and deficits: CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 7198 would not increase net direct spending by more than \$2.5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 7198 would not increase on-budget deficits by more than \$5 billion in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2035.

Mandates: If federal financial regulators increase annual fees to offset the costs of implementing the bill, H.R. 7198 would increase the costs of an existing private-sector mandate on entities required to pay those fees.

CBO estimates that the incremental cost of the mandate would be small and would fall well below the annual threshold established in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) for private-sector mandates (\$200 million in 2024, adjusted annually for inflation).

The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

Previous CBO estimate: On December x, 2024, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Small Business on September 10, 2024. The two pieces of legislation are similar, and CBO's estimates of their budgetary effects are the same.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Julia Aman (for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency), David Hughes (for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau), Aurora Swanson (for the Small Business Administration and for federal agencies funded by annual appropriations); Revenues: Nathaniel Frenz; Mandates: Rachel Austin.

Estimate reviewed by: Justin Humphrey, Chief, Finance, Housing, and Education Cost Estimates Unit; Kathleen FitzGerald, Chief, Public and Private Mandates Unit; Christina Hawley Anthony, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Estimate approved by: Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FINSTAD).

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan legislation, the Prove

It Act, which gives small businesses a seat at the table during the regulatory process and shields them from the most heavyhanded, one-size-fits-all regulations.

Government red tape has made it harder and more costly for Americans to start a business. For many, this hinders their opportunity to achieve the American Dream. For too long, D.C. bureaucrats have abused their power, trampling over the small businesses, which are the backbone of our communities.

Simply put, the Prove It Act gives teeth to the already-existing law, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which is often ignored by Federal agencies in pursuit of their own political agenda.

Under RFA, agencies are required to complete an initial and final analysis of their regulations and certify that they will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Unfortunately, in many cases, agencies have failed to meet the standards set out by the RFA and, in turn, have left our small business owners with the short end of the stick.

Throughout the last 4 years, the Biden-Harris administration has improperly certified dozens of regulations as not having a significant impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

Moreover, according to the American Action Forum, since 2009, Federal regulations have cost American taxpayers and businessowners \$2.3 trillion to comply with them and have added 985 million hours of paperwork for our small businesses to shoulder. The Biden administration alone has accounted for \$1.8 trillion of these costs and over 340 million paperwork hours.

With these compliance costs and paperwork hours skyrocketing, the Prove It Act is more important now than ever. Specifically, the Prove It Act will require Federal agencies to analyze both the direct and indirect costs their regulations would have on our small entities, create a way for small businesses to petition their chief advocate in government to review agencies' work and to make them prove that they are fully compliant with already-existing laws. If agencies fail to comply with the review process, small businesses would be exempt from the regulations in question.

Moreover, the bill ensures that small businesses can easily access pre-existing guidance documents via regulations.gov. If agencies failed to perform an already-required 10-year retrospective review, the regulations would be nullified, giving teeth to this requirement that currently is in statute.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the National Federation of Independent Business; Job Creators Network; National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association; National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors; a coalition letter on Regulatory Flexibility Act reform signed by over 45 national associations; and a

May 21, 2024, letter from numerous Chambers of Commerce.

NFIB,

Washington, DC, February 1, 2024.

Hon. BRAD FINSTAD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FINSTAD: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in support of the Prove It Act. This legislation would strengthen the requirements for agencies to analyze the impact of regulations on small businesses and increase small business engagement in the regulatory process.

NFIB members annually rate "unreasonable government regulation" as one of the top concerns facing small businesses. Unfortunately, the red tape and compliance burdens of small businesses continue to grow exponentially. According to a recent analysis, the total cost of federal regulations in 2022 was \$3.079 trillion. The study found that the average U.S. company pays roughly \$13,000 per employee to comply with federal regulations.

The pace of regulation has significantly increased over the last three years. As of January 26, 2024, President Biden had imposed more than \$454 billion of final rule costs and 279 million paperwork hours. These regulatory costs are massive. However, they pale in comparison to the proposed \$616 billion of regulatory costs and 191 million paperwork hours that are under development by the administration.

Small businesses often do not have compliance officers or lawyers to help navigate these massive new regulatory burdens. And existing laws like the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) were enacted to minimize the disproportionate impact that federal regulations have on small businesses. However, as NFIB's 2023 found, agencies use loopholes in the RFA to underreport, minimize, or ignore the impact of regulations on small businesses.

This circumvention of the RFA is unacceptable and small businesses ultimately pay the regulatory price in forgone growth and opportunity. That is why legislation like the Prove It Act is so important. The Prove It Act seeks to address the loopholes in the RFA by increasing small business input in the regulatory process and strengthening the requirements for agencies to examine the impacts of regulations on small businesses.

NFIB supports the Prove It Act and urges Congress to promptly enact this legislation. Small businesses appreciate your continued leadership to reduce onerous regulatory burdens and red tape.

Sincerely,

JOSH MCLEOD,
Director, Federal Government Relations
NFIB.

—
JCN,
Addison, TX, March 20, 2024.

Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JORDAN, RANKING MEMBER NADLER, AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: In advance of the Judiciary Committee's markup tomorrow, the Job Creators Network expresses its strong support for the "Prove It Act of 2024." JCN urges the Committee to pass this bipartisan legislation that would ensure federal agencies conduct meaningful reviews of the burden proposed rules would have on small business and hold them accountable if they do not.

JCN is a nonpartisan organization founded by entrepreneurs who believe that many gov-

ernment policies are getting in the way of the economic freedom that helped make this country prosperous.

JCN provides business leaders and entrepreneurs with the tools to become the voice of free enterprise in the media, in Congress, in state capitals, in their communities, and their workplaces—allowing them to hold politicians accountable to job creators and their employees.

The "Prove it Act of 2024" would help shield small businesses from executive overreach and provide Main Street with important tools to help contend with government overregulation.

According to the U.S. Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy small businesses employ almost half—46.4 percent—of America's employees. Truly America's job creators, small businesses accounted for 62.7 percent of net new jobs from 1995 to 2021.

Despite their significant contributions to our nation's economy, small business owners get the short end of the stick when it comes to regulation—one size does not fit all.

It is well-documented that small business owners are disproportionately negatively impacted by regulation as compared to big businesses.

When it comes to regulation, it is important to remember that seventy-nine percent of small businesses have fewer than ten employees. Firms with fewer than ten employees do not employ attorneys, accountants, or human resource professionals. If they are lucky, they have someone to manage sales. As a practical matter that means that it is the small business owner who is tasked with those duties, many of which involve regulatory compliance.

Moreover, it is well-documented that small business owners spend more on regulation than larger businesses. Businesses with fewer than fifty employees pay \$14,700 per employee, as compared to \$13,890 per employee for medium-sized businesses, and \$12,200 per employee for large businesses.

Despite these realities, increasingly we see federal regulators view their legal obligation to assess small business impact of new regulations as nothing more than a "check the box" exercise. According to an investigation conducted by the House Committee on Small Business, many government agencies in Washington are "failing to properly implement" statutes intended to shield small businesses from overburdensome regulations.

For example, the Army Corps of Engineers has twice certified as not significantly impacting small businesses its proposal to redefine "waters of the United States" in a way that would require millions of landowners to get a federal permit before doing things as simple as moving mulch. Similarly, the Department of Labor had the audacity to certify its recent regulation that effectively converts most independent contractors into employees as a mandate with little impact on small business. These are just two of many examples where federal bureaucrats are not following the letter and spirit of the Regulatory Flexibility Act when it comes to protecting small businesses from one-size-fits-all regulation.

The "Prove it Act of 2024" fulfills a key pillar of the Job Creators Network's American Small Business Prosperity Plan—an eight-point policy blueprint—by reducing the regulatory burden on small businesses.

The "Prove it Act of 2024" would bolster existing law that federal agencies have been side-stepping at the expense of small businesses. It would hold agencies accountable by providing a meaningful opportunity for small businesses to challenge an agency certification that a proposed regulation would not impact a substantial number of small entities. And small businesses would be exempt

from any rule in which an agency fails to follow the law.

Small business regulatory protections are in dire need of restoration. Passage of the “Prove It Act of 2024” would be a step in the right direction. We commend the Committee for marking up this important legislation and urge its passage. It is time for our elected leaders in Washington to prioritize Main Street.

ALFREDO ORTIZ,
CEO, Job Creators Network.

NSSGA,
Alexandria, VA, February 29, 2024.

Hon. BRIAN FINSTAD,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, DC.

Hon. YADIRA CARAVEO,
U.S. Congresswoman,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NATHANIEL MORAN,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINSTAD, CONGRESSWOMAN CARAVEO, AND CONGRESSMAN MORAN: I am writing on behalf of the over 400 members of the National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (NSSGA), to express our strong support for the bipartisan Prove It Act that you recently introduced. The aggregates industry, like many others, has faced considerable challenges due to the increasing complexity and scope of federal regulations. These regulations often impose substantial direct and indirect costs on small businesses, which unlike larger entities, lack the resources to navigate these regulatory burdens effectively.

NSSGA represents the aggregates industry, including thousands of quarries, sand and gravel operations, and other related businesses nationwide. NSSGA members conduct over 9,000 operations and employ over 100,000 citizens to create 2.5 billion tons of aggregates each year. These raw materials are essential to rebuild and repair our country's aging infrastructure and assist our nation's goals in lowering the overall energy cost for families.

The Prove It Act represents a significant step forward in ensuring that small businesses, including those within the aggregates sector, are not unduly burdened by regulations that can stifle innovation, reduce job creation, and hamper economic growth. By requiring federal agencies to analyze the impact of their regulations on small entities and limit these impacts, the legislation aligns with our longstanding commitment to sensible, balanced regulatory frameworks that protect the environment and public safety without imposing unnecessary costs on businesses.

Moreover, the Act's provisions for creating mechanisms for small businesses to raise concerns and request reviews are especially important. These measures provide a vital avenue for our members to ensure that regulations are fair, transparent, and consider the unique challenges faced by small businesses. Ensuring easy access to guidance documents and direct communication channels with regulators will also greatly benefit small businesses by reducing compliance uncertainty and fostering a more cooperative regulatory environment.

We thank you for your leadership and commitment to protecting small businesses from overbearing regulations. The Prove It Act will help ensure that federal agencies fully consider the impact of their actions on small entities, promoting a healthier business environment and supporting the vital contributions of small businesses to our national economy.

We look forward to the passage of this important legislation and stand ready to sup-

port its implementation to ensure that it delivers meaningful benefits to the aggregates industry and all small businesses across the country.

Sincerely,

MICHELE STANLEY,
Executive Vice President and
Chief Advocacy Officer.

NAIFA,
Arlington, VA, February 5, 2024.

Hon. BRAD FINSTAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FINSTAD: On behalf of the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors (“NAIFA”), I write in support of the Prove It Act. This legislation would strengthen the requirements for agencies to analyze the impact of regulations on insurance producers, registered representatives of broker-dealers, and financial advisors.

Founded in 1890 as The National Association of Life Underwriters, NAIFA is the oldest, largest, and most prestigious association representing the interests of financial professionals from every Congressional district in the United States. Our mission—empowering financial professionals and consumers with world-class advocacy and education—is the reason NAIFA has consistently and resoundingly stood up for agents and called upon members to grow their knowledge while following the highest ethical standards in the industry.

NAIFA members are Main Street financial professionals. NAIFA members—comprised primarily of insurance agents, many of whom are also registered Broker-Dealer representatives—serve primarily middle-market clients, including individuals and small businesses. Nine out of ten NAIFA members report serving middle-income individuals and families and 67 percent work with small businesses. A typical client's annual household income falls below \$150,000 for 69 percent of NAIFA members. In some cases, our members are the only financial advisor across multiple counties.

NAIFA members are also small business owners. Many of our members work in small firms—sometimes firms of one—with little administrative or back-office support. Often, their business practices are dictated by the broker-dealer with whom they work, including the format and provision of client forms and disclosures. They are also subject to transaction-level oversight and review by the broker-dealer.

The Prove It Act would require federal agencies to consider reasonably foreseeable indirect future costs of their proposed federal regulations as part of their Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, where feasible. The proposed legislation also creates a process whereby small businesses and organizations representing small business can ask the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy to formally review a federal agency's certification that a proposed regulatory rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). This ensures small businesses will be able to raise concerns that a rule was improperly certified and have a third-party review and determine whether certification was proper.

The Prove It Act would also require that, for any guidance document or other relevant documents clarifying or interpreting any rule found by agencies to likely have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, agencies shall publish said documents, as determined by the agency, to Regulations.gov or similar website and allow for comments to ensure

small businesses can both easily access the resources and provide feedback or request additional clarity where needed.

The regulatory burden on insurance producers, registered representatives of broker-dealers, and financial advisors is often put in place without proper discussion or concern for the negative impact on the ability to conduct business or properly serve clients and consumers. Additionally, federal regulators often work to circumnavigate the RFA, which leads to a loss of growth and opportunity for these small businesses that represent Main Street America and make up an integral part of the community in which they work. That is why legislation like the Prove It Act is so important. The Prove It Act seeks to address the loopholes in the RFA by increasing small business input in the regulatory process and strengthening the requirements for agencies to examine the impacts of regulations on small businesses.

NAIFA offers its full support to the Prove It Act and urges Congress to promptly enact this legislation. Insurance Producers, the registered representatives of broker-dealers, and financial advisors appreciate your continued leadership to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens and to allow these vital insurance professionals to continue to serve the best interest of their clients.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL W. HEDGE, JR.,
Senior Director, Gov-
ernment Relations,
National Association
of Insurance and Fi-
nancial Advisors.

September 5, 2024.

Hon. ROGER WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ,
Ranking Member, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS AND RANKING MEMBER VELÁZQUEZ: On behalf of millions of small businesses across the country, we write to thank you for prioritizing legislation to provide regulatory relief and reduce red tape for small businesses. We urge the Committee to advance legislation to strengthen the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) and ensure the intent of the law is fulfilled.

Small businesses are concerned with the unprecedented pace of regulations coming from Washington. Over the last three and a half years, more than \$1.6 trillion in new regulatory costs and almost 300 million new paperwork hours have been imposed on the private sector. These new burdens fall disproportionately on small businesses that do not have lawyers and compliance officers to navigate complex regulatory issues.

In 1980, President Carter and Congress recognized the disproportionate impact of federal regulations on small businesses and unanimously approved the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). The RFA sought to minimize the burdens on small businesses. However, in the 40-plus years since the RFA became law, agencies have found ways to disregard or avoid many of the requirements. In 2023, NFIB analyzed the Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Advocacy's comment letters to federal agencies from January 2021 to January 2023 and found significant noncompliance with the RFA. Advocacy highlighted 28 instances where agencies failed to adequately examine the economic costs of regulations. Advocacy noted that agencies often improperly certify that rules will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. By doing so, agencies disregard the intent of the RFA, leaving small businesses subject to the one-size-fits-all regulatory environment the RFA sought to remedy.

The House Committee on Small Business recently issued a staff report examining agency compliance with the RFA. The Committee found that most agencies are failing to properly comply with the RFAs requirements and live up to the spirit of the law. These findings mirror the conclusions of NFIB's 2023 White Paper and highlight the need to close loopholes to ensure the intent of the RFA is fulfilled.

In response to these findings, the Committee has prioritized several legislative proposals to strengthen the RFA. One proposal, the bipartisan Prove It Act, would increase small business input in the regulatory process and ensure agencies are fully accounting for the impact of regulations on small businesses. Other proposals would increase the transparency and accountability of the regulatory process for small businesses.

On behalf of millions of small businesses, thank you for your attention to the disproportionate impact of regulations on small entities. We appreciate the Committee's focus on ensuring the intent of the RFA is fulfilled through legislation like H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act. We urge Congress to take swift action to reduce red tape for small businesses.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Chemical Distribution, American Bakers Association, American Bankers Association, American Chemistry Council, American Craft Spirits Association, American Exploration & Mining Association, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association, American Waterways Operators, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Can Manufacturers Institute, Energy Workforce & Technology Council, Independent Community Bankers of America, International Franchise Association, International Wood Products Association, Job Creators Network, National Asphalt Pavement Association.

National Association of Convenience Stores, National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Realtors, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Fisheries Institute, National Funeral Directors Association, National Grocers Association, National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, National Mining Association, National Pork Producers Council, National Propane Gas Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Small Business Association, National Stone Sand & Gravel Association, North American Association of Food Equipment Manufacturers, Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors—National Association, Precision Machined Products Association, PRINTING United Alliance, The Meat Institute, The Toy Association, Treated Wood Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, USA Rice.

MAY 21, 2024.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned chambers of commerce strongly support H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, and urge the House to consider this important legislation.

This bipartisan bill was introduced by Representatives Brad Finstad, Nathaniel Moran, and Yadira Caraveo and is co-sponsored by Representatives Mike Gallagher, Harriett

Hageman, Maria Salazar, David Valadao, and Carol Miller. H.R. 7198 was reported by the Judiciary Committee in March and would be a major step forward for small businesses that are harmed by excessive federal regulations.

American small business owners are job creators and innovators. While their contributions to their communities and to the American economy are enormous, they bear an unreasonably heavy burden when it comes to regulatory costs. The annual cost of complying with federal regulations has risen by \$465 billion since 2012 and now totals over \$3 trillion (12 percent of U.S. GDP). The per employee cost of \$12,800 for small businesses is 20 percent greater than the cost per employee at their larger competitors.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act—passed 44-years ago—was intended to correct the lopsided burden on small business and require that regulators tailor rules to meet government objectives while minimizing the burden on small businesses. Unfortunately, federal agencies too often exploit loopholes in the law to hide costs imposed on Main Street businesses and to ignore their feedback.

The Prove it Act of 2024 would close those loopholes and bring more transparency to the true costs of red tape on America's innovators, job creators, and community builders. The bill would also prevent agencies from ignoring small business input in their rush to finalize new federal regulations.

We urge expeditious House consideration of H.R. 7198, the Prove it Act.

Sincerely,

Alabama:

Chandler Chamber of Commerce, Coastal Alabama Business Chamber, Enterprise Chamber of Commerce, Mobile Chamber, Prattville Area Chamber of Commerce, SouthWest Mobile County Chamber of Commerce.

Alaska:

Alaska Chamber, Greater Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, The Greater Juneau Chamber of Commerce.

Arizona:

Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Buckeye Valley Chamber of Commerce, Carefree Cave Creek Chamber of Commerce, Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce, Greater Phoenix Chamber, Mesa Chamber of Commerce, Nogales Santa Cruz County Chamber of Commerce, Northwest Valley Chamber of Commerce, Peoria Chamber of Commerce, Prescott Valley Chamber of Commerce, Queen Creek Chamber of Commerce, Scottsdale Area Chamber of Commerce, Southwest Valley Chamber, Springerville-Eagar Regional Chamber of Commerce, Tucson Metro Chamber, West Valley Chamber of Commerce Alliance, Wickenburg Chamber of Commerce, Yuma County Chamber of Commerce.

Arkansas:

AR State Chamber/AIA, Holiday Island Chamber of Commerce, Little Rock Regional Chamber, Rogers-Lowell Chamber of Commerce.

California

Anaheim Chamber of Commerce, Brea Chamber of Commerce, California Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, Chatsworth Porter Ranch Chamber of Commerce, Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce, Colusa County Chamber of Commerce, Greater Bakersfield Chamber, Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce, Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce, Greater Grass Valley Chamber of Commerce, Greater Irvine Chamber of Commerce, La Mesa Chamber of Commerce, Laguna Hills Chamber of Commerce, Lodi District Chamber of Commerce, Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of Commerce, Newport

Beach Chamber of Commerce, North San Diego Business Chamber, Oceanside Chamber of Commerce, Palm Desert Area Chamber of Commerce, Palos Verdes Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, Rancho Cordova Area Chamber of Commerce, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, San Juan Capistrano Chamber of Commerce, Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce, Santee Chamber of Commerce, South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce, Tracy Chamber of Commerce, West Ventura County Business Alliance, Yorba Linda Chamber of Commerce.

Colorado:

Vail Valley Partnership.

Florida:

Coral Gables Chamber of Commerce, Daytona Regional Chamber of Commerce, Lakeland Chamber of Commerce, St. Johns County Chamber of Commerce, Visitor Information Center, The Greater Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce, Venice Area Chamber of Commerce.

Georgia:

Barrow County Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Cobb County Chamber of Commerce, Fayette County Chamber of Commerce, Habersham County Chamber of Commerce, Jackson County Area Chamber of Commerce, Murray County Chamber of Commerce, Newton Chamber of Commerce.

Hawaii:

Chamber of Commerce Hawaii, Kapolei Chamber of Commerce, Kauai Filipino Chamber of Commerce.

Idaho:

Twin Falls Area Chamber of Commerce.

Illinois:

Chamber630, Edwardsville/Glen Carbon Chamber of Commerce, GLMV Chamber of Commerce, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Oak Lawn Chamber of Commerce, Quad Cities Chamber of Commerce, RiverBend Growth Association, Sauk Valley Area Chamber of Commerce, The Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Western DuPage Chamber of Commerce.

Indiana:

Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, South Bend Regional Chamber of Commerce, Wayne County Area Chamber of Commerce.

Iowa:

Cedar Rapids Metro Economic Alliance, Dubuque Area Chamber of Commerce, Iowa Association of Business and Industry.

Kansas:

Goddard Chamber of Commerce, Greater Topeka Chamber, Parsons Chamber of Commerce.

Kentucky:

Greater Louisville, Inc., Paducah Area Chamber of Commerce.

Louisiana:

Central Louisiana Regional Chamber of Commerce, Greenwood Chamber of Commerce, St. Tammany Chamber of Commerce, West Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce.

Maine:

Boothbay Harbor Region Chamber of Commerce.

Maryland:

Maryland Chamber of Commerce, Salisbury Area Chamber of Commerce, Talbot County Chamber of Commerce, Washington County Chamber of Commerce.

Massachusetts:

Blackstone Valley Chamber of Commerce, Metro South Chamber of Commerce, Peabody Area Chamber of Commerce, United Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Michigan:

Barry County Chamber and Economic Development Alliance, Cadillac Area Chamber of Commerce, Detroit Regional Chamber, Grand Rapids Chamber, Hartland Area Chamber of Commerce, Lansing Regional

Chamber of Commerce, Michigan Chamber of Commerce, Michigan West Coast Chamber of Commerce, North Oakland Regional Chambers Association, Southwest Michigan Regional Chamber of Commerce, Three Rivers Area Chamber of Commerce.

Minnesota:

Albert Lea-Freeborn County Chamber of Commerce, Austin Area Chamber of Commerce, Brainerd Lakes Chamber of Commerce, Cannon Falls Area Chamber of Commerce, Eden Prairie Chamber of Commerce, FORWARD Worthington, Glenwood Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce, Greater Mankato Growth, Greater Stillwater Chamber of Commerce, 1-94 West Chamber of Commerce, Lonsdale Area Chamber of Commerce, Marshall Area Chamber of Commerce, Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Princeton Area Chamber of Commerce & Tourism, Rochester Area Chamber of Commerce, Shakopee Area Chamber of Commerce, SouthWest Metro Chamber of Commerce, St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce, Tracy Area Chamber, Willmar Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce, Windom Area Chamber of Commerce, Winona Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mississippi:

Hancock County Chamber of Commerce.

Montana:

Billings Chamber of Commerce, Glasgow Area Chamber of Commerce & Agriculture, Inc., Missoula Area Chamber of Commerce, Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Nebraska:

Grand Island Area Chamber of Commerce, Kearney Area Chamber of Commerce Nebraska Chamber of Commerce, North Platte Area Chamber & Development Corporation, Washington County Chamber of Commerce.

Nevada:

Carson City Chamber of Commerce, Henderson Chamber of Commerce, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce Vegas Chamber, White Pine Chamber of Commerce.

New Hampshire:

Business & Industry Association New Hampshire.

New Jersey:

New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, The African American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey.

New York:

Capital Region Chamber of Commerce, North Country Chamber of Commerce, Sullivan County Chamber of Commerce, The Business Council of NYS, Inc.

North Carolina:

Alamance Chamber of Commerce, Charlotte Regional Business Alliance, Greater Mount Airy Chamber of Commerce, Mint Hill Chamber of Commerce, Moore County Chamber of Commerce NC Chamber, The Caldwell Chamber.

North Dakota:

Greater North Dakota Chamber, The Chamber Grand Forks-East Grand Forks, Williston Area Chamber of Commerce.

Ohio:

Chillicothe Ross Chamber of Commerce, Huber Heights Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Toledo Regional Chamber of Commerce, Troy Area Chamber of Commerce, Zanesville-Muskingum County Chamber of Commerce.

Oklahoma:

State Chamber of Oklahoma, Tulsa Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Oregon:

Albany Area Chamber of Commerce, Bend Chamber of Commerce, Canby Area Chamber of Commerce, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, Lake County Chamber of Commerce, Oregon Business & Industry, Oregon State Chamber of Commerce, Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce, Salem Area Chamber of Commerce, The Dalles Area Chamber of Commerce, Washington County Chamber of Commerce.

Pennsylvania:

Alle Kiski Strong Chamber, Blair County Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Business and Industry of Centre County, Columbia Montour Chamber of Commerce, Greater Latrobe-Laurel Valley Regional Chamber of Commerce, Hanover Area Chamber of Commerce, Harrisburg Regional Chamber & CREDC, Huntingdon County Chamber of Commerce, Indian Valley Chamber of Commerce, Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry, Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce, Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, Southern Chester County Chamber of Commerce, TriCounty Area Chamber of Commerce, Venango Area Chamber of Commerce, Williamsport/Lycoming Chamber of Commerce, York County Economic Alliance.

Rhode Island:

Greater Newport Chamber of Commerce.

South Carolina:

Anderson Area Chamber of Commerce, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce, Greater Hartsville Chamber of Commerce, Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Chamber of Commerce, South Carolina Chamber of Commerce

South Dakota:

South Dakota Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Tennessee:

Lawrence County Chamber of Commerce, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Texas:

Cedar Park Chamber of Commerce, Cuero Chamber of Commerce, Agriculture & Visitors Center, Denison Area Chamber of Commerce, Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce, Greater Waco Chamber, Kaufman Chamber of Commerce, Kilgore Area Chamber of Commerce, Longview TX Chamber of Commerce, Metrocrest Chamber of Commerce, Nacogdoches County Chamber of Commerce, North Texas Commission, Rowlett Chamber of Commerce, Texas Association of Business, United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce.

Utah:

Cedar City Chamber of Commerce, ChamberWest Chamber of Commerce, Davis Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake Chamber, South Valley Chamber of Commerce, Utah Pacific IsLander Chamber.

Virginia:

Central Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, Hampton Roads Chamber, Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

Washington:

Burlington Chamber of Commerce, Covington Chamber of Commerce, Economic Alliance Snohomish County, Greater Lake Stevens Chamber of Commerce, Mercer Island Chamber of Commerce, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce.

Wisconsin:

Beaver Dam Area Chamber of Commerce, Heart of Wisconsin Chamber of Commerce, Rice Lake Area Chamber of Commerce, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce.

Wyoming:

Campbell County Chamber of Commerce, Greater Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce, Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce, Lander Chamber of Commerce, Rock Springs Chamber of Commerce, Wyoming State Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the Prove It Act gives the hardworking American small businesses a voice in the regulatory process. It is time that we strengthen and empower our small business community rather than force them to comply with unnecessary and burdensome regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CARAVEO and Representative MORAN for partnering with me on this important legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of the Prove It Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. LEE CARTER), the newest Member of the Judiciary Committee, proudly carrying on her mother's legacy.

Mrs. LEE CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, a bill that would vest the chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy within the Small Business Administration, which has been chronically underfunded—and I wish we were spending time on that instead of this bill—with enormous and unreviewable authority over agency rules.

More specifically, H.R. 7198 authorizes the chief counsel, unilaterally and without review, to exempt large parts of the business community from proposed rules if he or she determines that an agency did not properly consider how a proposed rule could affect small entities.

In doing so, this bill would empower large companies and undermine the regulatory process that keeps Americans safe by imposing a series of requirements on regulatory agencies.

As we all know, regulatory agencies play a critical role in our safety and well-being by writing rules designed to protect our food supply, environment, physical infrastructure, and more. These regulations safeguard the freedoms that all Americans enjoy.

While efforts to ease burdens on small businesses can be useful, they should not prevent regulators from doing their jobs in the public interests.

The Prove It Act, under the guise of helping all small businesses, would actually allow an unelected administrator within the SBA to circumvent congressional and agency intent with little oversight. It is simply unacceptable that we would task a single official in the SBA with unilateral and unreviewable authority to suspend new and existing protections and safeguards for large swaths of the economy, not to mention that it would also require agencies to jump through new, vaguely defined and nontransparent bureaucratic hoops, which would cause delays and uncertainty, all the while doing nothing to actually help small businesses.

In fact, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, consisting of over 200 labor, consumer, and environmental organizations, oppose this bill, including the AFL-CIO, Economic Policy Institute, and National Women's Law Center.

It is important to convey to the American people that this bill is also simply unnecessary. By law, agencies already take small businesses into account, and these small entities already

have power through the Office of Advocacy to champion their concerns.

Rules and protections are critical to ensuring the safety and soundness of virtually every facet of our lives, including clean air, clean water, safe toys that my children might use, safe cars while I drive my children to school, and safe workplaces for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject any efforts that would prevent agencies from issuing these lifesaving regulations. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation to protect small businesses from the burdens of Federal regulations.

I was proud to join Congressman FINSTAD and Congresswoman CARAVEO in introducing this bill and to vote for it in the House Judiciary Committee.

This legislation puts teeth into the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which has been discussed today. In 1980, it required Federal agencies to take into consideration the direct and indirect impacts of their regulations on small and family businesses, but it is not being enforced today.

□ 1245

Effectively, there is no recourse to those businesses under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which is why, in more than 75 percent of the cases, these new regulations actually completely ignore that Regulatory Flexibility Act or put a de minimis amount attached to the impact on small businesses.

We need teeth to that 1980 Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the Prove It Act will do just that. It will change what has not been done in the past, and it will restore power to small businesses today to push back against new regulations.

Today, small businesses pay seven times more per employee than medium-sized businesses to stay compliant with Federal regulations. They don't have the resources to keep pace with the ever-growing burdens imposed by the heavy hand of the government.

I am amazed that I am hearing from the opposition words like "delay," "burden," and "uncertainty" as it relates to the Federal Government. I am more concerned with the delays, burden, uncertainty, and inadequate resources that exist for small businesses to respond to these new regulations.

Federal agencies seem to ignore the reality and harm that these regulations cause, which only further discourages American innovation and small business growth.

The Prove It Act empowers small businesses to petition the Small Business Administration to review proposed Federal regulations and gives them the tools to challenge unnecessary regulation imposed upon them, which they do

not have today. It brings more accountability and transparency to the work of government agencies and reaffirms our commitment to stand with small business.

If we are going to stand on the side of government or small business, I choose to stand on the side of small business. Small businesses are, in fact, the backbone of our economy, and their innovation keeps the spirit of the American Dream alive.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation to support the crucial role small businesses play as drivers of economic growth and job creation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. CARAVEO).

Ms. CARAVEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act. I also thank my colleagues, Congressman FINSTAD and Congressman MORAN, for working with me to run this bipartisan legislation.

Colorado has more than 600,000 small businesses owned by men and women who work hard day in and day out to provide for their families and serve our communities. Small business owners already face innumerable hurdles in pursuit of the American Dream, and burdensome regulations only add to their challenges.

The repercussions of overregulation are long lasting, impacting our economy and communities from the moment they are implemented, particularly in the Front Range and northern Colorado.

Unfortunately, the requirement for analyzing both the direct and indirect costs imposed on small businesses has often not been satisfied by various Federal agencies. That is where our bill comes in.

This bill would allow small business owners to be heard when they feel the Federal Government is imposing expensive roadblocks on them. It will shield small businesses from undue regulatory burdens and improve communication between small entities and Federal agencies.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have made it a point to engage with local small businesses directly through a series of roundtables throughout the Front Range and northern Colorado. These discussions highlighted the most pressing issues facing these small businesses, particularly the disproportionate impact excessive regulations have on their operations.

With the already razor-thin margins under which these small businesses operate, they need more of our help to thrive. As their Representative, I believe it is my duty to give a voice in Congress to our small businesses and ensure that they have a seat at the table in the regulatory process. Their views and priorities must be taken into consideration if we hope to foster a dynamic and robust economy.

Passing the Prove It Act means we can continue to support the small businesses that are driving our economy.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Representatives FINSTAD and MORAN for their work on this bipartisan legislation and for their diligent efforts to support our small businesses, and I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act of 2024, introduced by Representative FINSTAD. In full disclosure, I am a small business owner.

The Prove It Act is an important piece of legislation that will give small business owners the ability to petition the government when an agency fails to actively account for regulations impacting their operations.

Over the past 4 years, the Biden administration has created an unbelievable amount of \$1.7 trillion in new regulations. The Committee on Small Business, which I chair, conducted a thorough investigation into how it was possible to achieve this unfortunate milestone. We discovered that many agencies are treating the Regulatory Flexibility Act, a law that is supposed to protect small businesses from the most costly regulations, like a check-the-box exercise. They do not uphold the spirit of the law, which is an important check on the administrative state.

The Prove It Act would close many of the loopholes being utilized by Federal agencies and give small businesses the ability for their choice and their voice to be heard when the system fails them.

Main Street America has been dealing with many different economic headwinds. Inflation and labor shortages alone have made it a challenge for small business to survive. Out-of-control regulations are just one more obstacle that businessowners must work to overcome.

My committee held over 13 hearings where we brought in real small business owners to discuss the impact regulations had on their operations. Every one of our witnesses said that taking time to understand and comply with the new mandates prevents them from focusing on their core operations: giving service and selling product.

These small businesses are the economic engines of the country, and we must do all we can to support their continued success. The Prove It Act takes important steps in ensuring that agencies comply with the intent of the RFA and fully consider small businesses in the rulemaking process.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7198.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, over 200 labor, consumer protection, and environmental organizations oppose H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of opposition from the Coalition

for Sensible Safeguards, Earthjustice, and Public Citizen.

COALITION FOR
SENSIBLE SAFEGUARDS,
December 4, 2024.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER JEFFRIES: The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards (CSS), an alliance of over 200 labor, scientific, research, good government, faith, community, health, environmental, and public interest groups, is writing regarding the House of Representatives' consideration of the Prove It Act of 2024, H.R. 7198 which CSS strongly opposes.

The Prove It Act would expand the authority of the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy while failing to address fundamental flaws of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. This bill would slow down the regulatory process and empower an office that has been neither appropriately focused on small business concerns nor adequately transparent in how it conducts its actions.

The ostensible purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act is to ensure that small businesses continue to play a role in the U.S. economy. In practice, though, the implementation of the Regulatory Flexibility Act has failed to achieve this basic purpose, as it has instead been wielded as a blunt weapon to weaken regulatory requirements for firms of all sizes, often at the behest of large corporations and the trade associations they dominate.

The result is that protections of public health, safety, and the environment have been sacrificed without substantially improving the competitive position of small businesses in their respective industrial sectors relative to that of larger firms. These flaws are most apparent in the Regulatory Flexibility Act's burdensome analytical requirements, which are designed to weaken regulatory safeguards rather than promote small business competitiveness. H.R. 7198 does not fix this basic problem, however. Instead, it would expand those analytical requirements and make them more onerous.

The Prove It Act would enhance the authority of the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy in harmful ways. H.R. 7198, in Section 2(a)(3), would allow for endless petitions from "Any small entity, group of small entities, or organization representing the interests of small entities" that challenge a rulemaking agency's certification that its rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. In many cases, these petitions would trigger burdensome hearings conducted by the Chief Counsel for the Office of Advocacy, after which the Chief Counsel could then force the rulemaking agency to retract the certification and instead perform the full suite of burdensome analyses mandated by the Regulatory Flexibility Act. The bill also provides for expanded judicial review opportunities against agency certifications, which would further tie up rulemakings in wasteful and time-consuming litigation.

We urge members of the House of Representatives to consider reforms that would instead place greater constraints on the Office of Advocacy to ensure that it is actually helping, rather than harming, small businesses. A scathing 2014 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found significant deficiencies in the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy's compliance with its own internal procedures

when it intervenes in regulatory actions or engages in commissioning research on regulatory costs to small businesses. Of greatest relevance, GAO found that: (1) the Office had no policies dictating when individual staff should intervene in individual rulemakings, making it susceptible to improper industry influence; and (2) the Office repeatedly cited small business input in its regulatory comments but could provide no evidence or documentation supporting this input.

Evidence has also demonstrated the extent to which the Office of Advocacy has been captured by regulated industry. The Office has often worked with large trade associations to weaken rules in ways that benefit large businesses, at the expense of small ones. These interventions have the effect of harming small businesses, contrary to the Office's statutory mission. Nevertheless, this bill would give the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy even greater authority to intervene in and block agency rules.

Additionally, the Prove It Act would further delay needed regulatory actions—causing real harm to public health and safety and the environment—without improving the quality of agency decision-making. Numerous studies have demonstrated how existing regulatory analyses, and procedural requirements contribute to extensive delays of agency rulemaking. These studies confirm that existing Regulatory Flexibility Act requirements are among the biggest contributors to these delays. By creating new analytical and procedural requirements, this bill would only worsen those delays. These additional delays are unjustifiable because they do not result in better regulatory decisions.

Finally, the bill would empower the federal judiciary to block regulations by making agency compliance with its new analytical and procedural requirements judicially reviewable. This would provide judges with an additional new tool for blocking needed public protections.

Providing the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy with more authority to block, delay, or weaken new regulatory safeguards, without enacting the significant reforms recommended by GAO and others, will leave the public even more at risk to health, safety, and economic security threats. The numerous petitions, time-consuming hearings, and expanded judicial review that this legislation would allow will thwart needed protections while failing to help small businesses with better designed regulations.

CSS urges the House of Representatives to oppose the Prove It Act and encourages the Committee to evaluate proposals that offer real and meaningful reforms to strengthen the regulatory process, such as H.R. 1507, the Stop Corporate Capture Act.

We hope to work with the House of Representatives to ensure that our regulatory process is working effectively and efficiently to protect the American public.

We strongly urge opposition to the Prove It Act of 2024, H.R. 7198.

Sincerely,

RACHEL WEINTRAUB,
Executive Director, Coalition
for Sensible Safeguards.

EARTHJUSTICE,
Washington, DC, November 26, 2024.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

HON. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of Earthjustice, I strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 7198, the Prove It

Act, which would further a dangerous deregulatory agenda to restrict federal agencies from protecting our environment, health, safety, workforce, and civil rights.

The Prove It Act is an unnecessary deregulatory legislative proposal that seeks to address a problem already addressed by existing Federal law. Proponents of the bill believe small businesses are not allowed enough opportunities to engage directly with agencies to impact the policies, ultimately limiting and hindering their ability to conduct business, create jobs, and compete with larger corporations. The narrative that the rulemaking process leaves small businesses little to no opportunity to address potential economic impacts and engage directly is inaccurate and perpetuates dangerous deregulatory propaganda.

Despite being debilitating underfunding, Agencies are charged with complying with overarching federal requirements that consider impacts on all industries, including small businesses. Agencies, when proposing new rules, are legally bound by the constraints of the authorizing statute passed by Congress, the Administrative Procedure Act, providing appropriate notice and comment opportunities to the public, listening to the public and regulated entities (including small businesses), and carefully reviewing all submitted comments. Small businesses are provided multiple avenues to engage in the rulemaking process and compliance resources through state and federal government offices, including the US Small Business Administration. Businesses can use the Office of Advocacy and the Office of the National Ombudsman within the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) to address compliance concerns, make regulatory reform recommendations, and handle enforcement issues.

H.R. 7198 is a tool to help polluting corporations limit their compliance responsibilities and unfairly shift the cost of business to the public. Like other past attempts, this bill seeks to expand the scope of authority of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, which would increase unnecessary and lengthy regulatory delays and encourage costly litigation. The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) already requires agencies to consider alternatives to proposed regulations to limit economic burdens to small entities while still achieving the desired regulatory goals. Agencies must conduct initial regulatory flexibility analysis, assessing potential impacts on small entities and consider the feedback provided by small entities during the rulemaking process. This bill would cost additional resources and time by allowing small entities to require duplicative regulatory analysis to rules they would rather not comply with.

Most concerning are the provisions of H.R. 7198, which allow any small entity or organization representing a small entity to petition the Chief Counsel of Advocacy for the Small Business Administration to direct any agency to adopt a new determination of the economic impact on small businesses. If the agency does not do so or "in any other way fails to assist the Chief Counsel," the rule will be ineffective and invalidated for all small entities.

Regulations are vital to the public and small businesses, yielding many benefits that outweigh the costs. H.R. 7198 act seeks to delay these public protections at the detriment of the environment and the public, yielding health and environmental benefits for all who live here. While regulations are associated with compliance costs and administrative burdens, they can also provide significant benefits to small businesses, including but not limited to bolstering consumer confidence in their products and services,

leveraging the playing field by setting standards all must meet, including larger competitors and preventing monopolies or unsafe work environments, access to certain kinds of federal contacts, and limiting legal liabilities related to workplace safety or product safety issues.

For all the reasons stated above, H.R. 7198 should be opposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

BRIELLE L. GREEN,
Senior Legislative Counsel,
Earthjustice.

PUBLIC CITIZEN

Washington, DC; December 4, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER JEFFRIES: On Thursday, December 5, the House of Representatives will be considering the Prove it Act of 2024, H.R. 7198. While Public Citizen opposes H.R. 7198, this letter does not focus on Public Citizen's concerns regarding that bill which are outlined in a separate letter submitted to the members of the House from the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards which Public Citizen co-chairs. Instead, this letter is intended to provide information that we believe will help assess the current Administration's compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) as compared to prior Administrations. As the government data we cite below shows, the current Administration has complied with the RFA to a far greater degree than the previous Administration. Thus, any claims that the current Administration is not complying with the RFA are not supported, and in fact contradicted, by the government data we are sharing with members of the House.

One of the most telling indications whether an Administration is in compliance with the RFA comes from the number of so-called "SBREFA" panels that an Administration has conducted as compared to previous Administrations. Under the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA), three agencies, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) are required to conduct small business review panels prior to proposing regulations that will have a "significant impact on a substantial number of small entities." The Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy (SBA Advocacy) plays a central role in identifying small businesses to serve on the panel and collect their feedback. SBREFA amended the RFA to require these panels in order to provide small businesses an opportunity to express concerns to these three agencies when one of their regulations significantly impacts small businesses. To be clear, these three agencies have put in place regulations that have been among the most beneficial in protecting the public.

Our analysis of the number of SBREFA panels that occurred from the Obama Administration through the current Administration reveals a clear pattern of robust compliance with the RFA under the Obama and Biden Administrations with the opposite being the case under the Trump Administration. According to data from SBA Advocacy's website, there were a total of 31 SBREFA panels completed under the Obama Administration. By contrast, there were a total of only 3 SBREFA panels completed under the entire Trump Administration. Under the current Administration, there

have already been 22 SBREFA panels completed. Thus, the three agencies subject to SBREFA completed a total of 53 panels during the Obama and Biden Administrations, but only 3 panels during the Trump Administration.

Such a significant disparity in the number of SBREFA panels under the current and previous two Administrations should be concerning to the Committee as it gives the strong appearance that the SBREFA panel process is hardly neutral but rather is one-sided in practice by only seeking feedback from small businesses when the three agencies subject to SBREFA promulgate new regulatory protections but not when those regulatory protections are rolled back. The Committee should ensure that when small businesses face a less stable regulatory environment and more regulatory uncertainty due to regulatory rollbacks, the SBREFA panel process is reflecting those concerns as intended.

Additionally, Public Citizen urges Congress to conduct robust oversight of SBA Advocacy due to longstanding concerns that Advocacy has ignored certain small business viewpoints, namely those that support federal regulations, while favoring other small business viewpoints, namely those that oppose federal regulations, in an unbalanced and asymmetric fashion. While claiming to be "independent," there is considerable evidence that Advocacy is in reality acting in a partisan and ideological manner by consistently scrutinizing and expressing concerns about new federal regulations that protect the public while doing the opposite when those regulations are rolled back. Certainly, the data regarding the number of SBREFA panels across recent Administrations strongly supports the need for oversight from the Committee.

We hope members of the House of Representatives will find this information helpful as it assesses claims regarding the current Administration's compliance with the RFA and considers H.R. 7198 predicated on the false belief that the current Administration is failing to comply with the RFA. Public Citizen stands ready to assist Congress in any potential oversight of agency compliance with the RFA and whether SBA Advocacy is properly carrying out its responsibilities under the RFA in a neutral and unbiased fashion.

Sincerely,

LISA GILBERT,
Co-President, Public Citizen.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN).

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the bill, not because I don't want to see a whole host of reforms as it relates to helping our small businesses but because it does not exclude the big corporations from exploiting this bill to seize more and more of our power and wealth. I think people are very frustrated with just how much wealth and power has been consolidated among a sliver of Americans and a few big corporations.

For that reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered this motion as an amendment to focus the same kind of thinking on our veterans.

As part of the VA Committee and working with our veterans and our VA back home, I have become increasingly

frustrated with the layers of bureaucracy that slow down care for our veterans or prevent care for our veterans. My amendment would provide an exemption to this bill for rules that are determined to have substantial beneficial effects on veterans and veteran programs.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 7198. I will start by thanking my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Representative BRAD FINSTAD, for his leadership with this legislation.

Small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. They are the innovators, job creators, and backbone of our communities.

In my home State of Minnesota, small businesses account for over 99 percent of all businesses and employ more than half of all of our workforce. When small businesses succeed, America succeeds.

Unfortunately, we have seen time and time again how the Biden-Harris administration has failed to prioritize these small businesses. Instead, it has burdened them with an avalanche of costly and unnecessary regulations, leaving businessowners to navigate a maze of red tape with little regard for their challenges.

These regulations have a real and negative impact on entrepreneurs, making it harder for them to succeed and grow. It is clear: Small businesses need a stronger voice in the regulatory process.

We have the tools to stop overregulation, but those tools need to be accessible, especially for the smallest of businesses. We must provide clear and accessible pathways for small businesses to hold Federal agencies accountable for the regulations they impose.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor my fellow Minnesotan's bill. This bill gives small businesses the ability to challenge agency regulations and forces agencies to be transparent about how their regulations will affect small business owners.

By holding agencies accountable and requiring transparency, we ensure that small businesses aren't left behind when new regulations are created. This is a critical step in ensuring that any regulation created in Washington is shaped with a clear understanding of the real-world impact. By supporting this legislation, we can help small businesses thrive and continue to drive our economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 7198. Let’s ensure small businesses are heard and their concerns are addressed.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 7198, the Prove It Act.

Part of the role of the Small Business Committee is to recognize the impact regulations have on small businesses and work to find ways to balance the shared goal of minimizing the burdens and achieving the intended effects of regulations.

Throughout our committee hearings, we have heard that agencies have been better about considering the impact of their rules on small entities since the passage of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Another tool at our disposal is the ability of advocacy to convene SBREFA panels to give small businesses an opportunity to provide input at the beginning of the rulemaking process and when it is most important.

The Office of Advocacy has been working diligently to educate and train rule-writing staff about their responsibilities, and we have seen the fruits of their labor. The analysis agencies are conducting has improved significantly.

Yet, this bill ignores the current process. Instead of strengthening it to serve the interests of small employers, the bill we are considering today would bring our rulemaking process to a grinding halt.

It will also give big corporations a powerful new tool to delay and weaken rules, causing uncertainty and harm to small employers.

By creating an unworkable quasi-judicial process within the SBA’s Office of Advocacy for reviewing agency certifications, it allows any group that claims to represent small businesses to petition Advocacy to block rules that it doesn’t like.

The Prove It Act also requires agencies to conduct retrospective reviews based on the indirect costs identified in the initial analysis, without recognizing that agencies may have modified the rule during the rulemaking process.

Most concerning is the broad and unchecked authority of the chief counsel to announce that a rule is no longer effective if an agency fails to conduct a retrospective review. This means a small employer that came into compliance with an existing rule could see it eliminated and then possibly reinstated sometime in the future. This is counterproductive to what my colleagues state they are trying to achieve.

□ 1300

Finally, today’s bill implements another lengthy process without pro-

viding additional assistance to an under-resourced Office of Advocacy. If enacted, Advocacy will need to double its staff and, no surprise, this bill provides no additional resources.

CBO estimates that agencies and Advocacy will need an additional \$40 million over the next 5 years to implement this act, and that doesn’t include the \$17 million added to the Federal deficit.

Small employers need certainty, and this bill fails to provide it. It would only serve to cause undue chaos and confusion while achieving very little to help and support our Nation’s small employers. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY).

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Speaker, small businesses have been hit hard in the last 4 years by rising costs, supply chain problems, and heavy regulations. These businesses, which make up a large part of America’s economy, often bear the brunt of new Federal rules and regulations implemented by the Biden administration.

The Prove It Act, H.R. 7198, is designed to help small businesses push back when Federal agencies don’t follow the rules laid out in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or the RFA.

This bill gives small businesses the power to challenge proposed regulations if an agency hasn’t fully or accurately considered how those rules would affect them. It also requires agencies to consider indirect costs when conducting a regulatory flexibility analysis, publish any follow-up guidance to the rule online, and periodically review the rule to ensure it still makes sense. If the agency does not adhere to these requirements, small entities are exempt from complying with the rule. It is about time.

While agencies are already required by the RFA to do this type of analysis, they are not required to make it public. The Prove It Act changes that, adding transparency and accountability to the process. If they are doing this analysis correctly, then there should be very little additional burden and no concern in making it public.

This legislation gives small businesses a greater say in the regulatory process and will help ensure that agencies do their due diligence when considering how harmful their regulations are to Main Street.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Prove It Act is just the latest in a long line of Republican bills meant to undermine or block agency rulemaking. If this legislation is enacted, every single rule—past, present, and future—would be funneled for review through a single official in a chronically underfunded office within the Small Business Administration. This one person would be granted unreviewable and unilateral power to block or suspend lifesaving regulations

that ensure that we have clean air to breathe, clean water to drink, and safe food to eat.

I urge Members to oppose this dangerous legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There are several points that I think need to be made in relation to this bill, but also to the obvious misunderstanding not only of what the bill does but of the rulemaking process and procedure that occurs under the Administrative Procedure Act in this country right now.

First of all, it applies to small businesses, not large businesses. By definition, it applies to small businesses. The allegation that this is going to somehow help these huge corporations is absolutely incorrect.

In addition to which, the Prove It Act does not authorize the SBA to review the substantive policy of any particular regulation. Again, any allegation that this would allow the SBA to address the substantive aspect of a regulation is again incorrect. If the agency has complied with the RFA, then the regulation will apply to small businesses as normal.

Here is something that I think is important. We often talk in the abstract about regulations and the regulatory impacts and regulatory agencies and unelected bureaucrats. Let’s just talk about a real-life situation for once. Let’s talk about what really happens when a regulation is adopted by an agency and the impact that it has on our small businesses.

Let’s use the USDA EID rule as an example. On November 5, the U.S. Department of Agriculture issued a rule mandating electronic identification ear tags on cattle and bison. It will place a substantial burden on small ranchers when it goes into effect.

The USDA, however, in assessing this rule, only completed a brief, two-page initial regulatory flexibility analysis, finding that using the Small Business Administration’s guidelines that the majority of cattle operations in the United States are considered small. In other words, the majority of our ranching operations are considered small businesses.

In 2013, when the USDA first considered imposing a rule like this, they estimated that the cost would be between \$1.2 and \$1.9 billion imposed against our small ranchers, yet in this latest analysis, they did a two-page RFA analysis. I can’t imagine that anyone on the other side of the aisle would actually believe that that is adequate considering the circumstances and the fact that so many of our ranchers will be financially broken by such a rule.

After acknowledging that the proposed rule would have a substantial impact on small businesses, the agency then conducted an insufficient analysis based upon outdated and incorrect information. This entire analysis relies on a cost estimate created by APHIS.

This estimate undervalues the cost to ranchers, and it has not even publicly disclosed how it calculated those costs.

This example of avoiding the RFA requirements resulted in the USDA ignoring the true cost of the rule and how the burden is shouldered by our small businesses.

The USDA and the ear-tag manufacturers are also wholly unprepared to alleviate the harm caused by the rule. In fact, many States have run out of the ear tags before even being able to provide them to the ranchers.

Under the Prove It Act, the USDA would be required to account for the additional, reasonably foreseeable indirect costs that are borne by ranchers because of this rule, costs that the USDA is currently ignoring.

The Prove It Act would give a voice to the ranchers and the organizations that represent them to point out the obvious flaws in APHIS's proposals, flaws which were ignored during the finalization of the rule.

I think it is also incredibly important to understand that we are passing this bill today to help small businesses understand the true cost of compliance with regulations and to force regulators to be transparent when crafting their regulations.

If this bill becomes law, regulators will have to come to terms with the enormous weight that they place on small businesses in the form of regulations. In fact, under the Biden-Harris administration, the regulatory burden in this country is approximately \$2.1 trillion a year. It is almost \$16,000 per household.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, why anyone on the other side of the aisle would not want the agencies to have to disclose the real cost of these regulations. Maybe it is because they don't want the American public to understand the costs imposed by unelected bureaucrats. In an ideal world, regulators would think twice before imposing massive costs on our small businesses that are the lifeblood of so many of our communities.

I also want to point out that the claim that this would slow down rule-making is absolutely absurd. The Prove It Act is designed to ensure that agencies are complying with existing law, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, when they are crafting their regulations. Agencies must already comply with the RFA's requirements. They are just not doing it, and this is a law that would force them to meet that requirement.

The RFA has been the law since 1980. Why are we allowing these agencies to get away with ignoring the law as written by Congress?

No agency can credibly claim that compliance with the RFA, which Congress enacted, improperly slows down the rulemaking process.

I also want to point out the comment that this would result in a bottleneck created by these large corporations filing petition after petition after peti-

tion. Again, that argument is absurd. The claim that small businesses, large businesses, or trade associations would abuse the Prove It Act's petition mechanism is just simply misguided.

The Prove It Act gives a method for the chief counsel for advocacy at the Small Business Administration to dismiss any petition that lacks merit. Following an initial review, the chief counsel can close the petition without any further action if the case does not warrant it.

To be clear, big businesses are not allowed to petition the SBA under the Prove It Act. I would like to repeat that. Big businesses are not covered by this act.

Finally, the CBO score. The CBO score for this bill is clearly wrong. The generic language that the CBO cites does not remotely support its finding that this bill will increase the deficit. CBO claims that direct spending would increase by \$10 million, and Congress would need to appropriate an extra \$35 million to Federal agencies for them to do much of the same work that they were supposed to be doing for the last 40 years.

Every Federal agency that engages in rulemaking should already have the staff and resources on board to comply with the law. The Prove It Act simply requires the already existing staff perform some additional analyses to report on the reasonably foreseeable indirect costs of their regulations. This should be relatively straightforward for the personnel already tasked with the RFA analysis.

Finally, any agency that is burdened by the Prove It Act's requirements probably did not comply with the RFA in the first place.

One of the things that I find so interesting in these debates about our efforts to force transparency and good government provisions on our agencies is often this discussion that it is going to destroy the air and water, we are going to have sick kids, the toys are going to be destroyed, and everything is going to be dangerous. That is absolutely absurd, and it is a red herring.

There is nothing wrong with requiring our agencies to be transparent and up-front about the costs that they are imposing on our businesses when they adopt regulations. I am actually surprised that anyone would oppose the Prove It Act in light of what it is intended to do.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 118-791.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Prove It Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT.

Section 612 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking "**and intervention rights**" and inserting "**, intervention rights, and training**"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall provide training on compliance with the requirements of this chapter for any agency employee who writes, reviews, approves, or analyzes regulations or guidance documents."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1602, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by reiterating that as the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I recognize the impact of regulations, and I have worked to find ways to balance the shared goal of minimizing the burdens while achieving the intended effects of regulations.

The Prove It Act doesn't strike that appropriate balance. It allows big corporations to block, delay, and weaken rules. Yes, the Chamber of Commerce or NFIB could file a petition and doesn't have to identify the business that they are representing, causing uncertainty and harm to small employers. It also gives unchecked authority to the SBA's chief counsel and tasks an understaffed and under-resourced Office of Advocacy with a cumbersome and lengthy review process.

That is why I am offering a common-sense solution. My amendment will require the Office of Advocacy to train agencies on how to comply with their Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Key personnel at every rule-writing agency would be required to undergo RFA training once every 4 years. We have heard from Advocacy that when agencies have a better understanding of the RFA, it leads to more meaningful consideration of small businesses throughout the rulemaking process. Advocacy has been working diligently to train staff, and we have seen the fruits of their labor year after year.

Their training programs have made a significant difference in the rule-writing process, and requiring ongoing training will only lead to more success. Agencies have shared draft documents with Advocacy early in the rulemaking process, and Advocacy has worked to help agencies obtain reliable small business data. Their training program has led to much better analysis, and in many instances enhanced the factual basis for agency certifications or led to modifications to reduce the impact to small firms.

Mr. Speaker, we need to foster a constructive working relationship between

Advocacy and Federal agencies rather than create an adversarial one. This amendment will ensure that Advocacy reaches all agencies on RFA compliance on a regular basis.

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

□ 1315

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

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

This amendment simply strikes the entire bill and replaces it with a training mandate. Claiming that training is all that is necessary to help agencies comply with their obligations under the RFA completely ignores the problems that the Prove It Act is going to solve.

The Small Business Administration already offers training sessions for regulators and has done so for over 20 years. According to the SBA, they held nine training sessions and trained 139 Federal officials in 2023 alone.

Further, the SBA has already trained personnel at nearly every Federal agency and department since 2003. Despite this training, however, in 2023, SBA sent 46 letters to agencies across government outlining the deficiencies in their RFA analysis. In 30 cases, the SBA found that agencies conducted inadequate analysis of small business impacts.

What this means is that during the rulemaking process for 30 rules, agencies did not comply with already existing law despite the SBA training they likely received.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there are a few more points I would like to make.

Despite SBA's best efforts to help agencies comply with their obligations under the RFA, those efforts are being ignored. Agencies have had 40 years to develop the experience and expertise necessary to comply with the Regulatory Flexibility Act and still regularly come up short.

The claim that training is the answer is simply an attempt to distract from the importance of the Prove It Act. If we adopt this amendment and training is mandated instead of adopting the Prove It Act's provisions, nothing will change. Small businesses around the country will still be harmed by regulatory agencies blatantly ignoring their obligations under the RFA and discounting the costs of regulations.

The only legitimate solution is to adopt the Prove It Act, which strengthens the RFA and creates mechanisms to force regulatory agencies to comply with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RULLI). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

SWANSON AND HUGH BUTLER RESERVOIRS LAND CONVEYANCES ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8413) to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land at Swanson Reservoir and Hugh Butler Reservoir in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8413

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 "Swanson and Hugh Butler Reservoirs Land Conveyances Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The term "fair market value", with respect to a specified property right, means the most probable price, as of a specified date, in cash, terms equivalent to cash, or other precisely revealed terms, for which the specified property right should sell after reasonable exposure in a competitive market under all conditions requisite for a fair sale, with the buyer and seller each acting prudently, knowledgeably, and in the self-interest of the buyer or seller, as applicable, and assuming that the buyer and seller are not under undue duress.

(2) FRONTIER COUNTY.—The term "Frontier County" means Frontier County, Nebraska, acting through the Board of Commissioners of Frontier County.

(3) HITCHCOCK COUNTY.—The term "Hitchcock County" means Hitchcock County, Nebraska, acting through the Board of Commissioners of Hitchcock County.

(4) HUGH BUTLER RESERVOIR.—The term "Hugh Butler Reservoir" means the Hugh Butler Lake and Red Willow Dam constructed as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri

Basin Program, Frenchman-Cambridge Division, as authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1944") (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665).

(5) LAKEVIEW LODGE MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Lakeview Lodge Management Agreement" means the management agreement entitled "Management Agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, et al., for the Development, Operation, and Maintenance of a Concession Operation at Swanson Reservoir, Nebraska", numbered 23-LM-60-4160, and dated November 1, 2023.

(6) LAKEVIEW LODGE PERMITTED CONCESSION LAND.—The term "Lakeview Lodge Permitted Concession Land" means the approximately 21.5 acres of land and water for the operation of a public concession at Swanson Reservoir, as generally depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Lakeview Lodge Concession Boundary" and dated August 2023.

(7) RED WILLOW MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Red Willow Management Agreement" means the management agreement entitled "Management Agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, et al., for the Development, Management, Operation, and Maintenance of a Concession Operation at Hugh Butler Reservoir, Nebraska", numbered 24-LM-60-5155, and dated March 7, 2024.

(8) RED WILLOW PERMITTED CABIN LAND.—The term "Red Willow Permitted Cabin Land" means the approximately 6.5 acres of land encompassing the 8 permitted cabin lots at the Hugh Butler Reservoir, as generally depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Red Willow Cabin Map" and dated March 2024.

(9) RED WILLOW PERMITTED CONCESSION LAND.—The term "Red Willow Permitted Concession Land" means the approximately 23 acres of land and water for the operation of a public service concession at the Hugh Butler Reservoir, as generally depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Red Willow Concession Boundary" and dated August 2023.

(10) REQUESTED FEDERAL LAND.—The term "requested Federal land" means each of the following parcels of land, or any subset of those parcels, with respect to which a title transfer agreement is executed:

(A) The Lakeview Lodge Permitted Concession Land.

(B) The Red Willow Permitted Cabin Land.

(C) The Red Willow Permitted Concession Land.

(D) The Swanson Permitted Cabin Land.

(E) The Swanson Permitted Concession Land.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(12) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Nebraska.

(13) SWANSON MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Swanson Management Agreement" means the management agreement entitled "Management Agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation, et al., for the Development, Management, Operation, and Maintenance of a Concession Operation at Swanson Reservoir, Nebraska", numbered 24-LM-60-5154, and dated April 19, 2024.

(14) SWANSON PERMITTED CABIN LAND.—The term "Swanson Permitted Cabin Land" means the approximately 6.2 acres of land encompassing the 11 permitted cabin lots at the Swanson Reservoir, as generally depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Swanson Cabin Map" and dated March 2024.

(15) SWANSON PERMITTED CONCESSION LAND.—The term "Swanson Permitted Concession Land" means the approximately 20 acres of land and water for the operation of

a public service concession at the Swanson Reservoir, as generally depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation entitled "Swanson Concession Boundary" and dated August 2023.

(16) **SWANSON RESERVOIR.**—The term "Swanson Reservoir" means the Swanson Reservoir and Trenton Dam constructed as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Frenchman-Cambridge Division, as authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1944") (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665).

(17) **TITLE TRANSFER AGREEMENT.**—The term "title transfer agreement" means a title transfer agreement entered into under section 3(a)(1) between the Secretary and Frontier County or Hitchcock County, as applicable, that establishes the legal, institutional, and financial terms for the conveyance of the applicable requested Federal land.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCES OF FEDERAL LAND TO HITCHCOCK COUNTY AND FRONTIER COUNTY, NEBRASKA.

(a) **CONVEYANCES TO HITCHCOCK COUNTY AND FRONTIER COUNTY.**—

(1) **TITLE TRANSFER AGREEMENT.**—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (5) and sections 4 and 5, not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall make good faith efforts to enter into negotiations for, and enter into, title transfer agreements with each of Hitchcock County and Frontier County—

(A) under which the Secretary shall convey to Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, all requested right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the applicable requested Federal land;

(B) that provides that, as a condition of the conveyance, the applicable requested Federal land—

- (i) shall be conveyed in whole; and
- (ii) shall not be subdivided; and
- (C) that provides a plan for—
 - (i) a demonstration of—

(I) the technical capability of Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, to operate and maintain the applicable requested Federal land permanently; and

(II) the ability of Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, to satisfy financial obligations relating to the applicable requested Federal land; and

(ii) the management by Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, of the applicable requested Federal land to be conveyed in accordance with the applicable title transfer agreement, including addressing any issues to ensure compliance with applicable State fire, safety, and health codes and standards not later than 2 years after the date of the applicable conveyance.

(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Notwithstanding section 8002(3)(B) of the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (43 U.S.C. 2902(3)(B)), the Secretary shall negotiate the title transfer agreement under paragraph (1) in accordance with the criteria, terms, and conditions described in subtitle A of title VIII of that Act (43 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.).

(3) **OFFER TO CONVEY.**—As soon as practicable after the date on which a title transfer agreement is entered into pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall offer to convey to Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the applicable requested Federal land, in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the applicable title transfer agreement.

(4) **COSTS.**—

(A) **CONSIDERATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—As consideration for the conveyance of the applicable requested Fed-

eral land under paragraph (3), Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, shall pay to the Secretary, for use in accordance with clause (iii), an amount equal to the fair market value of the applicable requested Federal land, as determined by an appraisal conducted—

(I) in accordance with clause (ii);

(II) by a third-party appraiser approved by the Secretary; and

(III) subject to the management requirements under paragraph (5) and section 4.

(ii) **APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—An appraisal under clause (i) shall be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(II) **IMPROVEMENTS.**—For purposes of clause (i), any improvements to the applicable requested Federal land made by a permit holder shall not be included in the appraised value of the applicable requested Federal land.

(III) **RESOLUTION OF DISPUTE.**—Any dispute over the fair market value of the applicable requested Federal land under an appraisal conducted under clause (i) shall be resolved in accordance with section 2201.4 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(IV) **CONSIDERATION OF REVENUES.**—An appraisal under clause (i) shall take into consideration any future income stream that the United States would have derived from the applicable requested Federal land at the time of the conveyance, including revenues to the United States—

(aa) from existing water service and repayment contracts;

(bb) from known or reasonably foreseeable new contracts or renewals;

(cc) as aid to irrigation; and

(dd) from any other authorized source.

(iii) **USE.**—Amounts paid under clause (i) shall be available to the Secretary, subject to further appropriation, for activities relating to the operation of the Hugh Butler Reservoir and Swanson Reservoir.

(B) **CONVEYANCE COSTS.**—As a condition of a conveyance under paragraph (3), Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, shall be responsible for paying, in advance of the conveyance of the applicable requested Federal land, all survey and other administrative costs, as determined to be necessary by the Secretary, for the preparation and completion of transfer of title to, the applicable requested Federal land.

(5) **MANAGEMENT.**—Hitchcock County and Frontier County shall each manage the applicable requested Federal land conveyed to Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, under paragraph (3)—

(A) for substantially the same purposes for which the applicable requested Federal land is being used as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) for—

(i) recreation and public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the "Recreation and Public Purposes Act") (44 Stat. 741, chapter 578; 43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.);

(ii) public access;

(iii) fish and wildlife habitat; or

(iv) the preservation of the natural character of the applicable requested Federal land.

(b) **SUBSEQUENT CONVEYANCE OF REQUESTED FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), on completion of a conveyance to Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, of the applicable requested Federal land under subsection (a), Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, may not subsequently reconvey the applicable requested Federal land.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, may subsequently convey the applicable requested Federal land if—

(A) the applicable requested Federal land is reconveyed, at no cost, to an entity located in the State that is recognized by the State as a publicly owned or governmental organization, including—

- (i) a State agency;
- (ii) a county, city, village, or township in, or political subdivision of, the State;
- (iii) a natural resource district; and
- (iv) an irrigation or reclamation district;

(B) Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, has demonstrated an impending adverse impact if the applicable requested Federal land is not reconveyed;

(C) the entity to which the applicable requested Federal land would be reconveyed has the capacity to continue to manage the applicable requested Federal land for the same purposes for which the applicable requested Federal land has been managed as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(D) the applicable requested Federal land to be reconveyed would continue to be available for public access.

(3) **FUTURE CONVEYANCES.**—A subsequent conveyance of requested Federal land shall be subject to the requirements of this subsection and subsection (a)(5).

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON RESERVATIONS, EASEMENTS, AND OTHER RIGHTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A conveyance under section 3(a) shall be subject to—

- (1) valid existing rights;
- (2) operational requirements of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1944") (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665), including Swanson Reservoir and Hugh Butler Reservoir;

(3) any flowage easement reserved by the United States to allow full operation of the Swanson Reservoir and Hugh Butler Reservoir, as applicable, for authorized purposes;

(4) any applicable reservations described in the Lakeview Lodge Management Agreement, Red Willow Management Agreement, or Swanson Management Agreement, as applicable;

(5) oil, gas, and other mineral rights reserved of record, as of the date of enactment of this Act, by, or in favor of, the United States or a third party;

(6) any permit, license, lease, right-of-use, flowage easement, or right-of-way of record in, on, over, or across the applicable requested Federal land, whether owned by the United States or a third party, as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(7) as applicable, a deed restriction that prohibits building any new permanent structure on the applicable requested Federal land below an elevation of—

- (A) 2,785 feet at Swanson Reservoir; or
- (B) 2,628 feet at Hugh Butler Reservoir; and

(8) the granting of applicable easements for—

- (A) vehicular access to the applicable requested Federal land; and
- (B) access to, and use of, all docks, boat-houses, ramps, retaining walls, and other improvements for which access is provided in a permit for the use of the applicable requested Federal land as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **LIABILITY; TAKING.**—

(1) **LIABILITY.**—The United States shall not be liable for flood damage to a property, Hitchcock County, or Frontier County, or for damages arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to a permit holder, Hitchcock County, or Frontier County, other

than for damages caused by an act or omission of the United States or an employee, agent, or contractor of the United States before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **HOLD HARMLESS.**—Hitchcock County, Frontier County, and any entity to which requested Federal land is subsequently conveyed pursuant to section 3(b)(2) shall agree to indemnify and hold harmless the United States for all claims by Hitchcock County, Frontier County, or others arising from—

(A) the design, construction, operation, maintenance, or replacement of Red Willow Dam, Hugh Butler Reservoir, Trenton Dam, or Swanson Reservoir;

(B) the survey of claims, description of claims, delineation of boundaries, conveyance documents, conveyance process, and recording of deeds associated with a conveyance under this Act; or

(C) any damages associated with a structure or land that may be displaced in a flood event.

(3) **NO ADDITIONAL LIABILITY.**—Nothing in this Act increases the liability of the United States beyond the liability provided under chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the “Federal Tort Claims Act”).

(4) **TAKING.**—Any temporary flooding or flood damage to a property, Hitchcock County, or Frontier County, shall not be considered to be a taking by the United States.

SEC. 5. INTERIM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date that is the later of the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act or the date of conveyance of the applicable requested Federal land under section 3(a), the provisions of the Lakeview Lodge Management Agreement, Red Willow Management Agreement, and Swanson Management Agreement, as applicable, and any applicable permits, shall remain in force and effect.

(b) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO ENTER INTO TITLE TRANSFER AGREEMENT.**—If, by the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, Hitchcock County or Frontier County, as applicable, have not entered into a title transfer agreement with the Secretary under section 3(a)(1), the Secretary shall manage any of the Lakeview Lodge Permitted Concession Land, the Red Willow Permitted Cabin Land, the Red Willow Permitted Concession Land, the Swanson Permitted Cabin Land, and the Swanson Permitted Concession Land, as applicable, that is not subject to a title transfer agreement in accordance with applicable law.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 8413, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative SMITH’s legislation, which would initiate a transfer of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation to the Counties of Frontier and Hitchcock in southern Nebraska.

This legislation was introduced at the counties’ request with the hopes of gaining local control after disagreements arose between local stakeholders and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The disagreement stemmed from the Bureau of Reclamation’s decision to require the removal of mobile homes surrounding the reservoirs, an action that would significantly impact the local economy.

The cost of this transfer has not yet been determined. However, an appraisal will be conducted, and the counties will be responsible for providing fair market value compensation for these lands.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Swanson and Hugh Butler Reservoirs Land Conveyances Act. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into good faith negotiations with Hitchcock County and Frontier County in southern Nebraska to establish a title transfer agreement for certain lands within the Swanson Reservoir and Red Willow Reservoir lands.

The Swanson Reservoir and Hugh Butler Reservoir serve as home to several communities and popular recreation sites. Transferring ownership of these lands from the Bureau of Reclamation to the counties will allow the counties to manage and develop the land for recreational use and conservation in alignment with the communities’ needs.

It is worth noting that there are some health and safety concerns at the concession areas that need to be met to increase public safety and access to recreation facilities.

For that reason, the bill would require that prior to any conveyance, the local entities must demonstrate their ability to effectively operate, maintain, and enhance the lands for the same purposes for which they are currently being used and to establish a concrete plan to address health and safety concerns. This legislation will help improve the management of these sites for the surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the bill sponsor.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the House Committee on Natural Resources. I appreciate this opportunity, and I appreciate their support of H.R. 8413.

The Swanson and Hugh Butler Reservoirs Land Conveyances Act would begin the process of transferring ownership of roughly 77 acres of land from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Counties of Hitchcock and Frontier together. Importantly, this land does not include any water or power assets.

I am proud to represent Nebraska’s Third District, which is home to both reservoirs impacted by this legislation. Over the last few years, working closely with impacted stakeholders, as well as Senator DEB FISCHER, it is clear how important this transfer is to the local communities.

The current management of the land supports local marinas, housing communities, and areas for local economic activity. However, should the Bureau of Reclamation maintain ownership, impending changes to land use policy would force the removal of these businesses and communities from the land.

When the Bureau of Reclamation announced the planned management changes, it spawned extensive collaboration between the local communities, businesses, and housing owners. This collaboration generated outstanding support for a land transfer that would allow for increased local control of the recreational areas.

Further, this would provide long-term certainty for the businesses that depend on revenue brought in by tourism, the locals who enjoy recreational activities at the reservoirs, and some 180 housing owners from three States. These owners and their families have spent generations creating these homes away from home.

Tourism cultivated by current land use arrangements is vital for the local economies. Both counties are highly rural, with Frontier County covering over 700 square miles with just 2,600 residents. There are three restaurants in the entire county, one of which is a marina included in this transfer.

The 110 leaseholders at Swanson Reservoir bring in approximately 500 people multiple times throughout the year who support other local businesses in the area as well.

To put this into perspective, small businesses throughout Frontier and Hitchcock Counties estimate they would lose nearly \$1.5 million in revenue if these leases are terminated. Additionally, the marinas facilitate community activities and drive economic development, which would not occur if not for the patronage generated from the broader communities.

When the public and the Federal Government disagree on how land intended for public access should be used, the reasonable solution is to empower local control, which best suits the local community and visitors, especially considering all the discussion here this afternoon.

Additionally, the transfer comes at no cost to the Federal Government, as the legislation ensures taxpayers are reimbursed at fair market value and public access is maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for their work to move this bill forward and certainly Senator FISCHER for her partnership in the Senate, and I urge passage of H.R. 8413.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8413 provides a solution to a dispute between Frontier and Hitchcock Counties and the Bureau of Reclamation. These reservoirs, among other benefits, provide valuable recreational access to over 57,000 acres available for public hunting and fishing.

I thank Representative SMITH and all of Nebraska's congressional delegation members for their leadership on this issue. I encourage all Members to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8413, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1645

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIMENEZ) at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

- S. 709;
- H.R. 9598; and
- H.R. 9600,

Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 7198 by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York,

The motion to recommit H.R. 7198, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 7198, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes or 2-minute votes.

FEDERAL AGENCY PERFORMANCE ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 709) to improve performance and accountability in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 6, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—389

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams | Clyde | Gottheimer |
| Aderholt | Cohen | Graves (LA) |
| Aguilar | Cole | Green (TN) |
| Alford | Collins | Green, Al (TX) |
| Allen | Comer | Griffith |
| Allred | Connolly | Grothman |
| Amo | Correa | Guest |
| Amodei | Costa | Guthrie |
| Armstrong | Courtney | Hageman |
| Arrington | Craig | Harder (CA) |
| Auchincloss | Crawford | Harris |
| Babin | Crow | Harshbarger |
| Bacon | Cuellar | Hayes |
| Baird | Curtis | Hern |
| Balderson | D'Esposito | Higgins (LA) |
| Balint | Daids (KS) | Hill |
| Banks | Davidson | Himes |
| Barragán | Davis (IL) | Hinson |
| Bean (FL) | Davis (NC) | Horsford |
| Beatty | De La Cruz | Houchin |
| Bentz | Dean (PA) | Houlahan |
| Bera | DeGette | Hoyer |
| Bergman | DeLauro | Hoyle (OR) |
| Beyer | DelBene | Hudson |
| Bice | Deluzio | Huffman |
| Bilirakis | DeSaulnier | Huizenga |
| Bishop (GA) | DesJarlais | Hunt |
| Bishop (NC) | Diaz-Balart | Issa |
| Blunt Rochester | Dingell | Ivey |
| Bonamici | Doggett | Jackson (IL) |
| Bost | Donalds | Jackson (NC) |
| Boyle (PA) | Duarte | Jackson (TX) |
| Brecheen | Dunn (FL) | Jacobs |
| Brown | Edwards | James |
| Brownley | Ellzey | Jayapal |
| Buchanan | Emmer | Jeffries |
| Bucshon | Escobar | Johnson (GA) |
| Budzinski | Eshoo | Johnson (SD) |
| Burchett | Españillat | Jordan |
| Burgess | Estes | Joyce (OH) |
| Burlison | Ezell | Joyce (PA) |
| Bush | Fallon | Kamlager-Dove |
| Calvert | Feenstra | Kaptur |
| Cammack | Ferguson | Kean (NJ) |
| Caraveo | Finstad | Keating |
| Carbajal | Fischbach | Kelly (IL) |
| Cárdenas | Fitzgerald | Kelly (MS) |
| Carey | Fitzpatrick | Kelly (PA) |
| Carl | Fleischmann | Kennedy |
| Carson | Flood | Khanna |
| Carter (GA) | Fong | Kiggans (VA) |
| Carter (LA) | Foster | Kildee |
| Carter (TX) | Foushee | Kiley |
| Cartwright | Fox | Kilmer |
| Casar | Frankel, Lois | Kim (CA) |
| Case | Franklin, Scott | Kim (NJ) |
| Casten | Frost | Krishnamoorthi |
| Castor (FL) | Fry | Kuster |
| Castro (TX) | Fulcher | Kustoff |
| Chavez-DeRemer | Garamendi | LaHood |
| Cheerfilus | Garcia (IL) | LaLota |
| McCormick | Garcia (TX) | LaMalfa |
| Chu | Garcia, Robert | Lamborn |
| Ciscomani | Gimenez | Landsman |
| Clark (MA) | Golden (ME) | Langworthy |
| Clarke (NY) | Goldman (NY) | Larsen (WA) |
| Cleaver | Gonzales, Tony | Larson (CT) |
| Cline | Gonzalez, V. | Latta |
| Cloud | Gooden (TX) | LaTurner |
| Clyburn | Gosar | Lawler |

- | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Lee (CA) | Norcross | Spanberger |
| Lee (FL) | Norman | Spartz |
| Lee (NV) | Numm (IA) | Stanton |
| Lee (PA) | Obernoite | Stauber |
| Lee Carter | Ocasio-Cortez | Steel |
| Leger Fernandez | Ogles | Stefanik |
| Lesko | Owens | Steil |
| Letlow | Pallone | Steube |
| Levin | Palmer | Stevens |
| Lofgren | Panetta | Strickland |
| Lopez | Pappas | Strong |
| Loudermilk | Peltola | Suozzi |
| Lucas | Pence | Sykes |
| Luttrell | Perry | Takano |
| Lynch | Peters | Tenney |
| Mace | Pettersen | Thanedar |
| Magaziner | Pfuger | Thompson (CA) |
| Malliotakis | Phillips | Thompson (MS) |
| Maloy | Pingree | Thompson (PA) |
| Mann | Pocan | Tiffany |
| Manning | Posey | Timmons |
| Mast | Pressley | Tlaib |
| Matsui | Quigley | Tokuda |
| McBath | Ramirez | Tonko |
| McCaul | Raskin | Torres (CA) |
| McClain | Reschenthaler | Torres (NY) |
| McClellan | Rogers (AL) | Trahan |
| McClintock | Ross | Trone |
| McCollum | Rouzer | Turner |
| McCormick | Ruiz | Underwood |
| McGarvey | Rulli | Valadao |
| McGovern | Ruppersberger | Van Drew |
| McIver | Rutherford | Van Dyne |
| Meeks | Ryan | Van Orden |
| Menendez | Salinas | Vargas |
| Meng | Sánchez | Vasquez |
| Meuser | Sarbanes | Veasey |
| Mfume | Scalise | Velázquez |
| Miller (IL) | Scanlon | Wagner |
| Miller (OH) | Schakowsky | Walberg |
| Miller (WV) | Schiff | Wasserman |
| Miller-Meeks | Schneider | Schultz |
| Mills | Scholten | Waters |
| Molinaro | Schrier | Watson Coleman |
| Moolenaar | Schweikert | Weber (TX) |
| Mooney | Scott (VA) | Webster (FL) |
| Moore (AL) | Scott, Austin | Wenstrup |
| Moore (UT) | Scott, David | Westerman |
| Moore (WI) | Self | Wied |
| Moran | Sessions | Wild |
| Morelle | Sewell | Williams (GA) |
| Moskowitz | Sherman | Williams (NY) |
| Moulton | Simpson | Williams (TX) |
| Mrvan | Slotkin | Wilson (FL) |
| Murphy | Smith (MO) | Wilson (SC) |
| Nadler | Smith (NE) | Wittman |
| Neal | Smith (NJ) | Womack |
| Neguse | Smith (WA) | Yakym |
| Nehls | Smucker | Zinke |
| Newhouse | Sorensen | |
| Nickel | Soto | |

NAYS—6

- | | | |
|-------|-------------|-----------|
| Biggs | Good (VA) | Rosendale |
| Crane | Greene (GA) | Roy |

NOT VOTING—37

- | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Barr | Granger | Porter |
| Blumenauer | Graves (MO) | Rodgers (WA) |
| Boebert | Grijalva | Rogers (KY) |
| Bowman | Lieu | Rose |
| Crenshaw | Luetkemeyer | Salazar |
| Crockett | Luna | Sherrill |
| Duncan | Massie | Stansbury |
| Evans | McHenry | Swalwell |
| Fletcher | Mullin | Titus |
| Gallego | Napolitano | Waltz |
| Garbarino | Omar | Wexton |
| Garcia, Mike | Pelosi | |
| Gomez | Perez | |

□ 1713

Ms. ESCOBAR, Messrs. TIMMONS, and SMUCKER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 484.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9598) to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act to reauthorize such Office, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—399

Adams	Ciscomani	Fulcher
Aderholt	Clark (MA)	Garamendi
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Garbarino
Alford	Cleaver	Malliotakis
Allen	Cline	Garcia (TX)
Allred	Cloud	Garcia, Robert
Amo	Clyburn	Gimenez
Amodei	Clyde	Golden (ME)
Armstrong	Cohen	Goldman (NY)
Arrington	Cole	Gonzales, Tony
Auchincloss	Collins	Gonzalez, V.
Babin	Comer	Good (VA)
Bacon	Connolly	Gooden (TX)
Baird	Correa	Gosar
Balderson	Costa	Gotthaimer
Balint	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Banks	Craig	Green (TN)
Barr	Crane	Green, Al (TX)
Barragan	Crawford	Greene (GA)
Bean (FL)	Crow	Griffith
Beatty	Cuellar	Grothman
Bentz	Curtis	Guest
Bera	D'Esposito	Guthrie
Bergman	Dauids (KS)	Hageman
Beyer	Davidson	Harder (CA)
Bice	Davis (IL)	Harris
Biggs	Davis (NC)	Harshbarger
Bilirakis	De La Cruz	Hayes
Bishop (GA)	Dean (PA)	Hern
Bishop (NC)	DeGette	Higgins (LA)
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Hill
Boebert	DelBene	Himes
Bonamici	Deluzio	Hinson
Bost	DeSaulnier	Horsford
Boyle (PA)	DesJarlais	Houchin
Brecheen	Diaz-Balart	Houlahan
Brown	Dingell	Hoyer
Brownley	Doggett	Hoyle (OR)
Buchanan	Donalds	Hudson
Bucshon	Duarte	Huffman
Budzinski	Dunn (FL)	Huizenga
Burchett	Edwards	Hunt
Burgess	Ellzey	Issa
Burlison	Emmer	Ivey
Bush	Escobar	Jackson (IL)
Calvert	Eshoo	Jackson (NC)
Cammack	Espallat	Jackson (TX)
Caraveo	Estes	Jacobs
Carbajal	Ezell	James
Cardenas	Fallon	Jayapal
Carey	Feenstra	Jeffries
Carl	Ferguson	Johnson (GA)
Carson	Finstad	Johnson (SD)
Carter (GA)	Fischbach	Jordan
Carter (LA)	Fitzgerald	Joyce (OH)
Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (PA)
Cartwright	Fleischmann	Kamlager-Dove
Casar	Flood	Kaptur
Case	Fong	Kean (NJ)
Casten	Foster	Keating
Castor (FL)	Foushee	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Chavez-DeRemer	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (PA)
Cherfilus-	Franklin, Scott	Kennedy
McCormick	Frost	Khanna
Chu	Fry	Kiggans (VA)

Kildee	Morelle	Simpson
Kiley	Moskowitz	Slotkin
Kilmer	Moulton	Smith (MO)
Kim (CA)	Mrvan	Smith (NE)
Kim (NJ)	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Kuster	Neal	Sorensen
Kustoff	Neguse	Soto
LaHood	Nehls	Spanberger
LaLota	Newhouse	Spartz
LaMalfa	Nickel	Stanton
Lamborn	Norcross	Staubert
Landsman	Norman	Steel
Langworthy	Nunn (IA)	Stefanik
Larsen (WA)	Obermolete	Steil
Larson (CT)	Ocasio-Cortez	Steube
Latta	Omar	Stevens
LaTurner	Owens	Strickland
Lawler	Pallone	Strong
Lee (CA)	Palmer	Suozzi
Lee (FL)	Panetta	Sykes
Lee (NV)	Pappas	Takano
Lee (PA)	Pelosi	Tenney
Lee Carter	Peltola	Thanedar
Leger Fernandez	Pence	Thompson (CA)
Lesko	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Letlow	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Levin	Petterson	Tiffany
Lofgren	Pfluger	Timmons
Lopez	Phillips	Titus
Loudermilk	Pingree	Tlaib
Lucas	Pocan	Tokuda
Luttrell	Posey	Tonko
Lynch	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Mace	Magaziner	Torres (NY)
Magaziner	Ramirez	Trahan
Malliotakis	Raskin	Trone
Maloy	Reschenthaler	Turner
Mann	Rogers (AL)	Underwood
Manning	Rosendale	Valadao
Mast	Ross	Van Drew
Matsui	Rouzer	Van Duyne
McBath	Roy	Van Orden
McCaul	Ruiz	Vargas
McClain	Rulli	Vasquez
McClellan	Rutherford	Veasey
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Velazquez
McCormick	Rutherford	Walberg
McGarvey	Ryan	Wasserman
McGovern	Salazar	Schultz
McIver	Salinas	Waters
Meeks	Sanchez	Watson Coleman
Menendez	Sarbanes	Weber (TX)
Meng	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Meuser	Scanlon	Wenstrup
Mfume	Schakowsky	Westerman
Miller (IL)	Schiff	Wied
Miller (OH)	Schneider	Wild
Miller (WV)	Scholten	Williams (GA)
Miller-Meeks	Schrier	Williams (NY)
Mills	Schweikert	Williams (TX)
Molinaro	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Mooney	Scott, David	Wittman
Moore (AL)	Self	Womack
Moore (UT)	Sessions	Womack
Moore (WI)	Sewell	Yakym
Moran	Sherman	Zinke

NAYS—1

McClintock

NOT VOTING—32

Blumenauer	Graves (MO)	Rodgers (WA)
Bowman	Grijalva	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Lieu	Rose
Crockett	Luetkemeyer	Sherrill
Duncan	Luna	Smucker
Evans	Massie	Stansbury
Fletcher	McHenry	Swalwell
Gallego	Mullin	Wagner
Garcia, Mike	Napolitano	Waltz
Gomez	Perez	Wexton
Granger	Porter	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1718

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIMMY AND ROSALYNN CARTER POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9600) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 119 Main Street in Plains, Georgia, as the “Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter Post Office”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 15, answered “present” 2, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—381

Adams	Cloud	Golden (ME)
Aderholt	Clyburn	Goldman (NY)
Aguilar	Clyde	Gonzales, Tony
Alford	Cohen	Gonzalez, V.
Allen	Cole	Gooden (TX)
Allred	Collins	Gotthaimer
Amo	Comer	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Connolly	Green (TN)
Armstrong	Correa	Green, Al (TX)
Arrington	Costa	Greene (GA)
Auchincloss	Courtney	Griffith
Babin	Craig	Grothman
Bacon	Crawford	Guest
Baird	Crow	Guthrie
Balderson	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Balint	Curtis	Hayes
Banks	D'Esposito	Hern
Barr	Dauids (KS)	Higgins (LA)
Barragan	Davidson	Hill
Beatty	Davis (IL)	Himes
Bentz	Davis (NC)	Hinson
Bera	De La Cruz	Horsford
Bergman	Bergman	Houchin
Beyer	DeGette	Houlahan
Bice	DeLauro	Hoyer
Bilirakis	DelBene	Hoyle (OR)
Bishop (GA)	Deluzio	Hudson
Bishop (NC)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Blunt Rochester	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Bonamici	Diaz-Balart	Hunt
Bost	Dingell	Issa
Boyle (PA)	Doggett	Ivey
Brown	Donalds	Jackson (IL)
Brownley	Duarte	Jackson (NC)
Buchanan	Dunn (FL)	Jackson (TX)
Bucshon	Edwards	Jacobs
Budzinski	Ellzey	James
Burchett	Emmer	Jayapal
Burgess	Escobar	Jeffries
Burlison	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Bush	Espallat	Johnson (SD)
Calvert	Estes	Jordan
Cammack	Ezell	Joyce (OH)
Caraveo	Fallon	Joyce (PA)
Carbajal	Feenstra	Kamlager-Dove
Cardenas	Ferguson	Kaptur
Carey	Finstad	Kean (NJ)
Carl	Fischbach	Keating
Carson	Fitzgerald	Kelly (IL)
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Carter (LA)	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Flood	Kennedy
Cartwright	Fong	Khanna
Casar	Foster	Kiggans (VA)
Case	Foushee	Kildee
Casten	Fox	Kiley
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Franklin, Scott	Kim (CA)
Chavez-DeRemer	Frost	Kim (NJ)
Cherfilus-	McCormick	Krishnamoorthi
McCormick	Fry	Kuster
Chu	Garamendi	Kustoff
	Garbarino	Kustoff
	Garcia (IL)	LaHood
	Garcia (TX)	LaLota
	Garcia, Robert	LaMalfa
	Gimenez	Lamborn

Landsman
Langworthy
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Lee Carter
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin
Lofgren
Lopez
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McClain
McClellan
McClintock
McCollum
McCormick
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moran
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy
Nadler

NAYS—15

Bean (FL)
Biggs
Boebert
Brecheen
Burlison

Crane
Fulcher
Good (VA)
Gosar
Hageman

Harris
Harshbarger
Miller (IL)
Ogles
Wilson (SC)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rosendale Roy

NOT VOTING—34

Blumenauer
Bowman
Crenshaw
Crockett
Duncan
Evans
Fletcher
Gallego
Garcia, Mike
Gomez
Granger
Graves (MO)

Grijalva
Lieu
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Massie
McHenry
Mullin
Napolitano
Perez
Porter
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)

Rose
Sherrill
Spartz
Steube
Swalwell
Titus
Wagner
Waltz
Wexton
Wied

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1722

Ms. BOEBERT changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 486.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 484 and YEA on Roll Call No. 486.

PROVE IT ACT OF 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on amendment No. 1 to the bill, H.R. 7198, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require greater transparency for Federal regulatory decisions that impact small businesses, and for other purposes, printed in part B of House Report 118-791, offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 199, nays 204, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—199

Adams
Aguilar
Ailred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)

Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia, Robert
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gonzalez, V.
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kahlrager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Lee Carter
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Strong
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Tenneny
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wied
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—204

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Caraveo
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crawford
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duarte
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy

Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kean (NJ)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langworthy
Latta
LaTurner
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lesko
Letlow
Lopez
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Mace
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)

Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Molinaro
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Vargas
Walberg
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—29

Blumenauer
Bowman
Burgess
Crenshaw

Crockett
Duncan
Evans
Fletcher

Gallego
Garcia, Mike
Gomez
Granger

Graves (MO)	McHenry	Rose
Grijalva	Mullin	Sherrill
Lieu	Perez	Swalwell
Luettkemeyer	Porter	Waltz
Luna	Rodgers (WA)	Wexton
Massie	Rogers (KY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1727

Mr. GRIFFITH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 487, I mistakenly voted YEA when I intended to vote NAY.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Landsman of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7198 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LANDSMAN is as follows:

Mr. Landsman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7198 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all that follows after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Prove It Act of 2024".

SEC. 2. INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 603(b)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) except with respect to a proposed rule that the head of such agency has determined will have a substantial beneficial effect on veterans' programs, where feasible, any reasonably foreseeable potential indirect costs the proposed rule may impose on small entities, including small entities that—

"(A) purchase products or services from, sell products or services to, or otherwise conduct business with entities directly regulated by the rule;

"(B) are directly regulated by other governmental entities as a result of the rule; or

"(C) are not directly regulated by the agency as a result of the rule but are otherwise subject to other agency rules as a result of the rule.";

(2) in section 605(b), 605(b), by adding at the end the following: "Except with respect to a proposed rule that the head of such agency has determined will have a substantial beneficial effect on veterans' programs, the agency shall provide such certification and statement to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration not later than 10 days after completing the certification described in this subsection."; and

(3) by inserting after section 605 the following:

"§ 605A. Review procedures relating to initial regulatory flexibility analysis certifications

"(a) FILING A PETITION TO REVIEW AGENCY CERTIFICATION OF A PROPOSED RULE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except with respect to a proposed rule that the head of the agency proposing such rule has determined will have a substantial beneficial effect on veterans' programs, any small entity, group of small entities, or organization representing the interests of small entities may petition the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (in this section referred to as the 'Chief Counsel') to review a certification published under section 605(b) that a proposed rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

"(2) FORM.—The Chief Counsel shall—

"(A) determine the method, timing, and form of disseminating a petition described in paragraph (1); and

"(B) display the information described in subparagraph (A) on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in a conspicuous manner.

"(3) CONTENTS.—Each petition described in paragraph (1) with respect to a certification published under section 605(b) for a proposed rule shall clearly and concisely—

"(A) specify the name of the petitioner and a telephone number, a mailing address, and an email address that the Chief Counsel may use to communicate with the petitioner;

"(B) if the petitioner is an organization, provide additional identifying information, as applicable, including the organizational or corporate status of the petitioner, the State of incorporation of the petitioner, the registered agent of the petitioner, the interest of the petitioner in representing small entities affected by the proposed rule and the certification at issue, and the name and authority of the individual who signed the petition on behalf of the organizational or corporate petitioner;

"(C) present the specific problems or issues that the petitioner believes should be addressed or considered through a review of the certification, such as—

"(i) any specific circumstances in which the determination of the certification that the proposed rule will not, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities is incorrect, incomplete, or inadequate; or

"(ii) why the proposed rule would, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities;

"(D) cite, enclose, or reference any relevant and non-protected or confidential technical, scientific, or other data or information supporting any assertion of the problems or issues with the certification;

"(E) present a proposed solution to the problems or issues raised in the petition, including potential regulatory or compliance alternatives to the proposed rule;

"(F) provide an analysis, discussion, or argument that explains how the proposed solution described in subparagraph (E) solves the problems or issues raised in the petition; and

"(G) cite, enclose, or reference any other publicly available data or information supporting the proposed solution described in subparagraph (E).

"(b) CONSULTATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any entity or organization desiring to file a petition under subsection (a) may request a consultation with the Chief Counsel before or after filing the petition.

"(2) FORM.—The Chief Counsel shall—

"(A) determine the method, timing, and form of requesting a consultation with the Chief Counsel under paragraph (1); and

"(B) display the information described in subparagraph (A) on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in a conspicuous manner.

"(3) LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE.—In any consultation regarding a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel—

"(A) may only—

"(i) describe the process for filing, docking, tracking, closing, amending, withdrawing, and resolving the petition; and

"(ii) assist the petitioner to clarify the petition so that the Chief Counsel is able to understand the issues of concern to the petitioner; and

"(B) may not advise a petitioner on whether the petition should be amended or withdrawn.

"(c) PRIMA FACIE REVIEW.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receipt of a petition filed under this section with respect to the certification of a proposed rule, the Chief Counsel shall make an initial prima facie determination on the merit of the issues raised in petition as to the properness of the certification and whether the proposed rule in question would, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

"(2) NO FURTHER REVIEW.—If, following the prima facie review of a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the issues raised in the petition do not merit further review by the Chief Counsel, the Chief Counsel shall, not later than 10 days after receipt of the petition, inform the petitioner of that determination and the matter shall be closed.

"(3) FURTHER REVIEW.—If, following the prima facie review of a petition under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the issues raised in the petition do merit further review by the Chief Counsel, the Chief Counsel shall, not later than 10 days after receipt of the petition, inform the petitioner and the agency that promulgated the proposed rule that the Chief Counsel shall conduct a full review of the certification and proposed rule to which the petition relates under subsection (d).

"(d) FULL REVIEW.—

"(1) CONSIDERATIONS; MEETING.—In conducting a full review under this subsection with respect to the certification made under section 605(b), the Chief Counsel shall—

"(A) consider—

"(i) whether the agency that promulgated the proposed rule correctly determined which small entities will be affected by the proposed rule;

"(ii) whether the agency considered adequate economic data to assess whether the proposed rule will have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities; and

"(iii) the economic implications of the proposed rule; and

"(B) convene a virtual or in-person meeting between the Chief Counsel, the petitioner, representatives of the agency that promulgated the proposed rule who are determined appropriate by the Chief Counsel, and the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to—

"(i) provide positions and support for those positions regarding the certification of the proposed rule; and

"(ii) allow the Chief Counsel to ask questions as the Chief Counsel determines necessary to make a final determination as to the validity of the certification.

"(2) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel begins a full review of a certification made with respect to a proposed rule under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall submit to the petitioner and the agency that promulgated the proposed rule, and publish in the

Federal Register and on the website of the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1).

“(3) REQUIREMENT TO PERFORM ANALYSES.—If, after a full review of a certification made with respect to a proposed rule under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel determines that the proposed rule will, if promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, the agency that promulgated the proposed rule shall perform an initial regulatory flexibility analysis and a final regulatory flexibility analysis for the proposed rule under sections 603 and 604, respectively.

“(4) PENALTY.—If an agency fails to attend the required meeting under paragraph (1)(B) or in any other way fails to assist the Chief Counsel in a full review under paragraph (1) with respect to a proposed rule of the agency, as determined by the Chief Counsel, the final rule shall not apply to small entities.

“(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—For purposes of judicial review under chapter 7 of this title, a certification made by an agency under section 605(b) for which a petition is filed under subsection (a) shall be considered final agency action as of the date on which the Chief Counsel—

“(A) makes a determination under subsection (c)(2) that the issues raised in the petition do not merit further review; or

“(B) publishes the results of a full review of the certification under paragraph (1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605 the following:

“605A. Review procedures relating to initial regulatory flexibility analysis certifications.”.

SEC. 3. REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SECTION 610 PERIODIC REVIEW OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 610 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the following factors”;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) except with respect to a rule that the head of such agency has determined to have a substantial beneficial effect on veterans’ programs, any indirect costs described in the initial regulatory flexibility analysis under section 603(b)(6), and any other indirect costs that may have arisen during the 10-year period described in subsection (a).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) If an agency fails to conduct a review of a rule, other than a rule that the head of the agency has determined to have a substantial beneficial effect on veterans’ programs, as required under this section within the 10-year period described in subsection (a)—

“(1) the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration shall notify the agency that the rule has ceased to be effective;

“(2) the agency shall publish in the Federal Register a notification that the rule has ceased to be effective, and solicit comments for why the rule should be reinstated; and

“(3) if, based on the comments received under paragraph (2), the agency determines that the rule should be reinstated—

“(A) the agency shall have 180 days beginning on the date of that determination to complete the review of the rule under this section; and

“(B) upon completion of the review under subparagraph (A), the rule shall be rein-

stated, notwithstanding the notice and comment rulemaking procedures under section 553 of this title.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to any final rule issued by an agency—

(1) during the 5-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 206, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—197

Adams	Garcia (IL)	Mrvan
Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Nadler
Allred	Garcia, Robert	Napolitano
Amo	Golden (ME)	Neal
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)	Neguse
Balint	Gonzalez, V.	Nickel
Barragan	Gottheimer	Norcross
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Bera	Harder (CA)	Omar
Beyer	Hayes	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Panetta
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Pappas
Bonamici	Houlihan	Pelosi
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Peltola
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Peters
Brownley	Huffman	Pettersen
Budzinski	Ivey	Phillips
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Pingree
Carbajal	Jackson (NC)	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jacobs	Pressley
Carson	Jayapal	Quigley
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Ramirez
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Caspar	Kamlager-Dove	Ross
Case	Kaptur	Ruiz
Casten	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Salinas
Cerflius-	Khanna	Sánchez
McCormick	Kildee	Sarbanes
Chu	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster	Schneider
Clyburn	Landsman	Scholten
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Costa	Lee (NV)	Sewell
Courtney	Lee (PA)	Sherman
Craig	Lee Carter	Slotkin
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin	Sorensen
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Soto
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Spanberger
Davis (NC)	Magaziner	Stansbury
Dean (PA)	Manning	Stanton
DeGette	Matsui	Stevens
DeLauro	McBath	Strickland
DelBene	McClellan	Suozzi
Deluzio	McCollum	Sykes
DeSaulnier	McGarvey	Takano
Dingell	McGovern	Thanedar
Doggett	McIver	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Menendez	Titus
Espallat	Meng	Tlaib
Foster	Mfume	Tokuda
Foushee	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Frankel, Lois	Morelle	Torres (CA)
Frost	Moskowitz	Torres (NY)
Garamendi	Moulton	Trahan

Trone	Velázquez	Wild
Underwood	Wasserman	Williams (GA)
Vargas	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Vasquez	Waters	
Veasey	Watson Coleman	

NAYS—206

Aderholt	Franklin, Scott	Mills
Alford	Fry	Molinaro
Allen	Fulcher	Moolenaar
Amodei	Garbarino	Mooney
Armstrong	Gimenez	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moran
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Murphy
Baird	Gosar	Nehls
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Banks	Green (TN)	Norman
Barr	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bean (FL)	Griffith	Oberholte
Bentz	Grothman	Ogles
Bergman	Guest	Owens
Bice	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hageman	Pence
Bilirakis	Harris	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Pfleger
Boebert	Hern	Posey
Bost	Hill	Reschenthaler
Brecheen	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Houchin	Rosendale
Bucshon	Hudson	Rouzer
Burchett	Huizenga	Roy
Burgess	Hunt	Rulli
Burlison	Issa	Rutherford
Calvert	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Cammack	James	Salazar
Caraveo	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Carey	Jordan	Schweikert
Carl	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Joyce (PA)	Self
Carter (TX)	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Chavez-DeRemer	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Ciscomani	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cline	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Kiley	Smith (NJ)
Clyde	Kim (CA)	Smucker
Cole	Kustoff	Spartz
Collins	LaHood	Stauber
Comer	LaLota	Steel
Crane	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Crawford	Lamborn	Steil
Curtis	Langworthy	Steube
D’Esposito	Latta	Strong
Davidson	LaTurner	Tenney
De La Cruz	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Timmons
Donalds	Letlow	Turner
Duarte	Lopez	Valadao
Dunn (FL)	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Edwards	Lucas	Van Duyne
Ellzey	Luttrell	Van Orden
Emmer	Mace	Wagner
Estes	Malliotakis	Walberg
Ezell	Maloy	Weber (TX)
Fallon	Mann	Webster (FL)
Feenstra	Mast	Wenstrup
Ferguson	McCaull	Westerman
Finstad	McClain	Wied
Fischbach	McClintock	Williams (NY)
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Williams (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Miller (IL)	Wittman
Flood	Miller (OH)	Womack
Fong	Miller (WV)	Yakym
Foxx	Miller-Meeks	Zinke

NOT VOTING—29

Blumenauer	Granger	Perez
Bowman	Graves (MO)	Porter
Crenshaw	Grijalva	Rodgers (WA)
Crockett	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Duncan	Lieu	Rose
Evans	Luetkemeyer	Sherrill
Fletcher	Luna	Swalwell
Gallego	Massie	Waltz
Garcia, Mike	McHenry	Wexton
Gomez	Mullin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1734

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 196, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

YEAS—208

Aderholt	Franklin, Scott	Mills
Alford	Fry	Molinaro
Allen	Fulcher	Moolenaar
Amodei	Garbarino	Mooney
Armstrong	Jimenez	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Babin	Good (VA)	Moran
Bacon	Gooden (TX)	Murphy
Baird	Gosar	Nehls
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Banks	Green (TN)	Norman
Barr	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bean (FL)	Griffith	Obernolte
Bentz	Grothman	Ogles
Bergman	Guest	Owens
Bice	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hageman	Pence
Bilirakis	Harris	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Pfleger
Boebert	Hern	Posey
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Brecheen	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hinson	Rosendale
Bucshon	Houchin	Rouzer
Burchett	Hudson	Roy
Burgess	Huizenga	Rulli
Burlison	Hunt	Rutherford
Calvert	Issa	Salazar
Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Scalise
Caraveo	James	Schweikert
Carey	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Carl	Jordan	Self
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Sessions
Carter (TX)	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Chavez-DeRemer	Kean (NJ)	Smith (MO)
Ciscomani	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cloud	Kiggans (VA)	Smucker
Clyde	Kiley	Spartz
Cole	Kim (CA)	Stauber
Collins	Kustoff	Steel
Comer	LaHood	Stefanik
Crane	LaLota	Steil
Crawford	LaMalfa	Steupe
Cuellar	Lamborn	Strong
Curtis	Langworthy	Tenney
D'Esposito	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	LaTurner	Tiffany
De La Cruz	Lawler	Timmons
DesJarlais	Lee (FL)	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Valadao
Donalds	Letlow	Van Drew
Duarte	Lopez	Van Duyne
Dunn (FL)	Loudermilk	Van Orden
Edwards	Lucas	Wagner
Ellzey	Luttrell	Walberg
Emmer	Mace	Weber (TX)
Estes	Malliotakis	Webster (FL)
Ezell	Maloy	Wenstrup
Fallon	Mann	Westerman
Feenstra	Mast	Wied
Ferguson	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Finstad	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fischbach	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fitzgerald	McCormick	Wittman
Fitzpatrick	Meuser	Womack
Fleischmann	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Flood	Miller (OH)	Zinke
Fong	Miller (WV)	
Foxx	Miller-Meeks	

NAYS—196

Adams	Balint	Bishop (GA)
Aguilar	Barragan	Blunt Rochester
Allred	Beatty	Bonamici
Amo	Bera	Boyle (PA)
Auchincloss	Beyer	Brown

Brownley	Huffman	Peters
Budzinski	Ivey	Pettersen
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Phillips
Carbajal	Jackson (NC)	Pingree
Cárdenas	Jacobs	Pocan
Carson	Jayapal	Pressley
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ramirez
Casar	Kamllager-Dove	Raskin
Case	Kaptur	Ross
Casten	Keating	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan
Cherfilus-	Khanna	Salinas
McCormick	Kildee	Sánchez
Chu	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kim (NJ)	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster	Schiff
Clyburn	Landsman	Schneider
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scholten
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schrier
Correa	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lee (NV)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lee (PA)	Sewell
Craig	Lee Carter	Sherman
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Slotkin
Davids (KS)	Levin	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Davis (IL)	Sorensen
Davis (NC)	Dean (PA)	Soto
Dean (PA)	Magaziner	Spanberger
DeGette	Manning	Stansbury
DeLauro	Matsui	Stanton
DeBene	McBath	Stevens
Deluzio	McClellan	Strickland
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Suozzi
Dingell	McGarvey	Sykes
Doggett	McGovern	Takano
Escobar	McIver	Thanedar
Eshoo	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Espallat	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Foster	Meng	Titus
Fern	Mfume	Tlaib
Frankel, Lois	Moore (WI)	Tokuda
Frost	Morelle	Tonko
Garamendi	Moskowitz	Torres (CA)
García (IL)	Moulton	Torres (NY)
García (TX)	Mrvan	Trahan
García, Robert	Nadler	Trone
Goldin (ME)	Napolitano	Underwood
Goldman (NY)	Neal	Vargas
Gonzalez, V.	Neguse	Vasquez
Gottheimer	Nickel	Veasey
Green, Al (TX)	Norcross	Velázquez
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wasserman
Hayes	Omar	Schultz
Himes	Pallone	Waters
Horsford	Panetta	Watson Coleman
Houlihan	Pappas	Wild
Hoyer	Pelosi	Williams (GA)
Hoyle (OR)	Peltola	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Blumenauer	Granger	Porter
Bowman	Graves (MO)	Rodgers (WA)
Crenshaw	Grijalva	Rogers (KY)
Crockett	Lieu	Rose
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Sherrill
Evans	Luna	Swalwell
Fletcher	Massie	Waltz
Gallego	McHenry	Wexton
García, Mike	Mullin	
Gomez	Perez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1747

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to raise a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1608

Whereas on April 9, 2021, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives announced that it had begun to investigate allegations that Representative Matt Gaetz may have engaged in sexual misconduct and/or illicit drug use, shared inappropriate images or videos on the House floor, misused State identification records, converted campaign funds for personal use, and/or accepted a bribe, improper gratuity, or impermissible gift in violation of the Rules of the House, laws, or other standards of conduct;

Whereas over three years, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives compiled an extensive investigative record pursuant to Committee Rules 14(a)(3) and 18(a) into allegations that Representative Gaetz may have engaged in sexual misconduct and illicit drug use, accepted improper gifts, dispensed special privileges and favors to individuals with whom he had a personal relationship, and sought to obstruct government investigations of his conduct;

Whereas on November 13, 2024, Representative Matt Gaetz announced his resignation from Congress;

Whereas there is precedent for the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives to continue investigating and release reports of its investigations into former Members of the House of Representatives;

Whereas in 1987, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives released a report on its investigation into allegations of the misuse of campaign funds, improper gifts, the failure to reveal business interests on his financial disclosure, and the acceptance of a bribe by former Representative Bill Boner following his resignation from Congress;

Whereas in 1990, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives released a report on its investigations of sexual misconduct allegations, which included having sexual intercourse with a minor and making sexual advances towards a congressional employee, against former Representative Don Lukens following his resignation from Congress;

Whereas in 2006, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives released a report on its investigation of sexual misconduct allegations, which included sending sexually explicit messages to at least one minor, against former Representative Mark Foley following his resignation from Congress;

Whereas in 2011, the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives continued its investigation into allegations of sexual misconduct against former Representative Eric Massa following his resignation from Congress; and

Whereas given the serious nature of the allegations against Representative Gaetz, a failure of the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives to publicly release its report on its investigation undermines the committee's credibility and impedes the safety, dignity, and integrity of the legislative proceedings of the House; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives shall immediately release the latest draft of its report and a summary of its findings to the public, including any conclusions, draft reports, recommendations, attachments, exhibits and accompanying materials, with such redactions as may be necessary and appropriate to protect sensitive information, including witness identities, related to its investigation into allegations against former Representative Matt Gaetz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO REFER

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Scalise of Louisiana moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the Member being referenced in the resolution has actually resigned from the House of Representatives. Therefore, the question is moot.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the motion to refer, and I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 198, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

YEAS—206

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Jackson (TX)
Alford	Donalds	James
Allen	Duarte	Johnson (LA)
Amodei	Dunn (FL)	Johnson (SD)
Armstrong	Edwards	Jordan
Arrington	Ellzey	Joyce (OH)
Babin	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Bacon	Estes	Kean (NJ)
Baird	Ezell	Kelly (MS)
Balderson	Fallon	Kelly (PA)
Banks	Feenstra	Kiggans (VA)
Barr	Ferguson	Kiley
Bean (FL)	Finstad	Kim (CA)
Bentz	Fischbach	Kustoff
Bergman	Fitzgerald	LaHood
Bice	Fitzpatrick	LaLota
Biggs	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Flood	Lamborn
Bishop (NC)	Fong	Langworthy
Boebert	Fox	Latta
Bost	Franklin, Scott	LaTurner
Brecheen	Fry	Lawler
Buchanan	Fulcher	Lee (FL)
Bucshon	Garbarino	Lesko
Burchett	Gimenez	Letlow
Burgess	Gonzales, Tony	Lopez
Burlison	Good (VA)	Loudermilk
Calvert	Gooden (TX)	Lucas
Cammack	Gosar	Luttrell
Carey	Graves (LA)	Mace
Carl	Green (TN)	Malliotakis
Carter (GA)	Greene (GA)	Maloy
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Mann
Chavez-DeRemer	Grothman	Mast
Ciscomani	Guest	McCaul
Cline	Guthrie	McClain
Cloud	Hageman	McCormick
Clyde	Harris	Meuser
Cole	Harshbarger	Miller (IL)
Collins	Hern	Miller (OH)
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)
Crane	Hill	Miller-Meeks
Crawford	Hinson	Mills
Curtis	Houchin	Molinaro
D'Esposito	Hudson	Moolenaar
Davidson	Huizenga	Mooney
De La Cruz	Hunt	Moore (AL)
DesJarlais	Issa	Moore (UT)

Moran	Salazar	Timmons
Murphy	Schalise	Turner
Nehls	Schweikert	Valadao
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Norman	Self	Van Dуйne
Nunn (IA)	Sessions	Van Orden
Obernoite	Simpson	Wagner
Ogles	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Owens	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Pence	Smucker	Wenstrup
Perry	Spartz	Westerman
Pfluger	Stauber	Wied
Posey	Steel	Williams (NY)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Steil	Wilson (SC)
Rosendale	Steube	Wittman
Rouzer	Strong	Womack
Roy	Tenney	Yakym
Rulli	Thompson (PA)	Zinke
Rutherford	Tiffany	

NAYS—198

Adams	Gonzalez, V.	Pallone
Aguiar	Gottheimer	Panetta
Allred	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Amo	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Hayes	Peltola
Balint	Himes	Peters
Barragan	Horsford	Petterson
Beatty	Houlihan	Phillips
Bera	Hoyer	Pingree
Beyer	Hoyle (OR)	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Huffman	Pressley
Blunt Rochester	Ivey	Quigley
Bonamici	Jackson (IL)	Ramirez
Boyle (PA)	Jackson (NC)	Raskin
Brown	Jacobs	Ross
Brownley	Jayapal	Ruiz
Budzinski	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Caraveo	Kamlager-Dove	Salinas
Carbajal	Kaptur	Sanchez
Cardenas	Keating	Sarbanes
Carson	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Khanna	Schiff
Caspar	Kildee	Schneider
Case	Kilmer	Scholten
Casten	Kim (NJ)	Schrier
Castor (FL)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Kuster	Scott, David
Cheriflus-	Landsman	Sewell
McCormick	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Chu	Larson (CT)	Slotkin
Clark (MA)	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Lee (NV)	Sorensen
Cleaver	Lee (PA)	Soto
Clyburn	Lee Carter	Spanberger
Cohen	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Connolly	Levin	Stanton
Correa	Lofgren	Stevens
Costa	Lynch	Strickland
Courtney	Magaziner	Manning
Craig	Manning	Sykes
Crow	Matsui	Takano
Davids (KS)	McBath	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	McClellan	Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC)	McClintock	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Titus
DeGette	McGarvey	Tlaib
DeLauro	McGovern	Tokuda
DelBene	McIver	Tonko
Deluzio	Meeks	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Menendez	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Meng	Trahan
Doggett	Mfume	Trone
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Eshoo	Morelle	Vargas
Espallat	Moskowitz	Vasquez
Foster	Moulton	Veasey
Foushee	Mrvan	Velazquez
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Wasserman
Frost	Napolitano	Schultz
Garamendi	Neal	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Nickel	Wild
Garcia, Robert	Norcross	Williams (GA)
Golden (ME)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Goldman (NY)	Omar	

NOT VOTING—29

Blumenauer	Fletcher
Bowman	Gallego
Crenshaw	Garcia, Mike
Crockett	Gomez
Cuellar	Granger
Duncan	Graves (MO)
Evans	Grijalva

Porter	Rose	Waltz
Rodgers (WA)	Sherrill	Wexton
Rogers (KY)	Swalwell	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1758

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to refer was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to hope that about nine Republicans leave and don't vote, and I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1609

Whereas Matthew Louis Gaetz II of Florida served in the House of Representatives from January 3, 2017 through November 13, 2024;

Whereas clause 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution of the United States establishes that “Each House may determine the Rules of its proceedings” and “punish its members for disorderly Behavior”;

Whereas clause 3(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides the Committee on Ethics the authority to investigate alleged violations “by a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House of the Code of Official Conduct or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee in the performance of the duties or the discharge of the responsibilities of such individual”;

Whereas on April 9, 2021, the Committee on Ethics initiated a review of allegations that Representative Gaetz may have “engaged in sexual misconduct and/or illicit drug use, shared inappropriate images or videos on the House floor, misused state identification records, converted campaign funds to personal use, and/or accepted a bribe, improper gratuity, or impermissible gift, in violation of House Rules, laws, or other standards of conduct” in violation of Federal law and the Rules of the House;

Whereas on June 18, 2024, the Committee on Ethics released a statement acknowledging the Committee's continued review of allegations that Representative Gaetz may have “engaged in sexual misconduct and illicit drug use, accepted improper gifts, dispensed special privileges and favors to individuals with whom he had a personal relationship, and sought to obstruct government investigations of his conduct”;

Whereas if Representative Gaetz engaged in the alleged violations while serving as a Member of the House, such conduct would affect the rights of the House of Representatives and the integrity of the legislative process: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Ethics shall—

(1) preserve all documents and investigative materials related to any review of Matthew Louis Gaetz II's conduct while serving

as a Member of the House of Representatives;

(2) publicly release the Committee's report, including any associated findings, recommendations, and proposed disciplinary actions, as discussed by the Committee on November 20, 2024, regarding the alleged violations of the Code of Official Conduct of the House or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct by Matthew Louis Gaetz II while serving as a Member of the House of Representatives; and

(3) in accordance with the Committee's practice for releasing public documents, anonymize witness identities and redact any personally identifiable information of minors and victims from any House documents associated with this matter before publicly releasing them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO REFER

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Scalise of Louisiana moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ethics.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard enough on this. We can talk about it for an hour, four hours. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker: Why don't we get back to work for the people of this country.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to refer. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to refer.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to refer.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 198, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—204

Aderholt	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Alford	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Burlison	Donalds
Amodei	Calvert	Duarte
Armstrong	Cammack	Dunn (FL)
Arrington	Carey	Edwards
Babin	Carl	Ellzey
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Baird	Carter (TX)	Estes
Balderson	Chavez-DeRemer	Ezell
Banks	Ciscomani	Fallon
Barr	Cline	Feenstra
Bean (FL)	Cloud	Ferguson
Bentz	Clyde	Finstad
Bergman	Cole	Fischbach
Bice	Collins	Fitzgerald
Biggs	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Billirakis	Crane	Fleischmann
Bishop (NC)	Crawford	Flood
Boebert	Curtis	Fong
Bost	D'Esposito	Fox
Brecheen	Davidson	Franklin, Scott
Buchanan	De La Cruz	Fry

Fulcher	Latta
Garbarino	LaTurner
Gimenez	Lawler
Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)
Good (VA)	Lesko
Gooden (TX)	Letlow
Gosar	Lopez
Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Green (TN)	Lucas
Greene (GA)	Luttrell
Griffith	Mace
Grothman	Malliotakis
Guest	Maloy
Guthrie	Mann
Hageman	Mast
Harris	McCaul
Harshbarger	McClain
Hern	McCormick
Higgins (LA)	Meuser
Hill	Miller (IL)
Hinson	Miller (OH)
Houchin	Miller (WV)
Hudson	Miller-Meeks
Huizenga	Mills
Hunt	Molinaro
Issa	Mooleenaar
Jackson (TX)	Mooney
James	Moore (AL)
Johnson (LA)	Moore (UT)
Johnson (SD)	Moran
Jordan	Murphy
Joyce (OH)	Nehls
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse
Kean (NJ)	Nunn (IA)
Kelly (MS)	Oberholte
Kelly (PA)	Ogles
Kiggans (VA)	Owens
Kiley	Palmer
Kim (CA)	Pence
Kustoff	Perry
LaHood	Pflugger
LaLota	LaMalfa
LaMalfa	Lamborn
Lamborn	Reschenthaler
Langworthy	Rogers (AL)

NOES—198

Adams	Dingell
Aguilar	Doggett
Allred	Escobar
Amo	Eshoo
Auchincloss	Españillat
Balint	Poster
Barragán	Foushee
Beatty	Frankel, Lois
Bera	Frost
Beyer	Garamendi
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)
Bonamici	Garcia, Robert
Boyle (PA)	Golden (ME)
Brown	Goldman (NY)
Brownley	Gonzalez, V.
Budzinski	Gottheimer
Bush	Green, Al (TX)
Caraveo	Harder (CA)
Carbajal	Hayes
Cárdenas	Himes
Carson	Horsford
Carter (LA)	Houlihan
Cartwright	Hoyer
Casar	Hoyle (OR)
Case	Huffman
Casten	Ivey
Castor (FL)	Jackson (IL)
Castro (TX)	Jackson (NC)
Cherfilus-	Jacobs
McCormick	Jayapal
Chu	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Kamlager-Dove
Cleaver	Kaptur
Clyburn	Keating
Cohen	Kelly (IL)
Connolly	Kennedy
Correa	Khanna
Costa	Kildee
Courtney	Kilmer
Craig	Kim (NJ)
Crow	Krishnamoorthi
Davids (KS)	Kuster
Davis (IL)	Landsman
Davis (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Dean (PA)	Larson (CT)
DeGette	Lee (CA)
DeLauro	Lee (NV)
DeBene	Lee (PA)
Deluzio	Lee Carter
DeSaulnier	Leger Fernandez

Rosendale	Schakowsky
Rouzer	Schiff
Roy	Schneider
Rulli	Scholten
Rutherford	Schrier
Scalise	Scott (VA)
Schweikert	Scott, David
Scott, Austin	Sewell
Self	Sherman
Sessions	Slotkin
Simpson	Smith (WA)
Smith (MO)	Sorensen
Smith (NE)	Soto
Smith (NJ)	Spanberger
Smucker	Stansbury
Spartz	
Stauber	
Steel	
Stefanik	
Steil	
Steube	
Strong	
Tenney	
Thompson (PA)	
Tiffany	
Timmons	
Turner	
Valadao	
Van Drew	
Van Dуйne	
Van Orden	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Westerman	
Wied	
Williams (NY)	
Williams (TX)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Posey	
Womack	
Yakym	
Zinke	

Stanton	Trahan
Stevens	Trone
Strickland	Underwood
Suozi	Vargas
Sykes	Vasquez
Takano	Veasey
Thanedar	Velázquez
Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Titus	Waters
Tlaib	Watson Coleman
Tokuda	Wild
Tonko	Williams (GA)
Torres (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Torres (NY)	

NOT VOTING—31

Blumenauer	Gomez	Porter
Bowman	Granger	Rodgers (WA)
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Grijalva	Rose
Crockett	Lieu	Salazar
Cuellar	Luetkemeyer	Sherrill
Duncan	Luna	Swalwell
Evans	Massie	Waltz
Fletcher	McHenry	Wexton
Gallego	Mullin	
Garcia, Mike	Perez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1810

So the motion to refer was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed votes today due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 484, YEA on Roll Call No. 485, YEA on Roll Call No. 486, NAY on Roll Call No. 487, YEA on Roll Call No. 488, NAY on Roll Call No. 489, NAY on Roll Call No. 490, and NAY on Roll Call No. 491.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during the time of votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 484; S. 709; YEA on Roll Call No. 485; H.R. 9598; YEA on Roll Call No. 486; H.R. 9600; YEA on Roll Call No. 487; Velazquez of New York Part B Amendment 1; YEA on Roll Call No. 488; Motion to Recommit; NAY on Roll Call No. 489; On Passage; H.R. 7198; NAY on Roll Call No. 490; Motion to Refer; H. Res 1068, and NAY on Roll Call No. 491; Motion to Refer; H. Res 1609.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a series of votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 484, YEA on Roll Call No. 485, YEA on Roll Call No. 486, NAY on Roll Call No. 487, NAY on Roll Call No. 488, YEA on Roll Call No. 489, YEA on Roll Call No. 490, and AYE on Roll Call No. 491.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my votes on Roll Call Nos. 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490 and 491. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 484, YEA on Roll Call No. 485, YEA on Roll Call No. 486, YEA on Roll Call No. 487, YEA on Roll Call No. 488, NAY on Roll Call No. 489, NAY on Roll Call No. 490, and NAY on Roll Call No. 491.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 374

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the first sponsor of H.R. 374, a bill originally introduced by Representative Gaetz of Florida, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1815

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOPEZ) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is my resignation letter to New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy, effective December 8, 2024. It has been the honor of my life to serve New Jersey's Third Congressional District. I'm grateful to the people of New Jersey for entrusting me with the great honor of representing them in the United States Senate and I hope to do so with humility and integrity.

Sincerely,

ANDY KIM,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2024.

Gov. PHILIP D. MURPHY,
125 West State Street
Trenton, NJ.

DEAR GOVERNOR MURPHY, It is an honor and privilege to have been chosen by the people of New Jersey to serve them in the United States Senate. As you know, Senator Helmy has announced his intention to resign so that New Jerseyans may have their duly elected representation in the United States Senate as soon as possible. I, therefore, write to submit my resignation from the United States House of Representatives, effective December 8, 2024.

It has been the honor of my life to serve New Jersey's Third Congressional District, its people, and the community that raised me for these past six years. I look forward to the opportunity to serve the entirety of our state and I hope to do so with humility and integrity.

I thank you for your leadership and the opportunity.

Sincerely,

ANDY KIM,
Member of Congress.

VETERANS AFFAIRS DOGE CUTS

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

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am all for protecting public money, fighting price gouging in the defense industry and others. I am not for the Depart-

ment of Government Efficiency going after veterans' healthcare to pay for billionaire tax handouts.

I use the VA for my care, as do thousands of my constituents in western Pennsylvania. Yet, DOGE proposes cutting \$119 billion from veterans' healthcare. That is more than a third of the Department of Veterans Affairs' budget. That is all types of healthcare: surgical, specialty care, dental care, counseling for combat veterans, and more. It is ridiculous.

My question to my friends on the other side of the aisle, President-elect Trump, and others is this: Do you want to cut healthcare for veterans who risked their lives for this country? If not, you should say you don't. You should stand up against this. If you do, folks like me are going to fight you every step of the way. This is the cost of war, and this country expects us to pay it.

REMEMBERING BRYCE A. JOHNSON

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Bryce A. Johnson, who passed away suddenly this week at the age of 52. He was a husband to Erika, father to Will, son to Terry, and a friend to me.

He was a dedicated public servant who served as the Tifton Judicial Circuit District Attorney. In addition to his legal career, his love for our country and politics led him to teach history and political science to students at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College. He also had a passion for Georgia high school football and cohosted a local Friday night high school football radio show for about 15 years.

Bryce was one of those guys that no matter what team he was on or what group he was in, the organization was better because of him. Bryce was a genuinely good person who will be missed by those of us who had the privilege to know him.

CONGRATULATING DR. GEORGE HANBURY ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to rise and recognize the distinguished career of Dr. George Hanbury, the president and CEO of Nova Southeastern University.

Since 2010, Dr. Hanbury guided this institution with vision, integrity, and a true dedication to excellence. His impact is evident in the growth, innovation, and spirit that defines NSU, its students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

During his tenure, NSU established a state-of-the-art teaching hospital. It also opened the Levan Center of Inno-

vation for startup businesses and student entrepreneurship. It became the third university nationwide to offer both osteopathic and allopathic medical degrees in 2018.

Dr. Hanbury also established the President's 64, an elite group of student leaders with the purpose to strengthen the relationship between the university and its community. During a recent interview, he said his 27 years at NSU is "the most noble thing I have ever done."

I wish him well on his retirement and thank him for, the thoughtful and committed work he has done to enrich the students and faculty at Nova Southeastern University.

RECOGNIZING CONGRESSWOMAN DEBBIE LESKO

(Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my dear friend and colleague, DEBBIE LESKO, whom I have known for the past 6-plus years.

DEBBIE is such a hard worker. She has done so much incredible work serving her constituents in Arizona. She has done wonderful things for her State. For years, she served on the community committee for the Peoria Unified School District and later ran for school board.

From 2008 to 2018, she served in the Arizona legislature for 9 years, both in the house and the senate, where she received special recognition such as Champion of the Taxpayer, Guardian of Small Business, and Senator of the Year from various organizations, due to her outstanding work.

DEBBIE has served on several subcommittees within the Committee on Energy and Commerce during her time in the House of Representatives. She has served on several caucuses and founded the wonderful Protect Kids Caucus. In the 118th Congress, House Majority Whip TOM EMMER appointed her as a member of the whip team.

Some of DEBBIE's bills, including the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act and the United States Ports of Entry Threat and Operational Review Act have either successfully passed in the House or become law.

She led a delegation to Taiwan where we had many discussions about the importance of ensuring their independence from China. We also had a lot of fun!

DEBBIE has achieved many great things over the years and has made a positive impact while partaking in politics. I can attest to this firsthand as we sat next to each other for nearly every vote and would often discuss policy on the House floor.

She has accomplished so much in her work, and I am sure that she would say her greatest achievements in life are being a mother to her children and a

grandmother to her beautiful grandchildren. As a mother and grandmother, myself, I know how much of a blessing family is.

I wish there could be more opportunities for us to work together DEBBIE, but I know you will do a fantastic job as you enter your next chapter of life serving as Maricopa County Supervisor.

Thank you for your commitment to helping make Arizona a better place to live, for helping our nation, and for upholding conservative values.

We will all miss you!

THANK YOU TO JO-ANN YOO

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

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt gratitude to Jo-Ann Yoo for her lifetime of public service on behalf of the AAPI community in my district and the entire city of New York.

This year, Jo-Ann will retire after 13 years as executive director of the Asian American Federation, an organization dedicated to supporting the 1.5 million Asian-American community members in New York City.

Under Jo-Ann's leadership, the AAF played a leading role in combating the horrific rise in anti-Asian hate in 2020, organizing and ensuring local community response to provide safety to AAPI New Yorkers.

Jo-Ann testified at a public briefing held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the Federal response to anti-Asian hate, and she serves on New York City's Advisory Board on Implementation of Racial Justice Commission, working to end hate and discrimination of all kinds in our city.

Jo-Ann leaves behind a lasting legacy of spirit, courage, determination, and advocacy that will be felt for decades to come. Thanks to Jo-Ann, New York City is a better and far more tolerant place.

HONORING THE LATE CORPORAL MATTHEW A. WYATT

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Corporal Matthew A. Wyatt.

After graduating high school in June 2001, Corporal Wyatt made the courageous decision to serve his country. He joined the Marine Corps, where he was based at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina before deploying to Iraq.

On December 3, 2004, Corporal Wyatt gave his life to stop an enemy attack on his base. He was only 21 years old. Corporal Wyatt bravely acted without hesitation to save the lives of his fellow servicemembers.

Today, his memory is carried forward by his father, Marine Gunnery Ser-

geant Alan Wyatt; his mother, Verlene; and the entire family, who proudly uphold the three-generation legacy of military service.

Corporal Wyatt's stepmother, Lauren, also continues to honor his legacy through her work in my district office, where she serves veterans and military families, ensuring they receive the support they need.

To pay tribute to Corporal Wyatt's sacrifice, I am proud to support legislation to rename the United States Post Office in his hometown of Millstadt, Illinois, in his honor. While no act of gratitude will ever be enough to fill the void left by Corporal Wyatt's absence, I hope this naming will comfort his loved ones and remind them that his sacrifice will not be forgotten.

CELEBRATING BLUE COLLIE COFFEE SHOP

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Disability Awareness Month, we celebrate the inspiring work of Blue Collie Coffee Shop in Louisburg, North Carolina.

Since creating Blue Collie Coffee Shop, Al and Paige Sayles have provided meaningful employment opportunities for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Blue Collie has employed over 16 individuals, helping them gain meaningful skills and confidence while fostering an inclusive work environment where everyone has a chance to thrive.

Al and Paige's dedication to creating opportunities and building a more inclusive community is nothing short of remarkable. Their work transforms lives, opening doors and breaking down barriers one cup of coffee at a time. I thank Al and Paige.

SERVING IN CONGRESS HAS BEEN THE HONOR OF MY LIFETIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

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

It has been the honor of my lifetime to serve in these sacred Halls of the U.S. House of Representatives. Part of that great honor is to serve with fan-

tastic colleagues, Members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my great colleague. Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, the gentlewoman from Arizona, DEBBIE LESKO, Representative DEBBIE LESKO.

Representative LESKO has served Arizona's Eighth Congressional District with distinction and honor. She has fought for Arizonans and all Americans and has been a champion for the people she represents.

It has been my honor serving with Representative LESKO in the Arizona delegation. As a colleague, we frequently collaborated as advocates on behalf of communities in Arizona.

It is an honor to stand here tonight before you and tell my friend DEBBIE LESKO how much she means to me and how much I am going to miss her in these hallowed Halls of the House of Representatives.

However, I am heartened. I know she won't be too far away, and you can bet I am going to continue to phone her whenever I need her advice or just to talk.

More importantly, I am confident her character, demeanor, and principles will continue to serve her well in Maricopa County, where she has been recently elected to the Board of Supervisors. However, I am worried about it. In Congress, DEBBIE represented 800,000 people with full-time staff, but now she will represent over a million people with just one full-time employee. DOGE should learn something from you.

Congress' loss is Maricopa's gain. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with her. I applaud her for her service and wish her all the best. Arizona is a better place because of DEBBIE LESKO.

May God bless her and her husband, Joe.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GOSAR for his remarks. It means so much to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON), another colleague.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to send off my colleague, DEBBIE LESKO, and honor her long career in public service.

I first got to know DEBBIE when she was working on pension reform as a State senator and I was working on pension reform as mayor of the city of Phoenix.

We were both elected to Congress in the year 2018, and over the last 6 years, we have probably canceled each other's votes out more often than not.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, you know what? We have developed a really great friendship, spending so many hours together, talking about our families and politics at Sky Harbor International Airport and DCA as we wait to board our weekly flights back and forth to Washington.

I want to say something about DEBBIE. She inspires me. She is a survivor of domestic violence, and she got out of an abusive marriage.

Do you know what she did?

She poured herself into our community on the Peoria school board, at the State legislature, and now as a Member of the United States Congress. That is a great American success story.

Over her years in public office, she has shown immense courage in sharing her story as a domestic violence survivor and using her office to fight for other survivors to receive the care and attention they deserve.

To DEBBIE's husband, Joe, I see you on those weekly flights. It is not easy being a congressional spouse. I see the long hours you put in, in supporting DEBBIE. Thank you for sharing her with us.

I am going to miss DEBBIE in Congress, but she is continuing her work in public service as a newly elected Maricopa County supervisor. DEBBIE, I have one request in your new role. Please don't ever let the Cyber Ninjas back in Maricopa County.

In all seriousness, I am wishing you all the very best. Godspeed, Congresswoman LESKO.

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you so much, Representative STANTON. I greatly appreciate the words. I will tell Joe, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my friend and colleague who I have known for many years.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you. You didn't have to put the "many" in front of that, DEBBIE.

It is true. She was a young child when we first met.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak and recognize my good friend, DEBBIE. When I was serving from the east side of the valley and DEBBIE got elected to the school board, I started hearing about DEBBIE LESKO is going to be this great conservative politico. I did not know DEBBIE at that time, but I got to observe her. Then we ended up serving in the State legislature together, and she was dynamic and exciting and actually conservative.

As GREG mentioned, she worked on pension reform. The bulk of that took place after I left, thankfully, because pension reform, as anybody who has ever done it knows, is one ugly thing and takes a lot of courage. DEBBIE exhibited courage, and I would get reports on how she was doing that.

She brought in people with very disparate interests. She worked with them. She got them on board, and she would tell them where the rubber met the road. That was really awesome.

Then I am here, and then the next thing I know, DEBBIE is here with me. The bad news for me is that she is going home to Maricopa County. She is going to do a great job there.

This is great news for Maricopa County which, by the way, is one of the largest counties in the country. It is

about, what, 5.5 million people in the county, something like that, with only five supervisors.

DEBBIE has told me this. I know she has told PAUL this. I know she has told GREG this, and I know she has told DAVID and JUAN this: she only has one-and-a-half staffers. That is really bugging her. I can tell you that. She is going to do a great job.

She has been a great friend.

I will also pay homage to Joe and DEBBIE's family who have been so supportive, literally, for many years.

So with that, I—

Mrs. LESKO. Don't make me cry, ANDY.

Mr. BIGGS. I am like Winston Churchill. I am a crier.

DEBBIE, Cindy and I love you.

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you very much, ANDY.

Congressman BIGGS, you are a great friend. Thank you so much. We will be working many years together. I am going to keep calling you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER).

DIANA and I sit with each other in the women's row. And sometimes guys want to, you know, infiltrate, and we kick them out.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Exactly. Exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and legacy of my dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman DEBBIE LESKO, from the great State of Arizona.

I have had the privilege of working alongside Congresswoman LESKO for almost 4 years. In that time, I have had the opportunity to get to know her, working on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the caucuses we share. Congresswoman LESKO is a true civil servant, leader, and dedicated mother and grandmother to a wonderful family. I know they will be grateful to be able to spend more time with her at home.

Throughout her career in Congress, Mrs. LESKO has dedicated herself to defending the very principles that our Nation was founded upon. She stood up for religious freedom, speaking boldly in favor of faith-based institutions faced with encroachments from the Federal Government.

She has defended life, introducing legislation to prevent the dismemberment of unborn children in the womb. She stood up for justice, launching the Protect Kids Caucus to defend the innocent children in our schools' healthcare and government programs.

Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman LESKO's unwavering commitment to faith, family, and freedom has left an incredible mark on these Halls and the lives of countless Americans. While her leadership will be deeply missed, her legacy of service will continue to be remembered for years to come.

Thank you, DEBBIE, for being a wonderful friend to me. I will miss you.

We are going to charge for the seat you are going to vacate if somebody wants to sit there. Okay?

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you very much, DIANA. I greatly appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), my colleague who is sitting to my left, who I have known for a long time, too. I went to your wedding reception, I think.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the magic things about DEBBIE LESKO is she has proven you can be conservative and not be angry about it. You can actually be joyful and kind and sweet and just a decent human being. I have learned more things about urban chickens from her, because I have a 9-year-old that really wants daddy to build a chicken coop. Don't laugh. She really does.

Just an observation, because we sit on this airplane every week, flying back, and I often sit next to DEBBIE. Other Members, you see them on their computers, watching movies. DEBBIE has a stack of things because she doesn't use her computer. She has a stack of papers. You know, they do make these things called laptops.

She is there with her highlighter for hours on the airplane. That is the sort of thing you notice. You can be kind. You can be loving. You can be joyful.

DEBBIE, I think you are going to have an amazing experience with the leadership of Maricopa County. Remember, Maricopa County is right now the fourth most populous county in America. I actually still believe it is going to cross over Harris County's population. If there weren't so many hurricanes in the area, we probably would have already.

I used to be the county treasurer, and trust me, after some years around here, I miss those days when you could actually do things.

I am going to miss you. I am going to miss the times when you were my guiding light. When I am just mad, because I seem to be mad a lot, you just sort of smile and say, well, that is sort of how it is.

I think you are going to do amazing things for the people of the West Valley as their supervisor. We are going to make some very tough decisions here in the next couple of years where we are going to need the leadership at our State and local levels because we don't have a lot of dollars to send. So we are going to send a lot of our problems to you soon.

We love you, DEBBIE.

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you very much, DAVID. I greatly appreciate the friendship and the work we have done together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI) my other Arizona colleague.

JUAN used to work for Governor Ducey, and that is how I met him. He is such a great Member of Congress, and I am so happy he got reelected because he is in a tough swing district.

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor and pay tribute to my good friend, DEBBIE

LESKO, who has been an inspiration to so many.

We worked on different projects together. You have been a speaker and a panelist for some of the programs that Laura and I have done for youth and especially for women. I think you are a shining example.

A lot has been said by those that worked closest with you, which are, of course, our colleagues from the Arizona delegation. They have talked about your wit, your grace, your smile, the way in which you carry yourself and how you execute our priorities and our conservative values.

As has been said before, you are conservative. You are just not angry about it. You have gone out there and have done the work and have put in the time.

Seeing you on that plane, you and Joe many times, is great. I would much rather sit next to you than next to DAVID or GREG. I enjoy those trips back home when I get a chance to sit with you. You are a hard worker, giving your best to your constituents every single time. Even those who live in the southern part of the State, like myself and others, we have really admired your work the entire time.

I know you are going to do great things for Maricopa County, as well, and the entire State. Laura, our six kids, and I, wish you the very best in your next journey.

You were a great source for me in my freshman year when I had questions, from the most basic ones to the most complex ones. Your peace and the way you tackled these issues was always very inspiring, but it also gave me a great deal of confidence in what we could do with this place.

You have been a great mentor and a great friend. Thank you so much. We love you, and we are going to miss you. Thank you.

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you so much, JUAN. I am going to be calling you when I need help from the county.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), my friend and colleague who is on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I serve as his vice chair on the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and colleague from Arizona's Eighth District, Congresswoman DEBBIE LESKO.

I have had the distinct pleasure of serving alongside her, as she just told you, on the Energy and Commerce Committee and, more specifically, on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chair. She served this Congress as the vice chair of that subcommittee.

We explored and investigated many important issues, some of which included COVID-19 origins. She did some more work on that. There were investigations into drug shortages and the potential exploitation of unaccompanied minors crossing our southern

border. Her work with me related to world anti-doping in sports was outstanding. It was really very much appreciated.

Everyone here who has spoken already knows this. For those folks watching at home, this is one smart, tough lady. I have really, really enjoyed working with her on a number of issues over her terms here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, her hard work and her strong conservative record is obviously appreciated back home. As you have heard others say, she just recently won election to a seat on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.

I congratulate you, DEBBIE, on a fantastic career in the United States House, and I applaud your decision to continue public service a little bit closer to home as a member of the board of supervisors in Maricopa County.

Your work will be missed, and it is appreciated. It also will be missed when we reconvene and start trying to tackle some tough issues, whether it be healthcare or telecom or whatever Energy and Commerce has jurisdiction over.

I thank you for your service. I appreciate you.

Mrs. LESKO. Thank you very much, Morgan. I appreciate you. You always have a great legal mind, and I come to you for legal questions. You are a great person. Thank you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. You are very kind, thank you. You, likewise, are a great human being.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), my friend and colleague who serves on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend, DEBBIE LESKO, and her service to our country.

What a great Member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I have to say I know that people should be excited that she is going to come back home and serve.

We are really disappointed that you are leaving because you are so good at what you do. As many speakers have said tonight, you are a fighter. You are absolutely conservative, and you are a fighter. You always bring people along with you. You can track people because you want to bring them into the fold and not try to fight everybody outside of the tent.

It has just been a pleasure working with you and your grasp of issues and the way you work before big hearings. You know DEBBIE is going to be prepared. You know DEBBIE is going to be there and is going to make things happen. It has just been a great privilege.

□ 1845

I remember when you said that you were running for county supervisor in Maricopa County, I first thought is—because I used to serve in the state legislature, and every legislative body in the country is so vital and so important—I couldn't help but think I first

thought, you are going to leave the United States House of Representatives and serve in county government. It just shows that it is not a title to you. It is how you can best serve.

It just means a lot. I had friends of mine and others who say: Do you think I should run for this or the other? I'd say: You are doing a great job where you are. Every level of government is important.

I remember when Janice Hahn—I don't know if you remember when she was here—she left to go be on the L.A. Board of Supervisors. I said: You are leaving to go back to run for the county board? And she said that it is bigger than a congressional district. Yours probably is, as well, or close to it.

It is a great privilege to be here to know that I am with someone who is about service, not about her own title.

We are going to miss you. I am going to say that first and foremost, but we are also excited for you. We are excited for the people of Maricopa County because they are getting one heck of a fighter. They are getting one heck of a believer.

They are getting somebody that is going to give all their heart and soul. We are going to miss you here, but they are going to love you there, as they already do, but they are going to love having you home. God bless you. You are a dear friend.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, this is kind of overwhelming, but I will yield next to one of my friends and one of the ladies that sits next to me in our women's row over here, my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and legacy of my friend, Representative DEBBIE LESKO. It has been such a pleasure to serve with her in the 117th and 118th Congress.

When I first arrived, Representative LESKO was the most generous with her time, helping me navigate my way, answering questions, and offering advice. I was so grateful.

Representative LESKO is a genuinely good person, a true servant of our country, and a smart and fine lady also. I thank her for that example that she has given.

Representative LESKO has a sincere care for our children and our grandchildren, and wants to make sure that they are left with a legacy and access to the freedom and opportunities that we have all had to pursue the American Dream.

DEBBIE, I wish you all the best as you go back to Maricopa County, Arizona, to serve the good people there.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I remember when Michelle came in, we shared someone that helped us with our campaign, and she said you need to meet MICHELLE. I met her, and I thought she was great, and I have ever since.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mrs. LESKO for her

service. I have been honored to serve with DEBBIE.

She mentioned we met before I was elected, but I have to admit, it was in a nail salon the first time we met. Nobody else here can say that.

I know that so many of the speakers have talked about DEBBIE's service. It has been incredible. They have really honored you with that and talked about that.

I want to say, one of the things I just love about DEBBIE is I have never seen her in a bad mood—never seen her in a bad mood. I was her whip representative, so I had to come and ask her how she was voting. She always has a smile on her face.

I congratulate you on your new role in Arizona. I think that the people of Arizona and you county are going to be so incredibly well-served. You will do a wonderful job for them.

I thank her for her service in Congress and thank her for her friendship and her kindness. I have been so grateful for the guidance you gave me as a freshman, and I am sure so many others, because that is the kind of person you are.

I think she is especially happy that I was elected because I took her spot on the Rules Committee. I am incredibly grateful that I have been able to call her a friend for the last 4 years. I have no doubt that she is going to continue to do incredible things in her public service.

I know you are excited about this new chapter. You are going to be missed here. Come and visit occasionally. God bless, and all the best in the world to you.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, this lady, MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS, is just an energizer bunny. Every place I go, she is there. I don't even know how she does it.

I yield to a friend and fellow Energy and Commerce Committee colleague. I remember we were on a boat somewhere and flying through—it was raining like heck, and I think she had a towel or something over her face. I don't know, but it was quite the experience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor DEBBIE LESKO, Representative LESKO.

Although I am not from Arizona, I would wonderfully be in Arizona to have her as my Representative.

Yes, indeed, we were on a boat in Grand Lake in Oklahoma for a Heat and Western Caucus event. You don't think of Oklahoma as being cold. It was cold and rainy and nasty, but we were troopers, and we were out there.

My next interaction with Mrs. LESKO was approaching her about steering and how to get on the Energy and Commerce Committee. She was gracious, kind, knowledgeable, a tremendous mentor, as she was to everybody. Honestly, I don't think I have ever seen DEBBIE smile as much as I have seen

her tonight and as I have watched this on video.

Getting on the Energy and Commerce Committee, she was just one tier above me. Although, I had served on the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis my first term between 2021 and 2022, she then came on the committee this term; so we were serving in the 118th Congress both on Energy and Commerce and on the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis.

You have heard a lot about her kindness, her mentoring, and her friendship. You have heard about her grace. You have heard how she is conservative, but not angry. That is such a great description of her.

What you didn't hear a lot about was her intellect. DEBBIE studies. She is smart. She is able to dissect through things. She is able to prioritize. She is able to condense very complex topics into a 5-minute question and answer period.

I am telling you, if you are the witness and you are giving testimony, you don't want to be on the bad side of DEBBIE LESKO. She won't be angry. She won't be vindictive. She won't use profanity, but you are going to know you have been taken to the cleaners.

She will come out with a statement. She will smile. She will lead up to it, and then, bam. You are going: Where did that come from? That is DEBBIE LESKO. That is the power of DEBBIE LESKO. That is the power of preparation.

In my time in the military, you learn: If you failed the plan, you planned to fail. She always plans. She is always on target. She always studies. She always reads. And quite honestly, isn't that what we, as Americans, want of our Congress people? If they are going to make laws, if they are going to hold government accountable, don't we want people that do the work that their constituents ask them to do? She is a role model for all of us and an inspiration on what a citizen servant should be.

Next, if you get to travel with her, you don't have to go on a boat in the rain in Oklahoma. You can go to some far-off country. She is a great shopping companion. She likes to try all different kinds of foods. She does her homework on the plane over and on the plane back.

She is just a genuine and lovely person to travel and be with. When Members of Congress have to travel places, especially far off, for the work that they do, you really want to have somebody in the seat next to you that is a joy to be with and not making all kinds of noises and all kinds of stuff. They are not high maintenance. She is a shining example of what a good travel companion and what a good Member of Congress is.

I am probably over my time. It has been a real joy to serve with DEBBIE LESKO these 4 years I have served with her. She was a tremendous asset to the Energy and Commerce Committee and

the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis that we served on together. She will be deeply missed. I will deeply miss her. She will be missed in our Conference for all of the reasons that everybody has said.

Mr. Speaker, we know she is going to continue to do great things for the people of Arizona. We wish her all the best. I know her husband is very happy to have her back.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, serving in the U.S. House of Representatives has been an honor of a lifetime, very surreal. As someone said before, I think my colleague GREG STANTON from Arizona, over 31 years ago, I left an abusive ex-husband, and I had a little daughter. There were times when I had no money. I remember there was a time when I had no place to live. I went to see if I could get into a shelter, and it was full. To go from that, just trying to survive, to serving here shows you that God is good, and America is good.

Going from that, to flying on Air Force One; to sitting in my apartment in Washington, D.C., and getting a call from the President of the United States, President Trump, from staying overnight and being invited to Camp David—which not too many people get to do—and to be one of only eight U.S. Congress Members to be selected by President Trump to serve on his impeachment defense team. Wow, just absolutely unbelievable.

In the 6 years and almost 8 months that I have been here, I have been part of history. I experienced so much history that has never happened before.

I served on the Judiciary Committee during both impeachments, but it went through committee on the first impeachment of President Trump. I saw firsthand how I thought it was so corrupt and politically motivated, and it disgusted me. I was so upset. I really studied hard. I studied all of the so-called evidence, and it was just a dark time in the United States.

I was there when Robert Mueller came to Judiciary Committee to testify, and we all prepared and it was kind of really a surprise of how he testified and wasn't able to answer certain questions.

I was here in Congress and lived through COVID when Speaker PELOSI mandated that we wear masks in all of the committees and on the floor; when Speaker PELOSI put metal detectors right outside of those doors and every single Member of Congress had to go through metal detectors as if we were some type of threat.

I was here when Speaker PELOSI instituted proxy voting on the floor. It never been done before in the history of the United States; not through different diseases, not through wars, but we did it here. I joined in the lawsuit against it, thinking it was unconstitutional.

□ 1900

I was here on January 6. That was just a crazy day.

I have had one heck of a ride, one heck of a ride here, and I have met so many great people. Truly, I believe that the vast majority of Congress Members are good people, good people who want to make a difference in our lives.

I have been able to help hundreds of constituents, and that is such a great feeling because they have come up to me, and some of these constituents have come up to me crying, saying: DEBBIE, you were able to help me. I was at my wit's end. I couldn't get my Social Security payment. I couldn't get my veteran benefit payment. Your office helped me.

That is really satisfying to me.

I was able to pass legislation. Not only was I a cosponsor of the big border bill securing the border and other great bills, but there were my own bills, the Save Our Gas Stoves Act and the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, which were passed out of this House.

I was able to serve on the prestigious Energy and Commerce Committee, the select subcommittee on COVID-19, the Judiciary Committee, the Rules Committee, the Homeland Security Committee, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. What an honor it has been.

I also served on the whip team and on the steering committee where we would select which Republicans served on which committees and which Republicans served as chairman or ranking member on the committees.

I have made a lot of great friends, some of them are here today, and I will never forget you.

Now, it is time for me to move on. I have a great family at home. My mother is 95. My loving husband is home. I have three kids. I have six grandkids. I have a brother and a sister who all live within 20 minutes of my house. I am here in Washington, D.C., 60, 70 percent of the time. There is something wrong with that picture.

As I leave, it is kind of bittersweet, but I am happy. I am happy I am going home, and I am happy I have had this experience of my lifetime. I will never regret it.

I thank my constituents who have always put their trust in me, the voters in my district; President Trump, who has supported me; my staff that has worked in my congressional office either now or in the past and the staff here at the Capitol. You have been great people, and I won't forget it.

Thank you, and God bless all of you as God has blessed me.

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

DISCUSSION ABOUT DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona. I didn't get a

chance to get down here in time during the time that was set aside to honor her service, but I am glad I was down here and was able to get down at the tail end of it to hear her speech.

It has been an honor. We were classmates. We came in together, served together.

I remember when the gentlewoman told us that she wasn't running again. I found her on the floor, and I said: So, what is going on? Why aren't you staying with us? And she said one word, family. That is the right answer.

You have been a great patriot. Congress is far better for having had you in it, and we will miss you. We know you won't be too far away, and we hope to see you here.

God bless you. Spend time with your family. I feel the pain of being away as you do. I will be very happy for you, but I will give you a few floor speeches to watch every once in a while here just for fun.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight because there is a lot of talk going on right now about what has been referred to as DOGE, this effort by our friends Elon and Vivek with respect to the Department of Government Efficiency.

I am not 100 percent clear yet what that looks like in terms of formality, how the incoming President, President Trump, plans to establish it and set it up.

We had some great meetings today with those two men and Members of Congress who are interested in facilitating their work.

My only problem with the named Department of Government Efficiency is I would refer to it as the department of government elimination. I think we would be a lot better off if we were eliminating large swaths of that which has been unconstitutionally created to rack up \$36 trillion in debt.

I think what merits observation is what this body needs to do to actually deliver on what people are, I think, to some degree across the country, getting excited about with respect to the prospect of the brain power that has been assembled around this department, DOGE, or this effort. Congress has to actually do our part.

We had a meeting today. There was a lot of conversation back and forth, and there were a whole lot of Members of Congress who were looking to them to say to please do this. One Member said to please help give us the fortitude, the spine, to be able to deliver on removing and cutting this waste in government.

Look, to be very clear, the use of technology, crowdsourcing, AI by these guys and other smart people around the country, the use of technology, observe it, figure out what to do with it, great. I am for it.

I support their efforts. I support efforts by the incoming President and his staff, his administration, to, frankly, massively slash and burn the bureaucracy that is sucking away, frankly, the life of the American people through

overregulation, overspending, and driving up inflation because we keep spending more and more money in this vast bureaucracy. You can't even keep up with it.

I have a bill that I introduced a few years ago, the Count the Crimes to Cut Act. Do you know why? Nobody can tell me how many crimes there are. Literally, nobody can tell me how many crimes there are in the Federal Government. Does anybody see that as a problem? We literally don't even know how many—forget cataloging them all, organizing them all, figuring out how much of them are repeated or overburdensome or perhaps out of line. We don't even know, and I can't even get that bill through the committee and down to the floor. Members of this body don't want to know how many crimes there are so we can maybe go observe and try to do something about it?

On this score is where I believe Elon and Vivek can add massive value. They don't necessarily need us to pass something to go count the crimes. They can just use technology, AI, crowdsourcing, work and put a whole lot of effort into doing that because, frankly, a lot of people don't understand this, but we are pretty short-staffed here as it relates to our offices on Capitol Hill dealing with constituents services, dealing with the stuff we deal with all the time. Having an army of people and being able to leverage that is going to be really important.

Now, let's cut to the chase. The fact of the matter is, too many Members of the United States Congress are all too excited to hide behind Elon and Vivek to do the work they are supposed to do. That is the truth. I saw colleagues going to the mike thanking them saying, oh, please save us from the scourge of bureaucracy.

Well, what the hell is our job? We actually do have separation of powers. We actually are Article I. We actually do have the ability to use the power of the purse to constrain the leviathan and the executive branch. We just never do it ever.

If we dare try, oh, the scorn, oh, the look from your colleagues when you dare come down and object to a consent request, as I did, for \$19 billion. That seems trivial now, doesn't it? I objected to a consent request for \$19 billion in 2019 for Hurricane Harvey relief predominantly heavily in my home State of Texas.

A unanimous consent request was being offered on the floor. I was at the airport. I got word that they were going to do this by consent. I thought, wait a minute, they are going to pass \$19 billion by unanimous consent on the floor of the House, and we are not there, and it is not paid for.

Well, it might be meritorious in some respects. I don't know, but I would have to look at the funding and what it is going to be used for in Texas. There are people hurting in Texas, but we have to pay for it. We certainly don't pass things for \$19 billion by consent.

Mr. Speaker, I got in my car, canceled the flight, got in a car, an Uber, came back here to the Hill, and ran down on the floor, and I objected.

Do you know what happened back in Texas? The usual suspects, the newspapers, the editorial boards, the people who like to have wailing and gnashing of teeth, and the wine-sipping crowds of the elites in the cities in Austin, they are all like: Oh, you are the devil. This is horrible. How could you do this?

A funny thing happened, and this is my message to my colleagues, my constituents, even though, again, my district wasn't as directly impacted by Harvey, fair, but my constituents and other people around the State of Texas took notice that maybe if a Member of Congress says there ought to be some principles that guide what we do and that there is a right way to do things, maybe our country would be better off. Maybe we wouldn't have \$36 trillion of debt.

I would mention right now, in that very same context, we are currently considering a disaster supplemental bill again. Every year, we consider some sort of disaster supplemental bill. Why is that? That is because the world has events. They have always had events. Galveston was hit at the turn of the last century. It was wiped out. There have been floods. There have been fires. There have been constant issues, tornadoes. This isn't all related to climate change. It is over the course of the history of mankind. In fact, our use of technology makes us able to manage those better, our use of energy. We can manage that better by abundant, reliable energy.

What happens is every year there is something that strikes at our heart. There was Katrina in 2005, Ike, Harvey, what happened in Hawaii. Go down the list of things that we care about. We are in a massive drought in Texas, a massive drought.

We have all sorts of different things that pop up. So here we are, and we have \$113 billion that has been put forward from the administration under the name of disaster relief.

There are all manners of things in that bill, and we are looking at those things: replenish the disaster relief fund, what we call the DRF, \$40 billion; \$16 billion for some stuff on defense; another pot of money for farmers who have had issues across the country related to disaster and otherwise; and go down the list to the tune of \$111 billion or \$113 billion.

It is not paid for. It is just another check-writing exercise, but it is the writing of a check by printing of money because that is what we do. There is no limiting principle.

My question for anybody watching this is: What do you think the limiting principle ought to be for the elected Representatives you send here to represent you? Is it, well, man, that is a really sympathetic thing; write the check. Is that our limiting principle?

"CHIP, there are people hurting in North Carolina." Yes, I know. I pray for them. We try to support organizations like Samaritan's Purse and others that help.

□ 1915

I have had colleagues like CORY MILLS who went in early trying to deal with disaster relief. The last time I checked, the State of North Carolina is not a Third World country that has no resources or abilities. They have a very robust economy and a very strong State.

Are they unable to issue bonds?

Are they unable to find ways to come up with their own dollars to build their own infrastructure and rebuild?

The State of Texas when we have a calamity—the State of Texas is literally the eighth biggest economy in the world. Just Texas is the eighth largest economy in the world. Other than immediate disaster relief using the resources of the National Guard or the resources at FEMA where you have an actual emergency, where you have got to move people and help them deal with being in floods, we all help each other out. Send the resources, yes, Governors, go help.

However, we are now 1 month later, 2 months later.

Why is the State of Texas not able to deal with a disaster?

Are we unable to deal with it?

We have, I think, almost a \$400 billion biennial budget, i.e., roughly a \$200 billion a year budget in Texas.

So is Texas, the eighth largest economy, are we not able to deal with disasters?

I think we can. I think most States in this country can. I think most of us can do what we need to do.

The Federal Government doesn't need to be an ATM, but that is what we are turning it into.

If there isn't a limiting principle on printing money, then how can DOGE be successful?

Someone explain to me how all the efforts by Elon, all of the efforts by Vivek, and all of the efforts of the incoming Office of Management and Budget and President Trump, if this body, if this Congress, if this Republican majority does nothing but do the same old thing we have always done, which is come down here and write checks that have no backing, we are literally the Fed just printing money, then how can we possibly limit the size, the scope, and the growth of the Federal Government?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, look in the mirror. Don't look for a fiscal savior. Don't look for salvation for the future of the country's well-being with some folks over in the executive branch or who are friends with the executive branch who are going to provide us great information. Be grateful for it, but remember when we go through the appropriations process, it is our job. They can make the executive branch more efficient, yes, but we

are the ones who create these departments and create these programs. We are supposed to authorize them, but we don't.

The Homeland Security Department was created over 20 years ago. We have never reauthorized it. It is insane. There are 200 and something thousand employees at the Department of Homeland Security. We have never reauthorized it. That is our job, but all we do is sit around and shrug our shoulders and say: Well, man, have you been to the mountains of Western North Carolina? It is just awful.

We have to write that check.

What if I say: Okay, fine. God bless these awesome Americans. They need assistance. Yeah, fine, you don't have to pay for it. Write the check.

Then what?

Do we write the next check?

Do we just keep printing money for everybody's illness?

Mr. Speaker, do you know that right now under FEMA we are using FEMA emergency dollars to pay for COVID-related burials?

Why? Why?

It is because somebody declared an emergency at some point, the administration was given large pots of money, and now everybody just shrugs and walks away.

The fact of the matter is the President, President Trump, was elected in, in today's time, what you could describe as a landslide. In today's divided world with what we call the trifecta, Republicans will control the House, and Republicans will control the Senate. They are pretty thin majorities in both Chambers.

The question that will be for Republicans is: What are we going to do? Will we deliver?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we are not going to truly deliver unless at least two things are true, and I think there are three, four, or five, but at least two things are true.

One, we fully secure the border and undo the damage caused by the open borders of the last 4-plus years; and two, we stop spending money we don't have. If we can't do those two things, then we won't have a country left.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sitting here telling you that I think we can balance the \$2 trillion deficit in 1 year. I think that would be difficult to continue to have economic growth and do what we need to do. However, I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that we need to actually be serious because I would say to my fellow Republicans, I have said that we need to repeal the Inflation Reduction Act, which is subsidizing Chinese wind and solar. It is now putting American companies on the hook, and they are wanting to get the big drug high of getting more money and more subsidies.

We are now turning ourselves away from what is the strength of the reliable American oil and gas industry. We are driving up the cost of goods and driving up inflation all under the Inflation Reduction Act.

My view is, and the view of most Americans, and I promise you, virtually everybody in this Chamber—not all—we ran on repealing the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, ending those subsidies, returning to market forces determining the best reliable energy and, importantly, stop spending money we don't have for the subsidies to enrich the Chinese and enrich our enemies who undermine our own well-being.

A handful of my colleagues signed a letter saying that they don't want to do that.

Let me just posit: What if I am successful?

What if we are successful and we repeal it?

What have we done?

We have returned to the status quo of 2022.

Basically, on that issue I am begging to return to the halcyon days of old in 2022 when everything was great, deficits were great, and everything was wonderful.

I am being sarcastic.

So if I am successful, I fight, and I struggle for all the people who don't want to tell their big corporations "no," who are now hooked on the subsidies, because that is what is going to happen, including Texas, I am looking at you, Texas, all your big oil and gas companies are getting on the hook because they like free money. It ain't free, by the way. They like subsidies they can turn into current-day profits at the expense of your children's future. It is because they don't care because they will get a good earnings report, and they will make money now.

However, the debt will keep going up and the dollar will keep getting weakened and inflation will keep being real.

So if we can do it, if we can repeal it, if we are successful, then all we will do is rewind the clock to 2022. If we return to pre-COVID spending, Mr. Speaker, all you do is return the clock to 2020. That would basically save us \$200 billion a year.

Repealing the so-called Inflation Reduction Act and ending those subsidies would save us, oh, probably about \$70 billion a year over 10 years.

What if we secure the border tomorrow?

Now, mind you, Mr. Speaker, securing the border even under President Trump meant we had 30,000 or so a month still coming across the border. Let's just say we secure the border.

Now what are we doing with the, what, 10 million people or so who are now in our country that weren't?

Okay, let's repatriate them.

How many will we repatriate?

We would have to repatriate them all just to return to the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, my point of all this is: If you want to transform the country, then we need transformative policies, and you need a Congress willing to do it. You need a Congress willing to actually deliver on what they said they would do.

This is a refrain I have offered in a number of speeches here on the floor of the House. They are not always that well received. I gave a speech saying: Name one thing. Some of my colleagues got a little mad, as I said, the best way to do that is to do the thing, deliver.

However, we are \$36 trillion in debt. If we do everything I just said, if we renew the Trump tax cuts from 2017 and we extend them so that everybody's taxes—again, I am going back to my point, go to the status quo. If we do all of those things, then we will be struggling just to get to deficit neutrality on the issue, meaning we will still be at \$2 trillion of debt a year.

Now, if Elon, Vivek and company can find a bunch of waste and we can cut that out and then we can use that to either bring back savings or maybe cut down on drugs or take that money and use it for additional things that would be better, say, the Pentagon. Okay, that is great, maybe we will save a little bit.

However, if you save 30 percent of our discretionary budget, let's say they go and they hack out just mountains of waste, fire bureaucrats, and one-third, 33 percent, of the discretionary budget just goes away, poof, that is about \$600 billion. We are running about a \$2 trillion deficit. I am just trying to put this in perspective.

I am for that.

Do you know why I am for it, Mr. Speaker?

Fire the bureaucrats, end the weaponization, end the waste, and end the people who are targeting us. Make them have to go out and get a real job. I am for all of those things, and our country would be better off. If we do it, then we will earn the right to deal with mandatory spending.

I said to some of my colleagues today in a meeting when Vivek and Elon were here, and I pointed out that we have a \$113 billion bill on the floor for the disaster supplemental. I am pointing out that it is not going to be paid for. I am pointing out it is going to continue to perpetuate waste. I am talking about a bike path in Alaska, COVID spending across the country, and I think a church parking lot in Vermont. I mean, I could go down a laundry list of things that the current FEMA emergency funding is being used for, Mr. Speaker. Then we are going to just throw another \$40 billion at it after we have been criticizing FEMA all through the fall about how incompetent they are and how bad they are.

We will say: Do you know what your reward is?

Here is more money, keep doing your bureaucratic thing. Don't worry, Elon and Vivek will save us. That is because we sure as hell aren't going to save us.

That is what we do.

My perspective is we should look in the mirror. We should do our job and constrain that spending. Don't give it to bureaucrats. Do our part. Find the savings and do what we can do to make it work.

However, do you know what my colleagues said?

My colleagues said: Well, CHIP, the discretionary spending doesn't matter because of the point I said a minute ago. If you cut one-third of it, then you save \$600 billion, and you still have a \$2 trillion deficit.

Why?

It is because we have made promises for at least one-half a century on Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid and increasingly on veterans' benefits that we can't keep up with. Then Republicans go around pounding their chest on tax policy: We will cut taxes so we will create economic growth. We will bring in revenue, and we will ignore the deficits.

I am for the tax cuts, but if you are not doing the spending cuts, then you end up with \$36 trillion in debt.

Republicans need to look in the mirror. If my colleagues think we are going to just waltz in to a reconciliation debate in January and it is all going to be kumbaya because K Street wants tax cuts and because certain people think that they are going to get their bread buttered, but we are not going to focus on deficits, then I would just suggest that maybe they think long and hard about the calendar that the House put out whereby we are only here 3 days a week, 3 weeks a month, and maybe we should follow the Senate calendar, which to his great credit the incoming leader put out, 5 days a week every week for the first 3 months of the year.

We were elected to do something different, and by goodness, we are going to do something different. We must. We have no choice. Failure is not an option.

I will make just one other point in closing here as we deal with all of that on the spending issue. I watched the Senate Republicans doing this dance of hand-wringing and concern about the President's nominees.

The President was elected by the American people to change this town. He has nominated people who want to change this town. Mr. Speaker, if you want to go turn over every rock of everybody's past and then say that they are not capable or they don't deserve to serve in a position like Secretary of Defense as is currently occurring with the targeted attacks on Pete Hegseth, then maybe you should take the board out of your eye.

I am not saying that we don't have standards that are appropriate in the advise-and-consent process. We do, and we should. I am a believer in that separation of powers. However, the President also is deserving of the courtesy and the respect of his own party, in particular, of the individuals he is nominating to change the town.

He was elected to change it.

You don't like Tulsi because she is a Democrat?

Get over it. She is not anymore. She is a Republican now, but she was. In this Chamber, I served with her, she was a Democrat.

You don't like Bobby Kennedy because he is from an iconic Democrat family?

Get over it. I don't agree with Bobby Kennedy on a lot of different things, but I agree with him that we need to fundamentally change our healthcare system and that we need to make America healthy again.

I agree with Tulsi that we have been involved in endless wars and endless conflict that is draining our resources and undermining our men and women in uniform.

□ 1930

I agree with Pete Hegseth that wokeism is destroying the United States military. I agree with Pete that we don't need to have endless wars. I agree with Pete that we ought to have somebody who has served in battle and understands it who is at the top of the Pentagon, rather than the brass, who, frankly, often like the ribbons more than actually doing the work that is necessary to defend this country.

I like the fact that we have people who the President is nominating who will take on the establishment and take on, for example, the FBI with Kash Patel.

The fact of the matter is we have Senators who are wanting to challenge it. For example, the Senator from Iowa who is going after Pete Hegseth, or seemingly, being critical. This is the same Senator, by the way, who voted for an NDAA that would draft our daughters and has been fighting to draft our daughters.

I tell her: You will do that over my dead body. There will be no draft of my daughter.

She voted for The Respect for Marriage Act to codify gay marriage. She went out to her constituents and talked about how the horrible Senate border bill was somehow a good bill and then scolded President Trump for opposing it. She voted for Garland for Attorney General, voted for Lloyd Austin for Defense, voted for Buttigieg for DOT, voted for Janet Yellen, voted for Ukraine's borders over America's borders.

With all due respect to the Senator from Iowa, she is not where the American people are. President Trump is, and Pete Hegseth is.

We have an obligation to change this town, or we are going to lose this country. If Republicans do not deliver and if we do not do what we said we would do, this party will end. There will not be a Republican Party if we fail in this term, this Congress, to deliver.

That is not hyperbole. It is true. We will go the way of the whigs. We will secure the border. We will return order to our streets. We will cut spending. We will move toward balancing our budgets.

As the President has nominated, we will confirm people who will change this town and take on the bureaucracy. We will listen to and work with Elon and Vivek, root out the waste and fraud, but do it ourselves.

We will pass bills that actually get the job done. We will undo the damage of the Biden administration, replace it with a legacy that our kids and grandkids can be proud of, root out the wokeism, root out all of the DEI and the critical race theory. Kill it. Kill it now.

We will do these things, or we will not exist. We will organize ourselves as a Conference to do those things, or we won't succeed.

Our job between now, the first week of December, and the first week of January is to get our heads in the right places. They currently aren't there.

We are not structured right now to deliver, and we have 1 month to do it. That is my calling. We are not here to take breaks. We are not here for codels. We are not here for trips. We are here to get the job done.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2950. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Coastal Program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to work with willing partners and provide support to efforts to assess, protect, restore, and enhance important coastal landscapes that provide fish and wildlife habitat on which certain Federal trust species depend, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5302. An act to designate the Air and Marine Operations Marine Unit of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection located at 101 Km 18.5 in Cabo Rojo, Puerto Rico, as the "Michel O. Maceda Marine Unit".

H.R. 5536. An act to require transparency in notices of funding opportunity, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5799. An act to designate the checkpoint of the United States Border Patrol located on United States Highway 90 West in Uvalde County, Texas, as the "James R. Dominguez Border Patrol Checkpoint".

H.R. 7218. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to extend the program for promotion of public health knowledge and awareness of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7438. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the FIFA World Cup 2026, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7764. An act to establish a commission to study the potential transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8932. An act to establish an earlier application processing cycle for the FAFSA.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title.

S. 3960.—An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide a good faith exception to the imposition of fines for false assertions and certifications, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 6, 2024, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-6299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-072, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-6300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 24-071, pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-6301. A letter from the Chief Regulatory Officer, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security and Department of Labor, transmitting the Departments' temporary rule — Exercise of Time-Limited Authority To Increase the Numerical Limitation for FY 2025 for the H-2B Temporary Nonagricultural Worker Program and Portability Flexibility for H-2B Workers Seeking To Change Employers [CIS No.: 2788-25] (RIN: 1615-AC95); [DOL Docket No.: ETA-2024-0002] (RIN: 1205-AC20) received December 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6302. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Interagency Waster Workforce Working Group Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300j-19e(c)(4)(B); Public Law 115-270, title IV, Sec. 4304(4)(B) (as added by Public Law 117-58, Sec. 50211(2)(D)); (135 Stat. 1171); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-6303. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final action — Medicare Program; Changes to the Fiscal Year 2025 Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) Rates Due to Court Decision [CMS-1808-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AV34) received October 2, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3284. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit an annual report on the impact of certain Medicare regulations on provider and payer consolidation, with an amendment (Rept. 118-765, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture as a member of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-798, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6322. A bill to evaluate and disrupt financing to Hamas, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit the exchange stabilization fund from being used to deal in Special Drawing Rights from state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-799, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 8302. A bill to establish a commission to review the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and make recommendations for legislative reforms, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-800, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5409. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to require the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to determine whether a national security review is needed for reportable agricultural land transactions referred by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-801, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5557. A bill to impose sanctions against certain persons engaged in the proliferation or use of foreign commercial spyware, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-802, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6000. A bill to freeze \$6,000,000,000 of Iranian funds held in Qatar, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-803, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 760. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Communist Chinese military and surveillance companies; with an amendment (Rept. 118-804, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5523. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include information in the International Narcotics Control Strategy Report on improvements by countries in combating narcotics-related money laundering, to require a report on the consistency of Bank Secrecy Act examinations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-805, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5945. A bill to reinstate certain sanctions imposed with respect to Iran; with an amendment (Rept. 118-806, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9313. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to report to Congress on the compliance under the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 of all office buildings under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the General Services Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9541. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize Federal agencies to provide certain essential assistance for hazard mitigation for electric utilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-808). Referred to the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 6083. A bill to amend the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 to extend waiver of duplicate benefits limitation for certain payments to individuals in the event of a major disaster, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9591. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to sell certain property related to United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9750. A bill to authorize the President to provide disaster assistance to States and Indian Tribes under a major disaster recovery program, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 118-811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9037. A bill to require the development of a workforce plan for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Rept. 118-812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9024. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to take certain actions relating to incident periods and extreme weather, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 118-813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2892. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the effectiveness of local alerting systems, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 118-814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 6984. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 300 E. 3rd Street in North Platte, Nebraska, as the "Virginia Smith Federal Building", and for other purposes (Rept. 118-815). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 8728. A bill to establish alternate procedures for lump sum payments for certain covered small disasters, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 118-816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 9121. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to allow Indian Tribal Governments to directly request fire management assistance declarations and grants, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 8530. A bill to require Facility Security Committees to respond to security recommendations issued by the Federal Protective Service relating to facility security, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 6435.

A bill to ensure that a declaration for a major disaster or emergency is made on a timely basis, rural areas receive assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 9749. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to abolish the reorganization authority of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4406. A bill to require reporting regarding accreditation of basic training programs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 118-821 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1165. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to modernize the protection of the nonpublic personal information of individuals with whom financial institutions have customer or consumer relationship, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILLS

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3378. Referral to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

H.R. 4406. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

H.R. 5409. Referral to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

H.R. 6322. Referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

H.R. 8302. Referral to the Committee on Rules extended for a period ending not later than December 19, 2024.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BURLISON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. OGLES, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. ROY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ESTES, Mr. BRECHEEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. KUSTOFF):

H.R. 10299. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit Federal financial participation for gun violence prevention or intervention programs under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. MALOY,

Mr. OWENS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. BARR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 10300. A bill to provide for congressional review of rules with respect to which the agency explicitly relied on Chevron deference in the notice of proposed rulemaking or a Federal court upheld the rule based on Chevron deference; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Accountability, Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 10301. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to accelerate actions necessary to carry out caisson services at Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 10302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow employers to contribute to ABLE accounts in lieu of retirement plan contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 10303. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to assist projects that use nonlethal coexistence measures to reduce property damage caused by native beavers, a keystone species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FROST (for himself and Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK):

H.R. 10304. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to revise section 61.206 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to approve certain distribution or use of phosphogypsum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARBARINO (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 10305. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt certain drugs from the part D manufacturer discount program under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 10306. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a right-of-way for an emergency exit on certain National Park Service land in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 10307. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program under which a TRICARE Prime beneficiary may access obstetrical and gynecological care without a referral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. WIED, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIFFANY, and Ms. VAN DUYN):

H.R. 10308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for payments to certain individuals who dye fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 10309. A bill to make certain funds available to provide assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in response to Hurricane Helene and Hurricane Milton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. KILEY):

H.R. 10310. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish a procedure to dismiss and deter strategic lawsuits against public participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 10311. A bill to provide a private right of action for persons harmed by violations of the Franchise Rule of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 10312. A bill to authorize workforce development innovation grants for the implementation, expansion, and evaluation of evidence-based workforce programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 10313. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the automatic extension of residential leases during the deployment of the lessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. OMAR, Ms. BALINT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 10314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a National Resilience and Recovery Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 10315. A bill to withhold bilateral, multilateral, and humanitarian non-defense foreign assistance with respect to which of the President has declared a disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 10316. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require creditors to consider certain additional credit information when making mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H. Res. 1608. A resolution directing the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives to release to the public the committee's report on its investigation into alle-

gations against former Representative Matt Gaetz; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. Res. 1609. A resolution directing the Committee on Ethics to preserve and release records of the Committee's review of the alleged misconduct of Matthew Louis Gaetz II of Florida while serving as a Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ethics.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

ML-156. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Resolution 22, urging the Congress to remove the exception from the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution: "except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted"; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H.Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 10299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution states the Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Prohibits federal funds from going to "gun violence prevention programs or gun violence intervention programs" under the Medicaid program

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 10300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for congressional review of rules with respect to which the agency explicitly relied on Chevron deference in the notice of proposed rulemaking or a Federal court upheld the rule based on Chevron deference.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 10301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require the Secretary of the Army to accelerate actions necessary to carry out caisson services at Arlington National Cemetery.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 10302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow employers to contribute to ABLE accounts in lieu of retirement plan contributions.

By Ms. DELLBENE:

H.R. 10303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill creates a non-lethal beaver coexistence measures pilot grant program.

By Mr. FROST:

H.R. 10304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to revise section 61.206 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to approve certain distribution or use of phosphogypsum, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 10305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8.

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill would exempt certain drugs from the part D manufacturer discount program under the Medicare program.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 10306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To direct the Department of Interior to issue a right-of-way permit for an emergency road, provided certain conditions are met

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 10307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution

The Single Subject of this legislation is:

This legislation will implement a pilot program to remove the requirement for TRICARE Prime participants to receive a referral for obstetric and gynecologic care and services.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Federal taxation

By Mr. OGLE:

H.R. 10309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

Makes certain funds available to provide assistance under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in response to Hurricane Helene and Hurricane Milton, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 10310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend title 28, United States Code, to establish a procedure to dismiss and deter strategic lawsuits against public participation.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 10311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce

with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Creates a private right of action for individuals harmed by violations of the Federal Trade Commission's Franchise Rule. The rule requires franchisors to disclose certain relevant information to prospective franchisees.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 10312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America

The single subject of this legislation is:

Funding evidence-based workforce development programs to boost jobs and wages for working families

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 10313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the automatic extension of residential leases during the deployment of the lessee, and for other purposes.

By Ms. STANSBURY:

H.R. 10314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a National Resilience and Recovery Fund, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 10315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:

To withhold bilateral, multilateral, and humanitarian non-defense foreign assistance with respect to which of the President has declared a disaster under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 10316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill requires the consideration of additional credit information by a mortgage lender when evaluating a consumer's creditworthiness if a consumer requests that this information be considered. This additional information includes current payment and transaction information such as bank statements and rental payment history.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mrs. LEE CARTER.
H.R. 33: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 205: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 531: Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 549: Mr. VASQUEZ.
H.R. 1222: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1249: Mr. OGLE.
H.R. 1561: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 1666: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1671: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 1728: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1732: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 1787: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2414: Mr. LANDSMAN.

H.R. 2730: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2802: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2955: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 2992: Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3124: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 3503: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 3610: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 3875: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3923: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4006: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 4189: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 4249: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 4263: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 4285: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 4896: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4987: Mr. AMO.
H.R. 5012: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 5200: Mr. RULLI.
H.R. 5308: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5459: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 5547: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5563: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 5685: Mrs. MCIVER.
H.R. 5725: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 5785: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 5995: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 6041: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H.R. 6415: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 6759: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 6950: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 7002: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 7039: Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. SYKES, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 7132: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 7174: Mr. JAMES.
H.R. 7248: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 7297: Mr. SORENSEN.
H.R. 7416: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 7442: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 7481: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 7779: Ms. CARAVEO and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 7820: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 7905: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 8147: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 8390: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 8492: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8753: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 8977: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 8996: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 9094: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 9096: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 9233: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 9263: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 9272: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 9297: Mr. NUNN of Iowa.
H.R. 9382: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 9535: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 9581: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 9602: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 9647: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 9689: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 9855: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 9912: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 9950: Mr. ALFORD.
H.R. 10017: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 10045: Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 10073: Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TOKUDA, and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 10103: Mr. KILEY.
H.R. 10186: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 10215: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 10230: Mr. DELUZIO and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 10257: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 10268: Ms. TITUS and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 10284: Mr. PERRY and Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 10287: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mrs. HAYES.
H. Res. 1350: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 1545: Mrs. TORRES of California and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.